

The resolution (H. Res. 474) was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
March 16, 1944.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of six Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in connection with the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, late a Representative from the State of New York, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 272) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 272

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause the Vice President appointed Mr. WAGNER and Mr. MEAD as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 20, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of February 7), 1944.

THE JUDICIARY

Claude P. Stephens, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky, vice John T. Metcalf, resigned.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Ernest Gruening, of New York, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from February 9, 1944

Lt. Col. Hubert Rellly Harmon, Air Corps (temporary major general).

To be colonel with rank from March 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Benjamin Greeley Ferris, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Charles Samuel Ritchel, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Thomas Guerdon Hearn, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Donald Henley, Infantry.

Lt. Col. Joseph Daly Coughlan, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Reese Maughan Howell, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Henry Jervis Friese Miller, Air Corps (temporary major general), subject to examination required by law.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. William Donaldson Fleming, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 6, 1944.

Lt. Col. Samuel Demetrius Avery, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 9, 1944.

Lt. Col. Francis Joseph Clune, Medical Corps, with rank from April 10, 1944.

Lt. Col. George Edward Lindow, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 16, 1944.

Lt. Col. Jaime Julian Figueras, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 20, 1944.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. William Elder Sankey, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 17, 1944.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. James Harvey Pence, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 1, 1944.

To be captain

First Lt. S. Kingdon Avery, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 19, 1944.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Herbert Kelly Moore, Veterinary Corps, with rank from April 1, 1944.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Harry Dubois Southard, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from April 4, 1944.

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Henry Hingson, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from April 15, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Thomas L. Sprague, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of April 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL

James Harold Doolittle

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father, we praise Him who hath granted unto us exceeding great and precious promises that through them we might become sharers in the divine inheritance; to these let us add strong faith, self-control, endurance, and godliness. Inspire us to hallow our gifts, time, and influence. Thou, Lord of the temple, reveal Thyself in light, in grace, and in all goodness, full of blessings.

Impress us, blessed Master, that the measure of our labor and diligence is the measure of our success. Every earnest endeavor to serve God and man and every temptation mastered is added strength in that chamber where a man meets himself. As legislators, chosen by a free people, our responsibilities are outstanding and tremendous; we pray that they may be marked by loftiness of purpose and distinguished by the moral law and not by the rigor and rudeness of selfishness. Heavenly Father, let our sense of truth and honor be on the very highest plane, as a lamp shining in a dark place until the day dawns and the morning star rises in our hearts. Grant that the glorious realities of patriotic citizenship may dominate and be reflected in every group throughout our broad land. Unto our Saviour be glory both now and to the day of eternity. Amen.

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

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

FEBRUARY 29, 1944.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Sincerely yours,

EMORY H. PRICE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

MARCH 15, 1944.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation from the following committees: The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Committee on Accounts.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN D. McWILLIAMS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 470), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That EMORY H. PRICE, of the State of Florida, and WILLIAM A. ROWAN, of the State of Illinois, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Naval Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 471), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN D. McWILLIAMS, of Connecticut, is hereby elected to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

LABOR'S PERFORMANCE IN PRODUCING IMPLEMENTS OF WAR

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter I have received from Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOCH and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the record.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SOUND FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE UNITED STATES

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. I assume that most every Member in this Chamber reads David Lawrence, the columnist. I wish to read into the RECORD an article by him, as it is commendable to Congress. It appears in the Washington Star of March 6 and reads as follows:

CONGRESS DOES A GOOD JOB—ANALYSIS SHOWS FINANCES OF THE UNITED STATES SOUNDER THAN ANY COUNTRY IN THE WORLD

When American people do a good job they should be commended for it. When Congress does a good job it should be commended too, and the facts are that the finances of the Government of the United States are in better shape than those of any other government in the world, and better still, than they have been since the outbreak of the war. The story should be broadcast as widely as possible.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

SIMPLIFIED INCOME-TAX RETURN

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I notice present on the floor the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], ranking member on the minority side. There is a great deal in the newspapers about simplification of tax returns. I understand the Treasury Department has extended the time until April 15 for the filing of tentative returns on 1944 income. In the event this Congress fails to simplify the returns before that date, I believe there will be further reaction against the Congress for having led the people to believe that a simplification would be forthcoming, and then the returns have to be filed under the same old rules.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The Ways and Means Committee is working on simplification now, and we hope to have the basic points agreed upon this week, so that we will be ready to report a bill to the House within the next few weeks.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I am interested in, so that we will get it passed before April 15.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a newspaper article quoting Dr. Ruthven, president of the University of Michigan, regarding the effort of Federal agencies to build political power through the public schools.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the Polish question, which appears in a magazine printed in England, entitled "The Nineteenth Century and After," by Mr. F. A. Voigt, its editor. I have taken this matter up with the Public Printer, who advises me it exceeds the amount allowed under the regulations, and that the total cost will be \$195. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JEWISH HOMELAND IN PALESTINE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HCRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short radio address delivered by a young man at the Malvern Preparatory School on the soldiers' vote bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

JEWISH HOMELAND IN PALESTINE

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his remarks on the subject of the Wright-Compton resolution.

Unfortunately my views on the Wright-Compton resolution have been misinterpreted. Ofttimes in the heat of debate gratuitous remarks are injected, which, uncorrelated with definite aims heretofore expressed, may give erroneous impressions. I am and ever have been for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

As to the pending resolution, I shall oppose any amendment that militates against the establishment of such a commonwealth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann appearing in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CEILING PRICE ON STRAWBERRIES

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL ACT

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I recently spent a few days in my district and I returned to Washington with a clear impression that the people almost unanimously favor an extension of the Price Control Act. I am glad to learn that the chairman of the Banking Committee [Mr. SPENCE] has introduced a bill to provide for such extension. I also wish to endorse in its entirety the statement issued during my absence by three of my colleagues on that committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG], and the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN], urging prompt and full hearings on the bill.

I join them in urging that the administration of the act be fully considered so that the agency may meet its real purpose of preventing runaway prices and at the same time avoid needless and oppressive hardships upon our people. In my opinion the public will be greatly interested in these hearings and will fully approve efforts to correct legislative and administrative weaknesses in this program.

WASHINGTON, N. C., FIRST TOWN NAMED AFTER WASHINGTON

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a short speech by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a very conscientious constituent of mine which reads in part, as follows:

I guess it is foolish of me in my declining years to be so concerned about our freedom

and future. But I wish more people were more sensitive to our real position in the world. Our Nation now bankrupt and the planners and spenders still looking for ways to spend. When the final day of reckoning comes the children will begin to cry and those responsible will be gone and the generation responsible for having the Belshazzler feast today will bemoan their fate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Houston Chronicle on the subject of lend-lease aid to Russia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor on lend-lease.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a short article from the Washington Star of March 15.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by printing therein an editorial written by former Governor Cox, of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THANKS AND APPRECIATION

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my sincere gratitude to the many colleagues of mine in the Congress who communicated with my office and with me during my recent illness. It is a source of much gratification to have your friends interested in you when you are sick. I am certainly happy, however, to be back with you and to be again associated with such fine colleagues.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] expressed apprehen-

sion and alarm over an alleged agreement that has been entered into between the United States and several of the larger United Nations pertaining to post-war finance. As I recall, the Speaker appointed a special committee some months ago to which the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and myself were appointed. The able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] was named chairman. That committee was to keep track of post-war planning, which I presumed would embrace post-war financing abroad. To my knowledge that committee has never held a meeting. It would be shocking indeed for this administration to enter into fast and binding agreements with other countries without at least doing the Congress the courtesy of advising in advance what it is proposed to do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize very much with what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] have just said. Under our present rules of congressional procedure, and especially under the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate for ratification of treaties, we must expect the Executive more and more to act in international matters without consulting the Congress. It occurs to me that all these committees investigating post-war collaboration will become absolutely futile unless and until the constitutional provision requiring a two-thirds vote in the Senate to ratify treaties is changed.

This Congress in effect has no voice now whatsoever concerning international dealings and more and more in the future will be inept and impotent in these matters. The constitutional provision as to a two-thirds vote in the Senate is an obstacle to congressional expression, it handicaps this country in the administration of international affairs.

Let us remove this stump upon which our international affairs will continue to be wrecked and change that provision to a simple majority of the House and Senate in the matter of treaty ratification.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein letters from two constituents.

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

There was no objection.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, regarding the proposals of the administration for so-called post-war monetary collaboration, I wish to announce that I have just completed a second study of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme which I expect to present to the House next Wednesday, March 22.

Members will recall that I gave to this body the first study dealing with this subject November 1, 1943, under the title "British Plot to Seize Control of United States Gold."

The paper which I shall present to you next Wednesday will clearly demonstrate that the alleged capital formation of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme is a fraud.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram and a statement and to print the same in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full conference report.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is a bill that we have had in conference and the conferees have reached a unanimous agreement. The bill was passed by the House and provided that after a substitute had served as much as 5 years or more he could be made, should a vacancy occur, a regular of the fifth class.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Do the minority members of the committee know this is going to be called up at this time?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

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

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered (2) and (3).

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered (1).

And agree to the same.

T. G. BURCH,
B. FRANK WHELCHER,
D. J. WARD,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
N. M. MASON,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
WILLIAM LANGER,
C. D. BUCK,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment limits credit for adjustments of the increases in the rates of pay of substitute employees in the Postal Service to 3 years of past continuous service and the hourly rate of compensation is adjusted accordingly.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment requires 3 years of continuous active service to qualify for allowable service; whereas, under the original bill 1 year of continuous active service is sufficient.

Amendment No. 3. This amendment provides that allowable service shall be only such service as has been rendered immediately prior to the approval of this act; whereas the original bill does not contain such requirement.

T. G. BURCH,
B. FRANK WHELCHER,
DAVID J. WARD,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
N. M. MASON,

Managers on the part of the House.

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

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial showing how Minnesota has altered its laws to conform to the soldiers voting bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD

and to include therein copies of two letters from the Comptroller General.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from a soldier in the armed forces and to include also a letter I have written to Chester Bowles, head of the O. P. A.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in this morning's New York Times.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 473), as follows:

Resolved, That CECIL R. KING of the State of California be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL S. 1285

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker may be authorized to sign the enrolled bill, S. 1285.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL—1945

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4414) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 1½ hours, one-half of

that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4414, with Mr. RICHARDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the annual supply bill for the legislative branch and for the judiciary. In previous bills we have explained to the Congress the workings of the various units of organization under this bill, and I am not going into any extended explanation at this time.

I would like to state that we have been fortunate in the preparation of this bill to have the services of the somewhat new clerk of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Orescan, who has done a very satisfactory job. Although this is the smallest regular bill coming from the Appropriations Committee, there is no more pleasant committee to serve on than this committee. The associations have been most worth while, and the cooperation of the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. GORE, and Mr. KIRWAN on the Democratic side and Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. FLOESER, and Mr. TIBBOTT, a new member on the committee, has made very pleasant the few weeks we have spent in examining the requests for appropriations.

As you gentlemen know, the Bureau of the Budget does nothing in the way of preparing and examining appropriations for the legislative branch. It merely transmits them to the Congress. The same is true as to the judiciary appropriation, with the exception that the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to make comments and recommendations if it cares to do so.

The bill this year, as it has been for the last several years, is cut to the bone. I do not want to brag about the judiciary and legislative committee, nor do I want to praise Congress, but I must state that Congress governs itself as far as expenditures are concerned in a very close, economical way. We function up here on the Hill, in my opinion, on as small an amount of money as really is practicable, and I am proud of the fact that the Appropriations Committee which has cut the appropriations of so many of the executive departments has been and is now equally zealous in controlling appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government.

The total amount carried in this bill is approximately \$59,606,000. Of this total, the amount of \$46,000,000, in round numbers, is for the legislative branch and \$13,000,000 for the judiciary.

Of the total of \$46,000,000 carried in the bill for the legislative branch, the amount of \$21,165,000 is chargeable as the total expense of the Congress. This, one of the three great branches of the Government, is run on \$21,000,000 annually. There is a slight increase due to overtime, but the entire operation of running the legislative branch is approximately \$21,000,000. The balance of \$25,000,000 is for the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the Government Printing Office. Of the \$21,000,000-plus chargeable to Congress, the amount of \$9,602,000 is for the House of Representatives and \$4,057,000 for the Senate.

Just as a matter of information, the amount recommended in the bill is an apparent increase of \$1,467,000 over the current year's appropriation. However, when the cost of additional compensation in lieu of war overtime, which we are required to pay by law, still to be appropriated for the current fiscal year, is added to the appropriation already made, the net result is a decrease of \$37,325 under the requirements for the fiscal year 1944.

The amount of \$59,606,000 carried in the bill is \$2,027,000 under the Budget estimate. The decrease of \$37,325, when compared with 1944 requirements, indicates—and correctly so—that the principal reason for the increase is the additional war compensation.

As much as we would have liked to grant increases in salaries here on the Hill, there are only two slight increases in the bill, one for \$600 and one for \$300, and they were very meritorious.

We increased the amount for the Architect, who is in charge of the physical upkeep and maintenance of this building and other buildings. We allowed this year the amount of \$40,000 for painting the dome of the Capitol. Heretofore this has been done every 4 years but in the interest of economy the item was omitted from the bill last year. Provision for this work had to be made this year because the dome has gone unpainted for 5 years and is deteriorating, or will soon deteriorate, due to the fact that the paint is sloughing off, and good business dictates that that money be spent.

In the operations of the power plant we have had to grant an increase because of the increased price of coal. In the Library we gave a few increases in positions. Fourteen were requested. We allowed seven, and those seven are of a very unusual character. I think every one is for work in connection with some foreign field, principally the Near East and the Far East, dealing with languages and areas that very few people in this country know very much about, and developing information necessary and helpful to our military operations. We have therefore allowed these positions to build up that part of the Library, which needs help and support for the purposes of the war. However, even the cost of these positions will have to be defrayed out of savings that may accrue during the fiscal year. We have allowed a small sum for printing and binding to take care of the accumulation of binding work in the Li-

brary. We declined to appropriate \$300,000 for a new building which was very badly needed. The space in which a cafeteria was previously located cannot be used due to the fire hazard. There are other needs which were very well justified, but we felt it was an expensive proposition at this time, and more expensive now than it probably would be later.

The Government Printing Office had to have this year an increase in its revolving fund, its working capital, and the Deficiency Committee increased the working capital from \$3,000,000 to \$20,000,000. We, in turn, have done the same thing for 1945, because with the vast amount of business they are doing there, it is necessary to have more working capital. It is not a loss, because at the end of 12 months, after the fiscal year is over, that amount must be returned to the Treasury. It is merely working capital.

As to the judiciary part of this bill, practically every increase recommended is due to overtime and to additional expenses required by law. There were some things that we had included under the judiciary items which the full committee struck out, and today I believe the judiciary, presided over by a very marvelous group of men, is performing its work at a minimum of expense, and I personally feel that sometime common justice will demand that we give this important branch of our Government more help than it has at the present time.

I would like to say in conclusion that I think the departments on the Hill are in excellent hands.

On the business side Mr. Shanks and his organization have impressed us with the thoroughness, the interest, and the devotion that they have shown in all matters pertaining to the proper handling of money on the Hill.

The Government Printing Office is a remarkable institution and one that every citizen in this country can be proud of.

The Library of Congress is the largest and greatest library in the world. The Librarian in my opinion, is one of the ablest and most devoted public servants in the employ of the Government today. He is doing a tremendously important job as Librarian, and I think it is time for us all to recognize that fact, and I know that we will continue to be more and more proud of our Library.

There are many other men whom I would like to mention, but time does not permit. I am very confident that the committee has done a sound and conscientious job, and that this Congress can feel gratified in the work being done by the Congress as a legislative department. The Members of this body may feel sure that the most careful and conscientious studies of every kind are conducted by their legislative committees in the interest of good legislation.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that the trouble with most of this is that we do not utilize the tools that we have. I know that I am to be criticized myself in that respect and it is only recently that I have learned to use the legislative reference.

Mr. O'NEAL. I commend everybody to the use of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library. That service can do the Members inestimable good in research work on subjects to which they themselves have not the time to devote. I believe that possibly in time we may be able to increase the amount given in this bill for this purpose, to the benefit of the Congress itself, and to the people of America, who get much of their information through Congress and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, recently I gave the House information that came to me relative to the sale of dry-cell batteries at the Ogden, Utah, Army Depot. I told the House that I had taken this matter up with Under Secretary of War Patterson, and added he was greatly exercised when he called me on the telephone. He assured me that the Inspector General of the Ninth Service Command would make a complete investigation of the sale of these batteries.

A preliminary investigation was made and then the Inspector General of the Army decided to make a more extensive investigation to definitely fix the responsibility for the sale, so that appropriate action may be taken by the War Department.

Let it be distinctly understood that the War Department in no manner, shape, or form attempts to defend the sale of the batteries at the prices which were received. It admits that there was a serious lack of business judgment. As a result of the preliminary investigation remedial changes have already been instituted to provide for the enforcement of all existing regulations governing the sale and disposal of salvaged property.

I have stated on numerous occasions that there is going to be billions of dollars of surplus property in this country after the war. However, there is a tremendous amount of surplus property at the present time, goods of every description which cannot be purchased in the open market. My contention is that where this class of goods is available, whether it be trucks, motorcycles, all types of consumer goods, or what not, and it has been declared surplus it should be placed on the market because if sold now it in no way interferes with private industry. Then again, when a situation exists that only through the Government can certain items be purchased, certainly we should receive what we paid for the commodities if they are in first-class condition.

I am pleased to say that as a result of the Executive order issued by the President on February 21 which resulted in the appointment of Hon. William L. Clayton as Administrator of the Surplus

War Property Administration, an organization is being set up which in the end should certainly result in the proper distribution of surplus property, and further than that, see that that surplus property is not disposed of at ridiculous prices such as occurred in connection with the sale of the batteries.

Reports of the Inspector General are considered confidential records of the War Department but I have been furnished with a brief of the preliminary investigation of the sale of the batteries. Of course, everyone is going to be greatly disturbed when they read a report of the investigation as it has so far progressed, especially when the information contained in this report confirms the statement I made at the outset. It will be hard for one to understand how an individual, who was a civilian employee of the depot, could purchase surplus property in his own name, especially when it is a violation of an Army regulation to dispose of surplus property in that manner. It is my understanding this employee has been discharged.

The report shows that in one case 25,891 batteries cost the Government \$17,762, and 1,199 batteries cost the Government \$237.55, but the amazing feature is that this civilian employee at the depot offered \$15 for the lot and his offer was accepted. A second lot consisting of 65,909 batteries cost the Government \$142,934. A third lot consisting of 324 batteries cost \$231; 23,587 out of the second and third lots were sold for \$65 to the same civilian employee, and 42,646 were sold to a resident of Utah for \$50. Others, besides this civilian employee, participated in the sale and resale of the batteries. Part of the batteries purchased by the civilian employee were disposed of through a salesman employed by another individual. So far the price received has not been determined. It has been determined, however, that this civilian employee interested his brother in the transaction and that his brother sold part of the batteries for \$20,000. I think that the House and the country are entitled to know the facts in connection with this sale. It is my opinion that when situations such as this are disclosed it will be beneficial to the Government in the handling of surplus property in the future. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will include as part of my remarks, the information that has been sent to me. The statement in reference to the preliminary investigation that I received follows:

1. This report contains the results of the investigation thus far of the sale of dry-cell batteries at the Army Services Depot, Ogden, Utah. The investigation has not been completed and the results reported at this time must therefore be regarded as tentative only.

2. During the period April 17 to May 1, 1943, the salvage officer at Utah Army Service Depot, Ogden, Utah, received 27,090 dry-cell batteries of various sizes pursuant to the terms of two inventory and inspection reports both dated April 17, 1943. One covered 25,891 dry-cell batteries at a cost to the Government of \$17,762.63 and the other covered 1,199 batteries at a cost to the Government of \$237.55. These batteries were all over-age and therefore no longer suitable for military purposes.

3. On or about April 28, 1943, Mr. J. W. Harbertson approached the salvage officer and asked permission to buy these batteries which

were lying out in the open and were about to be destroyed. He offered a price of \$15.00 for the lot. The salvage officer states that he accepted this offer after securing authority from headquarters, Ninth Service Command, to make the sale. Payment was made in cash by Mr. Harbertson and the money turned into the finance officer at Ogden, Utah. Mr. Harbertson removed the batteries on May 1, 1943.

4. A second lot of dry-cell batteries consisting of 65,909 batteries costing \$142,934.76, and a third lot consisting of 324 batteries costing \$231.06 were received by the same salvage officer in September 1943 pursuant to Reports of Survey dated August 31, 1943, and September 20, 1943, respectively. All these batteries were also over-age and therefore unsuitable for military purposes.

5. The second and third lots were sold by the salvage officer to Mr. J. W. Harbertson, who purchased 23,587 on September 20, 1943 for \$65.00 and Mr. W. W. Grothe of Bountiful, Utah, who purchased 42,646 on September 23, 1943, for \$50.00. These sales were also made by direct negotiations pursuant to authority granted by headquarters, Ninth Service Command.

6. The salvage officer explained to both purchasers that the batteries were over-age and unsuitable for military purposes.

7. Mr. J. W. Harbertson was a civilian employee at the depot. This fact was not developed by the salvage officer at the time of the first sale; whether or not the fact was known by the salvage officer prior to the second sale has not been established. Sale to an employee of the Government is contrary to Army regulations. Some of the batteries acquired by Mr. J. W. Harbertson were disposed of through salesmen employed by one A. W. Schryber. The number so sold and the amounts received for them have not been determined. Mr. J. W. Harbertson interested his brother, James M. Harbertson, of Ogden, Utah, in attempting to dispose of the remaining batteries. Mr. James M. Harbertson sold most of the remaining ones to Jake Hayutin & Sons, of Denver, in November 1943, for \$20,000. On instructions from the Hayutin firm, some or all of the batteries purchased by that firm were shipped to Burstein-Applebee, of Kansas City.

8. The disposition of the batteries purchased by Mr. Grothe is not known. He is not employed by the Government and has not been questioned.

9. There is no evidence thus far of fraud or collusion on the part of the salvage officer or any other employee of the Government.

10. The batteries were turned over to the salvage officer because they had passed the predetermined shelf life which had been established to reflect deterioration due to age.

11. An error was made in disposing of the batteries at prices not in keeping with resale values. Without attempting to change the fact that an error was made, it may be pointed out, however, that the resale value of these batteries appears to be an abnormal situation arising from the shortage of batteries. Dry-cell batteries have little or no salvage value so far as the metal or other material components are concerned. The extent of deterioration resulting from age varies, however, and civilian purchasers were obviously willing to experiment with uncertain quality and indefinite age because first-class goods were not available.

12. The salvage officer had occupied his post for about 1 month; only at the time of the first sale, had had no previous experience with batteries, and believed that he was not only avoiding the expense of removing worthless articles but also securing some revenue. The original purchaser seems to have been equally unaware of the real resale value.

13. The error might have been avoided if the Ninth Service Command had not granted special authority to sell without asking for

written bids. They were authorized, however, to grant special permission for "spot sales" in appropriate cases and did so without being aware of the substantial resale value of the items.

14. Dry-cell batteries are a peculiar item of supply in that they must be stored in sufficient quantities to be available to meet any tactical condition, notwithstanding the fact that they are of a perishable nature. The rate of issue depends on the tactical situation at the particular time and supply must be ample to meet any given situation. Overage batteries cannot be shipped for overseas use, but limited quantities can be issued in the zone of the interior for training purposes. The amount of life left in a given battery depends on the type of battery, the condition under which it was manufactured, and storage conditions. The batteries produced by a competent manufacturer and stored under ideal conditions may have considerable remaining life, while others will be completely dead. The amount of life in any particular battery can be determined only by testing each battery. The cost of such testing would normally be excessive.

15. The following corrective action is being taken as the result of the facts developed thus far concerning this transaction:

a. Discussions are being had with Procurement Division, Treasury Department, for the purpose of determining whether or not it would be practical to turn over to that agency over-age batteries no longer suitable for military purposes. It may be possible for that agency to test and price items in a more satisfactory manner.

b. If the discussions referred to result in the conclusion that it is not practical to dispose of over-age batteries through Treasury Procurement, an attempt will be made to publish for the guidance of salvage officers price lists to be worked out with the assistance of the Office of Price Administration.

c. The possibility of returning over-age batteries to manufacturers on some agreed price basis is also being investigated. It is believed that this procedure would not be as effective as either of the two alternatives previously mentioned, but the possibility of effecting a satisfactory arrangement is being explored.

d. The necessity of having experienced officers assigned as salvage officers will be emphasized again by the publication of a directive to the service commands. The facts developed in this case will be cited as an illustration of necessity for selecting experienced officers.

e. The service commands are being advised again that property will be sold only on widely circulated written invitations for bids, unless the facts submitted clearly demonstrate that special permission to effect sale by some other method is in the best interest of the Government.

f. The Ninth Service Command is being advised of the contents of this report and requested to advise headquarters as to corrective action taken and to be taken in that Command.

16. The investigation is being continued for the purpose of determining responsibility for the errors made and what further corrective action should be taken.

Mr. Speaker, Washington is full of individuals hungry to get their hands on surplus property. Undoubtedly they recall what happened when surplus property was disposed of during and after the First World War. I am sure many of the old Members of the House recall the scandals that developed as a result of the disposition of that surplus property and as Under Secretary of War Patterson says, "That must not happen again."

Why, Mr. Speaker, one individual advertised in the New York Times seeking

clients that he desires to serve in connection with the purchase of surplus Government property stating that he had had 6 months' experience and indicating in the advertisement that he understood the procedure. In my opinion surplus property should be sold in the open market and bids should be received. Where the prices offered are ridiculous they should not be accepted.

It is not only certain groups that seek to secure surplus property at ridiculous prices. Strange to say, Mr. Speaker, some of the corporations likewise follow such a policy. For instance, there are 4,000 motorcycles available now and I have learned they have never been used. The official in charge offered those motorcycles to the manufacturers, and although the Government paid the manufacturers \$400 apiece for them, their top offer was \$130 apiece. These motorcycles are in the hands of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department and I have learned from the Chief of that Division, Hon. Clifton Mack, that he will not sell the motorcycles at the price offered, but he has gone out in the field to secure higher bids and at the time I talked to him he had bids as high as \$300 apiece. But why should we not receive what we paid for those motorcycles in view of the fact that you cannot purchase them in the open market?

The House in the last session passed a surplus property bill, but that bill, I understand, does not go far enough. The bill has been reported by the Senate committee and is on the calendar. It is my hope that bill will be passed at an early date by the Senate and sent to conference and there a real law, with teeth in it, could be agreed upon.

While the President has set up by Executive order this Surplus War Property Administration as a result of the report by Mr. Baruch and Mr. Hancock, still Congress has a duty to perform and legislation should be speedily enacted. I urged the President, because I could not see that Congress would expedite legislation on this subject, to set up a special agency to handle surplus property. My communication reached him however on the very date he issued the Executive order.

My contacts with Mr. Clayton and with Mr. Mack of the Procurement Division, whom I am pleased to know will handle the disposition of consumer goods that are declared surplus, convinced me that we have two excellent administrators.

In conclusion I want to again emphasize the feeling of the Under Secretary of War and his associates with respect to the sales that have already been disclosed, such as the sale of certain tools in Michigan and the sale of these batteries, and to know that the investigation is being continued and corrective action will be taken when they determine the responsibility for the mistakes.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. Robinson] rendered assistance in pressing the investigation.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to tell the gentleman from Missouri that he is bringing

to us a great contribution. In my State of Nebraska we had demands for batteries on the farms for many, many months. Many of my farmers who are isolated from railroads and the telephone, depend upon the radio for their information and the dealers out there cannot supply them with batteries. There was a sale of N. Y. A. goods in my home town. We were told that the surplus materials were going to be advertised and sold to the highest bidder. Yet many of the people in my locality were unable to get information as to how to bid, with the result that many pieces of valuable material were sold for a ridiculously low sum of money. There were trucks, typewriters, and many other things. The price which the Government received for this material was so small that the people were very much disturbed. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is doing us a great good here today in bringing this out into the light because the people of America will not stand for this surplus material getting into the hands of one monopoly or one individual. We think it ought to be advertised for bids and go through the regular channels of trade, so the people who need batteries can have them. They are producing food out there and they need this information. We need these batteries for the radios.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman it is my contention that where the Government has surplus property in good condition that cannot be purchased in the open market, then we certainly should receive the price we paid for it when the Government sells it.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to compliment the gentleman and thank him for his contribution in thus turning the fierce light of publicity on this sort of thing, which will help to prevent it until we can get further legislation to control it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, I do want to thank the gentleman for his contribution. I would further call his attention to this observation which I wish to make, that within the shadow of this House there have been surplus goods disposed of by the Treasury Department of an item that ordinarily calls for a price of \$20 to \$30 on the market, which has been purchased by a Member of the House brand new, for 80 cents apiece.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know nothing about any such transaction.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his disclosures. I would like to have his reaction as to whether or not this ridiculously low price was due to the dishonesty of the men handling it, or was it due to the system we have for getting rid of our surplus property?

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

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman that as a result of this disclosure, the Army already has changed its regulations, which will be beneficial in the future. The Army wants to protect itself against criticism. It wants to stop all such deals as this. But I will also say in reference to the statement that the gentleman from Arizona made, that the House passed the surplus property bill in the last session. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] handled that bill. It is still over in the Senate. We should get action in the Senate, I hope, at an early date. If the Senate will pass that bill and send it back to the House and let it go to conference, then we can write a real law in conference. That is what we need to protect the taxpayers of this country and to prevent having their surplus property sold at ridiculous prices.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. We had a similar scandal in Arkansas about the sale of surplus property. We had two or three investigating committees go down there and the net result was that a lot of property was given away, but it was done under the present existing laws and there was no other course for them to take. If that is true, I think it is up to Congress, and I hope the Senate will pass some kind of bill so that we now could enact proper legislation which is so needed for the disposal of this property.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All of these matters were pointed out when the House passed the bill for the orderly disposition of surplus property last year. At that time it was shown there are probably more than 100 statutes of various kind authorizing the disposition of surplus property.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, and the gentleman from Mississippi is to be complimented for reporting that bill and securing its passage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes to discuss the bill under consideration. As our chairman has so well said, this bill is probably the smallest appropriation bill that comes before the Congress for consideration, although it is a very important bill and carries items of great importance. The committee worked hard and conducted the hearings to the fullest degree possible in an attempt to bring out all the information bearing upon the various items in the bill before the House that it was possible to get. I cannot pay too high a compliment to the members of the committee. We are very happy that in this committee we have had no division along

partisan lines. We have worked hard trying to write a bill that was a good bill. While I take no particular pride in recommending this as a good bill, I will say that under the circumstances, and in view of our means of getting information, it is as good a bill as we could arrive at. But until such time as we are able to get information from sources other than the people who request these funds and determine what the function of their particular department shall be, we probably will not be able to do it any better than we have. The clerk of the committee, Mr. Ruskin, has been very helpful and very diligent in his efforts to assist the committee. Taking it all in all I believe that we do have the best sort of bill that it was possible to bring out under the circumstances.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES].

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, for more than a year now, I have been trying to help the several manufacturers of work gloves in my State and district in their struggle to supply the critical and steadily increasing demands for their products. This whole industry has been so completely bogged down in the swamp of bureaucratic regulations and restrictions that it simply has no hope of providing the millions of gloves that workers in war plants, on farms and on railroads must have to do heavy and difficult work with their hands.

Let me recount some of the glove manufacturer's troubles. First, W. P. B. sharply restricted the available materials, and forced drastic changes in almost every company's line. The manufacturers, however, took that hurdle pretty well in stride. Next, O. P. A. stepped in with price ceilings and quality formulas which added greatly to the manufacturers' burdens. Everything else being favorable, however, the average company would have survived these restrictions. But the Administration's wage stabilization program has proved to be the final straw.

Wage scales in the glove industry at the time of the freeze were far below scales in most war industries, and it was perfectly obvious from the start that the glove manufacturers could not hope to recruit new help or even keep their normal working forces unless they were permitted to increase their pay schedules sharply.

All these problems of this industry are as old as the emergency. The inevitable failure of the industry should have been apparent to any intelligent schoolboy. And it should have been equally obvious that work gloves are an absolute essential in the war effort.

But today, vital war work everywhere is suffering because men and women simply cannot buy satisfactory work gloves. Hardly a day passes that I don't

receive letters of protest from men in steel mills, glass plants, on farms, and on railroads, and their complaints are certainly justified.

Without adequate protection for their hands, men simply cannot handle hot steel and glass, or a thousand different rough, heavy, or dangerous objects which must be handled; and nobody with an ounce of common sense would expect them to do so.

These glove manufacturers and I, however, have so far failed to find a single official in a position of authority here in Washington who seems to have that necessary ounce of common sense or foresight.

Considered in the superficial manner, the problem of supplying gloves to our millions of essential workers may seem trivial. Maybe it is asking too much to expect bureaucrats, whose hardest work has been heavy thinking, to know what burned, blistered, or lacerated hands can do to a workingman's efficiency.

So this looks like another one of the little oversights which may loom up surprisingly large in the final cost.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, we have just learned that the English House of Parliament has extended an invitation to Members of the United States Congress, to visit and observe that body. I think this is an appropriate thing to do. Not only could we profit by studying and observing the procedure of the British Parliament but we could profit by doing the same thing in the case of similar nations—for instance the South American Governments.

It was my privilege and pleasure some months ago to be invited to sit in a session of the British House of Commons—not as a spectator from the Gallery—but as an observer from the floor of the Chamber—accompanied by a well-equipped parliamentarian who explained the procedure as they went along. In many respects the Congress of the United States and the House of Commons have many angles of procedure in common, but I observed one phase that is entirely different from our procedure here in the House of Representatives. On the day I was there, November 21, they submitted a series of questions to be answered by the Secretary of State for War at the first sitting of that body after the 23d of November. In other words, they gave the Secretary of State for War at least 2 days to prepare the answers.

I am here including these questions that were asked that day. I am sure they will be of interest to Members interested in this procedure.

QUESTIONS FOR ORAL ANSWER

1. Sir William Wayland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, if officers quartered in towns where their homes are situated can be allowed to reside with their families instead of having to live in barracks, or, in some cases, where barrack accommodation is not available, to pay for accommodation in hotels.

2. Sir William Wayland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, why there is no prospect of promotion to noncommissioned rank for privates in the Army Dental Corps at

Army dental centers, casualty clearing stations, and military and base hospitals; why the sole exception is made for clerk orderlies in field ambulance units; and is he aware that the ordinary service clerk orderly in the Army Dental Corps who carries no rank has important duties to carry out and responsibilities equal to those of a battalion orderly-room sergeant or battalion quartermaster sergeant.

3. Mr. Hannah: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he can hold out any hope of widowed mothers of soldiers being put on the same footing as soldiers' wives in the matter of allowances.

4. Mr. Thorne: To ask the Secretary of State for War, how many civilian doctors have passed through an Army school of hygiene course; and how many have taken courses for treating mechanical warfare casualties.

5. Mr. Gordon Macdonald: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he is aware that the holding of mock invasions sometimes interferes drastically with war production; and will he take such steps as will reduce such interference to a minimum.

6. Sir Richard Acland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, for how long was the Army Forms Depot without stocks of the form for making application for allowances to dependents of men serving in the Army; and what is the position now.

7. Sir Richard Acland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether any instructions or advice has been sent to commanding officers of units on the subject of the new allowances to dependents of men serving in the Army.

8. Sir Richard Acland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he will equip the London Regional Education Committee, and other similar committees, with magic lanterns so as to facilitate the giving of interesting lectures to military units.

9. Mr. Bellenger: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he has considered the organization and publicity methods adopted by the Royal Air Force in recruiting for the Air Training Corps; and what proposals he has for adopting a similar system in connection with the Army.

10. Mr. Bellenger: To ask the Secretary of State for War, what instructions have been issued to paymasters where soldiers who have received an overissue of pay, due to their names wrongly appearing in part II, Orders, have incurred substantial debts, as considerable hardship is being caused in innumerable cases of this nature through no fault of the soldiers concerned.

11. Mr. Bellenger: To ask the Secretary of State for War, what arrangements are made for journalists and photographers to accompany Army units on active operations against the enemy; and whether any similar procedure is adopted to that employed by the German Army whereby journalists and photographers are incorporated in the ranks of the army for the purpose of recording operations, either to be utilized in instruction of troops in tactics or by way of making documentary films for release to the general public.

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

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. In that connection, not necessarily in connection with the questions propounded on the floor of the House of Commons, but in connection with the invitation that is to be extended to this body that we send representatives of our group to London to fraternize, as it were, with members of Parliament and the House of Lords, what is the gentleman's opinion on that?

Mr. SNYDER. As I said in my opening remarks, I think this is the appropriate thing to do. That is, to visit, sit

in, observe, and listen to the procedure in bodies similar to ours, such as the British Parliament.

Mr. CELLER. Then I take it you are in fullest accord with the resolution that has already been adopted by both houses of the British Parliament. Does not the gentleman think we should take appropriate action as soon as the invitation has been formally extended to us?

Mr. SNYDER. I would not want to express an opinion about when we should take appropriate action. I would rather leave that to the leadership.

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

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE (H. RES. 462)

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, on February 17 I presented a question to the House involving the privileges of the House and presented a resolution—House Resolution 446—which on motion of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. On March 6, 1944, I presented an amended resolution—House Resolution 462—which was also referred to the Judiciary Committee.

The discussion of the question, which I shall make today for the RECORD, has already been presented to the Judiciary Committee in the nature of a preliminary brief. My discussion must be incomplete in detail at this time but I am prepared to amplify the points on the appropriate occasion, and present additional authorities.

IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 446, AS AMENDED AND AMPLIFIED IN HOUSE RESOLUTION 462 (BY MR. HINSHAW) ON THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE AS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED MEXICAN TREATY

The resolution—House Resolution 446—refers to the House Judiciary Committee the question of whether or not the proposed treaty with Mexico which the President transmitted to the Senate of the United States on February 15, 1944, invades the constitutional prerogatives of the House of Representatives. In the amended form—House Resolution 462—the resolution suggests 10 questions which may be grouped under 5 principal headings:

First. Does the proposed treaty undertake to dispose of "property belonging to the United States" in violation of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States?—First to sixth questions inclusive.

Second. Does the proposed treaty undertake to authorize diversions from and obstructions in the navigable waters of the United States in violation of paragraph 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States?—Seventh question.

Third. Does the proposed treaty undertake to commit or obligate the United States, without action by Congress, to raising, appropriating, and expending money for the construction of public works in violation of any provision of the Constitution vesting such powers in Congress?—Eighth question.

Fourth. Does the proposed treaty undertake to fix and determine what taxes, duties, imposts, or excises may or may not be laid and collected, in certain instances, in violation of paragraph 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States?—Ninth question.

Fifth. Does the proposed treaty undertake to fix and determine, without action by Congress, who may enter the United States without any immigration restrictions, passports, or labor requirements in violation of any provision of the Constitution vesting legislative powers in Congress?—Tenth question.

I

THE TREATY UNDERTAKES TO DISPOSE OF PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES IN VIOLATION OF PARAGRAPH 2, SECTION 3, ARTICLE IV OF CONSTITUTION

This question should be considered under two heads: First, "property belonging to the United States" which the treaty undertakes to dispose of without action by Congress; and second, property which the treaty undertakes to dispose of to the prejudice of the claims of the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada. The first heading in turn will be treated under two heads according to the kind of property affected by the treaty, to wit: (a) Water or the right to the use of water belonging to the United States and given to Mexico and also (b) the right given to Mexico to the beneficial use of dams, canals, works, and structures belonging to the United States.

A. Property belonging to the United States is disposed of by the treaty since it gives Mexico, first, water and water right; and second, the right to the beneficial use of reservoirs, canals, and structures of the United States; and third, makes disposition of the electricity generated at said works.

First. The water or the right to the beneficial use of water belonging to the United States which this treaty undertakes to give to Mexico is property within the meaning of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution and a lawful disposal thereof can be made only by Congress and not by the President and Senate alone.

(a) While it is generally true that there can be no title or ownership of the corpus or body of running water in the natural flow of a stream, yet the usufruct or right to use such water is capable of ownership and is property.

(b) When, however, the running water has been reduced to possession by being impounded and stored in a reservoir, its corpus then becomes the subject of ownership and it, too, is property.

(c) Furthermore, the fact that the water once stored is subsequently released and returned to the stream bed does not change its character or impair the title thereto if the owner intends thereby to adopt the stream channel as

his means of transportation to place of use lower down on the stream.

These general rules are set forth in 2 Kinney on Irrigation and Water Rights 1339-1341 as follows:

No man, State or Nation can receive or give an absolute title to it (water) while it is still flowing naturally in the streams.

It therefore follows from the other principles that the sale of a water right by its owner does not convey any specific quantity of water itself, but only sells the right to the use of the water for the reason that the only property owned by an appropriator is the right to use it. * * * But after the water itself has been actually diverted from the stream and taken into the possession of the appropriator in his ditches, canals or reservoirs, the title to the same changed and it becomes the absolute property of the appropriator. * * * After it has been captured, as it were, or diverted from the natural channel of the stream by an individual and taken absolute possession of by him in the ditches, canals, reservoirs of other receptacles constructed or prepared by his work and labor, it is as much his private property as anything else that is reduced to possession which otherwise would be lost to the uses of man.

Right to the use of stored water: After water has been once stored in reservoirs it becomes personal property and may be sold, contracted for, and disposed of as such property. (2 Kinney on Irrigation and Water Rights, 2d ed., 1484-1485; 1 Wiel Water Rights in Western States 755-758.)

The use of developed water belongs to the persons who by their own exertions discovered and developed the water, so far as their needs and necessities require. The water thus developed may be turned into a natural stream and conducted therein to the place of use and there recaptured by the parties developing the same." (2 Kinney, 2187-2188.)

To same effect see 1 Wiel Water Rights in Western States 37-41.

However, it makes little difference in the present inquiry whether we consider that the treaty disposes of specified quantities of the "corpus" of the waters of the Colorado River, as released by the United States from its reservoirs on that stream, or that the treaty accords Mexico the rights to the beneficial use of so much water of the Colorado River. In either event the subject matter is "property" and within the provisions of paragraph 2, section 3 of article IV of the Constitution vesting the power to make such disposition in Congress.

Second. The right to the beneficial use of dams, canals, works, and structures of the United States which the treaty bestows upon Mexico is property within the meaning of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution and a lawful disposal thereof can be made only by Congress itself.

The treaty undertakes to bestow on Mexico the beneficial use of the following properties of the United States:

(a) Boulder Dam and Reservoir, although not specifically named therein, because without this great storage reservoir—capacity twice the average annual flow of the river—the treaty guaranties could not be fulfilled.

(b) The Davis Dam and Reservoir—article 12 (b) of treaty.

(c) Imperial Dam and All American Canal—article 11 (c), article 12 (c), and article 14 of treaty.

(d) Rockwood heading and Alamo Canal—article 11 (c) and article 12 (c) of treaty.

(e) That the use for the benefit of Mexico of other works not specifically named is contemplated by the treaty is evident by the first sentence of article 10 and by general provisions obligating the United States to "construct or acquire works that may be necessary to convey a part of the Colorado River to Mexico."

Fifty, C. J. on Property defines "property" to include or mean—page 729:

In law—generally. The term "property" is in law a generic term of extensive application. It is a term of large import, of broad and exceedingly complex meaning, of the broadest and most extensive signification, a very comprehensive word and is the most comprehensive of all terms which can be used.

Page 730 as right or interest:

Primarily in its appropriate sense, in the broader sense, in legal conception, in a legal sense, or in the strict legal sense, the term "property" signifies valuable right or interest considered primarily as a source or element of wealth or any civil right of a pecuniary nature or as an aggregate of rights which are guaranteed and protected by the Government.

Page 732:

The right of user is an essential quality or attribute of absolute property without which absolute property can have no existence. There can be no conception of property aside from its control and use and upon its use depends its value. In fact it has been stated that the right to enjoy the beneficial use of property is the most real and practical idea of the nature of property, that property in anything consists in the use, the legal right to use and derive a profit from lands and other things is property, and that the use of property is property.

Ditches, canals, flumes, and reservoirs used for the conveyance or storage of water courses, lakes, or ponds are real property and the rules of law governing the same are in general the same as the rules governing other real property. (2 Kinney on Irrigation and Water Rights, 2d ed. 1462).

Third. By article 19, the treaty undertakes to make disposition of electric power which the two Governments may develop at international plants. The treaty, in article 2, defines the meaning of the words "two governments" in such a manner as to entirely exclude Congress. It there says:

Wherever there are provisions in this treaty for joint action or joint agreement by the two governments * * * it shall be understood that the particular matter in question shall be handled by or through the Department of State of the United States and the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico.

But in *Ashwander v. T. V. A.* (297 U. S. 288, 330) the Court said:

The water power which was an inevitable incident of the construction of the dam (Wilson Dam) the right to convert it into electric energy and the energy thus produced constitute property belonging to the United States.

The express power of Congress under the Constitution to dispose of property belonging to the United States is not abridged or withdrawn by the 9 or 10 amendments.

And again in *Ashwander v. T. V. A.* (297 U. S. 288, 333) the Supreme Court declared:

That the water power, and the electric energy generated at the dam, are susceptible of disposition as property belonging to the United States is well established.

Therefore, any disposition of electricity belonging to the United States must be made by Congress as provided in article IV, section 3, paragraph 2.

B. The treaty and the disposition of property proposed thereunder operate to prejudice the claims of the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada in violation of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV and amendment 5 of the Constitution.

By the terms of the Boulder Canyon Project Act the United States could not commence construction of Boulder Dam until contracts were first obtained assuring the repayment of its cost.

CONTRACTS

First. California power contracts: In 1930 and 1931 the United States executed contracts for the sale of "falling water" for the generation of electricity at Boulder Dam with various California municipalities, including Los Angeles, Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena, with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and with private power corporations, including the Southern California Edison Co., Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corporation, and the Southern Sierras Power Co.

California water contracts: Later the United States also executed contracts for the delivery of water out of Boulder Dam and Reservoir for domestic and irrigation uses at various points on the river below Boulder, with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the city and county of San Diego, Imperial Irrigation District, Palo Verde Irrigation District, and Coachella Valley County Water District. These contracts for power and water were sufficient in amount to assure the Government the repayment of its costs in building Boulder Dam. The aggregate annual net diversions from the river covered by the California contracts is 5,362,000 acre-feet.

For contracts see Wilbur & Ely; the Hoover Dam Contracts, pages 291-369.

Second. Nevada contracts: The United States in 1942 executed a contract with the State of Nevada for the delivery of water out of Boulder Dam and Reservoir of 100,000 acre-feet per annum, and in February 1944, executed a second contract with Nevada for an additional 200,000 acre-feet per year.

Third. Arizona contract: On February 10, 1944, the United States entered into a contract with the State of Arizona for the delivery to-it, for use in that State, of 2,800,000 acre-feet per annum of Colorado River water.

Fourth. Summary of water supply and required uses: The total water supply is subject to alternating wet and dry cycles of from 7 to 11 years. It is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation, based on studies of stream flow over a period of 44 years, that the total average releases of water available from Boulder Dam in the future, during critical dry cycles extending over 10 or more years, will

be 8,500,000 acre-feet per year. The supply and draft thereon is estimated as follows:

Annual supply of water	
	Acre-feet
Outflow from Boulder Dam.....	8,500,000
Reservoir and other river losses below Boulder Dam.....	600,000
Available for use.....	7,900,000
Annual requirements for withdrawal and use	
	Acre-feet
Nevada contracts.....	300,000
California contracts.....	5,362,000
Arizona contract.....	2,800,000
Proposed Mexican treaty.....	1,500,000
Total.....	9,962,000
Available supply.....	7,900,000
Requirements.....	9,962,000
Deficit.....	2,062,000

These figures show that any water guaranteed to Mexico must be taken from United States commitments heretofore made to our own communities and States.

Fifth. The contractual claims of the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada are prejudiced and will be seriously injured by the proposed treaty. Relying upon said contracts executed with the United States pursuant to an act of Congress, the California communities have committed themselves to the expenditure of over a half billion dollars for the construction of works with which to utilize Boulder water and power. These obligations are:

Boulder Dam and power plant.....	\$125,000,000
Metropolitan aqueduct.....	274,000,000
All-American Canal.....	78,000,000
San Diego aqueduct.....	16,000,000
Power transmission lines of the city of Los Angeles and private power companies.....	56,000,000
Total.....	549,000,000

Of the foregoing, more than \$400,000,000 have now been actually expended and are represented by bonds and contracts to repay.

The contracts and commitments made by the United States to furnish water to the States of Nevada and Arizona have led to large commitments and expenditures by and in those States.

Now the executive department reports to the Senate a treaty with Mexico which in its disposition of Colorado River water, water rights, electric power, and property would mean that the United States repudiates its contracts with its own communities and States to their serious injury and damage, in violation of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

Sixth. There is little discussion of, and not very much light which can be thrown upon, the part of the Constitution forbidding prejudicing claims of States. However, in 2 Cooley on the Constitution, at page 202, under chapter 31, headed "Powers of Congress," that authority states:

The next clause of the same article is: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to

prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular States" (art. IV, sec. 3, clause 2).

The proviso thus annexed to the power is certainly proper in itself and was rendered necessary by the jealousies and questions concerning the western territory which have been already alluded to under the preceding head. It was perhaps suggested by the clause in the ninth article of the confederation which contained a proviso "that no State should be deprived of its territory for the benefit of the United States * * *". The power is not confined to the territory of the United States but extends to "other property" belonging to the United States; so that it may be applied to the due regulation of all other personal and real property rightfully belonging to the United States. And so it has been constantly understood and acted upon (204).

We think that the author could have added with equal force "and subject to the same proviso and limitation."

II

The proposed treaty does authorize substantial diversions from and permanent obstructions in the Colorado River, part of the navigable waters of the United States, without action by Congress, in violation of paragraph 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

A. If this proposed treaty becomes effective, the United States guarantees Mexico the delivery of 1,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water per annum, which in some years of drought will be all the water that will ever reach the international boundary line. Furthermore, under the terms of this treaty, Mexico may take all the waters of the river available to her and leave the bed of the river dry. The treaty provides further that a substantial part of the 1,500,000 acre-feet of water directly allocated shall be diverted at points within the United States and permits all the remainder to be diverted "in the limitrophe section of the river"—the 20-mile section where the river is the common boundary—at a point where the easterly half of the Colorado constitutes navigable waters of the United States.

First. The navigable capacity of a river can be injured, obstructed, or destroyed by diversions from the channel of the stream—*Sanitary District v. United States* (266 U. S. 405, 426); *United States v. Rio Grande Co.* (174 U. S. 690-708-709).

B. By this treaty Mexico is permitted to construct and maintain a permanent dam in the limitrophe section of the river—where it is common to both countries, article 12 (a) of the treaty—and in addition, during the 5-year period following the treaty going into force and effect, Mexico is given the privilege of constructing, maintaining, and operating a "temporary diversion structure in the bed of the Colorado River in the territory of the United States for the purpose of diverting water therefrom into the Alamo Canal"; article 27 of the treaty.

In *Ashwander v. T. V. A.* (297 U. S. 288, 328), the Supreme Court said:

Commerce includes navigation. "All America understands and has uniformly understood," said Chief Justice Marshall in *Gibson v. Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1, 190) "the word 'commerce' to comprehend navigation." The power to regulate interstate commerce em-

braces the power to keep the navigable rivers of the United States free from obstructions to navigation and to remove such obstructions when they exist. "For these purposes," said the Court in *Gilman Philadelphia* (3 Wall. 713, 725), "Congress possesses all the powers which existed in the States before the adoption of the National Constitution and which existed in the Parliament in England."

In *United States v. Appalachian Power* (311 U. S. 377, 405), the Court said:

Congress has power under the Constitution (commerce clause) to regulate navigation. It may legislate to forbid or license dams in the water, its power over improvements for navigation in rivers is "absolute."

In *Arizona v. California et al.* (283 U. S. 423, 453) the Supreme Court found the Colorado River a navigable river and said:

We know judicially, from the evidence of history, that a large part of the Colorado River south of Black Canyon was formerly navigable and that the main obstacles to navigation have been the accumulations of silt coming down from the upper reaches of the river system and the irregularity in the flow due to periods of low water. Commercial disuse resulting from changed geographical conditions and a congressional failure to deal with them, does not amount to an abandonment of a navigable river or prohibit future exertions of Federal control (*Economy Light & Power Co. v. United States*, 256 U. S. 113, 118, 124).

Since the Colorado River is a navigable river by the declaration of Congress in the Boulder Canyon Project Act and by the decision of the United States Supreme Court and so acknowledged to be by Mexico in existing treaties, Congress is the department of government vested by the Constitution with the supreme and absolute power to regulate the same.

III

The treaty unquestionably commits the United States to raising, appropriating and expending large sums of money for the construction, operation, and maintenance of projects and work unauthorized by Congress. As examples note the following:

First. By article 5 of the treaty, the United States is obligated to participate in the construction, operation, and maintenance on the main channel of the Rio Grande of, first, three dams which the treaty says are required for the conservation, storage, and regulation of the waters of that river; and, second, dams which may be required for the diversion of its waters. The number of diversion dams to be built is not specified but is left to be determined in the future by the Commission. The share of the costs of all these works which the United States must pay is fixed, for storage dams, proportionate to the capacity therein allotted to our country and for diversion dams the cost is divided "in proportion to the benefits which the respective countries receive therefrom, as determined by the Commission." The cost estimates for these structures is not given and probably is not now known by anyone but the share which the United States must pay will certainly run into many millions of dollars.

Second. By article 7 of the treaty, the United States is obligated to pay half the cost of constructing certain hydroelec-

tric generating plants on the Rio Grande. By that article "each Government agrees to construct through its section of the Commission such works as may be recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments. Both Governments through their respective sections of the Commission shall operate and maintain jointly such hydroelectric plants." "Two Governments" is defined in article 2 to be, for the purposes of "joint action or joint agreement" the Department of State of the United States and the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico.

Third. By article 12 (b) of the treaty, the United States is obligated to construct the Davis Dam entirely at its own expense.

Fourth. By article 23 of the treaty, the United States is obligated to pay the entire cost of acquiring any and all private property within the United States which may be required for the construction of works proposed by the treaty or determined by the Commission with the approval of our State Department as being "required for the execution and performance of this treaty."

Where are the millions of dollars required for the above public works coming from? The money is not now in the Treasury. It must be raised for this purpose by Congress either by revenue bills which must originate in the House—article I, section 7 of the Constitution—or by borrowing, which is a power vested in Congress—article I, section 8, paragraph 1 of the Constitution. But the determination of what projects the money shall be used to build is reserved, by the treaty, to the Commission with the approval of our State Department. The Constitution is clear that these things can be done only by Congress and not by the President and the Senate acting by themselves.

IV

The treaty unquestionably undertakes to determine, fix, and decide without action by Congress matters relating to duties, imposts, and excises, and to provide for the free entry into our country of "all materials, implements, equipment, and repair parts intended for the construction, operation, and maintenance of such works" as are proposed to be constructed and operated in the execution of the treaty—article 20 of the treaty. This certainly violates paragraph 1 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution, which vests this power in Congress.

V

The treaty unquestionably authorizes the migration into this country of all persons, whether Mexican citizens or other nationals, who are employed "either directly or indirectly" on the construction, operation, or maintenance of the works proposed for the execution of the treaty, "without any immigration restrictions, passports, or labor requirements"—article 20 of the treaty. Some of these persons may be highly objectionable from the standpoint of our laws or our national policy. Immigration regulations have long been considered a proper subject for legislation by Congress under paragraph 1 of section 9 of article I and

the last paragraph of section 8 of article I, which vests in Congress power "to make all laws which shall be necessary or proper for carrying into execution" the express powers granted to Congress.

VI

CONCLUSION

First. I believe that the pending inquiry has a broader significance than the subject matter of the present resolution, important as I believe that to be. Our people and our Nation are now contemplating the post-war era. It is evident that sooner or later treaties are going to be suggested which may affect deeply our economic life and well being, the political structure of our Government, and even our preconceived ideas of government in relation to its citizens within and to the people of the world without. Will the House of Representatives play a rightful part in any such world movement, exert its proper influences on any such important and far-reaching treaties by the full discharge of the constitutional powers entrusted to it, or will it as the peoples' representative body be content to stand idly by as an onlooker while all the world about us, including our own American way of life, is changed by treaties?

Second. I do not contend here that the Congress has or should have treaty-making powers, but I do contend that in order to be valid and effective any treaty which intends by its terms to accomplish matters which are entrusted to the Congress, or which the Congress is charged to perform, requires either prior authorization by the Congress or that it be subject to subsequent act of Congress.

If that is not the clear intent of the Constitution, then the treaty-making agencies can by treaty both amend any laws enacted by the Congress and effectively enact new statutes, thereby annulling the powers of the House of Representatives and amending the Constitution itself. The Constitution would, indeed, have created a Frankenstein that could, and would ultimately, destroy its creator.

But no responsible authority has yet contended that the treaty-making power is unlimited. All agree that the treaty-making power is limited. Nevertheless, the treaty-making agencies are now going beyond their acknowledged limitations by undertaking to operate on subjects and within legislative fields declared by the Constitution expressly to be entrusted to the Congress.

Shall the House of Representatives supinely and silently submit now to this whitening-down process of its admittedly constitutional powers and prerogatives? If the treaty-making agencies of the Government can effectively discharge, in this instance, some of the powers which the Constitution vests in Congress, why can't they do it in other instances, and, finally, why can't they do it in all instances where it serves their purpose or meets their desires?

I believe there can be no distinction made in the degree of encroachment upon the rights of Congress. In principle there can be no difference between

a large and a small trespass, for if the treaty-making agencies can invade the constitutional powers of Congress and of the House of Representatives in one particular, they can invade those powers in all particulars.

Rights which are not defended will soon cease to exist. Putney on Constitutional Law, at pages 292 and 293, says:

Foreign countries dealing with our own are supposed to be acquainted with the general nature of our Government and of the limitations of the powers of each department. The greatest disgrace or danger with which our country can be threatened is the cowardly surrender by one department to any usurpation of powers by another.

Again at page 293 Mr. Putney says:

The treaty-making powers of the President and Senate together is not unlimited. The Constitution provides: "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land."

Treaties, therefore, are not the supreme law of the land by themselves but in connection with the Constitution and law of the United States. What is the order of precedence among these three? It is almost unnecessary to state that the Constitution of the United States must come first. An instrument which requires the vote of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and of three-fourths of the States for its amendment cannot be changed by the President and Senate.

Third. From the discussion which has gone before, it must be apparent that the proposed Mexican treaty undertakes to operate on subjects and within legislative fields declared by the Constitution to be expressly entrusted to Congress. In three instances, to wit, the disposal of property belonging to the United States, the control over the navigable waters of the United States, and the regulation of duties, imposts, and excises, the treaty makes a direct invasion of the express powers of Congress and of the House of Representatives. Again, the United States is obligated to raise and expend large sums of money for public works unauthorized by Congress, which certainly constitutes an indirect invasion of the powers expressly given to Congress and to the House of Representatives to raise revenue, to pay debts, and to appropriate money. In another instance, the treaty regulates migration of aliens into this country which, if not a direct invasion of an express power, is certainly a direct invasion of an implied power of Congress and of the House of Representatives to deal with the subject of aliens.

Fourth. I believe that for the protection of the rights of the House of Representatives, the proposed Mexican treaty should be protested as an invasion of its constitutional prerogatives.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] 5 minutes.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand an editorial from the Weymouth Gazette, of Weymouth, Mass., in the district which I represent, reading in part as follows:

Never, in our rather lengthy newspaper experience, have we observed such a tidal

wave of public resentment as that which developed on Monday within a few brief hours over the summary ousting of George E. Lane as chairman of the Weymouth Price and Rationing Board by the Regional (Boston) O. P. A. Office. And the wave increases in proportion with every passing day.

The O. P. A. Regional Office threw Mr. Lane out on the grounds that he violated regulations stipulating that rationing board members cannot participate in politics by holding public office. Specifically, he was charged with running for the office of town meeting member. It is understood that he was given the opportunity of resigning, but refused on the ground that the Hatch Act does not apply to unpaid volunteer Federal appointees like himself. Furthermore he holds that being a town meeting member is not a political office and therefore in holding such membership he was not participating in politics. Following his refusal to resign he was notified that his term of office on the local rationing board had ceased.

Everyone seems to agree that the Hatch Act has nothing whatever to do with the question at issue, developed in Mr. Lane's refusal to resign. Running for public office such as salaried jobs certainly could be classified as running for a political office. But town meeting members—No. They are elected by ballot, to be sure, but to classify this position in our town government as being a political office is utterly absurd. And whoever has ruled that such an office is political doesn't know what the score is. It's an absurd ruling and one that needs clarifying at once.

Mr. Chairman, immediately after the removal of the chairman of the local rationing board the entire board resigned in protest. The board of selectmen joined in the protest. The town of Weymouth, in town meeting assembled, unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the action of the O. P. A. and calling on Washington officials to review the entire matter immediately. The community seems to be solidly back of the rationing board in its position.

As stated in the editorial, the action taken by the O. P. A. regional director was not taken under the Hatch Act. The Hatch Act as amended specifically exempts a part-time officer without compensation, serving in connection with the existing war effort.

The action was taken by the regional director purely as a matter of policy, designed to restrain all O. P. A. personnel including volunteers from political activities regarded as within the spirit of the Hatch Act, even though the act as amended is not applicable to them. The application of the policy is delegated by the O. P. A. authorities in Washington to regional and district offices.

What is a town meeting member, Mr. Chairman, and what are his duties? Town meeting members in New England are chosen each year in those towns which have become so large that it is impossible for all the townspeople to attend the annual town meeting in person.

The duties of a town meeting member are to attend the annual town meeting normally a year after his election and such special town meetings, if any, as may be necessary in the meantime to deal with strictly local affairs. In the town of Weymouth there are some 249 town meeting members elected as individuals on a non-partisan basis.

The absurdity of the ruling in this instance is emphasized by the fact that the chairman of the rationing board has served for several years both as a member of the board and as a town meeting member, rendering efficient service to the town in both capacities, drawing no compensation from either office and encountering no objection whatsoever heretofore from O. P. A.

If the proposed ruling is to stand, it will, logically apply to all rationing boards throughout Massachusetts and other New England States having town meeting members. If the ruling is to stand, it should logically apply to town meeting members holding positions with selective-service boards and other similar activities.

I am in hearty sympathy with the broad objectives of the Hatch Act. I commend its enforcement.

I believe that the ruling in this instance however, is absurd and without justification. I cannot believe that the duties of a town meeting member bring it in any sense either within the letter or the spirit of the Hatch Act.

I again condemn the action taken by O. P. A., Mr. Chairman. I demand immediate reconsideration, in order that the town of Weymouth, may continue to have the services of its rationing board and that other communities in New England and elsewhere may not be subject to similar action.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD a copy of the editorial referred to, three of the many communications received in this connection, and a copy of a joint letter of protest addressed to O. P. A. Administrator Bowles by members of the Massachusetts delegation.

[From the Weymouth (Mass.) Gazette and Transcript of March 9, 1944]

LANE'S OUSTING STIRS TOWN'S FIGHTING SPIRIT

Never, in our rather lengthy newspaper experience, have we observed such a tidal wave of public resentment as that which developed on Monday, within a few brief hours, over the summary ousting of George E. Lane as chairman of the Weymouth price and rationing board by the regional (Boston) O. P. A. office. And the wave increases in proportion with every passing day.

The O. P. A. regional office threw Mr. Lane out on the grounds that he violated regulations stipulating that rationing board members cannot participate in politics by holding public office. Specifically he was charged with running for the office of town-meeting member. It is understood that he was given the opportunity of resigning, but refused, on the ground that the Hatch Act does not apply to unpaid-volunteer Federal appointees like himself. Furthermore he holds that being a town-meeting member is not a political office and therefore in holding such membership he was not participating in politics. Following his refusal to resign, he was notified that his term of office on the local rationing board had ceased.

When his fellow board members heard this news they were incensed that regional O. P. A. officials could take such a senseless and absurd attitude and they resigned as a body. Their action was in protest to the ousting of their chairman.

Incidentally, it took a good deal of courage on their part to take this action and they are to be complimented in backing their convictions with united action. What they did, not only showed how they feel on the matter at issue, but it is at the same time a personal

tribute to Mr. Lane and one in which he can take pardonable pride. They knew better than anyone else in town what a superb job Mr. Lane has done as a board member since the inception of O. P. A. here in town and particularly as chairman since he succeeded Attorney William J. Holbrook. Their solid backing certainly demonstrated what they thought about the action of the regional O. P. A. office.

This fighting spirit was again displayed a few hours later (early Monday evening), when the selectmen met to consider the resignations of the rationing board members. The selectmen declined to accept the resignations.

Later that evening, at the annual town meeting, J. William O'Donnell, of South Weymouth, rose for the purpose of advising the meeting that Mr. Lane had been "fired" as chairman of the rationing board, and pointed out that the action was taken because Mr. Lane was running for town meeting member in next Monday's town election. He presented a resolution condemning the O. P. A. for its action, and calling upon Washington officials to review the matter at once.

Everyone seems to agree that the Hatch Act has nothing whatever to do with the question at issue, developed in Mr. Lane's refusal to resign. Running for public office such as salaried jobs certainly could be classified as running for a political office. But town meeting members—no. They are elected by ballot to be sure, but to classify this position in our town government as being a political office is utterly absurd. And whoever has ruled that such an office is political, doesn't know what the score is. It's an absurd ruling and one that needs clarifying at once.

If being a town meeting member is something which rationing board members cannot be, at one and the same time, then the same logic must of necessity follow through to selective-service boards. Their members are nonpaid, volunteer workers. They are Federal appointees.

Some of our Weymouth's Selective Service Board's members are also town meeting members. If the same line of reasoning is pursued in relation to them, then they too much resign one position or the other—or be ousted by some \$12,000-a-year understrapper sitting at a polished desk in Boston—or Washington—who has a dwarfed notion of the fitness of things.

This situation, as it relates specifically to Weymouth, must also apply in 37 other towns in this Commonwealth which also have adopted the limited form of town meeting government, like we have here. And there are selective service boards having jurisdiction over all of these towns. When we contemplate a situation like this, with the possibilities it presents for wholesale oustings or resignations, you can begin to see what a tangled mess a stupid decision can create.

Here in Weymouth, Mr. Lane and his fellow rationing board members have the solid backing of the community. He and the others have been deluged with phone calls and messages. In every case, their fellow-townspeople were incensed over the regional O. P. A. raising such a silly issue in the first place, and pledged to support in any way possible, whatever move that might be taken next.

THE TOWN OF WEYMOUTH, MASS.,
East Weymouth, Mass., March 8, 1944.
Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the board of selectmen held this evening it was voted to write to the Office of Price Administration headquarters explaining our predicament in regard to our rationing board, all of whom have resigned, as you may know, in protest of the removal of their chairman, who is a can-

didate for a town meeting member from precinct 8.

We have a situation in Weymouth quite unlike most other towns or cities in Massachusetts or any other State in the Union. We have what is called a representative town meeting consisting of 240 elected members, a certain percent of the voters in each of the 9 precincts. These members are elected from their own precinct and not by vote of the whole town. This type of government was necessary, owing to the large population, approximately 27,000, and no hall suitable to hold such a gathering.

According to the ruling of the Massachusetts Office of Price Administration, the members of our rationing board cannot run for town meeting membership, therefore being deprived of their rights. Neither can we appoint any of the 240 members of the representative town government to the rationing board. In our neighboring towns members of the rationing boards may, and do, attend town meetings, taking an active part in same, but in Weymouth that privilege is denied the membership of the rationing boards. The net result is that we have 10 or more members of the rationing board who cannot take part in our town affairs, and 240 town meeting members, plus other elected officials, that cannot be rationing board members. In our opinion this is not fair to the rationing board members or to the board of selectmen who have to make the recommendations for appointments, especially when your paid officers and employees can take part in their town meetings with no strings attached.

The State officials of the Office of Price Administration inform us that they do not know where they can draw a line. We believe that the State is correct in keeping politics out of the rationing board membership, but we do not consider a town meeting member as being in politics, therefore why not draw the line there and give your rationing board membership the rights that they deserve?

Very truly yours,

MARY J. SHEEHAN,

Clerk, Weymouth Board of Selectmen.

BICKNELL SCHOOL,

North Weymouth, Mass., March 10, 1944.

HON. RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH,

United States Congressman.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the Weymouth Teacher's Association I would like to register their protest concerning the recent action of the Office of Price Administration. This protestation is not for any personal reason but rather a complaint against the fineness of the interpretation of the rule set up in Massachusetts concerning those who aspire to what the Office of Price Administration consider a political office.

We cannot rest with their assumption that a town-meeting member is a political office. It is in our opinion a numerical factor and not a political factor that has forced Weymouth to accept the limited form of town meeting.

Therefore we urge that the necessary steps be taken immediately to correct this injustice in Massachusetts or anywhere else in New England that this might exist and that all members of the dismissed Weymouth board be restored to their former status.

Very truly yours,

E. LEO MADDEN,

President, Weymouth Teachers' Association.

STETSON SHOE CO., RATIONING BOARD,

South Weymouth, Mass., March 7, 1944.

MR. STEPHEN EARLY,

Secretary to the President,

White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: George E. Lane, chairman of the Weymouth War Price and Rationing Board, has been removed by O. P. A.

This removal is based, as we understand it, on the fact that Mr. Lane is desirous of

retaining his status as a town-meeting member* (see explanation attached). That office has been classified by O. P. A. as a "Political" office. It is our further understanding that the entire panel of ration board members has resigned in a body in protest to this ruling.

George Lane was a former selectman of the town of Weymouth and passed up the opportunity to run again for that office, undoubtedly feeling that the time given to the Weymouth War Price Rationing Board would be a substantial contribution to the war effort. Mr. Lane was a candidate for town-meeting member in 1943 and no action was taken by O. P. A. at that time. The fact that he continued as a town-meeting member for the 1944 election has apparently caused this ruling to be made.

We should like to enter our protest against this ruling, for we have felt, as an industrial organization in the town of Weymouth, that the members of the Weymouth War Price and Rationing Board have done good work and that they deserve commendation and not condemnation.

May we respectfully request that everything be done to reinstate as promptly as possible the entire panel of Weymouth War Price and Rationing Board members as a vote of confidence in the work that they have done for their country and their community?

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT VINAL,

Treasurer.

Copies to Hon. DAVID I. WALSH and Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH.

The town of Weymouth, as well as all of the other towns in New England, holds an annual town meeting. In addition to this annual meeting, it sometimes is necessary to hold special (extra) town meetings during the year. Years ago all of the people who wished attended these town meetings, voted the necessary money to run the town and then went home. As the population grew there was no meeting place available which was large enough to hold all of the people who wished to attend. Thus, all who wished could not get inside and vote.

Today, in order to treat every citizen fairly, Weymouth and many other towns, holds its town meetings under what is known as the proportional representation plan.

Thus, a town-meeting member today is one of a body of approximately 249 unpaid citizens chosen by the rest of the citizens to vote for them the appropriations necessary for the operation of the town, in the same manner as all of the citizens did years ago.

Unless special town meetings are necessary these members attend town meeting for either one or two evenings each year. They have no other duties to perform, no other functions, and are not political in the common usage of that term.

MARCH 14, 1944.

HON. CHESTER BOWLES,

Administrator, Office of

Price Administration,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Our attention has been called to the removal of the chairman of the rationing board at Weymouth, Mass., by direction of O. P. A. Regional Director Shoup because of the chairman's decision to run for reelection as a town meeting member, which position he has held for several years, and to the unanimous protest of the town of Weymouth in a town meeting assembled over the action taken.

Those protesting point out that provisions of the Hatch Act have no application to the case inasmuch as by amendment to that act, a member of a war price and rationing board is a part-time officer without compensation, serving in connection with the existing war effort and therefore specifically exempted from the provisions of the act.

They indicate that the action has been taken under the policy of the O. P. A. to refrain from political activities within the spirit of the Hatch Act even though the act as amended is not applicable to them, decision having been delegated by the National O. P. A. Office to regional and district offices.

They believe that the classification of a town meeting member's duties as political duties is without justification and that if adhered to would have wide application to all rationing boards throughout the Commonwealth.

They point out that the duties of a town meeting member, of which we understand there are some 249 in the town of Weymouth, are to attend one town meeting a year after his election and such other special meetings, if any, as may be called in the meantime in respect to strictly local affairs and indicate that in their judgment, those duties can in no sense be classified as political within the letter or spirit of the Hatch Act. They indicate further that in this particular instance, the member in question has served consistently, both as a member of the rationing board and as a town meeting member, giving the town excellent service in both capacities, receiving no compensation in either position and without any objection heretofore on the part of the O. P. A. regional office.

All members of the rationing board resigned in protest over the action taken but have been prevailed upon to withdraw their resignations temporarily pending decision by O. P. A.

We are in hearty sympathy with the broad objectives of the Hatch Act and commend its enforcement, but we feel that the action of the O. P. A. in this instance is outside of the scope of the act. We protest against it and earnestly urge that the matter may be reconsidered with a view to reinstatement of the Weymouth rationing board and assurance of its continued service to the town.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., ALLEN T. TREADWAY, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, PEHR G. HOLMES, CHARLES R. CLASON, ANGER L. GOODWIN, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

MR. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

MR. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to read an Associated Press quotation of Walter Winchell as follows:

MIAMI BEACH, Fla., March 13.—Walter Winchell said here today that he had been asking various Members of Congress to be investigated for many years. "Dies is the kind of man who does not like any kind of criticism. Some time ago he asked Drew Pearson to please ask Walter Winchell to lay off him. When I told Pearson to tell him to go to hell I expected him to use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to even matters," Winchell said.

MR. CHAIRMAN, this utterly false statement by Mr. Winchell and the fact that he has demonstrated an unwillingness to find out the truth about a given situation convinces me that he is not concerned with the truth and that he deliberately and intentionally spreads falsehoods over the airways. Last December after Mr. Winchell had used certain false statements repeatedly I wired him and wired the Blue Network advising them that the statements were utterly false. I asked the officials of the Blue Network and Mr. Winchell to meet with me either in

Washington or in New York, that I would permit them to serve as a jury to consider the facts and if they concluded that the evidence was conclusive that the statements used by Mr. Winchell over the air were absolutely and completely false then I expected an opportunity over the same facilities to the same audience to deny those statements. Those wires were sent last December. More than 2½ months elapsed and neither the officials of the Blue Network nor Mr. Winchell saw fit to accord me an opportunity to be heard and to present the facts to them. When we consider their refusal to afford me an opportunity to present the real facts involved, and when Walter Winchell makes a deliberate falsehood to the press it must be obvious to every fairminded citizen that he is not interested in ascertaining the truth.

I wanted to be very careful to find out whether or not he made these misstatements because he did not have the correct information and it was for that reason that I gave to Mr. Winchell and the Blue Network full opportunity to investigate the facts. It happened that most of the evidence was in documentary form and it would not have taken the officials of the broadcasting company and Mr. Winchell more than 30 minutes to acquaint themselves with the facts.

For instance, Mr. Winchell said over the air that our committee had given access to our files to one Joe Camp. I have in my files a letter replying to Joe Camp's request for the information in which I told him that it was the policy of our committee not to permit private individuals to have access to our files and that we would not permit him to see these files. That is only one instance of the falsehoods that Mr. Winchell used over the radio.

Mr. Chairman, since this controversy has arisen I have received thousands of letters from people everywhere who are anxious to appear before our committee to give concrete proof of the deliberate falsehoods that Mr. Winchell has used over the radio. An eminent man in New York who has made a careful survey of all of the Winchell scripts wants to submit proof that only 40 percent of his statements over a period of time are truthful and that 60 percent constitute deliberate falsehoods. Another man in possession of similar evidence is anxious to be heard. I have written to the Blue Network, and said in effect:

Since I have given you every opportunity to demonstrate to the Congress and to the Nation whether or not you are interested in finding out the truth, and since you have declined to avail yourself of the evidence which I am prepared to submit to you, since you are unwilling to act as a jury to pass upon the truth or falsity of these matters it is becoming increasingly apparent to the American people that you are a party to this scheme to malign and smear and discredit American public officials and American citizens as a part of an insidious propaganda program that you are carrying on over the airways of the United States.

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

Mr. DIES. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All I know about Winchell is that he is an outstanding American who formerly came from my neighborhood. He was very helpful in the very thing that my distinguished colleague is doing, unearthing un-American activities. I think there must be some misunderstanding, some confusion about his efforts, although I do not know all the facts.

Mr. DIES. Let me answer the gentleman. If I made a statement about the gentleman and repeated that statement and if the gentleman came to me and said, "Now, Mr. DIES, these statements are not correct, I want you to afford me an opportunity to prove this to you conclusively and I will leave it up to your sense of fairness, Mr. DIES, whether or not those statements are true or false," and if I denied that request and then after the gentleman had given me every opportunity to ascertain whether or not I wanted to be fair I were to give to the press of this country a statement as vicious, and insulting, and as indicative of an arrogance which equals, if it does not exceed, Father Coughlin's, what would the gentleman think? Why, Mr. Chairman, when Coughlin was using the airways of this country to spread misunderstandings and promote hatred, leading Catholics were very deeply concerned. I was in communication with some of these Catholic leaders of the Catholic Church. They were as much concerned about that matter as anyone could possibly be, and they exercised their influence to restrict and restrain him and to prevent him from using the airways of this country for the purpose of promoting hatred in the United States.

I regret that there has arisen another man evidently drunk with the praise and the power he thinks he enjoys, who believes he can imitate the methods and technique of Father Coughlin and use the radios of this country for the purpose of spreading deliberate falsehoods.

Mr. Chairman, when Walter Winchell first advertised the book *Secret Army*, Members of Congress called attention to the fact that Spivak, the author of that book, was a member of the Communist Party, and there was a great deal of criticism of Mr. Winchell at that time, but Mr. Winchell then entered into a period in which he came out openly and aboveboard against the Communists. I believed then that Mr. Winchell was prepared to deal fairly and courageously with all of these issues. But he took Sabotage, Mr. DICKSTEIN, a book which was copied to a large extent from the reports of our committee on Japanese and Nazi activities—and there is no question about that—Mr. Winchell gave his endorsement to that book and declared it was one of the finest books ever published in the United States, that every American citizen should read it. In other words, while he did not know it, perhaps, he was endorsing the work of our committee as the finest work that had been accomplished in the history of this country. Then he proceeds to use an excerpt from the book, much of the material of which was stolen from our reports, for the purpose of smearing and

discrediting me and the committee I have the honor to head.

Mr. Chairman, I do not say that Mr. Winchell should not have the right to criticize me as a public official. Long ago I ceased to be sensitive about anything that anybody said about me. I am not contending that we should abridge freedom of speech. I do not propose that the broadcasting companies of this country censor the fair and truthful statements of commentators. What I am trying to say is that when a man uses the airways for the purpose of promoting hatred, whether that hatred is directed against the Jewish people, the Catholic people, or other people in the United States, he is imitating the dangerous technique of Hitlerism, fascism, and all other forms of totalitarianism.

I have analyzed some of his scripts. I wish I had the opportunity to show you the insidious way in which he seeks to create false impressions. I wish I could show you how that method of propaganda is similar in every respect to the method used by Goebbels and the propagandists of Germany. It is inconsistent, Mr. Chairman, for anyone to brand and condemn intolerance, then be guilty of it himself. If we condemn intolerance, we must set an example of tolerance ourselves. It is as wrong to condemn people of one race as it is to condemn people of another race. Yet here is a man who because he is intoxicated with the flattery and applause that greets him at Miami, Fla., has grown so bold that he does not hesitate to tell public officials who have never criticized him, who in all of their statements have been dignified and respectful, "Go to hell." Now that is a fine way to meet an issue.

Mr. Chairman, remember that I did not condemn Mr. Winchell when I spoke the other day. I merely answered the statements that he had made over the radio about me and the committee I serve as chairman. I said nothing that could have reflected upon him; yet with that arrogance, that confident belief that because he has the radio facilities of the country at his disposal, he can use innuendoes, inferences, and falsehoods to destroy public officials and the committees of this Congress. It is a repetition of the Coughlin incident in almost every detail. I want to say to him that bigger men than he have sought to discredit this committee. Smarter and more clever propagandists have sought to smear us, and they have not succeeded. If Mr. Winchell could see the thousands of letters that are pouring into my office, he would realize that he has just gone too far. The people of this country are sick and tired of radio commentators of any stripe who use the airways for the purpose of promoting hatred and spreading falsehoods.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE TAX BILL

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is probable that in the en-

ture history of this Nation there has never been a period, long or short, in which more information to which the people are entitled has been denied them than has been the case under the New Deal administration in the last 12 years. There has been no period in the history of our Nation when more misinformation calculated to deceive the people has been disseminated, than has been the case in the last 12 years under the New Deal administration. There has not been a time in the history of our Nation when an organized, cunningly devised, governmentally inspired, politically designed, coolly calculated propaganda has ever been more fully employed to confuse the people, to cover up the facts, to popularize fallacies, and to hide misadministration than in the last 12 years under the New Deal administration.

There has been no period in the history of this Nation when more pseudo emergencies and fake crises have been foisted upon the American people to justify on the part of the Executive demands for power and more power, which could not be justified in fact and in truth, than in the last 12 years under the New Deal administration.

One of the most widespread, unjustified and calculated deceptions practiced on the people has been in regard to the revenue bill which the Congress enacted and which the President vetoed in an insulting and unjustified message to the Congress and which both Houses of the Congress promptly and overwhelmingly passed over the President's veto.

A good deal of the misinformation about this revenue bill has been spread unintentionally by newspapers which fell into the habit of tersely describing the President's demands on the Congress for a ten-and-a-half-billion-dollar-tax bill, and the bill passed by the Congress as a two-billion-dollar-tax bill. There has, however, been a very great deal of cleverly designed propaganda, calculated to cover up the enormous expenditures which are being made, and the enormous tax load which has been placed upon the people, while the internationalists are insisting on giving away what we have to other peoples in the world.

The people should be informed and should keep very clearly in mind the difference—a very fundamental difference, by the way—between military strategy and humane impulse in our feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and sheltering the homeless in other nations who have been rendered helpless by the war, and the efforts of international adventurers in world-power politics to impoverish the American people by appropriating their substance in the form of machinery and manufactured goods to be used in what is now admittedly a struggle for world power and world domination. These people—these super-internationalists—who are engaged in this desperate game of world-power politics, apparently have neither conscience nor shame. They appear to be willing utterly to impoverish the American people in an effort to buy and bribe acquiescence in their political plots to secure world domination.

Of course, we in America are ready and eager to use bread instead of bul-

lets to secure military cooperation, save human lives, and prevent casualties. The damage which is being done is occurring because these international power adventurers and plotters are utilizing these military and human requirements as a cover for their schemes to make Uncle Sam put up the money for a world-wide W. P. A. unlimited. Some idea of what the American taxpayers will be up against provided these international political power schemers can get away with their designs, can be gained when we realize that the total population of the world is around 2,169,000,000, of whom probably more than one-half, judging by our standards, would fall into the category of ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed.

Added to these outpourings of our substance under lend-lease are the extravagance and the avoidable waste which this administration is permitting in the war effort. The Pentagon Building in Washington is a case in point. Such instances can be multiplied time and time again. There is not the slightest reason in this world why our hard-earned dollars should be squandered in a war effort any more than they should be squandered in peacetime. Certain extravagances and a very great deal of waste are unavoidable in a war effort such as we are engaged in at this time. That is bad enough. But when we have added to that terrible burden of waste and extravagance the deliberate and calculated waste and extravagance of bureaucrats who are determined to wreck the American Government, socialize American industry, make serfs and peons of American farmers, and keep the people in subjection to bureaucratic regimentation after the war ends, it is time the American people were told the facts so they can do something about such an outrageous state of affairs.

Apparently it is for the purpose of hiding these designs, the waste, the extravagance, the corruption, which are rampant in the executive branch of the Government today, that the propagandists and the New Deal press keep spreading the impression that the President asked for ten and a half billion dollars in taxes and that the Congress gave him only a \$2,000,000,000 tax bill.

In my years of service on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, I have become acutely conscious of the terrible tax burden which has been growing by leaps and bounds under this New Deal administration. The bureaucrats, sensing that the people are getting fed up with excuses, broken promises, visionary schemes, alien ideologies, and political waste and corruption, have begun to exert every effort to cover up and conceal from the knowledge of the people the tremendous sums of money which are being taken from the pockets of the citizens by taxation both visible and hidden.

This is the picture which lies behind this general impression being thrust upon the Nation, in terms of ten billions and two billions as representing the tax bill, instead of the real amount. I now shall tell you the facts. They are as follows: The estimated revenue of the Federal Government from all sources for 1943 was \$42,500,000,000. With the \$2,-

300,000,000 of added revenue which the Congress passed over the President's veto in the last revenue bill, the estimated revenue for 1945 would stand at \$44,800,000,000. What the President was asking for was not a tax revenue of \$10,500,000,000, but additional tax revenues of that amount to be imposed upon the \$42,500,000,000 of revenue already assessed against our people. This, if the Congress had been bludgeoned into passing it, would have run the Government's revenues for 1945 to \$53,000,000,000.

Every citizen knows when he stops to think about it that all taxation in the end is and must be paid by the man or woman who buys things across the counter. All this New Deal talk about making the rich pay the proposed additional taxes is just so much political "bunk." Big incomes, corporate revenues, are now taxed to the utmost. The fact is that an income of \$500,000 a year in the State of New York, one of the States having a State income-tax law, would leave the individual receiving it in debt when he had paid his Federal taxes and his State tax, the total amount of which would be more than his total taxable income. Any individual having a million-dollar income in the State of New York would be deeper in debt than the possessor of a \$500,000 income, after his Federal and State taxes were paid. Even in the States having no State income-tax law, no taxpayer, regardless of the size of his taxable income during this year and next, can have left after paying his taxes, a sum greater than \$24,261.76. In other words, we have already reached a point of practical confiscation of all big incomes. So, when Mr. Roosevelt proposes to take an additional \$10,500,000,000 in revenues out of the American people, he is proposing to take it out of the pockets of the poor people to a very great extent, and of those with smaller incomes, because that is the only place additional revenue can be secured to finance the waste and extravagance of the huge political bureaucracy which this administration has built up to bestride the shoulders of the taxpayers like an "Old man of the sea." The protestations of the administration, especially those of the Treasury Department, under Mr. Morgenthau, that they are trying to protect the poor people from this load of taxation is intentionally deceptive, and entirely erroneous, and one of the best authorities I can pick out at this moment for that statement is Franklin Delano Roosevelt himself when, in 1932, he said:

Taxes are paid in the sweat of the man who labors, because they are a burden on production and are paid through production.

Mr. Roosevelt, when he made that statement, was running for the office he still holds. That was before he had run our national debt from \$19,500,000,000, when he took office, up to about \$49,000,000,000 before we entered the war. No citizen can tell now what the national debt is, because it increases so enormously from day to day that he cannot keep track of it, and the Treasury avoids talking about it.

Mr. Roosevelt was not the first man, by any means, who discovered that waste means taxes, and taxes mean misery for

the people. Thomas Jefferson, in his day, pointed out the dangers of excessive waste and the consequent excessive taxation when he said:

Having seen the people of all other nations bowed down to the earth under the wars and prodigalities of their rulers, I have cherished their opposite—peace, economy, and ridance of public debt—believing that these were the high roads to public as well as private prosperity and happiness. * * * Taxation follows public debt, and in its train wretchedness and oppression. * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them they must become happy. * * * The same prudence, which, in private life, would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects forbids it in the disposition of the public money. * * * We must make our election between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude.

Let us stop a moment and ponder the hundreds of millions of your money squandered on the Canol pipe-line project in British Columbia; the Pentagon Building project in Virginia, adjacent to Washington, so ably exposed in its terribly wasteful ramifications by my good friend the gentleman from Michigan, Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL; the Alaska Highway, and the proposed oil pipe lines in Saudi Arabia. Ponder these along with the extravagances under cover of lend-lease, and the plans of the world-power politicians to take your substance—your goods and services—away from you, to bribe other people into acquiescence with the plans of these power politicians lusting for world domination—these men and women who would put their own people and all the other peoples of the world in economic slavery in order that their own passion for power may be gratified.

And then remember, my fellow citizens, that Mr. Roosevelt was demanding not a ten-and-a-half-billion tax burden of you, but a fifty-three billion tax burden of you. And remember, too, that it was your Congress, your representatives in the legislative body, who stood between you and that extravagant and extortionate demand and whittled these new raids on your pocketbook from ten and a half billion dollars down to two and a third billions.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

ALASKA, ELK HILLS, AND ARABIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is another speech about oil.

First, I want to express profound satisfaction over articles recently appearing in the press and other information which I have received to the effect that at long last real exploration is to be undertaken in the oil resources of Alaska. The Navy is dispatching a party of experts to the vicinity of Point Barrow at Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. In the near future it is reported that the War Department will undertake investigation of fields in Southern Alaska.

I do not know how much oil there is in Alaska, Mr. Chairman. But there are those who believe there is a very great quantity indeed and certainly there is every reason why Congress should do

everything within its power to encourage and facilitate the exploration of our own American resources in Alaska. Indeed my only regret is, it was not done long ago. For I think there is at least the possibility that had we found out accurately what Alaskan resources actually are some other mistakes and blunders might have been avoided. We might readily have avoided the mistakes of the Canol project, which understandable though it may have been in the beginning as a military measure, should certainly have been carried out in a very different manner and which as presently set up can only result in the long run in great benefits to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, through its 70 percent owned subsidiary Imperial Oil, Ltd., at American taxpayers' expense. For since Imperial holds all the leases, only Imperial can use the pipe line in the future. How much better it would have been had these Alaskan fields been developed instead with the whole project on American soil all the way through.

I wish I could continue on this constructive note, but I cannot. For on yesterday there was introduced in the other body of Congress, a bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy to enter into unit operations contracts with private oil companies for the exploitation of naval reserves. The purpose of this bill, of course, is to legalize the contract between the Navy and the Standard Oil Co. for the operation of Elk Hills Naval Reserve. Should this bill pass it will mean that not only that portion of the Elk Hills field where Standard owns sections of land checkerboarded with Navy sections, but also the entire western and southern portion of the field where the Navy owns the entire acreage will be thrown into a unit operations plan constituting a partnership in the exploitation of this oil between the Navy on the one hand and the Standard Oil Co. on the other.

It will be recalled that a year ago last November the first contract between Navy and Standard Oil Co. was quietly put into effect and continued in operation until last summer when as a result of congressional efforts on the part of other Members and myself, as well as the action of the Justice Department through its Lands Division, in declaring the contract illegal, that first contract was canceled. Something at least has been accomplished by our efforts for some of the worst features of the original contract do not appear in the new proposed contract. But the Attorney General has stated that this new contract would not be valid unless the basic law is changed. Congress, therefore, has this question squarely in its own lap as I see it, and will have to decide whether or not it wants to empower the Secretary of the Navy to go into partnership with the Standard Oil Co., giving it operation of the greatest oil reserve in the Western Hemisphere or not. I know it will be said that under the terms of the proposed new contract the Navy is free to deal with some other company than Standard if it sees fit to do so, but to anyone who is at all familiar with the actual situation in the Elk Hills areas, it will be clear that this is a meaningless

provision. The Standard Oil Co. of California owns all the pipe lines leading from Elk Hills, and under the California law these pipe lines are not common carriers. When the contract states that either party can dispose of its oil as it sees fit, therefore it virtually means that the Navy can either sell its oil to the Standard Oil Co. or else attempt to carry it out in buckets. This contract, furthermore, contemplates passage of this bill changing our whole policy and authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to enter into unit-operations-plan contracts, not only at Elk Hills but elsewhere as he sees fit.

I still believe, Mr. Chairman, as I have from the beginning, that the only right solution of this problem is by condemnation by the Navy of the Standard holdings in Elk Hills. That is the only way, in my judgment, that on any reasonable basis at all, Elk Hills can be made a true Navy reserve. At this very moment some of the very same people who are shouting that our oil resources are dangerously near exhaustion are complaining very loudly, indeed, because the Navy will not permit the Standard Oil Co. to pump more oil out of Elk Hills than it is now permitted to do. This is urged in spite of the fact that it is well known that an increase of the amount of oil taken by Standard from Elk Hills will inevitably deplete the oil under the Navy's land even more seriously than has already taken place by the drilling operations of Standard along the Navy section lines. I am opposed to this unit-operations plan because I am convinced it will immeasurably strengthen the monopolistic position which the Standard Oil Co. already holds. Five hundred and eighty thousand acres of California's potential or proven oil land is now either owned in fee, under lease, or with mineral rights, held by the Standard Oil Co. For years Standard has virtually controlled the price of crude oil in California and will be in an even better position to do so if it gains control of the Navy's Elk Hills field.

I want to ask the question as to just why the whole of the Elk Hills field is included in the unit plan of operation. It is clear from the map that only in the eastern and northern portions of the field does the checkerboard-ownership situation pertain. Through the southern portion and the entire western half of the field Standard owns only one or two quarter sections, and yet it is proposed, without our knowing with any degree of accuracy what lies underneath the rest of the field, to draw this whole business into the unit-operations plan with an oil company, which in the physical nature of the case can only be the Standard Oil Co. of California. Were Standard's holding condemned and purchased by the Navy, the Standard Oil Co. would still be able to get along quite well. But our Navy's oil could then be definitely produced and handled in whatever manner it was best to handle it from the national point of view. If this contract proposed to include only those portions of the Elk Hills field where Standard does own part of the land, I would not feel quite so strongly about the matter. But as I see the present proposal, it

boils down to one which would without any reason or necessity give the Standard Oil Co. a very greatly increased control of the oil of the United States.

Now, I am quite frank to say that the new contract is much better than the original one was, and if nothing else had been accomplished by our efforts, we would have at least the right to feel a certain satisfaction over the results so far obtained. For under the new contract, although the original participating percentages of 64 percent for Navy and 36 percent for Standard are still included, nevertheless it is provided that changes in participating percentages will be retroactive to November 1942. Under the old contract these changes would not have been so retroactive and to whatever extent oil was discovered on Navy lands, which is about the only place it can be discovered since Standard lands have already been pretty heavily exploited, Standard would still have retained any excess oil over its fair percentage which it has taken. As I say, in this contract that feature has been corrected, and, as a matter of fact, it is altogether likely that long before Elk Hills has stopped producing it will be found that well in excess of 64 percent of the oil will come from Navy lands.

In the second place, the new contract does make the Secretary of the Navy the final arbiter, which he was not under the old agreement, as to changes in these percentages of participation. Even so, however, the United States is starting out at a great disadvantage, for the percentages are based on the area of commercial production which is defined on the map. This area of commercial production includes only about 9,000 acres out of a total of 42,000 acres in the whole Elk Hills field. The area includes those sections belonging to Standard Oil Co. in which the encroachment of water has become a serious problem. Most important of all, however, the western line of this so-called area of commercial production is, as anyone can see, a completely arbitrary one, for it is nothing more or less than a section line. Any one man knows that oil is no respecter of section lines. Furthermore, this western line of the so-called area of commercial production is the west line of section 36 on which already a number of successful wells have been drilled and the land to the west of that line belongs to the Navy. It is almost certain that there is additional oil west of the line which would materially change percentages if the line were made to accord with the real facts of the situation instead of arbitrary section lines.

The very fact that so much stress is laid upon the matter of revision of the participating percentages is proof that no one knows adequately what the facts are, and even though these percentages are subject to revision, or rather, I should say, because they are subject to revision, we are running into a situation where it will be required, as I see it, to have as large an accounting staff and staff of lawyers as was ever had in the history of the oil business, or in any other business, for any readjustments made in participating percentages must be made ret-

roactive, as they should be, to November 1942. This means constant readjustments all along the line. It will probably mean constant litigation. It will require every time a change is made that the whole system of accounts will have to be altered.

In the next place, it is to be remembered that the oil company involved in this unit agreement is to be paid its costs of operation out of the Navy's share of the oil. Originally those costs will be shared on a 64-36 basis. They are to be settled periodically and in the end there must be a readjustment of the allocation of these costs in accordance with the division of participation in the oil. It will be virtually impossible, as I see it, to ever get these costs in balance. All these difficulties can be multiplied by at least two when I point out that there are at least two zones, namely, the shallow zone and the so-called Stevens zone, where it is known that oil exists in Elk Hills. It will be virtually impossible to find out where the Navy stands in this matter under the unit-operations plan at any given time.

I want to emphasize that the services of the oil company may be paid either in oil or in money. If they are paid in oil no appropriation will be necessary on the part of Congress, and, therefore, no check by Congress on the operations of the deal will be possible. I have not tried to go into any technical detail, Mr. Chairman. I am for condemnation and not for the unit-operations plan, first, because under the unit-operations plan the monopolistic control of the Standard Oil Co. will be immeasurably enhanced by governmental action; second, because at the very least I believe those portions of the Elk Hills reserve which are wholly owned by the Navy should be left wholly in the Navy's hands and should not be subjected to this unit-operations proposal; third, because of the terrific complications involved in attempting to even come close to telling where the Government stands with regard to the matter at any given time; fourth, because of the present outcry that the Navy release its restrictions on production at Elk Hills in order to let Standard pump more oil from there. This sort of thing would, in my judgment, continue just as long as this oil was being made available to a private corporation; and finally, because I do not believe there is any other way except condemnation whereby we can have a true reserve for naval oil at Elk Hills. I believe there are manifold reasons why it is a matter of the greatest importance that we should make this a true Navy reserve.

I now come to the proposed deal for construction of a pipe line across Arabia at Government expense, but without any sort of governmental control over the oil or over the policies to be pursued in its disposition. It is interesting I think that the same oil company which is so anxious to get into partnership with the Navy with regard to the Navy's rich Elk Hills reserve, has consistently refused to permit the Government to purchase any interest in its Saudi Arabia leases. Everything appears to depend upon which foot the shoe is on. I have spoken against

this pipe-line agreement for a number of reasons. It has been defended on only one ground, and that is the allegation that it is a war measure and one of military necessity. This, I contend once again, it cannot conceivably be—at least so far as the present war is concerned. For it will take as long to build the pipe line as anyone believes this war is going to last. Then they fall back on the argument that it is supposed to be for the next war. To which my reply is that under the present proposed agreement it appears to me that in attempting to get oil clear on the other side of the world in order to have it for "the next war" that these gentlemen are talking about so much, we are altogether likely to be at the same time putting ourselves in a position where we will be forced into that next war for which we are supposed to need this oil. In other words, instead of an investment in national security, it looks to me like an investment in national insecurity.

As I have explained in a former speech, my position is that either the Government should have nothing whatsoever to do with the construction of this pipe line, or else it should insist as it did insist in the beginning of negotiations that if it is to assume all the risk and get itself involved in all the dangers of an international sort which will inevitably result, it should then be in a position of having a substantial interest in the oil itself and of being able to exercise control over the policies to be pursued in order to prevent this oil falling into the hands of a huge international cartel, which in the absence of the United States Government opposition, is, I believe, quite inevitable.

I have believed from the beginning, Mr. Chairman, and I believe now, that it is utterly impossible to consider this Arabian pipe line without taking into account those features of the situation which it will create which have so vital a bearing on future peace and the security of our own Nation, as well as other parts of the world.

This is a job for the State Department, and I have made an earnest effort to secure information from the State Department about the matter. This effort was completely without success. Mr. Raynor, the petroleum adviser of the State Department, gave me absolutely no real information about the matter and simply told me that he approved the deal for the State Department without independent consideration or study on the part of the State Department and only because the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were insisting upon it as a military measure. I cannot conceive of the State Department, which is the Department of government that has responsibility for the foreign affairs of our country, permitting a thing of this sort to go through without insisting upon taking into account its implications bearing on the future international relations of the United States. And yet I am informed that that is precisely what happened. Not only that, but I was dealt with in a manner far from straightforward, an experience which has deepened and strengthened my suspicions about this whole affair.

The State Department did have a representative who went to Arabia to look over this project. He did make a report on it. I asked to see this man and was told at first that he was out of town. I now find this was not true; that he was in Washington at the time I was told he was not in Washington. Further, I was informed that this report was only a technical report dealing with the amount of oil that might be developed in the Arabian area. I subsequently find, however, that this is not true, either, but that the report does deal with the proposed pipe-line agreement, and, furthermore, that it is adverse to the agreement in its present form. I am compelled to conclude that this must have been one of the reasons Mr. Raynor refused to let me see the report. I am also informed on authority which I consider absolutely reliable that the report tendered to the War Department by its representative who went to the Middle East was also adverse to the terms of the present pipe-line construction agreement. I should certainly think some congressional body should find out about all this—and at once. For this pipe line is going forward just as fast as it can be pushed right at this moment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter where at the very least Congress is going to appropriate several hundred millions of dollars not only for the pipe line but for the necessary additional construction of a refinery, without which the pipe line can hardly be of much use. More than that it is a matter which may well have a vital bearing on the world peace which every last one of us is promising the fighting men of our country will be built after victory has been achieved.

Some weeks ago I introduced a resolution for a thorough investigation of all facts concerning the petroleum industry by a special House committee selected from the Military and Naval Affairs Committees, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Public Lands Committee, and the Agriculture Committee. If I am wrong about this matter, I am the first man who wants to know it. But the only way to find out is for a congressional committee to get all the facts regarding the matter, including reports made by men who have been actually on the ground and who know intimately the problems involved.

Members of Congress frequently express concern over domination of this body by the executive department. We become so extremely agitated when the President sends up a message to the Congress which is couched in terms which we do not like. On a number of occasions Presidential vetoes have been overridden. But here are matters connected with what is perhaps at the moment the basic natural resource of the Nation with regard to which Congress will either have to take a positive direct action of its own, insisting upon a decent coordinated policy calculated to build peace in the world in the future and to construct the security of our country on a really firm foundation, or else share the responsibility for whatever the consequence may be of things that are now being done.

Mr. Chairman, let us explore and develop our oil resources in Alaska as it is now planned to do. Let us free the independents in the oil industry from the domination of the majors. Let us conserve the oil in our naval reserves by making them in truth and in fact naval reserves and by condemning private holdings in those reserves. But let us insist that if ventures on the other side of the earth after oil are to be undertaken, they be undertaken on the terms of the American people and only in a manner which will promote the future peace and security of the American people, instead of leading them into a situation where they will be committed to huge international oil cartels and the very sort of practices in the handling of natural resources which the Atlantic Charter declared against.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, last year the subcommittee that prepared the pending bill graciously afforded me an opportunity to testify in behalf of an additional appropriation for the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress. I had no opportunity to avail myself of the grace of the subcommittee this year and since the matter is closed, I do not propose to offer any amendment. I do want to allude to the matter, because I believe it is quite imperative and important. It has some bearing upon the recent unpleasantness in the legislative and executive branches of the Government. It appears to me that in proportion as we make our own operation in the legislative branch more efficacious, we can always meet the administrative agencies on their own ground weaponed with necessary facts and figures and try to develop a better cooperative relationship between the two branches of government.

After all, the Constitution, while it contemplates three independent branches, does not contemplate three hostile branches of government. So the Congress must take its place in the sun and be adequately equipped. One of the weapons or instrumentalities which I think needs strengthening is the Legislative Reference Service. At the present time it consists of 66 people, of whom only 16 are specialists. Imagine, only 15 specialists in that agency of government that is under the direction and control of Congress, serving the requirements and needs of 531 Members of the House and Senate. They are inadequately compensated. The man who does work for Congress in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress on monetary matters, as I recall, on banking and fiscal matters, receives \$2,600 a year. He is expected to be a fiscal expert for \$2,600 a year. There are more than 40 experts in the Treasury and in the Federal Reserve Board who are receiving from \$5,600 to \$8,000 a year. The same thing is true in the field of social security and labor. In those appropriate executive agencies they have scores of men drawing \$4,200, \$4,600, \$5,400, \$5,600, \$6,500 and even

\$8,000 a year, who are specialist-advisers in that particular field of governmental activity. Yet over in the Library of Congress are men serving this body today, ostensibly as experts, who are working for as little as \$2,600 a year. How do we expect to command specialists in an expert service at salaries of that kind? I think men in the older age brackets who are not amenable to the requirements of selective service would be available for that kind of work, especially in this period when we are preparing already to begin the transition from hostilities to peace, when so much is necessary from this Congress by way of appropriations, authorizing legislation, and commitments in order to deal with the manifold problems which will be on the threshold of this body in the future. So we must be weaponed and equipped for it. One of the best things we can do to serve the taxpayers and serve the general welfare of the country is to take unto ourselves those aids and instrumentalities whereby we get the facts, whereby we get an unbiased and impartial view of every question that will be a great guide and a great directive in finding the right answers to the problems that are before us. I shall not offer that amendment today. I want to make the record here now in the hope that when the bill goes over before the Senate that perhaps they will give some attention to it also.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, last week I was in Wisconsin at the annual meeting of the livestock breeders of that State. The food-production program is marching on. There is a patriotic desire to produce the food for this war. It appears that they will continue to exert every energy they have to produce this food even if unnecessary obstacles are placed in their pathway by Washington.

One fact was very apparent. That is that the promises of the War Food Administration were being questioned. The promises to the dairy farmer, the egg producer, the hog producer, and now the potato grower have not been sufficiently well carried out to meet their approval. The programs of the A. A. A. and the Extension Service workers and other agencies is made less effective due to the fact that the commitments to producers have not been sufficiently well fulfilled. There isn't much use to pour funds into any program where the commitment is not carried out. They are in hopes that the LaFollette amendment to the act extending the life of the C. C. C. will remedy this situation. They cannot see, however, why it should be necessary to pass a law to make any individual or agency to carry out the provisions of law already a part of the law of the land.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point in the Record, the address I made at the livestock meeting at the agricultural college on March 8, heretofore referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The address is as follows:

It is indeed a pleasure for me to have the opportunity of meeting so many old friends and also to meet so many people who are so vitally interested in wartime agriculture.

Wartime agriculture has met an unprecedented demand for food for our armed forces, lend-lease, and for our domestic population. This demand has been made in the face of machinery shortages, equipment shortages, restricted transportation, and ever-increasing manpower shortages. Our armed forces are the best-fed of any army in the war, and our food products have not only gone to the armed forces of our allies but in large amounts have been distributed to the civilians as well.

The results have spoken for themselves. The patriotic desire to produce has resulted in a national food production during 1942 and 1943 that is comparable to the industrial production of the implements of war that American labor and management have made during this same period.

During these 2 years of war we have had an increase in total cattle from 75,000,000 on January 1, 1942, to an estimated 82,000,000 on January 1, 1944. Dairy cows have increased from 26,398,000 to 27,607,000, although the increase in cow numbers has not given a comparable increase in milk production. In fact, in 1943 with a half million more cows we produced over a billion pounds less milk than in 1942.

Hogs have increased from 60,000,000 to 83,000,000, or over one-third; chickens have increased from 474,000,000 to 572,000,000 during these same 2 years. Sheep have decreased in number from 56,000,000 to 51,000,000 for reasons I shall discuss later.

It is unnecessary for me to remind you of the contribution made by Wisconsin to the national production of livestock products and food crops during this period.

THE OVER-ALL PICTURE

We have some 500,000,000 acres of cropland in the United States, although only about 340,000,000 acres are usually harvested. Many of these idle acres are marginal but will raise crops such as beans, that are now rationed. The past 2 years have been years of above-normal weather conditions and the Food Administrator has asked for an increase in crop acreage in 1944 in the hopes of obtaining even the 1943 total production of food products.

Did you ever stop to consider where the great food-producing areas of our country really are located? Many States do not produce enough food to provide their own population. Much of our agricultural leadership has come during the past 10 years from States that produce a very small part of the Nation's food products. We wouldn't, otherwise, have had an agricultural program appropriation of \$400,000,000 to \$800,000,000 a year, wherein a soil-conservation program was for years carried on where the payments went largely to soil-depleting crops. This situation was a result of the leadership and of the legislation and should not be interpreted as critical of the men who had the responsibility of administering it. They followed the provisions of the legislation and they should not be criticized for the legislation. The incentive payment and Cannon amendment controversy of the last session of Congress is a concrete example.

Chicago is the food capital of the world—and a comparatively few States surrounding this city produce a very high percentage of the food of the Nation. These States include: Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Wisconsin.

Iowa and Illinois produce one-third of the corn and one-third of the pork of the Nation. Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin produce over 40 percent of the butter, and Wisconsin alone, as you well know, produces over half of the Cheddar cheese and a higher percentage of the foreign types of cheese of the Nation.

Although Wisconsin produces 12 percent of the milk of the Nation it produced in 1942, 13,000,000,000 of the 98,000,000,000 pounds of milk that went into commercial dairy channels. In fact, in 1942 Wisconsin alone produced more milk than all of New England with New York and New Jersey included.

The February 1944 price for milk ranged from \$2.60 per hundredweight in North Dakota to \$4.75 per hundredweight in Florida, with Iowa receiving \$2.65, Minnesota \$2.70, and Wisconsin \$2.75 per hundredweight. The new feed subsidy ranges from 50 cents per hundredweight in the largest milk-producing States like Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa to 80 cents in Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, where milk in Florida is already bringing over 75 percent more than in the Midwest. This situation is not as serious as it sounds because these Southern States produce such small amounts of the milk of the Nation.

During wartime with controls on new equipment and transportation, the transforming of the raw materials of the farm into commercial food products should of necessity be increased and fostered in the States and counties in the areas already engaged in the particular branch of farming that had been previously practiced in these areas. Greater effort could well have been expended and now expended to increase the production of milk in the natural milk areas instead of fostering a high subsidy program in areas with high production costs.

Some expansion of products such as peanuts in the Cotton Belt and the hemp and soybean growing in the Midwest have for other and logical reasons not been in keeping with this general plan.

THE BEEF SITUATION

I am sure you have followed the beef situation, especially when 40 percent of the beef and veal comes from the dairy farms. The stated purpose of the beef program is to produce as much good meat as possible but not give a price sufficiently high to encourage the production of the choice meats of peacetime. It would take more than the time allotted me here today to even get started on a discussion of this subject. Beef-cattle numbers have been expanding, but when one realizes that we have been on an import basis as far as beef is concerned for 30 years, I am sure you can see how tight the beef situation could be if any appreciable increase in demands should take place, or if a reduction in the production of beef should confront us.

On February 15, 1944, the price of beef cattle varied from \$8.50 per hundredweight in Vermont to \$12.60 per hundredweight in Pennsylvania, with an average price of \$10.10 per hundredweight in Wisconsin, and a national average of \$11.80. The February 1944 parity price is \$9.20. The fairness of the beef parity, as you know, has always been questioned.

THE HOG SITUATION

When Secretary Wickard, in April 1942, asked for the increase in hogs and put the floor of \$13.75 Chicago basis on them he obtained a great response in production. War legislation guaranteed farmers 90 percent of parity during the war and 2 years thereafter. This has its legislative controls, however. Support prices like the support prices on the hogs weighing from 200 to 240 to 300 to 330 had nothing to do with the 90-percent parity guaranty. However, recently when the Commodity Credit Corporation Act was extended Senator LA FOLLETTE added an amendment that provides that this 90-per-

cent parity promised the producer be paid and that all commitments to producers be fulfilled without fail.

Most people could never see any reason to ration pork, especially since December 1, 1943. A few months ago 128,000,000 pounds of lard were turned over to the soap manufacturers for soap making. Within the last few days another 50,000,000 pounds have been allocated to these soap manufacturers. This was done at a time that the housewife was paying points for lard, but these were removed on March 1.

The importance of pork production is known to everyone that has interest enough to study the situation. The hog is a very efficient animal in the conversion of feeds to human food when both calories and proteins are considered. No one has yet found out why it was more patriotic to eat chicken than pork.

Hog prices in February 1944 varied from \$10 per hundredweight in Florida and \$10.20 per hundredweight in Mississippi to \$14.10 per hundredweight in California. The average for Wisconsin was \$12.80 and the parity price of February is \$12.40 per hundredweight.

THE EGG SITUATION

The parity price of eggs was 35 cents for the year 1943. The parity price of eggs was 44 cents in December 1943, and 90 percent of parity guaranteed by law was 39.6 cents per dozen, when the farmers in many sections were receiving from 24 to 28 to 30 cents per dozen right in the face of advancing feed prices. The LaFollette amendment should guarantee that commitments in the future are fulfilled so that such occurrences cannot be repeated.

Egg prices in February 1944 varied from 28 cents a dozen in North Dakota, 41 cents per dozen in Arizona, with Wisconsin showing an average of 30 cents per dozen. The national average price for February was 31.9 cents per dozen and the parity price for the month is practically the same, or 31.8 cents per dozen.

THE DAIRY SITUATION

The attack on this industry during wartime has been from many angles. The oleomargarine interests put their demands for a removal of the one-fourth-cent-per-pound tax, the 10-cent coloring tax, and the licensing on the basis of war needs. This was soon shown a fallacious approach because the facts were that all the oleomargarine was being made for which the War Production Board had allocated the oil. The oleomargarine interests are still on hand to try to find some way to promote their wares. They claim they have a new and much better product now. They even want to change its sex. They used to call it Ole and now they want one to call it Margy. The oleomargarine tax plus Federal licensing brings in around \$2,000,000 a year to the United States Treasury. Vegetable-oil and cottonseed-oil processors are being subsidized for somewhere between forty and fifty million dollars in 1943 and the subsidy on vegetable oils is estimated at \$65,000,000 in 1944. Between two and one-half and three billion pounds of vegetable oil is being subsidized, so you can see that the vegetable oils in the oleomargarine are being subsidized more per pound than the Federal taxes on the product. The subsidy may be twice the tax collections.

The filled-milk makers obtained 6,700 tons of tin and steel for their concoction in 2 years when it was next to impossible to get enough tin to line a vat in a corner cheese factory. The product is not rationed. Incidentally, this filled milk sells for 9 cents per can, and three cans of natural evaporated milk can be bought even in Washington for 26 cents. When the butterfat is removed and sold as cream, which is not rationed, at 75 cents to \$1 per pound, and when cottonseed oil, which is subsidized and has a 13-cents-per-pound O. P. A. ceiling, is squirted

in the can to replace the butterfat, do you really think this is being done to help the war effort? This filled milk is the hand-maiden of oleo. All these synthetic dairy products belong in the same class. The oleo is to the butter producer what the filled milk is to the evaporated milk and whole-milk industry and what synthetic cheese is to the cheese industry.

Creamola is a new one. They take unrationed cream and mix it with vegetable oil and sell it unrationed. There are other "gyp" set-ups in food products springing up during wartime. Also among these are the low-fat and high-moisture cheeses.

THE WOOL SITUATION

One of the perplexing problems of the present day is the embarrassment of the wool accumulations in our country. Most people agree it would be both more perplexing and embarrassing if it were a shortage instead of an abundance.

At the time of Pearl Harbor no one knew exactly what the shipping situation really would be. We were accumulating stock piles of many strategic materials of war at that time. We produce in the United States around four hundred to four hundred and fifty million pounds of wool per year. We have a peacetime consumption of some 600,000,000 pounds. In early 1942 some military leaders expected to see a Japanese attack on Australia. England moved 400,000,000 pounds of its own wool into the warehouses of the United States. This is supposed to be in bond.

It appears that our Defense Plant Corporation advanced the freight and other charges and holds the warehouse receipts on this wool. In addition, the Defense Plant Corporation purchased outright some 300,000,000 pounds of wool. In addition to the purchases of this national agency, individual dealers and manufacturers during 1943 alone imported some 500,000,000 pounds. The Commodity Credit Corporation purchased the 1943 United States clip of 450,000,000 pounds and the estimated 1944 clip is about the same, or 450,000,000 pounds.

Adding the 400,000,000 pounds of British wool in bond, the Defense Plant Corporation storage stock of 300,000,000, the 900,000,000 1943 and 1944 clip, and the accumulations as a result of the imports of domestic individuals and manufacturers on a 500,000,000 annual import basis, one can visualize a billion-pound wool stock pile. Wartime demands may take 800,000,000 to 900,000,000 pounds annually. This situation has no doubt resulted in a weakening of the sheep position in the United States. It may have been a contributing factor to the reduction of sheep numbers from January 1, 1942, to January 1, 1944, of some 5,000,000, or from 56,000,000 to 51,000,000.

The foreign wool can be bought in Australia, have the duty added onto it, and still be purchased under the United States fixed price.

The Agricultural Committee had hearings on the problem and it is hoped that some workable plan will be evolved without too much hardship. To date the recommendations have been: (1) That one agency deal with the situation and be responsible for disposing of the stock pile in as orderly manner as is possible; (2) to use some of the stock pile in lend-lease; (3) use of this wool stock pile through United Nations relief and rehabilitation, and furnish goods in lieu of cash where feasible; (4) by licensing imports in the future; and (5) by making an acceptable agreement as to the amounts imported on an import quota basis the same as we have on wheat.

The February 1944 farm price of wool varied from 33 cents a pound in Oklahoma to 48 cents a pound in Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware, with Wisconsin receiving 42 cents per pound. The February parity price is the

same as the price received by farmers on a national average. In February 1944 it was 39½ cents per pound.

From the above one can see the problems in regard to price adjustments. We need a constructive approach rather than a destructive criticism in meeting many of these problems. Another example, Oklahoma in 1943 received 34 cents a pound for its wool, while Virginia received 50 percent more, or 51 cents a pound. It is apparent that adjustment for one of these States may not be satisfactory to the producers in the other States. Many factors must be taken into consideration in connection with all agricultural commodities in order to arrive at and follow a constructive approach in our efforts to make the best contribution to the war-food program.

SUBSIDIES

Wartime agriculture could not be considered without a few remarks about subsidies. From 1925 to 1940, regardless of party, there were plans put in operation to lift or raise agricultural prices. Many devices were put into effect. However, in 1939, after these many years of adjustments, we had wheat at 54 cents, 5-cent hogs, 6 months of 11-cent cheese and other prices that were not fixed, correspondingly low. Wisconsin in 1939 had the largest number and the highest percentage of foreclosures ever foreclosed in the history of the Federal land bank.

Now we have a program to hold prices down. It was difficult to raise these prices, as you well know, and it has been difficult and will continue to be difficult to hold prices down and still obtain high production totals. One fact is disturbing as well as confusing. It is, How can administration spokesmen advocate roll-back food subsidies in the face of the highest individual and national incomes in our history? If agricultural parity is worth consideration in any sense of the word how can administration spokesmen publicly admit that our citizens cannot pay their grocery bills when food prices are parity or the goal?

Since this subsidy issue has been under consideration for a year, it would take hours to discuss it from all angles. First of all, it isn't a question of subsidy or no subsidy. No responsible voice has been raised against subsidies resulting from an effort to increase food production. No voice has been raised against providing funds needed to support the support prices. The arguments arise as to subsidies to increase production and the roll-back or consumer subsidies.

THE POTATO SUBSIDY

Take the potato program as an example. The parity price of potatoes for 1943 was \$1.16 per bushel. The February 1944 parity price is \$1.22 a bushel. A support price of 90-plus cents a bushel was placed on potatoes in Wisconsin last year. The floor at the present time should be \$1.09 per bushel, which is 90 percent of the present parity price.

Due to the weather, the patriotic desire to produce and other factors, we had in 1943 a 461,000,000-bushel crop with an average production of 139 bushels to the acre. This crop was grown on a less number of acres than the acreage of many previous years. Also, some years the national average production has been under 100 bushels per acre.

Potatoes are selling in eastern cities at 3 to 4 cents a pound. This indicates the spread which is greater than the producer receives. In supporting the support price a large loss is being entailed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The new southern crop is adding to this embarrassment. No one knows exactly how much the subsidy will be but for this example let us use twenty million. Here is a subsidy as a result of supporting the support price which support price was 90 cents-plus per bushel or 26 cents per

bushel below the parity price for 1943. Who pays this \$20,000,000 subsidy? The answer is, as you know, the general public in this and future generations.

With all respect, I would like to ask anyone in this college at whose feet I worshipped, or anyone else for that matter, to tell us why in the name of fairness and common sense one should advocate a roll-back or consumer subsidy to the potato consumers of this country? Before anyone answers though, I want him to take two facts into consideration—first, the fact that the producer received 26 cents per bushel less than parity price for producing the potatoes because, due to the large crop the support price became the ceiling price and the market price as well, and, secondly, the fact that the producer will be called upon to pay his share of the \$20,000,000 used to support the support price.

Potatoes are being distributed free to low-income groups at this time. This is justified, but why should future generations be asked to pay the potato bill of high-income people?

THE WHEAT SUBSIDY

Let us analyze the wheat situation briefly. The United States was, formerly, a great wheat-exporting Nation and exported up to 30 percent of the national production. We gradually lost this export market until in 1940 we exported only 3 percent of our national production and paid an export subsidy of 25 to 30 cents per bushel to dispose of it. We paid millions per year and nearly a billion in total during the past 10 years to control the wheat production, though we imported more wheat than we exported in 2 years during this time of large payments for controlling the domestic production. In 1930 there was a 42-cent-bushel duty put into effect. In 1940, by agreement, a quota arrangement was made whereby only 800,000 bushels of wheat can be imported annually. This is practically an embargo when considered in the light of our annual domestic production of seven hundred to nine hundred and fifty million bushels. Up until April 1943, we were still paying 25 to 30 cents per bushel export subsidy. The same month the Commodity Credit Corporation started subsidizing imports of wheat for feed purposes. Recently they announced a \$125,000,000-subsidy to the millers, which is supposed to be a consumer subsidy in order to hold down the price of bread. If the embargo were lifted millions of bushels of wheat would enter our country even with the 42-cent-per-bushel duty. If there is anyone that believes in this roll-back subsidy, I would like to ask him just one question: It is:

Since a commodity has the protection of a duty of 42 cents per bushel, and since a near embargo has been put into effect to implement the benefits of the 42-cents-per-bushel duty, can you justify a \$125,000,000 bread subsidy without giving your approval to the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, with the added protection of the near embargo? I say in all frankness, who wants to take a bite out of that one and try to justify the \$125,000,000 subsidy now going to the millers, though supposed to go to bread consumers? Do you wish to be in a position of advocating a consumer subsidy for bread under these conditions?

You ask, How about the lower-income group who pay such a larger percentage of their income for food in comparison to the higher-income groups? The proposal to meet this problem was the Aiken-La Follette-Herter bill that would have provided the lower- and fixed-income groups with a fair fixed food cost. This had rather weak W. F. A. support, and could not be passed by its sponsors. It appeared to me that a majority of the Members of Congress were favorable to this legislation. There should not be any stigma attached to such a food subsidy as long as Federal employees receiving \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year accept the \$628.32 cost of living bonus

under the guise of overtime was passed and was so gleefully accepted even by the very men whose purported task was to fight inflation.

This cost-of-living overtime pay increase to Government employees was passed with the implied understanding that the number of nonwar civilian employees was to be reduced.

There is one outstanding fact that seems more apparent each day, and that is that the only time we hear about inflation is when the low income groups are involved or when the American farmer is in the picture. Otherwise it apparently isn't very disturbing. Eight cents per hour to the railroad men would cause inflation although one-third of them receive 57 cents per hour or less, and later after much unnecessary criticism it wasn't. A 5 cents per bushel advance in the price of corn would cause inflation but later 9 cents per bushel wouldn't.

We have current surpluses of potatoes and wool and could quickly have a surplus of wheat. We have thousands of acres of good onion land not producing onions although there is a shortage of onions. Why? We have sufficient land to have a surplus of all these crops and could have the same surplus we have of potatoes. One reason we haven't a surplus of all foods is because we haven't had a maximum food production program as yet. We cannot get this maximum domestic production if we continually drain our farms of manpower and if we do not furnish the necessary machinery to produce it. We cannot expect to have a maximum food production program with too many conflicting changes, nor can we hope to have one unless we have a program that keeps faith better with the producer.

There are many complicating features in connection with any program that could be suggested. For example, is it logical to give South Carolina dairymen 30 cents a hundred-weight more as feed payments than is given Illinois dairymen when the February fixed price in South Carolina was \$1.10 a hundred-weight more in South Carolina than in Illinois and especially when cottonseed meal is \$10 a ton less in South Carolina than in Illinois? These are Government fixed prices and indicate the factors that must be considered. You can readily see why Mr. Walter Katterhenry our State A. A. A. chairman, when he was in Washington a couple of weeks ago, was interested in advocating a feed payment program that went right straight across the board.

Sometimes in my more irritated moments I think that they muddy the waters just so that they can get the credit for purifying the stream.

CONCLUSION

These are serious days. Congress has appropriated every dollar and given every power to most effectively carry on this war. The future with an expected \$300,000,000,000 national debt requires the conscientious study and the constructive approach of every American. The farms of the United States on January 1, 1940, had a value of only \$35,000,000,000. However, the old saying that every cloud has a silver lining is no doubt as true today as ever.

I shall not take a defeatist attitude toward the future. Everyone realizes that in our country there is still elbow room. When people have elbow room the problems of government are easier to solve. We have millions of acres of land in our country to be drained; we have other millions of acres that will show increases in production by following approved farm practices now known; we have millions of acres still to be irrigated; we have millions of acres in the United States to be developed, for new crops for new uses such as drug plants. The 30 to 50 percent increase in production of many food products during this war is conclusive evi-

dence of the fact that the food production of our Nation could be doubled if all idle acres were put to work and if the consumption demands would justify the expansion.

We are now seeing a greater appreciation of trees as a crop. Evidently, the use of wood or pulp is going to take a larger place in the feed, plastic, and fiber economies of the future. Millions of acres are adapted to this wood and pulp crop and I personally expect to see a keener appreciation of the possibilities in wood and pulp production as its uses multiply in number. Apparently, it is soon to be considered the same as other farm crops.

Secondly, when you realize the scientific discoveries that have taken place during this generation who are we to say that our sons and daughters will not come forward with additional scientific discoveries for the well-being and the welfare of the human race? In agriculture alone in our own State we have the Babcock, Russell, Hart, Farrington, and Steenbeck discoveries as well as their followers carrying on in their footsteps. We have the manufacture of urea—now being used for plastics—where the nitrogen of the air is combined with gases of the coke oven to make urea that is being used as a source of protein in livestock feed. We can picture sawdust piles transformed into dextrose stock piles or into alcohol or into rubber without having anyone question our sanity.

Many of you here at this great institution are in a much better position than I am to see the expanded opportunities for science to make in its forward march for the welfare of all mankind.

Thirdly, education contributes to making men free. Though some States like Iowa and Oregon have only 4 or 5 percent illiteracy, other States have over 30 percent illiteracy. Wisconsin has 9 percent. Our national interest will require at least a grammar-school education for every child in America. Social progress goes hand in hand with education. For example, it takes an educated country to have wage-and-hour legislation. The Wages and Hours Act with its maximum hours and minimum wage has the universal approval of our country. A permanent support-price program to agriculture could afford another large group of our society advantages comparable to the benefits of the wage-and-hour legislation to labor. These support prices could not be too high or embarrassing stock piles would accumulate, and we must keep in mind that the Wages and Hours Act does not provide a man a job either. My contacts with labor lead me to believe that they are most interested in a permanent job at a fair wage level. My observations in agriculture convince me that farmers are more interested in a continued fair price than they are in the feast and famine prices which they have been forced many times to accept. A farmers' cooperative gives the producer a bargaining agency and an approach to collective bargaining. This is comparable to the collective bargaining of a labor union. Thus more attention to security of the individual and the family is in the picture for every individual and for every group. However, the individual may take a more constructive interest in his own security and also the family he has the responsibility to protect. Such processes can only be successful in a country where education is the rule rather than the exception.

Finally—and the most important—I wish to call your attention to the fact that after the war we will have had some twelve to fifteen million men and women who have been in the war. From your acquaintance with the Civil War, the Spanish-American War and World War No. 1 veterans you know that these millions will come home with a patriotism and love of country that will not only be a part of them during their lifetime but will carry on to their children and their children's children. We should have confidence in their leadership. With this confi-

dence we can look forward to the future of our country regardless of any obstacles that may appear.

In conclusion, may I again express my appreciation of having been able to be with you. I appreciate the opportunity. I have made every effort as a Member of Congress to be a credit not only to my family, but also a credit to this great institution to which I owe so much, and to its professors, whom I still hold in such high esteem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, the reclassification of doctors of veterinary medicine in the field services of the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Meat Inspection Division as authorized by the Classification Act of 1923 as amended has been completed and the War Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture have requested Congress to appropriate sufficient increases in the appropriations for the prevention, control, and eradication of animal diseases and for meat inspection for the payment of employees in these essential field services in accordance with the reclassification. These increases were requested after thorough study and consideration of the previous salary status of these services as compared with other groups in Government employ performing duties of like difficulty and responsibility and has the approval of the Civil Service Commission and the Director of the Budget.

The added compensation planned for these services would not give them a preferred position among Federal employees. It would merely give to them the same opportunities for advancement in pay, corresponding to the performance of tasks requiring special skill, that are afforded to others. As an example of this, I am informed that, although among other professional groups in the Department only 21.2 percent are in the beginning grade, 61.5 percent of the doctors of veterinary medicine are in this grade. Under the Classification Act of 1923 as amended, it is provided that employees should progress to the next grade, the regular "operating" grade, after satisfactory service in the beginning or "training grade." The proposal of the Department is to advance these employees in accordance with this principle. Because of a lack of funds to carry out the provisions of the Classification Act, 299 doctors of veterinary medicine have been in the beginning grade from 5 to 10 years; 82 have been in that grade from 3 to 5 years; and 150 have been in the beginning grade up to 3 years.

By way of contrast I would like to call your attention to status of attorneys in O. P. A., as revealed before the Subcommittee on Appropriations last year. Attorneys, like veterinarians, are subject to the provisions of the Classification Act respecting professional employees. I find that only 3.5 percent of the 1,412 attorneys were in the beginning grade, and only 2.5 percent in the next higher grade. Fully 96 percent received \$3,200 or more per annum, whereas only 10 percent of veterinarians receive that much. This contrast becomes more striking when one considers the many years of experience

which the veterinarians have to their credit.

It is not as well known as it should be that continued vigilance by veterinarians is required to protect food animals against the ravages of infectious disease, or that veterinary inspection of animals before slaughter, and of their carcasses after slaughter, provide the only means by which it can be determined whether meat for food is free from disease. You may not realize that the steady flow of cattle, hogs, and sheep to market is dependent upon the prevention of the spread and the eradication of animal diseases by veterinarians, and that the rate of kill by slaughterers in our meat-packing centers is strictly limited by the number of veterinarians furnished by the Meat Inspection Service to inspect food animals at the time slaughtered.

Animal-disease control and meat inspection require veterinary skill under the most trying and adverse conditions, with long hours of exacting work. The detection and determination of disease processes in herds of livestock or in animals presented for slaughter call for the application of specialized veterinary knowledge and sound veterinary judgment. The production and growth of millions of animals and the acceptance or rejection of billions of pounds of meat rest upon the decisions which must be made daily by the doctors of veterinary medicine. They must be ready at all times to back up their decisions with sound principles of veterinary medicine.

The livestock industry has never had a greater need for the services of veterinarians to enforce the quarantine laws and other laws passed for the prevention, eradication, and control of the diseases of farm animals. There are being sent to slaughter many more millions of food animals than ever before in our history. A large percentage of these animals must be slaughtered under Federal inspection. Numerous Federal purchasing agencies, such as the Army, Navy, and Lend-Lease are demanding more and more meat, all of which must be federally inspected. In addition, the demand by civilians for "U. S. inspected and passed" meats continues at a high level. The standards of inspection that have been developed during the past 35 years must be maintained. There is no such thing as half-way or limited veterinary inspection. The alternative to inspection by skilled veterinarians and well-trained assistants is no inspection at all.

No enterprise can long endure which fails to make provision for replacement of those who have devoted their lives to its service. Our veterinary colleges have for several years past discouraged their graduates from entering the Federal service, mainly because of the meager opportunities for advancement. Surely the young men who have devoted 5 years of college study to acquire the degree of doctor of veterinary medicine do not look with favor upon the prospect of remaining as long as 10 years in the beginner's grade. It is essential to the maintenance of these services that the better type of veterinary college gradu-

ates and lay assistants may be influenced to enter the Federal services. They must some day replace the highly trained employees of today with long experience in these services.

These doctors of veterinary medicine and their lay assistants receive benefits under the overtime pay bill of last year. You should realize, however, that the overtime pay is predicated on the regular or base pay of the employees. Here is a group of employees whose base pay is not on a par with others according to the provisions of the Classification Act provided by the Congress. They cannot have full enjoyment of the overtime provisions until their base pay is put on a level with other Federal employees doing equal work. The proposed reclassification is designed to accomplish this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] may extend the remarks he made previously this afternoon and include an editorial and certain letters and telegrams.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE].

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, the matter has come to my attention in an attempt to distribute certain publications that are made available to Members of the House for their respective constituents, of the apparent inequity with which they are allotted or allocated to the Members. I believe I represent at least the third or fourth largest congressional district in the United States in population. In my attempt to obtain certain publications that are made available to the Members of this House intended ultimately as a public good this apparent inequity became obvious to me. I refer particularly to a little book put out by the Marine Corps, known as Our Flag. That book, I am sure, was never intended that Congressmen should have in unlimited numbers without regard for other Members as a matter of possession. The Congressman is merely the office or facility whereby books and pamphlets such as this are distributed through the schools and to different people, so that the knowledge thereby disseminated will result ultimately in some benefit to the whole country. There are congressional districts which Members represent in this body, with a population around a quarter of a million, and in many instances even less than that. There are other congressional districts in which the population runs up to nearly a million.

It is not difficult to see the obvious injustice of allocating to a Member who has one hundred and fifty thousand or two hundred thousand the same number of these books or editions as is allocated to a Member who has a million, if the intent was to have that publication equitably distributed among the people.

I do not know what is to be done to secure the proper distribution of this material, but I would like to see a rule put into effect in this House providing that

the distribution would be made on the basis of the last Federal census. If the publication is intended for the public, and the Representative in Congress is the facility whereby the public is to obtain different pamphlets, it seems to me they should be distributed according to the population of the congressional districts as evenly as possible.

I encountered this rather embarrassing situation: The most populated city of my district has 37,500 school children alone. In my attempt to get some of these books, Our Flag, to be distributed for the benefit of knowledge that might be inculcated in the minds of the school children concerning our great flag and its worth which they should come to know and appreciate, I find I can only make partial distribution within limited grades. If I do that it will probably result in criticism of me because I have not impartially distributed them because of limited numbers. I have to forego distribution of any of them in order that there will not be any partiality shown. I am limited, according to a letter received from Lieutenant General Vandegrift, to 10,000 of these books, yet there are nearly 800,000 people in my congressional district and 52,000 school children in 1 of 5 cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER
Salaries: Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$8,000; 2 secretaries (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority), at \$5,400 each and \$1,500 additional each so long as the respective positions are held by the present respective incumbents; 2 assistant secretaries (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority), at \$4,320 each and \$480 additional each so long as the respective positions are held by the present respective incumbents; Deputy Sergeant at Arms and storekeeper, \$4,800 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; clerks—1, \$3,300; 1, \$3,120; 1, \$2,200; 1, \$2,120; and 1, \$1,800; 1 to the secretary for the majority \$2,280 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 1 to the secretary for the minority, \$2,280 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; assistant doorkeeper, \$2,800; messengers—3 (acting as assistant doorkeepers) at \$2,400 each; 1 at \$1,740 and \$260 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 29 (including 4 for minority) at \$1,740 each; 4 at \$1,620 each; 1 at card door, \$2,640, and \$240 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; clerk on Journal work for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be selected by the Official Reporters, \$3,360; cabinetmakers—chief, \$2,780; 1, \$2,300; 1, \$2,040; finisher, \$2,300; upholsterer, \$2,040; janitor, \$2,400 and \$300 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 5 skilled laborers, \$1,680 each; laborer in charge of private passage, \$1,740 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 4 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, at \$1,500 each; 3 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, Senate Office Building, at \$1,500 each; telephone operators—chief \$2,460 and \$280 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 14 at \$1,620 each; laborer in charge of Senate toilet rooms in old library space, \$1,200; press gallery—superintendent, \$3,660; assistant superintendent, \$3,000; as-

sistant superintendent, \$1,920; messengers for service to press correspondents—2 at \$1,560 each, 2 at \$1,440 each; radio press gallery—superintendent, \$3,000; assistant superintendent, \$1,960; laborers—3 at \$1,380 each, 28 at \$1,260 each, 3 at \$480 each; special employees—7 at \$1,000 each; 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$4 per day each, during the session, \$15,204; in all, \$273,944.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. You know it is almost sacrilegious for any of us today to talk about our discomforts here when we consider what our boys are suffering on the various battle fronts. Last evening I heard Eddie Rickenbacker tell of his experiences and the experiences of our armed forces throughout the world. It was one of the most amazing revelations that I had heard. The thing that amazes me is how little the people back home know about what is happening everywhere throughout the world to our men in the armed forces, what difficulties they are enduring, and how complacent we are in face of it.

Being mindful of the foregoing, I hope my colleagues will forgive me if I reopen a matter which I am sure causes us some degree of discomfort. I am still hopeful that an effective remedy will be found for ridding these office buildings of the cockroaches which infest them, and which you will admit are a nuisance at times. I might suggest that instead of our having to keep cockroach pills strewn around our offices something be done about it, starting with the basement floors.

This is the time to call attention to this problem, when we appropriate money for cleaning purposes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not do so now, but I am greatly tempted to offer an amendment to the appropriate clause of the bill to increase the salaries of the Members of this body to \$15,000 a year. It is high time somebody started the ball rolling in that regard; and I make the pledge here and now that when the next appropriation bill comes along for the legislative branch I shall have the temerity, if I may use that word, to offer an amendment to increase our compensation. Ours is the only case where there is a successful ceiling on salaries, despite the fact that the cost of living has gone up tremendously. Superimposed upon the expenses which we, for example, from the State of New York have to pay, is a State income tax at a very high rate; and if anyone happens to be so unfortunate as to have fixed charges that he must regularly meet he is in a deplorable state indeed. I refer to fixed charges such as interest on mortgages on homes or farms or on business properties, fixed rental charges, the payment of interest, and reductions of principle on indebtedness, insurance premiums.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a simple question?
Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman appreciate the fact that this Congress has raised the salaries of all Federal employees more than enough to offset the increased income tax, but has made no increase whatsoever in the salaries of the Members?

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that since Tom Dewey has been Governor of New York our New York State income tax has been reduced 25 percent.

Mr. CELLER. That is due in part to the fact that we have stood in the rostrum here and others have stood in the rostrum of the New York State Legislature and said in no uncertain language to that gentleman that he must reduce the income tax because of the vast amount of surplus we have in New York State. I would that he reduce the income tax to an even greater degree.

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; but does the gentleman recall any Governor in recent years who has left a surplus?

Mr. CELLER. Accrediting the State income-tax reduction to Governor Dewey is ignoring the actual factors that were in the main responsible for such deduction. It is quite apparent that the Governor of the State of New York is no financial expert. Certainly, the decrease was due to nothing he contributed, either by word or deed. He had no choice in the matter. The prosperity of New York is not of his making; rather it is of the period through which we are now passing. He may have social grace and charm, but he is no more a financial expert than he is a constitutional law expert. Witness his castigation of our great Commander in Chief on the matter of a Federal ballot for our armed forces, and his deeming such ballot unconstitutional. He probably never heard of the First and Second War Power Acts which gives almost supreme powers to the President and amply justifies a soldiers' vote bill federally controlled. Our work in this chamber and outside this chamber, too, as the Members realize, has greatly increased. There is a greater strain on us, and beyond the peradventure of a doubt, our medical and dental bills have greatly increased in the last few years because of that strain, and I think it is high time we gave some attention to paying adequate compensation to ourselves.

I may be called that one who rushes in where angels fear to tread for making this statement, and I may be severely criticized for it at home. My opponent in the next election may seize avidly upon what I say here this afternoon as being what he calls a good campaign missile against me. I care not, Mr. Chairman. I am sure the good people of my district, when they view the work I have done over the years—for almost 22 years—will realize that I am speaking truly and adequately, and if I may be so bold as to

say so, wisely, with reference to what we so thoroughly deserve, namely, an increase to at least \$15,000 in salary.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: Seven official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House at \$7,500 each; clerk, \$4,000; assistant clerk, \$2,000; six expert transcribers at \$2,000 each; in all, \$70,500.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, about 2 weeks ago I discussed on the floor the workings and operations of the War Manpower Commission as it relates to my own congressional district. I said at that time that the regulations and orders of the War Manpower Commission were, in my humble opinion, retarding the war production program in that area. The truth of this statement is available in my office. I turned the data I had in my possession over to the Smith committee and have received the assurance of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Congressman SMITH, that just as soon as they complete an investigation they are now conducting they will look into this situation. I thought, however, that Members of the House might be interested in a small part of the report made by the secretary of the Hartford County Manufacturers' Association on March 14. I have in my hand here a rather interesting chart showing both the man-hours and the number of employees employed in that area from August 1939 to 1944. The number of employees has gone up from 59,000 in 1939 to 135,000 as of January 1, 1944. It is rather interesting to note that each year, in fact each month, from September 1939 to date, or in reality up to February 1, 1943, the number of man-hours and the number of employees increased. At that point the War Manpower Commission came into the picture with their restrictive regulations. It is enlightening to note that each month of the year 1943 up to March 1, 1944, the trend has been downward from a high of 245 percent to 212 percent of normal. As a further indication that their regulations are retarding progress I want to quote from this report of the manufacturers' association.

A company, which through its own representatives solicited housewives in the immediate vicinity of the factory, discovered 46 who were willing, because of the proximity of their homes, to enter into a contract of employment which would enable them to put in a full day, after they had bundled their children off to school before 8 in the morning, until they get home to receive them, just before 5.

The United States Employment Service and the Manpower Commission refused to issue certificates of availability to these women to work in that specific factory. The result—they are not working.

A company which because of cut-back in contract, released a large number of its employees is faced now with a charge of unemployment insurance for 27 of them who refused work in companies

where they believed their talents could not be used, or for personal reason, or where the distance from home was great enough to offer a hardship. They obviously are walking the streets of Hartford, because the State unemployment commission has granted them compensation.

It certainly is ridiculous in an area declared by the War Manpower Commission as a group 1 critical labor scarcity area that hundreds of people are drawing unemployment compensation. It does not make sense and I am hopeful that I can convince the House Military Affairs Committee or the chairman of that committee that there are various phases of this program that merit the attention of that committee.

In the columns of the Hartford Times, under date of March 7, an employer, given permission to advertise, states that he curtailed a 3-day advertisement in 2 days because he was able to recruit in Hartford, 25 people—the sum total that he needed, who were idle. The manufacturer involved is quoted as saying that some of the applicants who responded had been hanging around the United States Employment Service a couple of afternoons for hours at the time and they carried their registration cards from the Employment Office to prove it.

Another plant, where cut-backs permitted a release of 179 persons, discovered through investigation that 77 of them after a month's time, are not employed in any factory in Hartford County.

Thirty-seven women, recruited from homes in the immediate vicinity of an industrial plant for part-time work—the designation of part time, by the United States Employment Service, is 30 hours or less per week—after acquiring a greater knowledge of their duties, requested the company to put them on full-shift operation. The blanket request by the company, so the workers could make more money and increase production, was refused by the United States Employment Service—on the grounds that if they were full-time workers, they would have to be discharged, receive certificates of availability, and be sent to so-called more critical industries. These are actual cases. How many similar situations exist, or the number of persons they would include must of course be developed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 106. This title may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1945."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 19, committee employees, in order to offer an amendment to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 4, after the word "clerk", strike out "\$2,760" and insert "\$3,300."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this has to do with the work of one of the most important committees of the House, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which I have the honor and the responsibility of being chairman.

This committee is charged with a tremendous amount of work. We have to deal with legislation affecting all the policies of reclamation throughout the whole of the United States and particularly the Northwest. We have to deal with authorizations involving irrigation projects, we have to deal with all legislation affecting those projects, we have to deal with the policies of the Government in the development of this country, we have to search out the provisions of the laws and know their application in connection with the formation of these projects and their effect and bearing on the rights of the Federal Government and the constitutional rights of our States.

I submit that the paltry salary of \$2,700 which is paid at the present time to the clerk of our committee, which has a membership of some 22 Members of this House, is not adequate pay for such clerk and, in my opinion, it is time that we give a salary that will bring to the service of that committee a clerk equipped with the necessary qualifications to study the laws, do the research work that is necessary, and handle the business of our Members so that we may adequately protect the interests of the Government and the water users on the lands throughout the country. Here we have a \$2,700 clerk for the Congress and the people we represent to deal with a whole set of executive and administrative officials in the departments who get three times that salary with much less to do.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman realizes, of course, that such an authorization should come from the Committee on Accounts? It does not originate with the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WHITE. I may say to the gentleman that an authorization coming direct from the House would have just as much weight as coming from any minority committee. I am submitting this to the Congress in order to bring the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation in line with a lot of the other committees of the House. Our committee is in the lowest brackets. The clerks to the main committees get a much higher salary and they have more clerks. This committee is doing a fine work, yet its clerk is on the lowest scale of all the committees and for that reason I am taking the opportunity at the present time to ask the House in the case of this particular committee to give a sufficient amount of remuneration so that the committee can bring to its assistance a qualified clerk to do the work that it is required to do and handle it in a way that will be a credit to the House and to the country.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this is an important amendment and I ask for its support by the Members of the House.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, there are over 2,000 employees here and every year the committee and individual Members of the Congress are importuned by hundreds of people to change their salaries. We are asked to change this salary, and that salary, we are told that this man is not getting what he should get and that the other fellow should get more. The only way to handle the situation is to have the matter thoroughly considered by the fine Chairman of the Committee on Accounts, which is the legislative committee for this Appropriations Subcommittee. That committee goes into those matters carefully. If it recommends an increase to us the chances are it will be in the bill but you cannot on the floor of the House adjust all the salaries and do justice to all the employees deserving of consideration, because if you give it to one, there may be 10 others who are as much justified in getting an increase. Therefore, this should be done by an independent investigation and that is the way it is handled by the Committee on Accounts. I trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] will be defeated.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Just to keep the record straight, I will say to the gentleman from Idaho that half of the committees of the House today are paying their clerks \$2,760. That includes the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Committee on Insular Affairs, the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, and other committees.

If you are going to do that for one committee you are going to upset the applecart.

The Committee on Accounts has had a special committee trying to work out some method to satisfy some of those who have been complaining over a long period.

Mr. O'NEAL. I will say to the gentleman that they also get their additional 15 percent in lieu of war overtime.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows there are many secretaries in Congress and in other offices that are getting paid far in excess of the amount authorized by law.

Mr. O'NEAL. I will say to the gentleman there may be inequalities all the way through, but I say it ought to be done by the proper committee and not on the floor because some Member is particularly interested in some one person.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows that by law the Congress can pay up to \$3,900 a year for one secretary.

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes; I know that.

Mr. WHITE. Many of them are doing it, but we are bound, we cannot do a thing with \$2,700.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Whire) there were—ayes 3, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that some of us are not convinced that the men who dig the coal in this country should have portal-to-portal pay, the coal miners, in other words. I think that some people do not understand what "portal to portal" means.

May I call your attention to it in this light? I happen to live about 13 miles from a plumber. If a washer goes bad in my sink I have to get this plumber to come from the other town. He starts out at 9 o'clock on Sunday morning. He takes his helper with him. He gets \$1.50 an hour, and the helper gets 90 cents an hour. They get out in the sun and drive down to my place and go in and look it over. It takes 20 minutes to put on a washer. Then they drive back the 13 miles, and when they get back they look at the clock and they find that it took them 3 hours, they charge me \$9.82 for that trip, for 20 minutes' work.

The miner goes to the pit mouth, or the shaft, and he may have to go in 1 mile, 2 miles, 3, 4, or 5 miles, and some think he ought not to be paid for going in there to the place where he is going to actually start to dig, as it were, or use his machine. I say he should be paid from the time he enters the pit mouth till he comes out.

I am not kicking about the plumber being paid. That is perfectly all right with me. I am just trying to draw a comparison, that, if the plumber is paid, why should not the miner be paid when he starts into that pit mouth, especially in these days when all the care in the world cannot be taken, the mines are many times cold and dreary and slushy and sleeting, electric wires are liable to be hanging loose some place and bad conditions prevail, yes he takes his life in his hands. Sometimes they go in only half a mile, some places 2 miles, 3 miles, and in my district, up to 5 miles.

I think it is altogether humane that coal miners should be paid portal-to-

portal pay from the time they step into the mouth of the pit or the top of the shaft when they start down till they come back to the same place.

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

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad to hear the gentleman saying something on behalf of the work of the coal miners.

Mr. SNYDER. I have said quite a bit in the last 12 years for them.

Mr. WRIGHT. I know the gentleman has. He is a friend of the miners and has spoken in their behalf.

May I remark also that, as the gentleman knows, the occupation of coal-mining is difficult, dangerous, and requires a lot of skill, and the compensation which the miner gets, contrasted with the wages in other industries, has always seemed to me to be out of line with the type of work he has to do. I certainly feel that when they ask for more money they have not been unreasonable in doing so.

Mr. SNYDER. I said 3 months ago that they should have an increase. I did not know the scale of wages and did not know what the increase should be, but they should have had a liberal increase at that time.

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

Mr. SNYDER. I gladly yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. STEFAN. I come from a country where we do not mine coal. We have to buy it and burn it for heat. I have visited coal mines. I agree with the gentleman. I have seen those miners come to work in the evening or in the morning. They report to the office and they get aboard these cars and are shunted into the pit. I think it is reasonable that they should be given portal-to-portal pay.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the administrative office and courts of the United States, \$89,000.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, it is naturally with a great deal of satisfaction that I announce to Congress that the Navy is today starting a preliminary reconnaissance group to Alaska by air to ascertain the potentialities of its Oil Reserve No. 4, which comprises 35,000 square miles in the northernmost part of Alaska. I am the only Member who has advocated the development of these great oil prospects, based on all geological reports.

The need for the development of new fields is recognized today to be most urgent. The personnel of this group comprises the most technical men experienced in both oil production and general construction, who are members of the Seabees, which organization has

played a great part in this present war. All of these men have had experience in the far Arctic regions and the Aleutians, another place where the Seabees have been so instrumental in our success.

It is indeed gratifying to state that the man heading this expedition is none other than William T. Foran, who originally convinced me of the great possibilities in this area, he having been a member of the geological survey group of the Government, which made the original survey in 1923 and 1924.

The eyes of the world will be on the findings of this group. They have a logical and practical program outlined and will proceed on a sound basis, namely that they will make a survey of all problems of transportation, housing, provisioning, and general working conditions, in addition to obtaining further geological findings. In other words, this time we will not be drilling wells, building pipe lines and refineries until we have these preliminary findings.

I am herewith quoting a Navy release:

The departure for Alaska of a reconnaissance engineering group marks the beginning of an exploratory program by Navy to determine the ultimate usefulness of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 at Point Barrow.

Little is known as to the potentialities of this area of 35,000 square miles at the northernmost tip of Alaska except that oil seepages have been found in several places, but the belief is that it holds large quantities of oil.

The reconnaissance party will begin at once preliminary work on the job of ascertaining what the oil resources are. It will study and report upon problems of transportation, housing, provisioning, and general working conditions which will confront geological parties and drilling crews which it is expected to send into the reserve later in the spring and summer. Appropriations are being sought currently to provide for this work.

Alaska has not yet produced much satisfactory evidence of possessing substantial quantities of recoverable oil. Several private companies have carried on explorations at various places with somewhat disappointing results but, despite this, the Territory remains generally regarded as geologically promising. Development of the fields and transportation of the oil when produced present many problems, and much exploratory and experimental work will have to be done before the real petroleum possibilities of the Territory will be definitely known. It is frankly expected that much of the drilling in the Point Barrow reserve will be of a speculative nature.

Harold Ickes, as Petroleum Administrator for War, and the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior have been fully advised of Navy's exploratory program for Point Barrow. Navy expects to take full advantage of the technical abilities and services available in other Government agencies, and duplication of effort is to be avoided.

The Alaskan exploration now set in motion is a part of a broader program which Navy has formulated for its petroleum reserves in line with the resurgence of interest in oil as one of the Nation's key problems. Another of Navy's reserves about which relatively little is known is No. 1, located in the Elk Hills region of California. The only substantial exploration of this reserve has been in the shallow oil zone in the eastern end of the field. The large area to the west and the deeper Stevens zone are unexplored. The Navy has plans there, too.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4414) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be the Consent Calendar, to be followed by the rivers and harbors bill. On Tuesday we will consider the Private Calendar, to be followed by the rivers and harbors bill. On Wednesday I expect the agricultural appropriation bill will be taken up and remain the order of business for the remainder of the week. Of course the conference report upon the U. N. R. R. A. bill will be taken up when the Senate disposes of it. If there is any change in the program, if any other legislation comes up, other than by unanimous consent, I shall advise my friend from Michigan and the House, in ample time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us when the U. N. R. R. A. conference report is likely to come before the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot. As we have already gone over until Monday, it surely will not come up until next week anyway.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

MARCH 15, 1944.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the United States
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the following committees of the United States House of Representatives, to be effective when accepted: Rivers and Harbors, World War Veterans' Legislation, Education, Claims, Public Buildings and Grounds, District of Columbia, and Patents.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], may have unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, in one instance and include a short article, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a statement.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain excerpts in the extension of my remarks made in committee this afternoon.

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

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a release issued by me.

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

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order today for 30 minutes. I yield back that time, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FERNANDEZ, for 15 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HOCH, for March 20 and 21, on account of death in family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1618. An act to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1634. An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations out-

side the continental United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1682. An act to provide for the payment of compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1748. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, as amended, to continue it in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1749. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, to continue it in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Irving L. Jones;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart;

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1273. An act for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre;

H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner;

H. R. 1488. An act to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation;

H. R. 1518. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased;

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard;

H. R. 2385. An act for the relief of Nadine Gorman;

H. R. 2419. An act to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler";

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy;

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Edwin Foley;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Adelard Demers;

H. R. 2890. An act for the relief of H. G. Tooley;

H. R. 2956. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska;

H. R. 2993. An act for the relief of John W. Booth III;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Leo Gullo;

H. R. 3139. An act for the relief of Henry Gross;

H. R. 3173. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.;

H. R. 3371. An act for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin;

H. R. 3547. An act for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson;

H. R. 3618. An act to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3701. An act for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson; and

H. R. 3763. An act to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1285. An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes; and

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE
JAMES A. O'LEARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sadness that I announce the death of our late lamented colleague, Mr. JAMES A. O'LEARY, from the State of New York. I have known Jim personally, as we familiarly called him, for a great many years, and I and others in this Chamber over the years have learned to respect and have for him a most affectionate regard. I repeat the words of Genesis, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Nonetheless, it is indeed very sad to note the parting of this good and loyal friend. It is difficult to say farewell to one as loyal as he, to one as sincere. He has gone to that undiscovered country, from whose bourne no traveler returns. As I grew to know JIM I always felt that he followed most religiously the teachings and admonitions of the great prophet Micah, who said that he always loved mercy, did justice, and walked humbly. Jim by his deeds and by his words did indeed walk humbly and he loved mercy and did justice. He was ever kind, benign, and gentle. Though quiet in demeanor, he had great stability of character. In his very meekness there was great strength. I would say that he knew the soft, sad music of humanity. He never feared death. He was sick for an undue length of time. He said to me, "Why fear that which is inevitable, and death is inevitable?" I agree with the poet, "What is death? At most it is a journey for a season, and a sleep longer than usual. If thou fearest death, thou shouldst fear also sleep." Jim had no fear in his heart. I would say, in conclusion, that God has put His finger upon him; and he sleeps.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the first sad hour of shock it is always difficult for me to express the emotions that I feel coursing through my mind. Such a shock has come to me twice in the last 2 weeks, once when I lost a friend in Tom Cullen, who served in this House for 24 years, and now again when I lose another who has been close to me for 8 years, JIM O'LEARY. I was very fond of him. I shall always remember with great pleasure the many

happy hours that we spent together when I would refresh myself in his sound, American philosophy. To talk to JIM O'LEARY reminded me of the way Amos must have felt when he said, "When I want strength I kiss the earth." When I wanted strength it was nice to feel that I could, in a manner of speaking, kiss the hand of my friend, JIM O'LEARY. I do not know that I would be exaggerating at all, Mr. Speaker, if I were to say more sincerely Jim was one of the finest characters I ever knew, simple and sweet. He had the three characteristics that I think make the measure of a man. He was courageous, he was tolerant, and he was kind. He was courageous even in these days when courage is not always too evident. He was courageous because he never failed to announce his conception of Americanism. He believed in this country, in this country above all things. I am sorry to say that in many realms of society that is not too popular today. But JIM O'LEARY never faltered in his devotion to his country. Therefore I think that at this moment we have lost a man whom we can ill afford to lose. The Nation suffers. I in my personal life suffer. Strange, is it not, how lonely life grows as the years accumulate? We see snatched from us from time to time the things we have grown to love, the things that become actually a part of us. They are snatched from us through no act of ours and they leave us tremendously saddened. The loss of JIM O'LEARY will leave an ache in my heart that nothing that I can conceive of will ever fill.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the Congress has heard with deep regret of the demise of our dear friend and colleague, JIM O'LEARY.

He was my dear friend and, with many Members of the House, I shall miss him very much. He was a credit to his city, State, and Nation. As Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments he did a splendid job and reflected great credit on his ability as a leader and an executive.

The fine work he did as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is well known to the Members of this House. Although ill at the time, he, in the pursuit of his duties, went on a long and tedious trip to the west coast to get a true picture of the marine situation there.

To his family go the sympathy and condolence of all of us in the Congress.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, God in His wisdom has seen fit to reach out and take from our midst one of our very dear and loyal friends, a valuable asset to the House of Representatives; JIM O'LEARY was a true friend and a good American. A man who at this moment has one son giving his very best so that we can continue in this deliberation in which we are taking part this afternoon. The things that Jim stood for were pronounced by his every deed and his every action up until this present moment. His suffering was tremendous, not only his physical suffering, but his mental suffering as well, having just suffered the

loss of his dear wife. I am sure his son and daughters will be happy in the knowledge that he has left behind him many, many friends. We stood here no more than 2 weeks ago and uttered practically the same words in behalf of another departed colleague. But, just as often as we repeat those words, just as often are we that much more sincere in our eulogy of the passing of a great and dearly beloved friend.

Jim's absence is a tremendous blow, not only to the constituents in his district, and to his family, but especially to his friends, among whom I am happy to know that I was numbered.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the grim hand of death has again visited this body. For 10 years our late friend, JIM O'LEARY, as his friends knew and called him, labored in this body, giving a character of service to his people and his country which it will be difficult for anyone who succeeds him to surpass. We who knew him personally, we who were numbered among his friends, feel keenly the passing of JIM O'LEARY and we are going to miss him greatly from among our ranks.

I remember well seeing him last fall on two occasions in Boston when he was there undergoing medical treatment in connection with the illness which brought about his death this morning. With full knowledge of the seriousness of his condition, as was evidenced in my talks with him, he viewed it from a fine, high, noble, philosophical, and religious angle. Those two talks which were among the last I had with him, the philosophical way in which he considered his illness, made a very strong impression upon me.

For 10 years he gave the best that was within him to his people and to his country by sincere and faithful and loyal service in this body. As previous speakers have well said, he was sincere. We can all subscribe to that beautiful trait possessed by our late friend. But more than sincere, he was kind. He was a man who encouraged others. He was a man of understanding. The passing of JIM O'LEARY leaves another gap in our ranks.

To his children I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement. To the people of his district I extend my feeling of sympathy in the loss of their great Representative. I know that they appreciate the character of service that he so ably gave to them. And to our colleagues of the New York delegation I also express my sympathy because each and every one of them were not only personal friends of our late colleague, JIM O'LEARY, but he also was one of their delegation.

The New York delegation has had two visitations of death within a few weeks. There is no finer delegation in this House than the New York delegation. I deeply sympathize with them in the loss from their ranks of a sincere and kindly character, a man of understanding, our late friend and colleague, JIM O'LEARY.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may care to use to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAY].

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time in 30 days that death has visited the ranks of the New York delegation. Only 2 weeks ago we attended the funeral of the venerable Tom Cullen, of Brooklyn. Today we mourn the loss of Congressman JIM O'LEARY, of Staten Island. He was a businessman of fine accomplishments. Last summer I spent 2 months in the hospital on Staten Island, in his district. I came in contact with the civilian personnel who lived on Staten Island. Everyone spoke highly of JIM O'LEARY as their Representative. He exerted considerable influence in developing Staten Island as a great port in the harbor of New York. He brought business and manufacturing to Staten Island, and it now stands today as a great important section of our city.

We shall miss JIM O'LEARY. I extend to his family my profound sympathy and respect for a great father and husband who typified the qualities of a gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] such time as he may care to use.

Mr. BENDER. We all know how futile mere words are on an occasion like this. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Expenditures and I knew JIM O'LEARY well. He was all that the distinguished majority leader stated. He was kindly and friendly and generous to a fault. He was a good friend. He was a strong partisan. No man served the Democratic Party better as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures than JIM O'LEARY, and he was always fair and considerate of every minority member of the committee. I join the New York Members in mourning his passing. I am sure if any man deserves a place in the heavenly throng, JIM O'LEARY does.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BURCHILL] may extend his remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest sympathy and a sense of the greatest loss that I join with my colleagues in announcing to this body the passing of my beloved colleague, the Honorable JAMES A. O'LEARY, of Staten Island, N. Y. JIM O'LEARY has been, in addition, my dear friend and neighbor, as we had the distinction of representing adjoining districts in the State of New York. This enabled me to appraise his character and abilities from observations as well as association. His legislative record and judgment were unsurpassed during his term of service in this body

and his character, demonstrated as a Member of this House and his community, was beautiful in its simplicity and dignity.

JIM knew the sorrow that follows the irreplaceable loss that comes with the passing of a close and dear one, having suffered the loss of his beloved wife a short time ago. Since that time he has devoted his life to his lovely family of two daughters and one son, Lt. James A. O'Leary, Jr., now serving his country. There is so little I can say to them in their hour of sorrow that would in the smallest measure approach the adequate. I can only extend my personal sympathy and hope that God will give them that supernatural strength He sends to all of us at some time in our lives when the need for it arises. The memory of their father will rest with this House throughout the years to come. It is a memory which will hallow and revere his many years of loyal and faithful service. The high regard in which he was held by the leadership and his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, who sat in stricken silence today at the grave announcement of our loss, serves as mute and golden evidence of the great esteem in which JIM O'LEARY has always been held by this honorable body.

Because of the location of his district, JIM O'LEARY's greatest interest and most of his life were devoted to maritime matters. In memoriam I am reminded of those famous and beautiful words of the epitaph of Robert Louis Stevenson which might well have been uttered by JIM O'LEARY as he went to his Heavenly resting place:

Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from the sea,
And the hunter home from the hill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRIS] such time as he may care to use.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of my first committee assignments on coming to the House was to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. At that time, JIM O'LEARY was one of the ranking Democrats on the committee. I came to know him exceedingly well through a common interest we had in more than one project concerning our respective districts. Through this association I quickly came to recognize his great ability, to respect his judgment, and to admire and have great affection for him personally. He was an independent thinker, a man of courage, and of courageous action. He is another of our beloved colleagues who have gone down fighting on the legislative firing line. We can ill afford to spare his like. We sorely shall miss him. His memory ever will remain green in our minds. Our hearts fully of sympathy go out to his children.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TORRENS] such time as he may care to use.

Mr. TORRENS. Mr. Speaker, although I did not have the honor of knowing Congressman O'LEARY but slightly, still I knew of the splendid work he did as a Member of Congress.

With his colleagues I join in offering my sympathy and my condolence to his bereaved family.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS].

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I made the acquaintance of JAMES O'LEARY when he was first elected to this House. It so happened he was assigned as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I was then the chairman. He served on that committee during the entire time he was in Congress, and when I resigned the chairmanship to accept my present assignment he became chairman and occupied that position at the time of his death.

He was always kind and helpful and was blessed with a personality that made friends for him with everyone he came in contact with. The people of his district, the State of New York, and the Nation have lost a faithful public servant.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death of our colleague from New York, Representative JAMES A. O'LEARY.

During my term as a Member of the House I became rather well acquainted with him. His quiet and unassuming attitude seemed to be a magnet that drew people to him. During his 10 years of service in the House of Representatives he devoted himself wholeheartedly to the best interests of the people of his district. His loss will be deeply felt not only by the people of Staten Island and lower Manhattan, which he represented, but also by all the New York delegation.

To his family I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 474) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of six Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following members of the committee: Mr. CELLER, Mr. FISH, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POWERS, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, and Mr. BURCHILL of New York.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, March 20, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

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. Friday, March 17, 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 RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will continue its hearings on House Joint Resolution 148 (joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health) on March 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1302. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the War Relocation Authority of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1945 containing an estimate of appropriation amounting to \$40,100,000 (H. Doc. No. 501); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1303. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 14, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Intracoastal Waterway throughout Broward County, Fla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and by an act of Congress approved on June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1304. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated December 10, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Waimea, Hanapepe, Waialua, and Hanalei Rivers and their tributaries and Kapaa Swamp on the island of Kauai, T. H.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1305. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular 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. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1157. An act to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of providing such training of State and Territorial military forces as is deemed necessary to enable them to execute their internal security responsibilities within their respective States and Territories; without amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1250. An act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4420. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act by adding a new title thereto relating to the sale or other disposition of surplus property of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4421. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4422. A bill relating to certain Japanese residents of the United States and to certain citizens of Japanese descent found to be unfriendly to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4423. A bill to establish State offices in the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4424. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 so as to provide mustering-out payments for certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 4425. A bill to incorporate the Regular Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 472. Resolution to create a special committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of race relations in the United States; 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 Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to express to Congress of the United States its respectful and firm opposition to have the people of Puerto Rico deprived of its revenue on rum; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 20, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

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

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

Our Father God, we turn to Thee, driven by our drained lives, with tension of the present, anxiety about the future, deep concern about ourselves, our dear ones, our Nation, and our world. As we play our part in days of destiny, with all mankind standing in the valley of decision, we seek the sanctuary of prayer. Entering its gates of peace, we bow for this dedicated moment at a shrine of the spirit, apart from the clamor of the world, from the pull of conflicting opinions, and from the rivalry of personal loyalties. In Thy loving kindness and in Thy tender mercy look upon us; empower us, sustain us, as, toiling feverishly, our strength unequal to our task, we turn again to respond to the call of the world's great need.

In the midst of the dismaying circumstances of our times, open for us the crystal fountain whence the healing waters flow. Towering o'er the wrecks of time, may our eyes behold the conquering sign of a rugged cross and our ears, attuned to the infinite, catch the clear accents of the inevitable Christ, declaring, "I will draw all men unto me." We ask it in His ever-blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 16, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILLS

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 the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 16, 1944:

S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States;

S. 1337. An act to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; and

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield.

On March 17, 1944:

S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1285) to