

portation of their dependents on assignment to their first duty station and to the mileage allowance of persons entering the United States Military Academy as cadets; with amendment (Rept. No. 1513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4733. A bill to amend section 514 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 241. Joint resolution requesting the President to urge upon the governments of those countries where the cultivation of the poppy plant exists, the necessity of immediately limiting the production of opium to the amount required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1515). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 283. Joint resolution to extend the time limit for immunity; with amendment (Rept. No. 1516). 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. BLAND:

H. R. 4880 (by request). A bill to amend the provisions of the act approved March 9, 1920, as amended, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, to extend the statute of limitations with respect to causes of action arising after the declaration of the present national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 4881. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, and the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to classify a new synthetic drug, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4882. A bill to authorize the completion, by the use of Lanham Act funds, of hospital projects initiated by the Works Progress Administration and the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4883. A bill to amend section 22, subdivision (b), paragraph (2) of subparagraph (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 4884. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 so as to guarantee to persons after their period of military service certain rights with respect to employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 4885. A bill to authorize State and local taxation of machinery owned by the United States which is being used in war production by private contractors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARNES of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (No. 1311) of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, dealing with the leadership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations political action committee; to the Committee on Printing.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 4886. A bill for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4887. A bill for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4888. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 4889. A bill for the relief of Bart B. Pigman; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

5749. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Buffalo Real Estate Board on May 19, 1944, opposing the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5750. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the National Society, United States Daughters of 1812, urging Congress to take recognition of the fact that the act providing for the elimination of all subversive elements from radio stations in the merchant marine is not being enforced and to take such steps as in its judgment may be deemed appropriate and necessary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5751. Also, petition of the National Society, United States Daughters of 1812, urging that the Constitution of the United States be upheld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5752. Also, petition of the National Society, United States Daughters of 1812, urging that the migration of huge masses of immigrants be restricted; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5753. Also, petition of the National Society, United States Daughters of 1812, urging freedom of the radio and freedom of the press and speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5754. Also, petition of the National Society, United States Daughters of 1812, protesting against the regimentation of science in the field of technical invention and in medicine; to the Committee on Education.

5755. By Mr. SLAUGHTER: Petition of Charles E. Phillips and 2,087 other citizens of Kansas City, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5756. Also, petition of James R. Browne and 1,401 other citizens of Kansas City, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5757. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Watertown Building and Construction Trades Council, Watertown, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to approval of Senate bill 1385; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5758. Also, petition of the secretary, Journeymen Barbers Union, Local 295, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the importance of maintaining ceiling prices and the continuance of the Office of Price Administration program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

For the hand that reaches down to the one who falls and to the one who climbs, send out Thy light and truth. For all the intimations of Thy dignity and power and for Thy exceeding great and precious promises, we give Thee all honor and praise.

Where there is heaviness and deadness of heart; where there is peril and sorrow, perplexity and despondency, we pray Thee to show Thyself transcendent and infinitely beyond the reach of human limitations in the power of wisdom and in the beauty of Thy holiness. Give us the conviction that the future will be full of fidelity, of gladness and peace. O keep the mind of our country from levity and from the lack of earnestness, remembering the counsels and teachings of our Heavenly Father. Teach us not to count our present afflictions worthy to be compared to the joyous freedom that awaits all true and devout lovers of the imperishable worth of the individual. Take away all selfish ambitions and conceit, lead us away from these shivering regions of deception and let us go forth toward the fulfillment of those gracious liberties for which we labor and pray. In the name of the Son of man. Amen.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 329. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for the benefit of natives of Alaska in advance of the enactment of legislation making appropriations therefor;

H. R. 1628. An act for the relief of John Hirsch;

H. R. 1635. An act for the relief of William E. Search, and to the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search;

H. R. 1984. An act for the relief of Paul Barrere;

H. R. 2008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae Scheidel, Mr. Fred Scheidel, Mr. Charles Totten, and Miss Jean Scheidel;

H. R. 2105. An act extending the time for repayment and authorizing increase of the revolving fund for the benefit of the Crow Indians;

H. R. 2143. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Christian Wenz;

H. R. 2408. An act for the relief of Clarence E. Thompson and Mrs. Virginia Thompson;

H. R. 2438. An act for the relief of Bernadine Salmons;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.;

H. R. 2689. An act for the relief of Pete Paluck;

H. R. 2757. An act for the relief of Margaret Hamilton, Mrs. Catherine Higgins, Mrs. Rebecca Sallop, and Mrs. Dora Projansky;

H. R. 3028. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of Ruth Coe;

H. R. 3186. An act for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons;

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1944

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.  
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we would say with most grateful hearts: "Still, still with Thee."

H. R. 3403. An act to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields, and to amend sections 202, 203, and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3537. An act for the relief of Bessie Eason;

H. R. 3848. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources;

H. R. 4054. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.; and

H. R. 4710. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 272. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda, Jesse M. Knowles, and the estate of Lee Stroud;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, the legal guardian of Paul M. Campbell, a minor;

H. R. 1475. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of O. W. James;

H. R. 2472. An act for the relief of the estate of Gertrude Mullins;

H. R. 2711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Maag;

H. R. 2855. An act for the relief of the estate of John Buby;

H. R. 3054. An act to amend the Expediting Act;

H. R. 3102. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eva M. Delisle;

H. R. 3126. An act for the relief of Mary Ellen Frakes, widow of Joseph A. Frakes;

H. R. 3476. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the Klamath drainage district and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3570. An act to provide as an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3891. An act to provide night differential for certain employees;

H. R. 4292. An act to amend section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 4320. An act relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service; and

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 198. An act to amend further section 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 267. An act relating to marriage and divorce among members of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians;

S. 338. An act for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota;

S. 873. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribes of Indians;

S. 1081. An act to add certain lands to the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife and Fish Refuge;

S. 1093. An act for the relief of Fermin Salas;

S. 1240. An act to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1080), relating to estates of certain deceased Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma;

S. 1451. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861;

S. 1453. An act for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.;

S. 1461. An act for the relief of Frederick G. Goebel;

S. 1465. An act for the relief of Dr. A. R. Adams;

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugene W. Randall;

S. 1481. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Marino Bello;

S. 1501. An act for the relief of the Rau Motor Sales Co.; and

S. 1572. An act for the relief of Frank Robertson.

S. 1580. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the nonreservation Indian boarding school known as Sherman Institute, Calif.;

S. 1593. An act for the relief of the heirs and assigns of Widow Cesare De Blanc;

S. 1597. An act to amend section 1, Act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 703), for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Grand Coulee Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes;

S. 1602. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winnie Left Her Behind, a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1605. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Borrego; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Silva; the legal guardian of Frank Borrego; the legal guardian of Rueben Silva; and the legal guardian of Rudolph Silva;

S. 1710. An act to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian;

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Helen Halverson;

S. 1763. An act for the relief of the Square D. Co.;

S. 1782. An act to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes;

S. 1795. An act to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army;

S. 1808. An act to authorize temporary appointment as officers in the Army of the United States of members of the Army Nurse Corps, female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such corps, female dietetic and physical-therapy personnel of the Medical Department of the Army (exclusive of students and apprentices), and female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such department as female dietetic or physical-therapy personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1809. An act to remove the limitation on the right to command of officers of the

Dental Corps of the Army which limits such officers to command in that corps;

S. 1826. An act to amend section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), relating to the exportation of certain commodities, and to continue said act in effect;

S. 1837. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Hugh A. Shiels, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 1838. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in quarters occupied by naval construction battalions;

S. 1839. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in quarters at naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on February 6, 1944;

S. 1840. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters, naval operating base, Argentina, Newfoundland, on January 12, 1943;

S. 1841. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1842. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on April 25, 1943;

S. 1847. An act to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds;

S. 1848. An act for the relief of Claude R. Whitlock, and for other purposes;

S. 1849. An act for the relief of Muskingum Watershed Conservatory District;

S. 1881. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fire at the naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944;

S. 1894. An act to provide for the transportation to their homes of persons discharged from the naval service because of under age at time of enlistment;

S. 1934. An act to provide for abandonment of the project authorized in the act of October 17, 1940, for a seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor, Mass.; and

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution relating to the invitation to the Congress of the United States to send a delegation to visit the British Parliament.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1029. An act to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

#### HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a splendid article by Merlo J. Pusey, which appeared in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

#### AMERICAN PRISONERS OF JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

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



therein a press release issued by the State Department.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

#### NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the Navy Department appropriation bill.

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

#### POLICY OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT TOWARD PALESTINE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. 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. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### RETIRED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS EMPLOYED IN CIVILIAN POSITIONS BY THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a copy of the bill H. R. 3872, which I have introduced.

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

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

#### THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the Weekly Clip Sheet of the Democratic National Committee, published here in Washington and dated May 11, 1944. On the front page, under the heading "The Democratic Party," we find the following very modest declaration:

The Democratic Party has contributed to this Nation four of its greatest documents—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. Speaker, the only comment I care to make concerning this very modest claim is: "My, oh, my! What has not the New Deal done to these four historic documents and the Democratic Party during the last 10 years, in cooperation with the Communist Party and its affiliates."

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my

remarks and include a speech made by Mr. Baruch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address I made last evening.

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

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in certain remarks which I expect to make today in Committee of the Whole, a letter relating to the subject matter of those remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. HÉBERT] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on next Monday, May 29, after the regular business of the day and any other special orders.

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

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Evening Bulletin.

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

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 451 OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1758) to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the statement.

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 House to the bill (S. 1758) to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 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 disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 6, 7, 8, and 9, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "operator, or agent of a highway vehicle, bridge, tunnel, or ferry,"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment and in lieu of

the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "other means of highway travel upon, over, or through any highway, bridge, tunnel, or ferry"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "other means of highway travel upon, over, or through any highway, bridge, tunnel, or ferry, between the United States and Canada"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "or agent of any such highway vehicle, bridge, tunnel, or ferry, or other person"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "over highways or toll bridges"; and the House agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,  
JERE COOPER,

JOHN D. DINGELL,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

PETER GERRY,  
A. H. VANDENBERG,  
TOM CONNALLY,  
ROBERT A. TAFT  
(per A. H. V.),

*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 House to the bill (S. 1758) to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment numbered 1: The Senate bill relieved owners and operators of bridges, tunnels, and ferries between the United States and Canada and between the United States and Mexico from paying the compensation of customs inspectors assigned to duty on Sundays, holidays, or at night to duties in connection with the arrival in and departure from the United States of persons and property by means of such bridges, tunnels, and ferries.

The amendment of the House numbered 1 extended the benefits of this provision to owners and operators of highway vehicles and aircraft operating between the United States and Mexico and between the United States and Canada.

The Senate recedes with an amendment the effect of which is to omit aircraft from the House amendment.

Amendment numbered 2: The amendment of the House numbered 2 was a technical amendment made necessary by the amendment of the House numbered 1.

The Senate recedes with an amendment in conformity with the action on amendment numbered 1.

Amendment numbered 3: The Senate bill required the collector, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, to assign customs officers and employees to duty,

at ports of entry where persons or property arrive in or depart from the United States by motor vehicle, trolley car, on foot, or by other means upon, over, or through any bridge, tunnel, or ferry between the United States and Canada and the United States and Mexico, at such times during the 24 hours of each day, including Sundays and holidays, as the Secretary in his discretion determined to be necessary.

The amendment of the House numbered 3 extended this requirement to include the assignment of customs officers and employees to duties at customs stations on highways between the United States and Canada and the United States and Mexico and at ports of entry where persons and property arrived in or departed from the United States to Canada or Mexico by aircraft.

The Senate recedes with an amendment the effect of which is to limit the amendment to requiring assignment of customs officers and employees to stations on highways.

Amendment numbered 4: The Senate bill provided that in the cases described in connection with amendments numbered 1 and 3, the compensation payable to the customs officers and employees for duty on Sundays, holidays, or at night shall be paid by the United States without requiring a bond, license, financial undertaking, or payment in connection therewith, on the part of the owner, operator, or agent of any bridge, tunnel, or ferry covered by the bill.

The amendment of the House numbered 4, in conformity with amendments numbered 1 and 3, extended this relief from payment, license, giving bond, etc., to owners and operators of highway vehicles and aircraft.

The Senate recedes with an amendment the effect of which is to limit the extension of this relief under the House amendment to owners and operators of highway vehicles; in conformity with the action on amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

Amendment numbered 5: The Senate bill provided that the extra compensation of customs officers and employees heretofore assigned to the performance of inspectional services in connection with traffic between the United States and Canada and the United States and Mexico by means of facilities described in connection with amendment numbered 1, shall be payable by the United States without reimbursement.

The House amendment, in conformity with amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, extended this provision to include customs officers and employees heretofore assigned to duty in connection with traffic by aircraft, highways, and toll bridges.

The Senate recedes with an amendment the effect of which is to limit the extension of this provision under the House amendment to customs officers and employees assigned to duty in connection with traffic by highways.

Amendment numbered 6: The Senate bill provided that any reimbursement of compensation made payable by the United States without reimbursement under section 2 of the bill shall be refunded.

The amendment of the House numbered 6 limits the refund to amounts which have accrued and been collected since January 6, 1941.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment numbered 7: The Senate bill directed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to cause an investigation to be made concerning differences between the compensation of customs personnel performing inspectional work and of other Federal personnel performing comparable work under comparable circumstances, and to report his recommendations to the Congress for the equalization of any differences which will eliminate the necessity for the assignment of individual customs employees to work regularly on seven days in any week. The bill also directed that the Bureau make recommenda-

tions with respect to the establishment of pay differentials for customs employees required to work on Sundays, holidays, or at night.

The amendment of the House numbered 7 provided that this investigation, and these recommendations, should be made by the United States Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The Senate recedes.

Amendments numbered 8 and 9: The amendments of the House numbered 8 and 9 are clerical amendments made necessary by amendment numbered 7.

The Senates recedes.

R. L. DOUGHTON,  
JERE COOPER,  
JOHN D. DINGELL,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House some days ago with certain amendments to the Senate bill. In the conference the Senate conferees agreed to all the House amendments except one pertaining to airplanes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill, S. 1758, is to clarify a situation caused by a decision of the Supreme Court in what is known as the Myers case. Prior to this decision the Treasury Department had furnished free inspectional service at international bridges, certain ferries and tunnels, on Sundays and holidays.

Under the Myers case the Treasury Department is precluded from assigning custom officers and employees to perform inspectional work on Sundays and holidays at toll bridges, toll tunnels, and certain ferries, unless such inspection employees are paid overtime. Thus, as a result of the decision in the Myers case, the Treasury feels it has no authority under existing laws to assign inspection work on Sundays and holidays as it did prior to the Myers case, without guaranties from the interested facilities to reimburse for the overtime paid the custom inspectors.

The facilities, such as the toll bridges owned jointly by the United States and Canada and by Mexico and the United States, cannot pay the overtime without international complications. The result is that traffic is stopped at many points on the international boundary.

I am in favor of every provision in this bill.

My opposition is to the elimination of what was put in the bill by a unanimous vote of the Ways and Means Committee.

The part eliminated was an amendment to provide the same free inspection service for airplanes on the boundary between Mexico and the United States and on the boundary between Canada and the United States.

The planes at these two boundary lines land and leave under military orders, yet they will be obliged to pay overtime for inspection service on Sundays and holidays, in fact at all times.

What reason—or rather, excuse—is given for this discrimination? A whispering campaign from bureaucratic sources that unless airplanes are eliminated from fair treatment, the President would veto the bill.

I repeat that the only objection that was made to including airplanes in this provision was this one thing, the usual whispering bureaucratic propaganda that if airplanes were included in the bill President Roosevelt would veto it. I do not mind saying here and now that I believe in the independence of this legislative body. We should not be terrified by the threat of a veto when legislation is brought into this House for consideration. I say it is time to stand up and be counted as an American Congress and not let this body descend to the low level of a Reichstag.

I have no objection to the bill except as stated. I want it to go through at this time to relieve the congestion on the international borders.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein certain tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I simply want on this occasion to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST], who sponsored this legislation in the House; and the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, for so promptly effecting this legislation which will relieve a most distressing situation at every international bridge in the country, seven of them in New York, a number in Michigan, and on the Mexican border.

I want also to pay my respects to the members of the Finance Committee in the Senate who considered the bill so promptly. I had hoped that the Senate could agree to these provisions today and that the bill would be signed by the President before Decoration Day. However, inasmuch as the Senate is in recess today, this cannot be accomplished now until Monday.

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.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Montana yield for a unanimous-consent request? I should like to be recognized before we take up any business to submit a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has agreed to recognize the gentleman from Montana to take up a bill for consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. Would the gentleman from Montana like to have a quorum?

It is customary, Mr. Speaker, to take up these consent requests before we get into a long legislation program.



The SPEAKER. It is customary for the Chair to transact business like conference reports at any time.

Mr. RANKIN. If we are going to have legislation considered, we probably ought to have a quorum here to help consider it.

Mr. KEEFE. This will take just a minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR rose.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker—

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

#### [Roll No. 71]

Allen, Ill.	Gallagher	LeFevre
Andrews, Ala.	Gavin	Lewis
Baldwin, Md.	Gilchrist	Luce
Barden	Gillespie	McCord
Bell	Grant, Ala.	McLean
Bolton	Grant, Ind.	Manasco
Bonner	Green	Martin, Iowa
Boren	Griffiths	Merritt
Boykin	Gwynne	Morrow
Brehm	Harris, Ark.	Morrison, La.
Bulwinkle	Harris, Va.	Morrison, N. C.
Burdick	Hébert	Newsome
Burgin	Heffernan	Patton
Butler	Heldinger	Pfeifer
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Philbin
Capozzoli	Hinshaw	Pracht
Carter	Holmes, Mass.	C. Frederick
Case	Hull	Randolph
Celler	Jackson	Rees, Kans.
Clason	Jarman	Robison, Ky.
Cole, N. Y.	Jeffrey	Sadowski
Compton	Jenkins	Shafer
Cooley	Johnson	Snyder
Costello	Anton J.	Stearns, N. H.
Curley	Johnson	Sumners, Tex.
Dewey	Calvin D.	Taylor
Dies	Johnson	Vincent, Ky.
Dirksen	Lyndon B.	Wasielewski
Disney	Johnson, Okla.	Wene
Douglas	Jones	Whittington
Durham	Kearney	Wilson
Eaton	Kee	Winter
Fernandez	Kennedy	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fish	Kerr	Woodruff, Mich.
Flannagan	King	Zimmerman
Folger	Klein	
Ford	Knutson	
Fulbright	Larcade	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 320 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. O'CONNOR asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

#### MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 166) to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out "\$1,420,-836.03" and insert "\$1,767,616.11."

Page 4, line 22, strike out "3 years" and insert "1 year."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain these amendments?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], to explain them.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution passed the House unanimously on December 6, 1943. It passed the Senate on May 25, 1944, with two minor amendments. I should like to explain to the Members just what this resolution provides.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain the amendments particularly?

Mr. KEEFE. I will explain the amendments as soon as I have explained what the resolution is, so that you will understand the resolution and then will understand what the amendments are.

The purpose of this bill is to settle the controversy between the United States and the State of Wisconsin and Menominee Indian Tribe, which dates back to 1854. It grows out of a situation which arose when, in 1854, the Government of the United States ceded certain lands to the Menominee Indians for a tribal reservation. Thereafter under the provisions of the Swamp Land Act it was held by the courts that the Government of the United States had ceded certain of this land involved in the treaty obligations to the State of Wisconsin under that act. Therefore the Menominees never did receive from the United States Government the number of acres of land that were supposed to be included within their treaty with the Government. Thereafter this Congress authorized the commencement of an action in the Court of Claims in behalf of the Menominee Tribe of Indians to ascertain the value of the land that should have been ceded by the Government to the Menominee Indians. That action has been tried and determined and the Court of Claims has entered an interlocutory decree holding that the Government failed to turn over to the Indians the lands provided by treaty. The interlocutory decree provided for the computation of the damages. The Government and the tribe have now agreed that the sum of \$1,767,616.11 represents the proper measure of damages. The original resolution as passed in the House provided for a judgment in the amount of \$1,420,836.03. The legislation passed by the House provided that in lieu of payment of this sum of money to the Indians the proceeds of the judgment should be used in purchasing these lands for the Indians by payment to the State of Wisconsin which has legal title to the land, the amount agreed upon in the final judgment.

The amount as finally agreed upon is the amount specified in the Senate bill, which raises the amount from \$1,420,-836.03 to \$1,767,616.11, as the result of the findings resulting from the joint action of a cruise made by the State of Wisconsin and the Land Office of the Federal Government and the Department of the Interior. This bill has the approval of the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, the Indian Department, and the Bureau of the Budget. May I say also to the Members of the House that the Menominee Indian Tribe is one of the self-supporting tribes in the United States. Their principal support comes from the operation of a large sawmill which this Congress provided for years ago. They need this timber to get it out into the sawmill for war production purposes. There is involved on this land one of the finest stands of birch timber that exists in the United States. The Army and Navy are tremendously anxious to get that timber into the mill and get it into production. The only way that can be done is to pay the proceeds of the judgment against the United States that the Menominee Indian Tribe has, to the State of Wisconsin, as the purchase price of this timber land. This will then put these Indians in a position where they will be for all time self-sufficient. They are simply asking you to let them use their own money to acquire these lands and thus carry out what the Government of the United States originally agreed it would do, and give them the land that their treaty obligation called for. This is simple justice.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The Attorney General has already approved the Senate amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. The Senate amendments have been approved by the Attorney General and the Department of Justice and all the agencies of Government that are interested in this matter.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. You say all the agencies of Government. Did you consult the F. E. P. C.? I want to warn the gentleman if he did not, and called those people Indians, he may be subject to be called up on the carpet down there and excoriated, as the Dallas News was, for mentioning the race. They would much rather see those Indians do without the benefits of this bill, I am sure, than to have the members of this committee, the Members of Congress, or anybody else violate the holy orders of the F. E. P. C., that conglomerate bunch of communistic crackpots who are trying to run this country.

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

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman from Montana will yield to the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The House has already manifested unanimous consent as to the purpose of this bill. The only question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment which the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from

Wisconsin state carries out the understanding of the Government and brings justice to this group or tribe of Indians.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly right.

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of this bill is to give them justice. Is that right?

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I may say I discussed this matter yesterday with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Indian Affairs, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], in the absence of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] and it has his full and complete support.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HUNGRY HORSE DAM

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3570) to provide as an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "urgently needed for the war effort."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does the amendment do?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, this is an authorization for the Hungry Horse Dam on the south fork of the Flathead River in northwestern Montana as a post-war project. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] that the bill has already passed the House unanimously.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are the Senate amendments?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. There is only one and that is to make it a post-war project instead of a war emergency project. That is the only difference.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You are not going to do it in wartime? It was originally passed as a war measure and now you are going to put it in as a post-war measure?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. No; it was passed with that inclusion in it

because of the fact that the Army engineers came into the Flathead last summer and were going to raise our lake to a height of 37 feet eventually, which would have affected 50,000 people directly and indirectly and 50,000 acres of the best land in Montana and inundated numerous towns along the lake and adjacent to it. Because of that we included this as an insurance and as an alternative in case they ever did come in again. We do not know when an emergency will arise, I might say to the gentleman, hence our desire for this bill, no piece of legislation has affected western Montana as this matter now before us for consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has this amendment been submitted to the committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Individually, yes; I have contacted the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARTT], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], and all the others, and the chairman, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, this practically postpones the project?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That is right. I can assure the House that the people of Montana will be deeply appreciative if the Members will consent unanimously to pass the bill, as amended, now before us for consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire as to what the program is going to be the rest of this week and next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The program for today is the further consideration of the appropriation bill now before the House.

If the bill is disposed of today, which I hope, then I will ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tonight it will adjourn to meet on Monday next.

On Monday, the Labor Department appropriation bill will be taken up for general debate.

Tuesday is Memorial Day and there will be no legislative business.

Wednesday is the House memorial for our deceased Members. Outside of the memorial exercises there will be no legislative business.

On Thursday there will be a continuation of the consideration of the Labor Department appropriation bill, and thereafter, the lend-lease and U. N. R. A. appropriation bills will be the next order of business.

I want to make one reservation, that conference reports, of course, might be considered, that are in order next week, but the House will be advised so that the Members will have notice.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand, the tentative plans are to meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think so; yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It might be well to state that so that if the Members are away for Memorial Day they will be aware of that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think probably we will come in at 11 o'clock some days next week. I do not want to commit myself about Thursday, but I do know that from now on if we are going to dispose of our program by June 20, or thereabouts, we will have to speed up. The House has been doing a mighty good job. We will probably have to sit on Saturdays and come in at an earlier hour on many days between now and June 30.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. As I understand, it has been stated that on Thursday a very important matter is going to come before this House. That is the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill. There are four or five items of legislation on that appropriation bill that are in disagreement and will have to come back for a vote in the House, including the T. V. A.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to inquire from the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, if it is the intention to bring up the conference report on the independent offices bill next Thursday?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The House and Senate conferees have met, and the House conferees have signed a report. The latest information I have is that there is some hesitancy on the part of the gentlemen in the other body, but I believe a report will be filed, and it is my thought at the moment that it would be ready for consideration by Thursday, if the program of the House will permit it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How about the conference report on the Navy Department appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we might as well clear up some of these conference reports if we can. If the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill, which involves many items, is ready for Thursday, I think it should be in order on that day.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It will take about 3 hours.



Mr. McCORMACK. If the conference report is reported in, it will be set down for next Thursday.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Many Members are especially interested in the bill providing for school lunches. The conferees are filing their report today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will that be controversial?

Mr. PACE. In part.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is a matter that will have to wait until the latter part of the week.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I think it is a matter of the utmost importance that this conference report on the Pace bill be considered by the House at as early a time as possible, because it involves the school-lunch program and the Farm Security Administration appropriation. The conferees on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill have deferred further conferences with the Senate until that conference report is acted upon by the House. I sincerely hope that the majority leader may permit its consideration on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman says is thoroughly appreciated. I am sure the gentleman realizes that on Monday the Labor Department appropriation bill should be considered for general debate. It is impossible to set down that conference report for Monday. It will be considered as soon as possible after Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand the Navy Department appropriation bill conference report is controversial.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from California, [Mr. SHEPPARD] this morning received permission to file that conference report before midnight tonight. He told me there was a very controversial amendment which was brought back to the House for a separate vote.

Mr. McCORMACK. Conference reports will not be brought up before Thursday. The independent offices appropriation bill conference report will be in order on Thursday. I am not making any commitment about the others now because it is not possible, but I will bring them up as soon as the order of business will permit.

Mr. RABAUT. The State, Justice, and Commerce Departments bill will be ready.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments bill will be ready. Those matters will be brought up as soon as possible, but none before next Thursday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I understood the

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], had the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], had the floor by sufferance. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for an inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of the gentleman's statement about this adjournment Thursday, something was said about June, and our finishing up the work then. Is it the understanding or the thought that when we adjourn in June we may adjourn until September sometime?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that is something I cannot give any definite statement about at the present time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not expect a definite statement, but just sort of a thought you might have.

Mr. McCORMACK. The penetrating mind of the gentleman on this occasion is unable to receive from me a response that I could have confidence in myself. We are hopeful that some kind of arrangement may be made. I am not talking about an adjournment or anything else, but an arrangement of a nature that could be made, having in mind the two conventions and other problems of a practical nature that confront and will confront Members from June on.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is some possibility of getting either the Nurses Corps bill, or the WASP bill next week, or the week following.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not next week. I am very anxious that both bills be considered. Of course, the WASP bill was up last week and it was displaced because of reasons with which the gentleman is undoubtedly acquainted. However, it is impossible to put on either bill next week. The Nurses Corps bill is a very vitally important bill, and I was hopeful that we might pass that by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAY. I would be willing to have that done.

Mr. McCORMACK. It might be well for the gentleman from Kentucky to work on that and see if that can be accomplished. But I have both bills in mind for the week after next week.

I cannot give a definite promise.

Mr. RANKIN rose.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan. It is my understanding that the majority leader in the Senate announced yesterday that there will be no recess. I am not sure of that; you might look at the Record.

But I want to say with reference to conference reports that as I see it now it will not be possible to bring up the conference report on the veterans' bill, the so-called G. I. bill next week. Sena-

tor CLARK, chairman of the committee of conference, was called home and the conference was adjourned for a few days until he returns. We will meet again at the call of the chairman and expedite our work just as rapidly as possible with a view to bringing the conference report to the House as soon as we can.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. By way of recapitulation, we will resume consideration of the War Agencies Appropriation bill in the hope it will be completed this afternoon. If it is completed there will be no session tomorrow. If it is not completed this evening we will dispose of it tomorrow in a Saturday session.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of necessity we shall have to.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have several unanimous-consent requests to submit.

On yesterday I asked unanimous consent to insert in the Record the address of Prime Minister Churchill before the House of Commons on day before yesterday. I find now that it will cover five pages of the Record and if all costs are included of running the Government Printing Office, and so forth, for that time, it would amount to \$260; but this is one of the most important statements on international affairs that has been made since the beginning of the war, and it was published in full in only one newspaper in the United States that I have been able to find, the New York Times. In the light of that situation I am going to ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the Record with these facts before us.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the river and harbor bill and to include therein excerpts from some statements made before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors by Colonel Feringa and also some made before the Committee on Commerce of the Senate by Gen. Thomas M. Robins, the Assistant Chief of Army engineers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks which I shall make in the House today on the so-called F. E. P. C. item, to which I referred a few moments ago, I may extend my own remarks and include several clippings from Texas newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on two subjects and to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a speech I made last Saturday over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and to include therein an article by Mr. Fred McCollum, of the Forest City Times Herald, Forest City, Ark.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### PUNISHMENT FOR WILLFUL INJURY TO WAR MATERIAL

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report on the bill (H. R. 3442, Rept. No. 1517) to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes", approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3442) to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes", approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103). That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the statement made by the majority leader, that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill; and I couple with that the request that all points of order be reserved on the bill.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

I further request that the committee also have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill, and that all points of order be likewise reserved on that conference report.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman means that points of order be reserved, not waived.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My request is that all points of order be reserved on both bills.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is making that request contingent upon the House being in recess tomorrow.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. If the House is in session we will, of course, file it under the rules without securing leave.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file conference reports on the Labor and Federal Security bill and on the Independent Offices bill and that all points of order to each be reserved.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to fix the time of general debate?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have no requests to submit as to time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

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 further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4879), the National War Agencies appropriation bill, 1945, with Mr. COOPER in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Allow the Chair to announce that at conclusion of debate on yesterday the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had consumed 1 hour and 30 minutes, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had consumed 43 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, Members have said that had they understood that the item which caused such controversy yesterday was not subject to a point of order they would have voted differently. In view of this misconception and the fact that the entire argument yesterday of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was based upon the assumption that the item was subject to a point of order on the ground that it was proposed, an appropriation without authority of law, I desire to make a brief statement citing the au-

thorities and in substantiation of the fact that the item is not subject to a point of order; that whether this request had been granted or had not been granted, it could not have been taken out by raising a point of order. It could not be eliminated by a point of order because it was authorized under Executive Order No. 9346.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

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

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman says it is authorized by certain legislation. Will the gentleman, waiving any question as to whether or not an appropriation for the agency is authorized by legislation, explain what legislation authorized the temporary employment of persons by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the very point I now propose to discuss.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman admits that is legislative in character and therefore the whole paragraph undoubtedly would have been stricken on a point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will contain his soul in patience, I shall be glad to enlighten him on the subject.

Mr. TARVER. I am perfectly patient, but I do not think the gentleman proposes to enlighten me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If that is possible.

Mr. Chairman, this item was submitted to the Congress by the President, after having been transmitted to him by the Bureau of the Budget, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations under Executive Order No. 9346, issued by the President on May 27, 1943, just 1 year ago tomorrow. He issued the Executive order by virtue of the authority vested in him as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy by the powers conferred in section 2, article II, of the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, this matter has been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States and I will take just a minute or two to quote the opinion of the Court.

In *Hirabayashi v. United States* (320 U. S. 81), the Supreme Court said in upholding the west coast Japanese curfew orders:

It [the war power] extends to every matter and activity so related to war as substantially to affect its conduct and progress. The power is not restricted to the winning of victories in the field and the repulse of enemy forces. It embraces every phase of the national defense.

Similarly Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, in an article written for the American Bar Association during the First World War, wrote that the President's war powers were coextensive with "the power to wage war successfully"—42 A. B. A. report 232, 238.

In the recent case of *Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp Corporation v. Badeau* (No. 132 D. C. Western District Ky., May 9, 1944), Judge MacSwinford, in discussing the President's powers aside from statute, to



seize the plant in question, wrote as follows:

I further conclude that without an act of the Congress there was sufficient authority by the terms of the Constitution itself to justify the action of the President in this case. The President has no power to declare war—that belongs exclusively to Congress. But when war has been declared and is actually existing, his functions as Commander in Chief become of the highest importance and his operations in that connection are entirely beyond the control of the Legislature. There develops upon him by virtue of his office a solemn responsibility to preserve the Nation and it is my judgment that there is specifically granted to him authority to utilize all resources of the country to that end.

Charged with the grave responsibility of preserving a Government which guarantees the property rights of individuals the Chief Executive as Commander in Chief must not be hampered in the prosecution of the war effort. His exercise of authority to this end is subject only to the review by the Court that his actions are not arbitrary or without reasonable justification. With this limitation there need be no fear that constitutional government as we know it in these United States will be abolished, destroyed, or impaired.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, does this 10 minutes come out of the time of debate or is it in addition to that?

The CHAIRMAN. Answering the parliamentary inquiry, this is general debate and any time yielded, of course, comes out of general debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman contend that the President has a right, for example, to tell the railroads of the South or of any part of the country whom they shall employ?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman understands that we are trying to dispose of this bill today, and I am taking as little time as possible on the question before the House. For that reason I am confining myself to the point under consideration at this time. At some later time I shall be glad to take up other issues with the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This \$500,000 is in this bill and that is one of the points that is before the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If my friend will permit, I am discussing the parliamentary situation status of the item on page 9 under the order granted by the House on Wednesday.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Inasmuch as the gentleman has made the statement that the President has power under Article II, Section 2, of the Constitution to set up this bureaucratic institution, which the gentleman has discussed, under Section 2, Article II, I would like for the gentleman to point out one phrase, one word, or one clause in Section 2, Article II, of the Constitution that authorizes the President to set up such an agency.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would not presume to undertake to do what the Court itself has done so much better and more authoritatively.

Concerning the existence of the President's Constitutional powers, Attorney General Murphy said—39 Opinions 347:

You are aware, of course, that the Executive has powers not enumerated in the statutes—powers derived not from statutory grants but from the Constitution. It is universally recognized that the constitutional duties of the Executive carry with them the constitutional powers necessary for their proper performance. These constitutional powers have never been specifically defined, and in fact cannot be, since their extent and limitations are largely dependent upon conditions and circumstances. In a measure this is true with respect to most of the powers of the Executive, both constitutional and statutory. The right to take specific action might not exist under one state of facts, while under another it might be the absolute duty of the Executive to take such action.

Theodore Roosevelt wrote in his autobiography:

My view that every executive officer, and above all every executive officer in high position, was a steward of the people bound actively and affirmatively to do all he could for the people, and not to content himself with the negative merit of keeping his talents undamaged in a napkin. I declined to adopt the view that what was imperatively necessary for the Nation could not be done by the President unless he could find some specific authorization to do it. My belief was that it was not only his right but his duty to do anything that the needs of the Nation demanded unless such action was forbidden by the Constitution or by the laws.

The wartime powers of the President can best be explained by pointing out some of the most famous historical examples of the exercise of those powers. Abraham Lincoln, who took office at a time when Congress was not in session and when rebellion was spreading swiftly throughout the Southern States, had to take many drastic steps under his war powers. He issued a call for volunteers, he increased the size of the Regular Army and Navy, he issued regulations which in effect resulted in compulsory conscription, he authorized the seizure of property of private citizens wherever it was indispensable to the successful prosecution of the war, he ordered the blockade of southern ports, and he proclaimed the emancipation of the slaves—all without enabling legislation. At his direction, Postmaster General Blair closed the mails to certain newspapers which publicly advocated that the Federal Government accede to the demands of the Confederacy. A congressional committee, investigating this action, concluded that the President not only had

the authority, but that it was his positive duty to close the mails in such cases. The committee stated that "Every government, unless by its constitution restricted, has the most ample power of self-preservation, and it is by no means essential to that power that it should be enumerated among its expressly granted powers. It springs from the essential elements of government itself."

Our Presidents have often been forced to use these constitutional powers to protect American shipping. Thus President Adams in 1798 authorized the arming of American merchantmen to resist the attacks which were being made upon our commerce by the French, and in 1801 President Jefferson sent a squadron of frigates into the Mediterranean to protect our commerce against the Barbary brigands. Naval vessels were ordered to sea to protect the merchant marine of the United States by Buchanan in 1858 and by Lincoln in 1861, with no congressional authorization. Blockades were established with no legislative authority along the Mexican coast by Polk in 1846, along the southern coast by Lincoln in 1861, and before certain Cuban ports in 1898 by McKinley. These are all examples of the type of special emergency powers which the President must exercise when he finds that the national safety demands such action.

In more recent times, our Presidents, in the emergency of war or of threatened war, have had to take sudden and drastic steps to preserve the national strength. During the last war, for instance, when President Wilson found that our national safety demanded an immediate control of messages entering and leaving the country, he ordered a very strict censorship of all foreign cable, telephone, and telegraph messages, solely in his authority as Commander in Chief. Before we entered the present war, President Roosevelt found it necessary to direct the Secretary of War by Executive order to take over the plant of the North American Aviation Co., and to produce the airplanes called for by its Government contracts because it was apparent that a strike there was seriously hampering our national defense. The legal basis for this action was stated by the Attorney General:

There can be no doubt that the duty, constitutionally and inherently, rested upon the President to exert his civil and military as well as his moral authority to keep the defense effort of the United States a going concern.

These and many other actions of Presidents of the United States, taken in pursuance of their duty to protect the Nation and its citizens, have sometimes been challenged as being beyond the scope of authority outlined for the President in the Constitution. The general approval of the American people, however, and the frequent recognition and ratification of such acts by Congress have conclusively answered the arguments of those who would make the President powerless in a time of national crisis. As former Chief Justice Hughes once said:

The framers of the Constitution did not contrive an imposing spectacle of impotency.

• • • Self-preservation is the first law of national life and the Constitution itself provides the necessary powers in order to defend and preserve the United States.

"The transaction of business with foreign nations," which as Jefferson said, "is executive altogether," is also a very important element in determining the war policies and actions of the United States. Even in the process of making a formal treaty, which must of course be ratified by the Senate, all the preliminary negotiations are completely in the hands of the President or his agents. In time of war or of international emergency, it is the President's duty to make clear, by declaration or by agreement with representatives of other nations, the policy which the United States intends to pursue with regard to the war or the emergency. Because of his special sources of knowledge and because of his responsibility for the direction of our State Department and our ministers abroad, the President must both formulate our American foreign policy and make certain that it is understood by the nations whom it concerns.

The earliest important exercise of this power was the proclamation of neutrality issued by President Washington in 1793. Mindful of the weakness of the new republic and fearing that our free growth might be damaged should we become involved at that time in the war between France and Great Britain, Washington determined that the national interest required that we remain free from involvement in that struggle.

The proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine in the President's message to Congress of 1823 is perhaps the most famous example of the exercise of Executive power in the field of foreign relations. Although announced by President Monroe with no legislative authorization, this "Doctrine" which has served as a warning to any European or Asiatic nation whose actions threaten the liberty and safety of any independent government on either of the American continents, has from the time of its announcement to the present day been one of the fundamentals of our national foreign policy. As President Cleveland said of it:

It may not have been admitted in so many words to the Code of International Law but • • • it has its place in the Code of International Law as certainly and as securely as if it were specifically mentioned.

Another declaration made by the President, over a century later, in conjunction with the Prime Minister of Great Britain, may become an equally important part of our foreign policy in the future. This is the Atlantic Charter, a declaration of joint policy of the United States and Great Britain in relation to the people of every land on the face of the earth, which was signed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill at a meeting on a warship in the North Atlantic during August 1941.

The President's power with regard to foreign affairs does not stop, however, with mere declarations of policy. He has also the power to enter into international agreements of more immediate and practical importance. Under such an agreement the United States Govern-

ment in September 1940 transferred 50 destroyers to Great Britain in return for leases of important naval bases on British territory in the Western Hemisphere. In transmitting to Congress copies of the notes which had been exchanged, the President explained this action by pointing out that—

Preparation for defense is an inalienable prerogative of a sovereign state. Under present circumstances this exercise of sovereign rights is essential to the maintenance of our peace and safety.

The President thus, acting under the Executive power placed in him by the Constitution, buttressed the strength of one of our future allies in one of her most critical hours and at the same time greatly strengthened our own national defense.

No President of the United States, however, takes it upon himself—as do the dictators and ruling cliques of the Axis nations—to ignore or violate the will of the people by acting solely upon his own personal convictions or desires. The sweeping emergency actions of American Presidents have been taken in times of national crisis when Congress was not in session or could not act quickly enough to meet the necessities of the moment. Such acts have always been in accord with the President's belief as to the way in which the people and the Congress of the United States would direct him to act were there sufficient time to consult them through elections or the regular legislative processes.

Often when the President has been forced to use his emergency powers, he has asked that Congress specifically approve and authorize these acts. Thus, the action of President Jefferson in sending the American Fleet into the Mediterranean to wage war against Tripoli was communicated to Congress at the opening of its next session, and Congress thereupon gave its authorization to the hostilities. Similarly, all the orders and proclamations of President Lincoln, increasing the size of the Army and Navy and calling out volunteers, were, by later act of Congress "approved and in all respects legalized and made valid, to the same intent and with the same effect as if they had been issued and done under the previous express authority and direction of the Congress of the United States."

During the First World War, President Wilson had, with no statutory authority, ordered Mr. Hoover, the Chairman of the Committee on Food Supply and Prices, to take all necessary steps to further the saving of food and the elimination of waste, because he believed it essential to our war effort that the program be started immediately. Shortly thereafter Congress passed the Food and Fuel Control Act, which not only confirmed the powers the President had already exercised but also authorized him to take many other steps necessary to guarantee an adequate supply of food and fuel at reasonable prices. Since the start of the present war, Congress has similarly ratified an order of President Roosevelt which gave the Secretary of War and certain military commanders the power to set up military areas, to exclude any

or all persons therefrom, and to impose restrictions "in his discretion" on the right of any person to enter, remain in, or leave such an area. Realizing that this order was necessary because of emergency situations in our coastal area, Congress recognized its validity and gave it added strength by making it a criminal offense to violate any of the restrictions imposed in such military areas.

When circumstances permitted, the President has often consulted with the Congress about an emergency action, even though he already had the power to act under the Constitution or under existing statutes. Thus, President Wilson, when he wished to arm our merchantmen in 1917, said in a message to Congress:

No doubt I already possess that authority without special warrant of law by the plain implication of my constitutional duties and powers, but I prefer in the present circumstances not to act upon general implication. I wish to feel that the authority and the power of the Congress are behind me in whatever it may become necessary for me to do. We are jointly the servants of the people and must act together and in their spirit, so far as we can divine and interpret it.

It was only after the President saw that an overwhelming majority of both Houses were in favor of specifically granting him this power and that the passage of a bill to that effect was being delayed by the technical obstructions of a small minority that he ordered the merchantmen armed.

Similarly, President Roosevelt, in the present war, although convinced that he had the power to limit the further rise of prices on agricultural commodities, preferred to go to Congress for specific authority to do this. In his message of September 7, 1942, he said:

The President has the powers, under the Constitution and under congressional acts, to take measures necessary to avert a disaster which would interfere with the winning of the war. I have given the most thoughtful consideration to meeting this issue without further reference to the Congress. There may be those who will say that if the situation is as grave as I have stated it to be I should use my powers and act now. I can only say that I have approached this problem from every angle, and that I have decided that the course of conduct which I am following in this case is consistent with my sense of responsibility as President in time of war, and with my deep and unalterable devotion to the processes of democracy.

But the conduct of our national defense does not depend entirely or even to a large extent on the special emergency powers of the President. Most of the broad discretionary powers which a President exercises in time of war are given to him by acts of Congress. When the Nation enters upon a war, or when it is confronted by a threat to its safety, the people and Congress have always recognized that many serious problems will arise which demand a solution so swiftly that they cannot be solved by specific congressional action. Trusting in the wisdom of the President to use his powers only to the extent necessary to save the Nation harmless through these crises, Congress has therefore delegated to him many types of wide and general powers.



In some instances the grants of power have been only temporary, designed to meet an immediate but passing need. In others they have remained a part of the body of our national law as a reserve of legislative preparedness for the emergencies of national defense.

One of the first national emergencies which called forth legislation of this type was the Pennsylvania Rebellion of 1792. To enable President Washington to put down this rebellion, Congress empowered him to call out the militia of the States to enforce the laws "whenever the laws of the United States shall be opposed, or the execution thereof obstructed," or "whenever the United States shall be invaded, or be in imminent danger of invasion from any foreign nation." This statute, enacted and reenacted in many different forms throughout our national history, finds a place still in our code of laws today.

From the early history of our country comes also the act of 1798, still in force, that empowers the President in time of war or of threatened invasion to apprehend and detain enemy aliens. In answering objections to the breadth of power given the President by this act, the chairman of the committee which had drafted it explained that—

It would be impossible for Congress to describe cases in which aliens \* \* \* ought to be punished or not; but the President would be able to determine this matter by his proclamation.

This recognition by Congress of the necessity of providing for the President a wide sphere of discretionary action in certain types of emergency cases where the specific problems cannot be foreseen has continued throughout our national history, and has been one of the greatest elements in the success with which our democracy has been able to meet a crisis.

It has been recognized throughout our history, for instance, that in war, when there is not the time to go through the ordinary processes of bargaining and contract, it may be necessary for the Government to take the property of a citizen for military purposes upon the payment of its fair value. Before our National Government had been formed, General Washington was given the power by the Continental Congress during the struggle by which we obtained our independence "to take, wherever he may be, whatever he may want for the use of the Army, if the inhabitants will not sell it, allowing a reasonable price for the same."

During the last war the President was empowered to take over and operate any factories or industries necessary for the production of military supplies if the owners refused to produce war supplies for the Government. An almost identical statute was passed in September 1940, even though we were then still at peace, because of the necessity of swiftly strengthening our defenses.

A very broad requisitioning statute was passed a few months before our entrance into the present war. This act applies to a wide range of military or naval equipment and to the tools and materials necessary to produce or operate that equipment. If the need for a particular

piece of property is immediate, if there is no other source of supply, and if it cannot be obtained upon fair and reasonable terms, the President "is authorized to requisition such property upon the payment of fair and just compensation, and to dispose of such property in such a manner as he may determine is necessary for the defense of the United States."

The history of this statute is an illustration of the self-corrective processes of our American democracy. During the First World War, as the need for the exercise of requisitioning powers became evident, a long series of statutes was passed, each of which gave to the President the power to requisition a different type of article. When we began to prepare our national defense before the present war, Congress realized from this experience that piecemeal delegation of the requisitioning power is not adequate, because it is never possible to foresee all the types of articles which will have to be taken. Congress, therefore, gave to the President the general requisitioning power which they believed he needed.

Another type of Presidential power which has been found necessary during time of war is the authority to prohibit commercial intercourse with enemy nations. As our international commercial relations have become ever more complex, it has been necessary for Congress to delegate broader powers in this field. Within 2 weeks after our entrance into the present war, the First War Powers Act gave to the President complete discretion to regulate or prohibit any transactions whatsoever involving any property in which any foreign nation or citizen of a foreign nation has any interest.

As the mechanization of armies has increased, the mobilization of manpower for the armed forces has been increasingly matched by the mobilization of the Nation's physical and industrial resources. Today this discretionary control of the President over the Nation's business and industry has expanded until he has a complete power of life and death over every enterprise in the Nation. He may order factories to produce certain specified articles and nothing else; he may permit them to purchase certain raw materials in certain quantities for certain purposes or he may cut them off entirely; he may designate the persons to whom they may sell and the quantities they may sell. All these powers, tremendous in their potentialities of abuse, have been freely given to the President for the period of the war because of our knowledge and faith that he will use them for the common good alone.

In order that the war mobilization of the Nation's resources might be achieved without disastrous effects on the civilian population, the Food and Fuel Control Act was passed in 1917. It vested in the President the power, whenever he deemed it essential, to license the importation, exportation, manufacture, and distribution of food, feed, fertilizer, and fuel; to regulate the businesses so licensed; to fix prices of such food and fuel; to requisition food, fuel, and other supplies or factories or mines in which

they were produced; and to take many similar steps to preserve a free and adequate flow of food and fuel. Under this act, the President was able to do much to prevent the unnecessary hardships and deprivations of the civilian population which the continued unchecked operations of our peacetime economic system would have produced.

In the present war, several sweeping delegations of power have been made to enable the President to meet similar problems. Among these, for instance, is the act of October 2, 1942, which authorizes and directs the President "to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living." This act contains, of course, certain limitations of the power of the President and certain directives of policy which the Congress wishes him to follow; but by and large, it delegates to the President the power to take any steps he deems necessary to prevent inflation and resulting economic hardships. It constitutes a recognition by Congress that such a problem can be solved only by day-to-day decisions, as new difficulties arise which must be solved instantly and effectively.

A delegation of power of a new type was made to the President during the emergency which preceded our entrance into the present war. Although we were not yet involved in hostilities, the people of America and the Members of Congress saw clearly that our national safety depended upon the continued resistance of the democratic nations which were fighting a gallant struggle against the aggressors. For this reason, we desired to supply those nations with arms and other necessary supplies even though they no longer had the money to pay us for them. It was evident that such a program could not be carried through by numerous specific statutes. Under the Lend-Lease Act, therefore, he is empowered "when he deems it in the interest of national defense" to authorize the manufacture or procurement of any defense article "for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States." The terms and conditions upon which such aid is to be given are to be "those which the President deems satisfactory" and the benefit to the United States may be payments, repayments in kind, or "any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory."

These are only a few illustrations of the vast powers which have been freely delegated to the Presidents of the United States in times of national emergency. They constitute the most eloquent proof that can be found of the faith of the American people in our democratic system of government. These powers were not seized arbitrarily by a small clique as in Japan; they were not obtained by elections where there is only one possible way to vote, as in Nazi Germany; they do not rest upon the meaningless assent of a packed, sham legislature, as in Fascist Italy. They were given freely by a democratic Congress to a President freely elected by the people, so that he can coordinate the energies, the labor,

and the property of all the people for the common welfare in time of national peril. They were given only temporarily, for use in emergency situations. As President Roosevelt has said, "When the war is won, the powers under which I act automatically revert to the people—to whom they belong."

Mr. Chairman, the authorities, and the instances of exercise of the war powers of the President which I have cited, conclusively sustain the contention that the item on page 9 of the bill is not subject to a point of order under the rules of the House. I regret that there was no opportunity to present them yesterday when the issue was raised.

They effectively refute any suggestion that the order for the consideration of the pending bill in any degree affected the status of the appropriation recommended by the Committee on Appropriations for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

I shall be glad to answer any further questions on the subject during consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as the report indicates, this bill carries appropriations for 18 agencies. For those 18 agencies the Congress has provided appropriations or contract authorizations for the present fiscal year to the extent of \$2,819,000,000. This bill provides appropriations or contract authorizations amounting to about \$1,033,000,000 for these agencies. In other words, the sum recommended is about \$1,785,000,000 less than the sum carried for the present fiscal year, and about \$38,000,000 less than recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

In view of the extended comments by the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the remarks of the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. TABER] I shall confine my remarks to comments on two or three of the agencies which are provided for in this bill.

#### WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The largest item in the bill is an item of \$550,350,000 for War Shipping Administration, which compares with an appropriation for the current fiscal year of \$2,272,350,000.

The appropriation provides, first, the sum of \$350,000 for the State marine schools. The same amount was provided for the current fiscal year. The appropriation provides next the sum of \$80,000,000 as compared with \$72,000,000 for the current fiscal year, for the maritime training fund, the increase being due to the increased number of trainees and recruits estimated for the next fiscal year. Finally it provides the sum of \$470,000,000 for the agency's revolving fund. That sum of \$470,000,000 is to be increased by a \$100,000,000 transfer from the insurance fund of the agency and by \$821,000,000, representing an unexpended balance for the current fiscal year. In other words, there will be

\$1,391,000,000 available for the revolving fund.

While on the face of things there appears to be a decreased appropriation, it is really an increase when the unexpended balance of \$821,000,000 is taken into consideration. The agency estimates gross expenditures for the next fiscal year of \$2,840,000,000, an increase of about 24 percent, which results in the main from an increase in the fleet of ships from something over 3,000 to something over 4,000, or about 33 percent. The committee has allowed the full request for the agency with the exception of \$20,000,000.

The tremendous contribution which the War Shipping Administration is making to the war effort is shown in the hearings and is rather fully outlined in the committee report.

On January 27 last, when the Maritime Commission appropriation was under consideration by the House, I inserted in the Record certain detailed information indicating, in the absence of explanation, and regardless of legal questions, gross waste of the people's money.

As the Members will recall, I placed in the Record tables compiled from figures presented by the Maritime Commission, War Shipping Administration, and other official sources, referring to purchase prices, charter hire, insurance, Red Sea charters, ships traded in for credit, agency fees, profits, and so on. It was at about the same time that the Comptroller General made his report to the Congress in respect to the purchase of 10 vessels from the Southern Pacific Co., Morgan Line, in the course of which he stated:

There is evidence that the Commission utterly disregarded its responsibility to the Congress and the taxpayers of the United States by pursuing a course of action which was unsound and imprudent at the very outset, and could lead only to waste and extravagance in the expenditure of public funds.

Some time later on, March 28 to be exact, further information and further tables were inserted in another body purporting to show the increase in assets, the increase in capital, dividends and profits, of 11 or 12 companies referred to during the period 1938-43. This information appears at page 3183 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1944.

These tables indicate among other things that one company during the years 1938 to 1943 increased its assets from \$9,000,000 to \$43,000,000, increased its capital from \$4,000,000 to \$31,000,000, paid preferred stock dividends of 5 percent in each of the years and common stock dividends reflecting increases in the respective years of 55 percent, 96 percent, 100 percent, 150 percent, and 200 percent.

The War Shipping Administration in the record now under consideration reports that a new schedule of reduced rates is now proposed. That schedule calls for a basic bare boat rate of \$1.25 per dead weight ton per month, reflecting a decrease of from 5 to 10 percent and a rate for insurance valuation of \$56.25 per dead weight ton, a decrease of about 25 percent, with an estimated saving, according to the agency, of some \$50,000,000. The details appear in the record.

The whole matter has been complicated by the legal questions which have been raised with reference to the interpretation of section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act and the so-called enhancement clause. The legality and propriety of the proposed reductions may still be open to question. Further detailed information is essential.

The War Shipping Administration seeks to fix rates which it considers both legal and fair. It is interesting to compare in this connection the \$1.25 rate per dead weight ton per month now suggested as fair, with the \$5.13 average per dead weight ton per month rate actually paid in respect to the Red Sea charters.

Commenting editorially recently on this general situation, the New York Journal of Commerce stated that:

For more than 2 years the question of ship values and earnings has been passed around Washington from agency to agency, and from committee to committee, without once arriving in any office where anybody would accept the full responsibility for it.

It went on to state that W. S. A. wanted to adopt a certain scale of value but the Comptroller General declared it was too high; further, that W. S. A. hesitated to flout the Comptroller and entered into inconclusive negotiations with him instead; further, that three eminent judges were finally called in by the President to advise on the matter but that there is still no agreement on their own conclusions. It states:

Surely it is time for Congress to look into the matter and find out what is wrong.

If Congress is to look into this matter, Mr. Chairman—and it should be looked into immediately—it cannot, in my judgment, be done within the scope of appropriation hearings. Only through a thorough investigation can we ascertain all the facts as a basis for intelligent action.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to my distinguished friend from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I wish to inform the gentleman that I have been tremendously interested in what he has had to say. The various illegalities that he refers to are now under advisement and have been under advisement by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and its subcommittees for quite some time. Some of these cases have been adjudicated. As far as the Comptroller General's office is concerned—and I believe the gentleman is aware of that—may I ask if there is another agency in Washington, in the gentleman's estimation, that has done the splendid job that the Maritime Commission has done under the able leadership of Admiral Land?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have many times on the floor of this House taken off my hat to the fine work that both the Maritime Commission, in terms of construction, and the War Shipping Administration, in terms of transportation, have contributed to the war effort. The criticism which I have directed at both agencies, as the gentlemen well knows, has been directed at the financial opera-



tions of the two agencies. I think that sooner or later those operations will have to be thoroughly investigated.

I fully appreciate the fact that the committee of which the gentleman is a member has had under consideration some of these matters for a very long time, as the gentleman indicates. I hope that it will not be much longer before the House may have the benefit of the critical conclusions of that committee.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I appreciate the gentleman's criticism because it is always constructive and very beneficial to the members of the committee. I for one appreciate it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the record indicates that the results of W. S. A. renegotiation have not been substantial and that further progress in this connection in respect to the Red Sea charters has not yet been made. Two lines, and two only, have made voluntary repayments aggregating something like \$310,000.

The Members will find further information in regard to trade-ins for credit under section 510 of the act in a table on page 499 of the hearings. The information is not complete, however, in that original construction costs and dates of trade-ins are not furnished.

Agency fee figures will be found at page 503 of the hearings.

Three other matters may be mentioned in passing. First, in reference to the agency's inspection force, the record develops that instead of the \$50,000,000 saving that was confidently anticipated in November when an inspection force of 5,000 was requested and allowed by the Congress, it is now estimated that the saving will be somewhere between \$2,000,000 and \$10,000,000, and that the inspection force will be reduced to about 100 individuals.

Second, in the matter of the auditing of W. S. A.'s finances, in May of 1943 Admiral Land advised your committee that a complete audit of W. S. A. had been requested by the Comptroller General and that it would require only a matter of months to complete it. In April of 1944 he advised your committee that the Comptroller General was still working on the audit and that he had no idea how long a job it would be. I have a letter dated May 5, 1944, from the Comptroller General indicating that this audit is in active progress, but that it has not yet been completed.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1944, at page 3175, quotes the Comptroller General in this connection as follows:

The latest balance sheet available is as of June 30, 1942. A recent examination thereof was made by a representative of this office who reported that the records were in such condition—supporting documents and papers being missing—that a proper verification of the balance sheets of the War Shipping Administration and the United States Maritime Commission as of June 30, 1942, was impossible.

Finally, in respect to the matter of expense accounts, I have a letter from the Comptroller General indicating that one of the big shipbuilding corporations of

this country has been paying for rooms, meals, cafe charges, transportation, and other expenses of officials and employees of the United States Maritime Commission, and not only of the officials and employees themselves but of their wives and other members of their families.

The aggregate sum paid is not a large amount but the principle involved is fundamental. The payments listed number 155, the officers and employees named number 33, and include some of the high ranking officers of the agency. Obviously it is improper to accept such payments from a contractor doing work for the Federal Government. The matter does not reflect creditably upon the agency. It is to be hoped and assumed that there will be no repetition of this practice.

#### OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on the O. W. I., for which the sum of \$64,390,000 was requested as compared with \$38,222,504 for the current fiscal year. The request is divided into three parts: First for administration, about \$2,363,000, an increase of about \$200,000 as compared with the present fiscal year; second, about \$2,264,000 for the Domestic Branch, a decrease of about \$300,000; and third, about \$59,562,000 for the Overseas Branch, an increase of about \$26,200,000, or 70 percent.

The committee allowed the request for administration expenses in full, cut the request for the Domestic Branch by something over \$264,000 and reduced the request for the Overseas Branch by \$5,500,000, a total reduction of \$5,764,633.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The Committee on Appropriations, however, is giving to the O. W. I., in this appropriation, a little more than \$20,000,000 above the appropriation for this year; is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That means that the total appropriation for the O. W. I. for the coming fiscal year will be somewhere above 30 percent more than for the present fiscal year; is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It will be about \$58,625,000 as compared with about \$38,222,000.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is an increase of better than 30 percent, or almost 35 percent, if my mathematics are correct.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is more than that. It is over 50 percent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; 50 percent. Now you have included in your original appropriation, of course, the deficiency appropriation?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes; that is in there.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. So that actually the increased appropriation this year over last year, counting the regular appropriation and the deficiency appropriation, is more than 50 percent?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has that unusual increase been justified, in your opinion?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. So far as I am concerned the figure reported represents a compromise agreement in committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Was there a unanimous agreement in the committee on the amount?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As finally reported the figure was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Can you tell the Committee in a few words or sentences just what this additional \$20,000,000 is to be used for?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is practically all for the Overseas Branch of the agency. If the gentleman will look at page 40 of the hearings he will find a break-down of the various divisions of work of the agency, and the increases requested for each.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have read that break-down, but I still do not understand just what new situation has developed that calls for such a great increase in the appropriation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Of course, the major item in the increase is in respect to the outpost service of the Overseas Branch for which the agency asks, if I recall correctly, 35 additional outposts. The work is being built up all along the line in view of the contemplated invasion.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Have any of the conditions of which the members of this committee complained at the time the deficiency appropriation was before the House last autumn, or the regular appropriation was before the House last May, been corrected?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that I think there has been some improvement but that personally I am far from satisfied in my own mind, as I shall develop as I go along, with conditions as they appear to be at this time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is rather, in my opinion, if I may say so, strange, and there must have been some great change in conditions or certainly some great change in the attitude on the part of the committee to cause the committee which originally criticized greatly the action of the O. W. I., to suddenly come in here with a bill that is \$20,000,000 higher or 50 percent higher than in the current year and approve it unanimously and ask the House to accept it without question. I cannot understand it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that the minority members of the committee have been very critical of O. W. I. in the past and so far as I know they are very critical of the O. W. I. at the present time. The fact remains, however, that the picture is very different today from the picture, let us say, in November, because of the impending invasion.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, you do not know of any of these members of the O. W. I. who are going to do any fighting, do you? They are not going to carry guns or get into the conflict?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think it is a very great question how much of the work of this agency is of value and how much of it is valueless. But the basis for stepping up the request is the stepping up of its work all along the line in the light of the impending invasion.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mr. CELLER. It is well to make a comparison between the expenditures made by our Government through the O. W. I. and that which the Germans are making: For example, Mr. Davis testified, according to the statement in the London Economist, that the Germans spent, altogether, about \$540,000,000 a year for propaganda. Our efforts are Lilliputian in comparison.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think that is a fair comparison. In fact, I think it is pretty valueless for the reason pointed out on the floor yesterday that the entire radio set-up and all the newspapers of Germany are under government operation.

Mr. CELLER. It may not be an exact comparison, but it certainly leads to the conclusion we are spending very little in that regard.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield there, it probably costs the Germans \$500,000,000 to operate their newspapers and their radios without anything else. If their total is \$540,000,000 that would be about \$40,000,000 for propaganda. Of course, my guess is just as good as yours and yours is just as good as mine. But that is the picture. That is why the thing is not a fair comparison between the O. W. I. and the German figure.

The German figure is the over-all publicity and communication cost.

Mr. CELLER. That may be so, but it is interesting nonetheless to have these figures with reference to what the Germans spend for their over-all propaganda.

Mr. TABER. The British figure of \$80,000,000 includes British-owned radio, whereas our domestic radios are privately owned.

Mr. CELLER. I am not criticizing.

Mr. TABER. That is one reason why it is not a dollar-for-dollar comparison.

Mr. CELLER. I am not criticizing what the Appropriation Committee has done or what the gentleman from New York has said or done, but I think it is well to have before the House information which I have given.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I notice on page 132 of the hearings the comments of some gentleman by the name of Cowan. Who was he? Was he connected with O. W. I.?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You will find on the first page of the hearings his exact title.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I notice he makes the statement that "the people of the world have been subjected to a lot of propaganda, particularly occupied countries, and are pretty well fed up on it."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I recall that statement.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. If that is true, this tremendous increase of several millions in the appropriation would just add to the nausea, would it not?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that the figure before the House is a compromise figure. Had I been setting the figure personally, I would have set it lower, but I have agreed to this figure; and I am going along with it in the light of the conditions overseas by which we are confronted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The amount of the increase contained in the appropriation for O. W. I. is for the foreign division?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes; most of it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Practically all of it?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What percentage of the amount of money spent by O. W. I. for foreign propaganda is spent for propaganda within Great Britain or within countries where the English language is read and where the propaganda material is printed in English.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot give the gentleman a specific answer to that. There was a break-down in the hearings last November, as I recall it, but I do not think the present record brings it up to date.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Fifty percent at least of the short-wave broadcasts going out of New York are in English. That applies probably about the same on the west coast. So that all of that might be said to be directed to the British as well as to those who understand English on the Continent. How many of them there might be I would not say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How many English-speaking nations do we have listed among our enemies? Are there any? I know of no enemy of the United States today that speaks English. Yet, a great percentage, perhaps half or more of all the propaganda put out by the O. W. I. in their foreign branch, is printed or spoken in English. Evidently we are propagandizing not our enemies, but our allies. I wonder why it is necessary to spend so much money for that purpose.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I know the committee has done its very best. As I understand, the requests for these appropriations are based largely upon the testimony of Mr. Sherwood, in charge of the

Overseas Branch, and Mr. Davis. Is that not the basis?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Sherwood was not present in person, but Mr. Davis was present, as were other principal officers of the agency.

Mr. VURSELL. Unfortunately, from the standpoint of economy, those two men are newspapermen—advertising men. They handled this matter so badly that the Congress practically had to stop some of their work in the United States. So it seems to me they are likely asking for a greater amount of money than is needed, and that possibly we are getting off to a bad start if their testimony is relied upon.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the gentleman may very well be right.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Being the ranking member of the subcommittee handling the independent offices appropriation bill, the gentleman naturally is advised with reference to the Senate amendment, which being legislation, will have to be brought back to the House for a separate vote by the conferees, which as I understand, prohibits the spending of any money from any appropriation bill for certain activities after January 1, 1945. Is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Unless the Congress specifically appropriates for them.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then how many of the appropriations in this bill will be affected by that amendment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think any one of them will be affected by it if the Congress specifically appropriates for them. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would rather reserve discussion on that until we get to the independent offices bill, because I want to proceed with the subject under discussion.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What evidence was presented to your committee to justify this increased appropriation for O. W. I. particularly for the foreign broadcasts?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As I have already indicated, the fundamental basis is the stepping up all along the line, of all divisions of the overseas branch, in view of the pending invasion.

Mr. DONDERO. It is mostly speculative as to what value it has?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Well, it is a matter of judgment; yes.

Now I might point out to the gentleman from Ohio that the sum which we have discussed does not represent the entire sum that the agency is to receive, because in addition it is to receive something under reverse lend-lease. Just what that will amount to, I do not know. But it appears from the record that one item alone under reverse lend-lease, namely, power in north Africa, will amount to the equivalent of about \$1,800,000, in a calendar year.

In addition to that, it appears that the agency has had the use of Army signal corps communication facilities during



the past year, and presumably will during the coming year, to the tune of about two and one-half million dollars. There are other items like printing, which is done in Great Britain under reverse lend-lease, which will increase the overall sum available.

It is a tremendous sum. And the field which the agency is attempting to cover is also a tremendous one. How much is of value, how much is valueless, and even harmful as is charged, I think it is almost impossible to determine with any real accuracy, in the absence of a thorough-going investigation.

The record indicates among other things that O. W. I. sends out 2,850 broadcasts a week. That is said to be more than double the broadcasts sent out by N. B. C. and C. B. S. together. It indicates control of all short-wave frequencies in the country. It indicates 100,000 words a day over cable and wire services. It indicates 2,300 still pictures a day sent out to various points. It indicates 8 to 10 radio photograph programs a day. It indicates 288 motion-picture reels in a single year. It indicates 12,000 cartoon mats and proofs per week as well as miscellaneous features, pamphlets and other publications to an unlimited number. The news sent out seems to comprise news of every conceivable description, including religion, sports, music, entertainment, and almost anything else that can be thought of.

It has been stated that in the month of February the O. W. I. sent some 808,000 words to Algiers; 155,000 to Beirut; 32,000 to Bagdad; 61,000 to Berne; 81,000 to Brazzaville; 109,000 to Chungking; 170,000 to Istanbul; 56,000 to Kabul; 83,000 to Sydney and so on.

Everyone, Mr. Chairman, appreciates the value of psychological warfare on the fighting fronts—no one would deny a dollar necessary for that purpose.

It is charged, however, and constantly charged that some of the work of the O. W. I. has been harmful, that much of the work has been valueless and wasteful and that the agency's personnel is not in the condition it should be.

For my part I am frank to confess that I think there is ample evidence to justify grave misgivings on all three counts.

Several Senators who made a tour of the world during the last year on their return were very critical of the work of this agency, of the work done in Allied and neutral countries, particularly in Australia and India. Others of standing returning from Europe have a similar point of view. It has been stated to me and stated repeatedly by persons of such authority that I cannot brush aside the statements, that much of the broadcasting of O. W. I. to friendly countries has been sheer communism and to that extent harmful rather than helpful to the war effort. The foreign language press of this country has been repeatedly critical of the work of the O. W. I. Serious criticism has been directed at the Hungarian desk, the Italian desk, the Polish desk, and the Yugoslav desk.

We all know that it was reported authoritatively last autumn that the American Federation of Labor and the Com-

mittee for Industrial Organizations had liquidated their labor short wave bureau set-up to aid O. W. I. after protesting for months to Mr. Davis that the O. W. I. overseas branch was regularly broadcasting communistic propaganda; that they liquidated it because they could find no basis for agreement for the elimination of the O. W. I. communistic influence. They objected particularly, as you will recall, to the man who was then head of the bureau, retained because of the insistence of Mr. Barnes, despite his alleged communistic affiliations. It is interesting to note that the World Telegram of December 10, last, reported the resignation of this gentleman, stating that he had joined—

A pro-Communist labor news service which became in recent years a haven for Communist and fellow-traveler newspaper men.

These are serious charges, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You will find on page 149 of the hearings a list of publications, booklets, and pamphlets published between July 1, 1943, and March 31, 1944.

Included is the Alphabet Primer of Friendship, of which I have a copy in my hand. If time permitted I should like to discuss it in detail. Included also is Children of the U. S. A., a large pamphlet of 56 pages, full of pictures probably 8 by 10 inches in size. Here is a copy. Included also is another called Small Town in U. S. A., of about the same dimensions and covering some 36 pages. Here again is a copy.

You will also find included the famous John's Book that has been produced on this floor before this. You will find also A Pocket Calendar, The Women of the U. S. A., Photo Review, Music in the U. S. A., and The Rumor Monger, a cartoon booklet.

I confess it is difficult for me to see how these publications contribute to the war effort. Are they worth the money expended in their preparation, Mr. Chairman?

On page 162 of the hearings you will find a list of the motion pictures completed or in process of completion. Here are some of them: Cowboy, The Town, City Harvest, Pipeline, Yellow Springs, Valley of the Tennessee, Steel Town, Playing Fields of America, New England, The American Child, Iowa University, Native American Music.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I question whether these pictures contribute to the war effort and whether they justify the costs of production.

I understand that the O. W. I. among other things has dramatized a mail-order catalog.

A recent press publication written by one who had been through some of the clip sheets prepared for distribution abroad, reports that among other articles found were Radium Lost and Found, Atoms at Work, Singing Lady Who Likes

People, Tin Pan Alley Always in Tune, and Bogey Andrews, Grand Old Man of the Stage.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the newspaper article at this point in the RECORD:

O. W. I. HAS SPENT \$66,000,000 AND ASKS 64 MILLION FOR 1945

(By Charles T. Lucey)

NEW YORK, April 14.—Government press agency, a flossy phenomenon of the New Deal which has cost untold millions, is in its greatest flowering in 1944. Never before was a war press-agency like this one. It has cost \$66,000,000 so far, and \$64,000,000 is being sought for next year.

This is just the Office of War Information. The other war agencies are using the bellows, too. The Navy, for example, has 161 officers, enlisted men, and civilians in its Washington public-relations office. George Creel had about three doing the Navy's press job in the First World War.

You might think the avalanche of words going overseas was significant stuff with a strategic relationship to fighting the war. But a check of some O. W. I. material shows plenty of trivia which would be interred far back with the eczema remedy advertisements in any newspaper.

The O. W. I. dotes on birthdays, for example. Is it the birthday anniversary of Dedrich Smetana, Czech composer? Good. That will make a fine broadcast to Czechoslovakia. Einstein? Good again, and O. W. I. goes to Princeton or somewhere to get proper statements about it, aimed at showing how genius, stifled under dictatorship, thrives in a democracy. Carl Schurz? More of the same.

#### ALWAYS FINDS WORDS

Or it may be the anniversary of an outstanding Swede or Turk or Egyptian. The O. W. I. can always drum up statements to show how conscious is the United States of the various foreign cultures.

In the O. W. I. shop here there's a press review desk which combs United States publications to produce clip-sheets for distribution abroad. Look at one of these in the field of science and you find handled such subjects as Radium—Lost and Found, Atoms at Work, Aluminum News Letter, and The All-American Highway.

In an arts-and-letters clip-sheet you unearth such stirring headings as "Singing Lady Who Likes People," "Tin Pan Alley Always in Tune," or "Bogey Andrews, Grand Old Man of Stage."

How does it help win the war? Well, when people in foreign lands read about the Singing Lady and Tin Pan Alley and hundreds of other subjects dished out to just about anyone who will take them—at United States taxpayer expense, of course—the idea is that they're supposed to understand and like us better. A bit indirect, you may think, but it's part of the O. W. I.'s propaganda thinking.

Then there's the bale of material, 100,000 words daily, that is piped around the world by cable and wireless. Here are samples of the material dispatched to London:

A business-paper article reporting that gasoline and water do mix profitably in airplane engines, 1,200 words.

List of anniversaries (Madison's birthday, West Point established, United States troops arrival in Australia, General Stilwell named Chinese chief, Philippine independence bill signed).

High vegetable prices and lower beet-sugar production, about 1,200 words; Representative EATON (Republican, New Jersey) praises Lend-Lease, 250 words; woman war workers honored, about 1,000 words; lumber situation, 150 or so words; Maltese residents present scroll to Mr. Roosevelt; new military

demands for anhydride, 400 words; congressional committee meeting, 150 words; machine-tool shipments, 250 words.

#### MUCH HITS WASTEBASKET

That's a fair sample to show the exciting nature of some of the O. W. I. output. It's not too surprising that O. W. I. men acknowledge that much of the output has gone directly into the wastebaskets in foreign bureaus.

Similarly with O. W. I. material shortwaved overseas—nobody will ever know how much of it is utterly wasted, but the percentage must be high. Due to atmospheric conditions, the short wave is perhaps only 60 per cent effective, and even when it gets through it is questionable how much is heard. In Germany and occupied Europe the Gestapo tries to bar radio listening, of course.

O. W. I. says it has evidence that short-wave broadcasts to Germany are being heard there, but for reasons of security it can't tell just how it knows. A recent magazine article out of Stockholm, though, tells of a lack of short-wave listening in Berlin—and the bulk of O. W. I. radio output to Germany is by short wave. Of 1,125 short-wave programs monthly in German, only 217 are relayed by medium wave—more likely to be heard—from Mediterranean points, and 71 medium-wave broadcasts monthly go into Germany from England.

O. W. I. has a carefully designed propaganda line to Germany, but people inside the agency concede it is weakened by lack of a definite statement on what the United States expects to get out of the war—a creed comparable to the 14 points President Wilson gave George Creel.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not quite understand what is done with all these publications that are printed by the Government at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand they are sent overseas with a view to expediting the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman heard the testimony at the hearings. Did he inquire what Tin Pan Alley had to do with winning the war?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No; we did not have a chance to go into that detail. In a list of publications which I have received, partly as the result of a request which I made for the RECORD, it came to light.

Mr. MICHENER. I commend the gentleman for at least getting the names of so many of these publications. I hope at the time the next appropriation bill is considered he will be able to tell the House just what the Government does with these various publications.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this represents only a small portion of the work of the agency. It seems to me to be important, however, as indicative of the type of work that is being done. It indicates to my mind that work which has been undertaken had much better not have been undertaken, the money expended being saved for the taxpayers of the country.

I do not want to take too much time but in passing I call attention to the work of the so-called Surveys Division of the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. You will find it at pages 304 to 308 of the hearings. From my point of view the work

reported is absolutely without justification. Some of it is ridiculous and a sheer waste of money. In one instance the survey found among other things that women with three children turned in less tin cans in a tin-can drive than women with two children. I may say that this work has been eliminated by the committee.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The record indicates the continued maintenance of six libraries and an unlimited number of lecturers and incidentally that there has been no reduction in personnel in any of the other information services of the Government.

Now, just a word as to the personnel of this agency.

There have been many changes made since O. W. I. was before the Congress previously, some of them in major positions. Mr. Barnes has resigned, Mr. Johnson has resigned, Mr. Warburg has resigned, Mr. Alan Cranston has left and joined the Army.

There is evidence also of some progress in eliminating personnel of questionable loyalty or capacity. Forty-two persons have been eliminated since January 1, 1943, at the instigation of the Civil Service Commission or the O. W. I. security committee. I have a list of those 42 people. In my judgment the elimination of some of them was long overdue.

The records indicate, however, that there are still 533 aliens on the rolls of this agency here in this country as compared with 417 a year ago; and that there are 1,089 people on the rolls whose backgrounds have not been as yet investigated.

The work of the Civil Service Commission in this connection seems to be painfully slow and in some cases, in my judgment, fairly open to question.

One year ago I gave to the O. W. I. a list of 45 names who from information I had received seemed to deserve investigation. Fifteen of those 45 have been eliminated from the rolls of the agency. There are still 8, however, in respect to which it is reported that the investigation has not as yet been completed. A year ago their names were brought to the attention of the agency, still they have not been investigated, this in spite of the fact that 1 or 2 of them have allegedly notorious backgrounds.

Frankly, I think that the committee appointed to investigate the Civil Service Commission should call for the files not only of those whose investigation has not been completed but also of some of those whose investigation has been completed and who have been given clearance.

The list of personnel still includes many whose backgrounds have been questioned. A supplementary list was presented to the agency this year. The report indicates that one-third of those on the list have not yet been investigated.

Surely the O. W. I. is one of the last places for persons of questionable loyalty to this Government.

Mr. Chairman, I am going along with this item, as already indicated, because of my appreciation of the importance of psychological warfare on the fighting fronts and because of the impending invasion.

In my opinion, it is impossible to pass on the charges to which I have referred with certainty within the scope of appropriation hearings. They can only be dealt with fully, in my judgment, by a thoroughgoing investigation. An investigation resolution has been pending before this House for a considerable period of time. In my opinion it should long since have been adopted. Only in this manner can we ascertain exactly what has been sent out over the radio, exactly what has been sent out in various publications, exactly what the condition of the personnel rolls of the agency is.

#### NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude with a brief word as to the National War Labor Board. The request in this instance was for \$15,596,000, as compared with \$14,437,300 in the current fiscal year—\$15,000,000 is recommended by the committee.

The great complaint which comes to me, and I am sure it comes to many of us in reference to the War Labor Board, is complaint at delay, complaint at procrastination, complaint at duplication of effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the agency reports that its wage-adjustment cases should be handled in 5 weeks, that its dispute cases should be handled in 5 months. This is certainly not in accord with my experience and I am sure it is not in accord with the experience of many of us.

Case after case has arisen in respect to which there has been interminable delay. Strikes have resulted not so much against management as against the War Labor Board itself because of the impossibility of obtaining a decision. I know of one dispute today which has lasted for over 10 months resulting only recently in a strike. I know of another which has been pending for some 14 months.

I hold in my hand an article quoting a leading labor leader of long standing, Mr. Robert Watt. The article appeared in the Washington News under date of December 31, 1943. It is entitled "Utter Confusion Rules United States Handling of Labor Disputes."

Let me read it to you. I quote:

"UTTER CONFUSION" RULES UNITED STATES HANDLING OF LABOR DISPUTES

(By Fred W. Perkins)

"Utter confusion" in Government handling of labor disputes was charged today by Robert Watt, an American Federation of Labor representative on the War Labor Board since its creation 2 years ago, and before that a member of its predecessor, the National Defense Mediation Board.

Mr. Watt, just back from a London meeting of the governing body of the International Labor Organization, of which he is



the American worker member, declared that conditions in the same field are much better in Great Britain—because, he said, the official agencies dealing with labor problems there are "integrated," in contrast with "duplication, scattered authority, uncertainty and unbelievable delays" in this country.

"The weakest link in our whole war set-up," he asserted, "is in the Government agencies dealing with labor, directed in many instances by persons of good intentions and abilities in other lines, but with no experience in labor problems."

"The confusion is undoubtedly a substantial factor in causing dissatisfaction, unrest, and occasional strikes or lock-outs."

Mr. Watt's views were said to represent a substantial portion of sentiment in organized labor.

#### GOT PROMISE

"When labor gave its no-strike pledge," he said, "it did so on the promise of a tripartite tribunal for settlement of grievances and disputes. The War Labor Board was accordingly established. When the 'hold the line' policy was established to curb inflation, the W. L. B. was made responsible for controlling wages. But in neither field has the Board been given full authority."

"A reasonably satisfactory handling of disputes could be expected if employers would deal in good faith with labor unions. But the employer in too many cases employs a labor expert who considers his job that of outmaneuvering the union. Delays and technicalities become his stock in trade too often."

"A union seeking contractual relations usually has to deal with the exhausting, slow, legalistic, business-as-usual routine of the National Labor Relations Board. Then when bargaining is attempted the union frequently finds that the employer insists he must check with the uninformed labor relations experts of the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, etc."

#### CONCILIATOR NEXT

"About the time when patience is exhausted, the United States Conciliation Service is called in. The conciliator can settle the cases only by argument and persuasion, and he does settle a lot of them that way."

"After conciliation more time is used in certification of the dispute by the Secretary of Labor to the War Labor Board."

"If the order or decision is finally established by the War Labor Board, the case is still faced by another time-consuming obstacle if the wage issue involves any possible petition of the employer to the Office of Price Administration for price relief."

"No matter how many months have been used, nor how many earnest officials, representing the public, management, and labor, have wrestled with the case to reach an equitable judgment, the case is still subject to veto or revision by the one-man boss of wage stabilization whose authority closely resembles the systems we are fighting against. Despite all the democratic processes that have been used the decision is still subject to the dictum of one man."

#### CLASSIC EXAMPLE

"The case of the nonoperating railroad unions with which the War Labor Board had nothing to do, but which during more than a year went through all the processes provided for such matters by the Railway Labor Act, was a classic example of such an unfortunate and undemocratic finale."

The "one-man boss" referred to by Mr. Watt is Fred M. Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization.

"If the country wants to reduce unrest and labor disputes," Mr. Watt recommended, "it ought to set up a clear, simple, straightforward, tripartite labor-relations agency working under one set of rules administered by one policy-making board."

Mr. Chairman, I urge all those desiring prompt and fair adjustment of labor dis-

putes to consider with care the views attributed to Mr. Watt.

I reserve, Mr. Chairman, such further comments as I may have to make for discussion of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have great regard for much that has been accomplished and is being accomplished by the War Shipping Administration and by the Maritime Commission. They have turned out a great many ships in this emergency and undoubtedly in turning them out at such a rapid rate they have at times spent a lot more money than would normally be expended on the same construction under different circumstances; however, in my humble opinion, based on such knowledge as I may have picked up from 18 years' experience as a purchasing agent for a large corporation the Maritime Commission purchasing department is not above reproach in any sense of the word.

A little while ago they called for bids on a quantity of small motors for 100 ships now under construction known as the C-1-M-A V-1 vessels. A gentleman representing a firm in Gladstone came into my office who sought to bid on those motors. Because of low overhead, favorable labor conditions, and favorable wage rates in his concern, he thought that he could bid a lower price for those motors than some of his competitors. So he submitted his bid to the Maritime Commission. At the same time he was satisfied that because of the splendid reputation that his company had for its products there was no reason why their bids should not be acceptable as to quality. He was certainly able to meet the delivery dates required by the Maritime Commission.

This man was notified, however, that his bid would be thrown out because of the fact his quality was not suitable and that he did not have the proper facilities for meeting the delivery schedules, and so forth. He was denied the opportunity to personally appeal his case to the purchasing department of the Maritime Commission and in my absence from the city on April 6 during these negotiations my secretary took him over to the gentleman from New

York [Mr. O'BRIEN], who went right to the top of the Maritime Commission, to Admiral Land himself, and insisted that this man be given an opportunity to state his case. That interview was then given him.

The gentleman in question in the Commission who had made the statement that his product was not satisfactory admitted, of course, having made the statement, and immediately this gentleman suggested that the two of them make a trip to Gladstone and inspect the factory. This inspection trip was made immediately, and the two gentlemen spent all day, April 8, inspecting that factory.

On that Saturday afternoon, following the inspection, and in the presence of this salesman, this man from the Production Survey Division Office of the Maritime Commission called his chief here in Washington on long distance telephone and gave that company a clean bill of health, and stated that the Commission would make no mistake whatsoever in awarding the business to that firm.

Furthermore, on the following Monday, while they were looking over the source of the motor controls that this company had tied into their bid, he again contacted his superiors here in Washington and again repeated the same statement. He told these gentlemen in the purchasing department and in the Production Survey Division that he was amazed at the plant this firm had; he was amazed at their set-up and their ability to perform. He pointed out that there were a good many people in the organization above the draft age; that there was no problem of a potential labor shortage; that there was no probability of labor difficulty, owing to the fact that many of these men owned their own homes and they were satisfied with conditions of employment; that many of them had been there ever since the plant started production in 1917.

So this Gladstone firm was given an opportunity to bid. They submitted their bids and they were considered. But even after all that I was told, on or about May 1, that there was still the probability of their being frozen out of any of this business. However, they have since received approximately a quarter of a million dollars worth of this business. I have here a complete break-down of the bids which I received from Admiral Vickery's office on this particular series of inquiries.

Motors and controls for C1-M-AV1 vessels, U. S. Maritime Commission  
(100 shipsets—with spares)

Inquiry No.	Required	Purchase price	Low bid	Next low bid	Saved	Lost
2-646	2-10 horsepower	\$135,025	\$135,025	\$178,100	\$43,075	
	2-7½ horsepower					
2-646-A	2-10 horsepower	132,925	132,925	159,350	26,425	
2-647	1-15 horsepower	127,135	103,500	127,100		\$23,635
2-735	2-25 horsepower	75,300	75,300	89,300	14,000	
2-738	2-7½ horsepower	117,335	110,770	123,900	6,565	6,565
2-741	2-15 horsepower	109,000	77,600	109,000		31,400
2-753	1-15 horsepower	112,075	92,115	112,000		19,960
2-736	2-9.4 horsepower	42,863	37,000	42,863		5,863
2-755	1-7½ horsepower	78,925	77,985	78,850		940
	2-10 horsepower					
		930,583	842,220	1,020,463	10,065	88,363
				842,220		
Total possible saving				178,243		

<sup>1</sup> Actually saved.

The total purchase price of the motors and controls as finally awarded in this series amounted to \$930,583. If the Maritime Commission had accepted the low bid in each of these several inquiries, that series of orders could have been purchased for \$842,220, but if they had thrown my constituent completely out of the picture, and refused to accept or give him any consideration whatsoever, it would have cost the taxpayers of this country \$1,020,463. In other words, by their arbitrary practices in the Maritime Commission purchasing department it would have cost the taxpayers of this country an overcharge of \$178,243 on a million-dollar purchase, which is about 18 percent.

I wonder just how much further such practices have spread all through the purchasing department in the Maritime Commission. Since I have gone into this investigation I have talked to men who have sought to deal with the Maritime Commission purchasing department in other lines, and they find that that is often their general practice. I have told Admiral Vickery this: It is about time that the Maritime Commission gets to work and checks into their own purchasing department, and if it is as inefficient, extravagant, and arrogant and arbitrary as it has been pictured to me, it is about time that they clean house and get some good buyers in there. And by the way, do not think for one moment that that company has not been severely criticized—or chastised—because they had the effrontery to appeal to their Congressman as their last hope when they disliked being frozen out of business which they wanted and on which I have shown they could save the overburdened taxpayers of this country almost 20 percent.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to know, and every other Member of this House wants to know, is when has it become a crime in this country for honest, upstanding businessmen to come to their Congressman for redress when autocratic bureaucrats refuse to give them a fair opportunity to present their case and to compete honestly and fairly and openly in their quest for Government business?

I fully appreciate that any time a purchasing agent is operating under emergency conditions that he may have to sacrifice price, and even at times sacrifice quality, in order to secure the deliveries required to keep an over-all production line moving, and I have faced that issue too often myself during my 18 years of experience. However, there is never any justification for freezing any honest, reputable bidder out of the picture. Any legitimate bidder is entitled to the utmost courteous consideration by Government purchasing agents at all times, because let them remember once and for all that they are just as much servants of the people as are we Members of Congress. Any time they forget that, they are no longer worthy to draw their pay from Uncle Sam. And let me serve notice right now, Mr. Chairman, that if I hear of any more complaints of badgering this company by the purchasing department of the Maritime Commission because they appealed to me in this instance, you

will hear plenty more about it on the floor of this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in explanation of the reasons for not always purchasing from the lowest bidder, and especially as illustrated by this case in question, Admiral Vickery sent me a letter dated May 10 which was delivered to me by special messenger on May 18 at 1 p. m. Seemingly it takes a long time to get communications across the city of Washington by special messenger. I want to quote from that letter in part as follows:

Reference is made to your letter of May 3, 1944, in regard to the subject inquiries. Attached are price tabulation sheets covering the motor and control bids received from all the manufacturers quoting on this equipment. In the awarding of these contracts, consideration was based on the following:

1. As the normal amount of time required for plan approval is from 6 to 8 weeks, and the time element always plays an important part, every consideration was given to the manufacturers who had prior plan approval, and are in production on this equipment. In most instances these vendors are in a position to offer the most attractive delivery schedule.

2. Where bids were submitted to the design agent for analysis the technical analysis sheets received on these inquiries are carefully checked, and it is the endeavor wherever possible to follow the design agent's recommendations.

3. It is the policy of the Procurement Division to check the facilities of the various manufacturers with the view of not overloading their production capacity, and thus it is often necessary to make award to other than the low bidder.

4. It is also our policy not to tax the capacity of a concern not having had previous marine experience inasmuch as it is the endeavor of the United States Maritime Commission to produce ships with the least possible delay.

Each inquiry was analyzed on its own merit and we list below a complete summary of the awards that have been made on the subject inquiries.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say that I very plainly told Admiral Vickery over the phone that, in my humble opinion, the foregoing explanation, as applied to this particular transaction, could be well dubbed succinctly as nothing more than eyewash. These motors, Mr. Chairman, in the sizes covered by these inquiries, regardless of the manufacture, are standard motors, all of them built to N. E. M. A. standards as to motor, frame size, base size, and so forth. Each manufacturer's equipment is equally interchangeable with the others. True, some manufacturer's quality is better than others insofar as serviceability and ruggedness is concerned; but, as I have previously stated, the Maritime Commission's own men, who had been critical in the first instance, gave this company a clean bill of health.

In my 18 years' experience as a purchasing agent—let me point out that was for a steamship-operating concern, and during which time I was connected with the building of six ships of entirely different design and of a far more intricate design, being Great Lakes self-unloaders, than are these vessels in question—I have had plenty of experience with the so-called design agents and their recommendations. That, too, is a lot of eye-

wash to cover up a waste of the taxpayers' money.

I was particularly interested in point No. 4, advanced by Admiral Vickery, intimating that this concern had not had previous marine experience. As a matter of fact, this gave me a tremendous kick because of all the hullabaloos that has been raised about the success of Henry Kaiser and the Bechtel boys, and all these other famous dam builders who have been doing an admittedly good job turning out merchant ships. Since when has the Maritime Commission now decided that reputable manufacturers in other lines are incapable of finding their niche in the maritime program. However, as a matter of fact, this concern in my district has had plenty of marine experience, because they furnished a great many motors heretofore to the United States Navy and have been renegotiated by the Navy during the past year. In fact, I referred to them and their experience in a broadcast which I made on April 9 last and which appeared in the Appendix of the RECORD under date of April 13, from which I quote, as follows:

I have a letter in my files from a relatively small but very capable manufacturer in my district, who last year did a half-million dollars' worth of Government business. He showed a paper profit of roughly \$145,000, of which taxes ate up \$115,000. He set aside as a reserve for post-war adjustments \$11,000, leaving him a net profit of \$29,000. Now, this is not unreasonable bookkeeping, but along comes Mr. Renegotiation, and he takes \$10,000 in addition to the taxes of \$115,000, leaving the manufacturer a net profit for distribution among his stockholders of \$20,000, and a reserve for post-war adjustments of but \$4,000.

And remember this: No provision remains for the absorption of any losses. Government takes away the profits, but Government is never renegotiated to make good on any losses. That is simply the manufacturer's tough luck.

So here we have another case, Mr. Chairman, where an agency of this Government seeks not to be the servant of the people but the master of the people, and seeks not only not to permit a reputable bidder to have an opportunity to secure some Government business, but on the other hand when he appeals to his Congressman, he is severely reprimanded for going out of bounds by these arrogant, autocratic bureaucrats. Wake up, America, and bring this folly to an end.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I shall at the proper time submit an amendment to the pending bill to strike therefrom the proposed appropriation for the Fair Employment Practice Committee. I submitted an amendment in the full Committee on Appropriations where it was rejected on a roll-call vote of 16 to 11, with 15 members of the committee not present.

It has not been my practice during more than 17 years of service in Congress to unnecessarily raise or discuss questions which involve race problems and with regard to which no remedial



action could reasonably be anticipated by legislative means or benefit to the public welfare brought about by lengthy discussion in this forum. I raise this question now with regard to the activities of the Fair Employment Practice Committee because I believe it to be one with regard to which remedial action by Congress may be reasonably expected and because I feel that if such action is taken it will contribute to the cause of unity in the war effort and eliminate a source of disunity which has been, and will continue to be, unless eliminated, a fruitful source of dissatisfaction to millions of American men and women who are laboring in war activities and to whose morale the activities of the Fair Employment Practice Committee have not only not been helpful but have been exceedingly destructive.

There is no reason why I should detail the various items of a great volume of evidence which support this conclusion. Many of these items are within the knowledge of the membership of this House. I have not personally discussed them with any Member of the House, whether Democrat or Republican, but that he deplored their existence and agreed that unity in the war effort would be best served by the elimination of the possibility of their recurrence.

I shall make reference, however, to some of the most outstanding of these items of evidence. The facts with regard to some of them have been thoroughly developed in hearings before the Smith committee. I refer particularly to the evidence relating to the issuance of certain directives against 21 different railroads, one of which was the Southern Railway Co., and against various railway labor organizations, the purpose of which was to require these railroads and these railroad brotherhoods to eliminate certain employment practices which have been followed for many years and which have been found satisfactory to the railroads and to their employees. Twenty-four percent of all of the employees of the Southern Railway Co. are Negroes, yet until the F. E. P. C. undertook its efforts to stir up racial trouble among its employees there had been no complaint from the great body of these Negro employees as to any unfair discrimination in employment as between Negroes and whites. The effect of the F. E. P. C.'s efforts, therefore, was to promote disunity where none had existed and instead of contributing to the unity of the war effort to bring about dissatisfaction and threats of strikes with the possibility of serious interference with transportation essential to the successful prosecution of the war effort.

This statement is applicable not only to the Southern Railway Co. and its employees, but to all of the railroads and their employees in the South and Southeast against whom the directives were filed. It is a significant circumstance that, while there was evidence of alleged discrimination against the cited railroads in the Northeast, the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, the Baltimore & Ohio, and the Baltimore & Ohio Chicago Terminal, of their refusal to employ Negroes in certain categories of work, and

although findings of fact and directives were issued by the F. E. P. C. against those railroads finding them guilty of alleged discrimination against Negroes contrary to Executive Order No. 9346, and "directing" them to cease such discrimination and to employ Negroes in all categories of employment without discrimination, Chairman Ross and the F. E. P. C. have soft-pedaled the actions taken against those railroads in the Northeast and have made a deliberate effort to sectionalize the matter and to publicize only findings and directives against railroads in the South in an apparent attempt to capitalize on some sentiment in the North and West against the South and its attitude toward the solution of difficult racial problems. The action of the F. E. P. C. in these railroad cases, therefore, was patently not an attempt to promote national unity, but to bring pressure to bear on the South to change its attitude in the control of matters affecting the relationships of the races from that attitude which has always been satisfactory to the vast majority of both races in the South and relates to one of the basic problems of our southern civilization and concerning which no issue arises until that issue is raised by pettifoggery and troublemaking busybodies in other sections of our country who know nothing about our problems, care nothing about them, and whose sole purpose is to oppress and, if possible, to destroy the progress of the southern people. Among this type of troublemakers, the F. E. P. C. is entitled to high rank.

Its capacity for making trouble, however, has by no means been confined entirely to the South. Members of the House are no doubt familiar with the case of the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Co. and the employees' union of that company who were directed by the F. E. P. C. to provide for the employment of colored men as motormen, conductors, operators, and cashiers and thus to violate a contract of long standing between the company and the union which required the continuance of practices of employment which had been followed for many years and which had been found satisfactory, not only to the white employees, but to the colored employees of the company.

Thus, a fruitful source of trouble was explored in the Philadelphia case involving, as I recall, approximately 10,000 employees engaged in transportation work vital to the war effort, and difficulties were brought about where no difficulties had theretofore existed. In this connection I may say that I have been unable to find evidence of a single case in which these efforts of the F. E. P. C. have contributed to unity in the war effort. All of its efforts with which I am familiar have contributed to disunity.

There is also the case brought to the attention of the Smith committee by the Seafarers International Union of North America. I shall insert in the Record in connection with my remarks a letter from the secretary-treasurer of this union to the gentleman from Virginia, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman, Special Committee to Investigate

Executive Agencies, dated January 28, 1944. I shall quote from it at this point two or three paragraphs relative to the activities of two agents of R. M. O. inspired by F. E. P. C. named Vincent and Pollatsek:

Messrs. Vincent and Pollatsek are trying to compel our union to abandon a sound and tested policy which has resulted in harmonious relationships between Negro and white members over a period of many years. This policy, which is supported by the more than 2,000 Negroes in our membership, provides for a rotary hiring hall system, fair and equitable in every way, which enables whites to share ships' quarters with whites and Negroes with Negroes.

The Negro members of our union receive the same wages and voting privileges and enjoy precisely the same working conditions as our white members.

If the views of these two officials are permitted to prevail—and they have the enthusiastic endorsement of every Communist and sympathizer infesting the water front—in other ports throughout the country they inevitably would create a state of chaos in the maritime industry in a critical hour for our country. We would see a mass exodus of trained seamen to other jobs, we would see a flare-up of race hatreds and we would pay for all this in costly delays in the shipping of supplies and equipment to our fighting fronts.

It should be pointed out here that the R. M. O., in the Atlantic coast district is misrepresenting or concealing the facts when it recruits boys from American homes and then tries to compel them to depart abruptly from old-time family traditions to share eating and sleeping quarters on American ships with members of another race, particularly when such condition is not at all necessary and is disruptive of rather than helpful to the war effort.

There have been repeated instances where the R. M. O. office in New York has refused to send Negroes to our hiring hall in order to be dispatched to our contracted ships. This resulted in these ships sailing undermanned. On other occasions when our hiring hall was closed for the night or over Sunday, the R. M. O. deliberately dispatched Negroes to vessels with white crews, thereby arousing protests and unnecessary ill feeling.

By permission heretofore granted in the House I insert here the entire letter:

JANUARY 28, 1944.

Representative HOWARD W. SMITH,  
Chairman, Special Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: I consider it an urgent obligation to direct the attention of your committee to a situation which is fast developing to a point where it may hamper the delivery of the cargoes so desperately needed by our fighting forces.

I have reference to the arbitrary, dangerous, and unrealistic interpretation being applied to the President's Executive order establishing the Fair Employment Practice Committee by a pair of starry-eyed fellow travelers heading the Atlantic coast district of the recruitment and manning organization of the War Shipping Administration.

These gentlemen, Mr. Craig S. Vincent, Atlantic coast representative of the R. M. O., and Mr. Frank Pollatsek, Chief of the R. M. O., office in New York, are insisting that the President's order is being violated in connection with the hiring of ships' crews because our union requires that white seamen shall not be forced to eat and sleep in the same quarters with Negro seamen, and vice versa.

Under this arrangement, each race is disrespectful of the other's rights, just as prevails in the armed forces of our country.

Messrs. Vincent and Pollatsek are trying to compel our union to abandon a sound and tested policy which has resulted in harmonious relationships between Negro and white members over a period of many years. This policy, which is supported by the more than 2,000 Negroes in our membership, provides for a rotary hiring hall system, fair and equitable in every way, which enables whites to share ships' quarters with whites and Negroes with Negroes.

There is not the slightest vestige of discrimination in the running of our union. In fact, a number of our officers are Negroes. The union lives up in every regard to our section of the President's order which calls for the elimination of discrimination with relation to hire, tenure, terms or conditions of employment or union membership because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The Negro members of our union receive the same wages and voting privileges and enjoy precisely the same working conditions as our white members.

It is this particular section of the President's order which is being twisted and distorted by Messrs. Vincent and Pollatsek to conform to certain social reformist theories which they are seeking to experiment with at the expense of the American seaman and the war effort, and in defiance of the sober judgment of practical men who have spent the greater part of their lives in the maritime industry.

If the views of these two officials are permitted to prevail—and they have the enthusiastic endorsement of every Communist and sympathizer infesting the waterfront—in other ports throughout the country they inevitably would create a state of chaos in the maritime industry in a critical hour for our country. We would see a mass exodus of trained seamen to other jobs, we would see a flare-up of race hatreds, and we would pay for all this in costly delays in the shipping of supplies and equipment to our fighting fronts.

It should be pointed out here that the R. M. O., in the Atlantic coast district, is misrepresenting or concealing the facts when it recruits boys from American homes and then tries to compel them to depart abruptly from old-time family traditions to share eating and sleeping quarters on American ships with members of another race, particularly when such condition is not at all necessary and is disruptive of, rather than helpful to, the war effort.

The interpretation which Messrs. Vincent and Pollatsek are so zealously trying to read into the President's order is a flat violation of the statement of policy which our union signed with the War Shipping Administration on May 4, 1942. This statement of policy reaffirms article 3 of the service agreement signed between general shipping agents and the War Shipping Administration and states specifically: "If the general agent has contracts with unions and those contracts require, for example, preference of employment or use of union hiring halls, the agent would be required to procure men in accordance with the contracts."

What Messrs. Vincent and Pollatsek are trying so hard to do is to disturb our existing and harmonious policy with regard to this union's hiring-hall system in order to grind their own pet reformist ax. Apparently they have no concern over the inevitable consequences.

The views of these men also run counter to the statement of principles governing wartime policy which was signed on December 18, 1941, following negotiations by representatives of the maritime industry, the maritime unions, and the Government.

In arriving at the statement of policy it was agreed that the hiring-hall system em-

bodied in our contracts was to be respected and not interfered with in any way. The union agreed to waive its right to strike for the duration and that pledge has been lived up to faithfully. There have been no strikes or delays on our ships since the war started.

There have been repeated instances where the R. M. O. office in New York has refused to send Negroes to our hiring hall in order to be dispatched to our contracted ships. This resulted in these ships sailing undermanned. On other occasions when our hiring hall was closed for the night or over Sunday the R. M. O. deliberately dispatched Negroes to vessels with white crews, thereby arousing protests and unnecessary ill feeling.

Our understanding is that the R. M. O. was set up for the explicit purpose of supplementing the unions and the operators in the supplying of seamen personnel in order to prevent delays in sailings.

This is clearly a situation which calls for a thoroughgoing investigation by your committee in the interests of the American seamen and the maritime industry.

The taxpayers' money which is being appropriated for the running of the R. M. O. office in New York could be agent to far more useful and constructive purpose. I am sure our Congress never intended to countenance the use of Government funds to promote theories and reforms inconsistent with American traditions and with plain ordinary common sense.

Yours very truly,

JOHN HAWK,  
Secretary-Treasurer and First Vice  
President of the Seafarers Inter-  
national Union of North America.

It is quite apparent from the statements made by this union official that in this case, as in many others, the F. E. P. C. is engaged, not in an effort to promote the war effort, but in an effort to foist certain ideas of social, not economic, equality, which have long been entertained in communistic quarters in this country, upon the white people of the country who feel a certain pride in their race, and justly so, and who, while they are willing and anxious that the Negro shall have his economic rights, are not willing, and will never submit, to his being forced upon them as a social equal and bedfellow. There are undoubtedly many white people in this country who feel they are no better than Negroes. With their appraisal of themselves I have no quarrel, but the fact remains that God Almighty when He made the races of mankind provided the white man with more powerful mental faculties than He did the people of the Negro race and endowed the Negro with certain racial traits and characteristics which will never permit him to be a satisfactory social associate of the white man.

While these facts have been controverted in the communistically prepared publication *The Races of Mankind*, which was prepared for circulation among our armed forces and which has been severely condemned by a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, they cannot be successfully challenged by men and women of intelligence who are, in good faith, endeavoring to state facts.

As a further evidence of the purpose of the F. E. P. C. to stir up racial animosities, rather than to allay them, I have been advised that that organization has recently stationed in an office building

in Atlanta, Ga., a Mr. Bruce Hunt, a white man, as its representative in that city who installed himself with a Negro stenographer in an office building otherwise occupied entirely by whites and insisted upon his Negro stenographer being allowed to use the rest rooms provided for white women employees in that building.

Atlanta is one of the focal points of war industry in this country and those who know the people of Atlanta and of the South cannot fail to realize that such a studied affront to southern customs and usages, not only will not contribute to the war effort but will stir up racial bitterness and hatred where no racial troubles would have otherwise existed. Other citations of the activities of F. E. P. C. that are harmful to the war effort might be continued indefinitely. We are all familiar with its insinuations that employers who desire to employ white stenographers through United States Employment offices must accept Negro stenographers if available whether they want them or not, and it is even reported that in one case in California an employer was required to reduce the number of his white Caucasian employees already employed and provide for the employment of a certain proportion of clerical employees who should be Negroes or people of another race.

I say, therefore, that F. E. P. C. is not only not contributing anything to the war effort, but is a tremendously disturbing factor. It has never been authorized by law. I am aware, of course, that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has insisted that it is authorized by law, but he has so far been unable to point out the specific provision of any existing statute which authorizes Congress to appropriate for it. It is in the bill under a waiver of points of order obtained 2 days before the bill was reported to the House by the Chairman of the full committee in late afternoon when few Members were on the floor, when the bill had not been reported even to the full committee; when no Member of the House excepting those serving on the subcommittee knew what was in it and at a time when no Member of the House had any reason to suspect that such a request for waiving points of order would be submitted.

The mere fact it was thought necessary to secure unanimous consent to waive points of order is sufficient evidence that it is realized that the appropriation is not authorized by law, because if authorized by law the waiving of points of order would not be necessary. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] realized this fact on yesterday because when the chairman of the full committee sought to obtain unanimous consent to undo the mischief he had accomplished by securing the waiver of points of order against the bill the gentleman from New York promptly objected. It is also to be noted that the Committee on Labor is now considering legislation to authorize appropriations to the Fair Employment Practices Committee. If appropriations are already authorized by law, such legislation would not be necessary.



Members of the House will recall that when the agricultural appropriation bill was presented to the House, it did not include any items for the school-lunch program or for the Farm Security Administration, although there are many Members of the House, including myself, who would have been glad to have had such items included. They were not included because they were not authorized by law. The Senate has placed them in the agricultural appropriation bill and the committee of conference on the bill has deferred action on these items until the House shall have an opportunity to consider the conference report on the Pace bill which it is understood will contain proposals for legislation authorizing these items. I consider that procedure entirely appropriate and I think it would be appropriate in this case, that the House should await the submission of legislation from the Labor Committee authorizing appropriations for the F. E. P. C. and take action thereon before undertaking to make an appropriation for that activity.

I regret that in the discussion of this matter, it has been necessary to discuss frankly certain racial problems. I am a friend of the Negro race. I believe in according to the people of that race the fullest measure of economic opportunity which they are capable of using advantageously. I know that the people of the South are the best friends the Negro ever had, or ever will have, and that my views are in accord with those of the vast majority of the southern people.

I know the real enemies of the Negro are those who, falsely, pose as his friends and seek to stir up dissatisfaction in his heart and mind with conditions on account of which he would not be dissatisfied excepting for their meddling interference.

I know that F. E. P. C. is only one tentacle of a devilfish which is seeking to fasten itself today upon the structure of southern civilization. Other tentacles are represented by such things as the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Texas primary case; the policy adopted during the war of having Negroes incorporated in, and made a part of, white military organizations, of having white men in the service in many instances subjected to the commands of Negroes; of having whites and Negroes hospitalized together at Army general hospitals. I have in mind also a policy which is being pursued here in Washington, and with which you are all familiar, of integrating the Negro and white clerical employees of departments and bureaus of the Government into one body, requiring them to eat together in departmental cafeterias, withdrawing administrative sponsorship for organization dances unless the Negroes are invited to dance with the white people, and other matters of a similar type. All of this, of course, does not spring from the F. E. P. C. The F. E. P. C. springs from the over-all source which is directing these many assaults upon the social system of the country and particularly of the South, in an effort, not to win the war, but in an effort to use the war as an excuse for bringing about integration of

the races, socially and otherwise, in a manner which could not have been hoped for by the proponents of the plan under peacetime conditions. This is the lowest type of effort in which the National Government could engage. I am opposed to it, and I think a vast majority of the people of this country are opposed to it, even the intelligent Negroes of the country. I propose to do everything I can to bring about the elimination of this policy. I believe that it cannot succeed in accomplishing the catastrophic results for which its sponsors hope.

The Republican Party in the coming national campaign will appeal to the people of the South to vote against the incumbent administration and its candidate for President, whoever he may be, because of these recognized evils in policies which are being pursued by the administration. I have frequently said to the people of my district, when they have discussed these matters with me, that while, in my judgment, their complaints against the policy of this administration in these particulars are well founded, they have no hope that the Republican Party will ever do anything for the correction of these evils, and the entire history of the Republican Party supports that statement. I wonder how many members of the Republican Party today will show by their votes that that conclusion is correct. You have criticized the bureaucracy which has grown up in Washington, the establishment of bureaus without the authority of law, the expenditure of public funds which have not contributed to the war effort, and you have here an opportunity to vote to eliminate one of these bureaus set up by Executive order and not by law, performing a disservice to the war effort, instead of a service, fostering disunity among our people and stirring up racial hatreds, and I am wondering if, in recognition of these generally accepted facts, you will stand up today and vote to strike this appropriation from the bill, thereby showing the Republican Party is willing to do something to correct these policies of which our people complain, or whether you will vote to continue this unauthorized bureau with all of the purposes which its organizations and conduct evidence? Will you be more responsive to the overwhelming cry of the white people of the South for the cutting out of this cancer on the body politic, or will you here in Committee of the Whole, where no roll-call vote can be taken, avoid a record vote by voting down this amendment which I have offered, and thus evidence greater consideration for the views of the Negro voters and voters, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARC-ANTONIO], in New York and Philadelphia in Pittsburgh and in Chicago, than you have for the many millions of white people in this country who, by reason of their geographical locations, have primary responsibility for dealing with the Negro problem and working out its satisfactory solution? The vote which will be taken here today will demonstrate whether the South can entertain any hope for the correction of these evils through action by the Republican Party as taken by its representatives on this floor.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think the gentleman from Georgia has made a very excellent statement. I shall vote for his amendment to strike out the entire appropriation for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. I think this organization has committed some violent abuses and, as the gentleman says, has rendered a disservice, and created a disunity in time of war. In addition to specific instances of meddling cited, I have in mind the instance of the Dallas News, wherein the Dallas News advertised, "Wanted: Colored man." And this organization, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, took that up with the Dallas News and said they had no right to use the word "colored" in an advertisement, that it was discriminatory as to race, and demanded that this ad should not be used. The News wanted a colored man and not a white man for a particular job, but they must not so advertise for fear of offending the colored race. An agency which has no more sense than that should be abolished.

Mr. TARVER. My attention has been called to that incident of the abuse of authority, or rather the use of authority which they do not possess under the laws of this country, by the F. E. P. C. I am heartily in accord with the views expressed by the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I want to say to the gentleman I was one of those who supported his action in the committee. I propose to vote for his amendment.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. GIBSON. Is it not true under the Executive order setting up this Committee they are given authority to make their own laws and regulations irrespective of any law of the land?

Mr. TARVER. It depends on whether the gentleman means by the words "they are given authority" that they are given legal and constitutional authority or whether he means that they are given assumed authority which the person undertaking to delegate that authority to them did not possess and which he does not have the power to delegate.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. FOAGE. Is it not true, even if the person who attempted to delegate that power had had the power to delegate it, and I do not think he had, that even that order itself says it is confined to war work and confined to war activities and they have assumed to have the power to interfere with every kind of activity?

Mr. TARVER. I think the gentleman's position is entirely correct.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. GIBSON. The following is one of the powers granted under the order:

4. The committee shall receive and investigate complaints of discrimination. It may conduct hearings, make findings of fact, and take appropriate steps for the elimination of such discrimination.

That is one of the powers granted in the order.

Mr. TARVER. I certainly hope that the amendment which I will offer when the proper place is reached in the bill to strike out the \$500,000 which is proposed for this activity may prevail and that that amount of money may be saved to the Government and the dissatisfaction and just complaints occasioned by the activities of this organization be eliminated.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the address of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] in condemnation of some of the activities of the Fair Employment Practice Committee. I shall support the gentleman's motion to strike from the bill the appropriation for this organization.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] has just referred to one of the most utterly absurd and ridiculous actions which has been taken by the committee, and I want to join with the gentleman in condemnation of this action. I am referring to the efforts of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice to prevent Texas papers from carrying advertisements in their help-wanted columns for colored help, the advertisement quoted by the gentleman from Texas. If there is anything illegal, unconstitutional, unfair, or discriminatory in placing an advertisement in a newspaper for colored help, I am unable to see it. I positively refuse to vote public funds to pay the salary of any person who is so lacking in intelligence and ordinary common sense.

We are in the midst of a great war—the worst possible time to arouse race prejudice and hatred. Our enemies are seeking to create disunity among us. It is intolerable that people on the pay roll of the Government should be engaged in the same practice.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in sympathy with the action of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. I was for his motion before the committee, and certainly expect to do everything I can and vote with him in his efforts here.

Many things have been done by departments of this Government which in my opinion have not aided the war effort and which have in fact done a great deal of damage to the Nation. Of all acts done by such departments none has done more to incite racial disturbance, unrest, and riots than has the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee. Set up by the executive department, fi-

nanced by its emergency funds, it is my opinion that no legislative authority exists for its continuance.

Mr. Chairman, I was opposed to any appropriation for this group of agitators before the committee. I am opposed to it now and expect to support the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to strike the appropriation from the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the real American people of this Nation are sick and tired of all national political parties catering to, and running after the racial and political minorities of the country in order to secure their vote. Sometimes it looks like the Democratic Party and the Republican Party will do anything to secure the vote of the Negro, the support of the C. I. O., and other organized minorities in the national election. Both parties seem willing to ignore the rights of the solid white Americans. They are letting the tail wag the dog.

No one objects to fair treatment. However, it is not fair treatment which this outfit, F. E. P. C., desires. Look to the record. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] recently put some interesting figures in the record on this so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee, which claims one of its purposes is to see that members of the various races are employed in the same proportion they have in the Nation. Mr. Gibson's figures show that, while there are 12 or 13 times as many white people in this Nation as there are Negro, of the 106 persons employed in the F. E. P. C. 61 are Negro and 45 are white. The 45 white employees draw \$143,600 per annum and the 61 Negroes draw \$173,560 per annum. The employees of this Bureau are the highest paid of any bureau or department of the Federal Government. In the Washington office there are 13 white employees and 35 Negro employees. While the chairman is white, his associate examiner is Negro. The office of the chairman is staffed by two other whites and three Negroes. The administrative office is staffed by 11 Negroes and no whites. The operations section has 7 Negroes and 6 whites. The review and analysis section has 7 Negroes and 3 whites. It is apparent this group was not set up to secure fair employment practices. The entire committee is Negro dominated with a sprinkling of white employees to attempt to claim fairness.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion both parties are using this committee and most of those supporting it are doing so for political purposes. If this were not so the make-up of this committee would not be predominately Negro.

There is much evidence that I am correct in my belief. Men who do the hiring in various departments tell me that they can turn down an average white American because of failure to meet qualifications and nothing is said about it. If, however, a Negro is turned down then that is termed racial discrimination.

A confession of the length political parties go in courting the Negro vote was made in the Senate recently by a Senator from Missouri, a man prominently mentioned as a candidate for Vice

President on the Democratic ticket. This Senator, in paying tribute to a Negro by the name of Tompkins, recorder of deeds, said:

Mr. President, the Negroes of the United States look to the person holding the office of recorder of deeds (Tompkins) for interpretations of political questions. \* \* \*

We have frequent occasion to consult and advise with him on matters concerning our colored constituency back home.

The Congress recognized the value of his advice on political matters when it specifically excluded him from the prohibitions contained in the Hatch Act—passed some years ago and which prevents Federal office holders from taking part in politics. He, as recorder of deeds, is the only Negro Government official who is permitted under the Hatch Act to participate in political campaigns.

Mr. Chairman, the office of recorder of deeds, according to this Senator, has adorned the walls of the building, a Federal building, with seven murals showing the contributions Negroes have made but not a single one showing any contribution to the Nation by a white man.

No, Mr. Chairman, it is not fair treatment for the Negro—the group who exempted Tompkins from the Hatch Act; it is not to prevent unfair discrimination against Negroes that this so-called Fair Employees Practice Committee exercises itself. What they wanted, what they have done and are doing is to discriminate in favor of the Negro in an effort to secure the votes of the Negroes that they may win the national elections.

Not only is the recorder of deeds exempted from the operation of the Hatch Act but his employees are exempted from the Civil Service. He may employ a Negro from Chicago, New York, or St. Louis without regard to his qualifications if it will help the party in power.

This same practice was followed by the Republican Party when it was in power. This desire and effort on the part of both parties to cater to the racial and political minorities in order to win national elections is doing more to undermine our Nation than anything I know.

How can a Congress, sworn to uphold the Constitution of Washington and Jefferson say the Government or any employer shall hire so many Negroes, so many Chinese, so many Indians, and so on? Mr. Speaker, that is strictly un-American. Such practices look to the destruction of our whole system. It follows the Communists' lead. Both parties are permitting the tail to wag the dog.

Through the years we have gotten along with the Negro in the South by having segregation. We expect to continue that practice because we know it is the only way the two races can live together in harmony. If today you make this appropriation to continue this committee, you are doing more to create strife, riots, to destroy our America, than anything you could possibly do.

You will be marching further along the road of forcing the solid American citizens to band together against organized racial and political minorities, and when that day comes these same minorities will regret the day you surrendered the Constitution in an effort to secure votes to win a national election.



The Good Lord made the Negro black. He is black. If he accepts that fact, he can be a credit to himself and to his race. All the committees in the world will not change his color. All the orders of the F. E. P. C. that he shall not be referred to as colored will not change that color. If the F. E. P. C. is abolished and the Negro and the white man left alone, racial problems will be solved. In the South, the only place where the two races have gotten along, we have practiced segregation. The white man is protected in his home and in his meeting places from interference. The Negro is protected in his home. We expect to keep that segregation. To do as is advocated by those who sponsor the F. E. P. C. is to destroy such segregation. White and Negro would have social intermingling. The natural result through the years means a mongrel race. We from the South will have no part of it.

You must refuse this appropriation. Some things are more dear than winning any election. We must preserve our country, and destroying this committee will do much to preserve it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] such time as he may require.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I should extend my congratulations to my colleague from Georgia, Judge TARVER, for his accurate description of the conditions which have been brought about through the activities of the Committee on Fair Employment Practices. He has so truly and fully presented the question that there is little I can add.

I have investigated the activities of the agents of this committee, and if they continue much longer it is going to be necessary for the white people, not only in the South, but in many other sections of the country, to organize committees for their own protection. The agents and employees of this so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee are nothing more than agitators, deliberately trying to stir up trouble between the races. They should be dismissed immediately.

This committee has never been authorized by law, and Congress has never appropriated any funds to pay the salaries and expenses of the numerous agents and employees of the committee. The committee was set up by an order of the President issued May 27, 1943, and its expenses have been paid by the President out of funds which the Congress appropriated to the President for other purposes.

In his order creating this committee the President indicated that he was doing so in order to contribute toward unity in the war effort. He should have known then, and certainly he does know by now, that the activities of this committee would have just the opposite effect. It is bringing about more disunity among the people than everything else which has been done by the numerous Government agencies since the beginning of the war. It is nothing more than a deliberate effort to take advantage of war conditions, to impose upon the patriotism of the white people of the

country, and to try to force social equality.

It is unfair to millions of our white boys now in the service. I do not know of any of them who have gone to offer and give their lives for the establishment of social equality for the Negro. Certainly those from my section of the country, at least, are going to be greatly disturbed and disappointed when they return home to learn that their Commander in Chief has set up and promoted this agency to try to change the social and economic ways of this Nation while they were out on the battle front. They responded to the call of duty because they love their country, they love their way of life and were willing to fight to defend it, but they did not enter the service in order to have that way of life changed during their absence.

I do not regard this as purely a southern problem. Already in most of the war-production centers of the East and the Northwest there have been strikes and other disturbances brought on by the activities of this committee. Numerous Members of this House have told me that race relations in their States are growing more critical every day and are approaching the explosive point. Unless these activities are brought to an end I fear some terrible consequences are going to follow, bringing on disunity almost comparable with that which existed back in the sixties, except it will not be confined to an issue between sections.

Very few people outside of the South have any understanding or appreciation of our race problem. Very few Members of Congress from the other sections understand our difficulties or appreciate our efforts to treat the Negro fairly and maintain proper relations. There is one thing I have definitely satisfied myself about, and that is that the southern white man has more concern about the welfare of the Negro than do the people in many other sections.

As my colleague stated a few minutes ago, there appear to be some white people who do not regard themselves any better than a Negro, and, like my colleague, I am ready to accord them the right to reach their own estimate of themselves, but if you will study the activities of such people you will find that many, if not most of them, are actuated by what they can get from or out of the Negro rather than a sincere effort to be helpful to the Negro.

We have our problems in the South, economic and racial. They are great problems and require the best thought and best effort of our people. I believe we can solve them, if we are permitted to do so, in a way consistent with the best interest of all. All the South is asking today is to be let alone, to be permitted to settle our local problems just as the founders of this Nation intended for them to be settled. It seems to me that is so little to ask, and yet there are so many people who want to take a hand in our affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope the Members of the House will support the motion of my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [JUDGE TARVER], to strike

out the paragraph in this bill which would appropriate \$500,000 to continue the activities of this Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, if I may have your attention for just a moment: Times without number I have heard Members of this body declare in the well of this House that they would never vote to appropriate a single dollar of the taxpayer's money which was not essential for the war effort or absolutely essential to carry on the necessary civil affairs of government. In the matter that I intend to present this afternoon and the amendment which I shall offer when this bill is presented for amendment I shall endeavor to test the sincerity of those statements. May I say to you as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which will shortly bring before you the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill, with the aid of other members of that subcommittee, we have been trying diligently to find out where there is duplication of effort in various agencies of Government with the ultimate objective in mind of trying to eliminate duplication of effort wherever it may be found and thus save some money for the taxpayers of this Nation. I know there are some people who say, "Oh, saving a million dollars does not mean anything." So far as I am concerned I have told the people whom I have the honor to represent that I will not vote for a single dollar of appropriation that is not justified in the public interest or in the necessary effort to carry on the war.

Let me call your attention to the fact that by legislative action of the Congress we created in the Government a Department of Labor and charged it with certain specific fundamental responsibilities. I want the Department of Labor to function and to be in a position to carry out the responsibilities that this Congress has placed upon it in aiding the solution of the multiple problems that confront that department of government today.

Now, let me be specific. In the hearings before the subcommittee this year there appears an item of \$200,000, requested by the Secretary of Labor, in order to carry on what is known as the working-conditions program. It appears that the Secretary of Labor was given this amount in a deficiency appropriation last fall. The amount became available January 1, 1944, and pursuant to that appropriation, the Secretary of Labor set up in the Department of Labor an organization known as the working-conditions program. Now, what is this for? This money was appropriated and the program was established to enable the Secretary of Labor, operating through the Labor Standards Division of the Department of Labor to look after working conditions of men and women in production, in the factories of this country, to try to make suggestions as to the health, sanitation, and general

working conditions, and to investigate and to cooperate with manufacturers and industry in an effort to provide better working conditions. That is a fundamental function of the Department of Labor and is to be found in its basic law as passed by this Congress when the Department of Labor was created.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman will pardon me I prefer not to yield just now.

This year the Department of Labor seeks to incorporate that \$200,000 into its regular appropriation bill. I am not critical of the Department of Labor for engaging in this activity. It is an activity that it is contemplated the Department of Labor will perform.

I now find upon examination, however, that the War Production Board has set up within it an agency known as "The Labor Production Office," and they are asking in the particular bill that is now before us for an appropriation of \$600,700. For what purpose? In part, at least, to do exactly the same work, specifically the same work that is contemplated to be done under the \$200,000 appropriation requested by the Secretary of Labor in her request for appropriation. The work in the Secretary's office is to be performed by the Division of Labor Standards, and over in the War Production Board is this labor production office, headed by Mr. Keenan, which is doing exactly the same thing. Now, I ask any of you on the floor of this House to stand up here and, after investigation and analysis of that activity, tell me whether there is any justification for having two agencies of Government spending the taxpayers' money to do exactly the same thing.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman is aware, is he not, that a great deal of exactly the same work, this same sort of activity, is handled by the Office of the Surgeon General, the Public Health Service, partly through the State departments of public health. For example, in my State, they have a very extensive program, partially supported by Federal funds through the public welfare, and partly through State funds through the public welfare, and the department of public welfare inspects and coordinates these factory standards and conditions. The same thing is being done in three departments, not just two departments.

Mr. KEEFE. I am fully aware that the Public Health Service, operating in conjunction with the State public health services, is engaged in the matter of the protection of the health generally of the citizens of the various States. I do not think they have any specific duties or functions, however, in this particular field.

I am calling attention to this particular situation because at the proper time by suitable amendment, I intend to move to eliminate the appropriation for the War Production Board that is found in the pending bill, that proposes to duplicate the work of the working condi-

tions program in the Department of Labor.

Now, let us take up another item. We have in the Department of Labor the Conciliation Service, which is headed by Dr. John Steelman, a man in whom I personally have utmost confidence, and whose organization, in my judgment, is performing a splendid function and a splendid service for the people of this country in attempting to mediate and conciliate labor difficulties throughout the country.

Now, what is the job that Mr. Steelman is charged with performing, under the law? His specific function is to mediate and conciliate labor difficulties and labor disputes. We provided him with a constantly expanding appropriation to enable him to hire all the conciliators and mediators that might be necessary in order to meet the growing demand on the part of both labor and industry for that type of service.

As far as I am concerned, I want that service performed. It is a vital service. But we find now that the War Production Board, in setting up this Labor Production Office, is again duplicating the work of the Conciliation Service. Not only duplicating the work but actually interfering with the orderly work of the Conciliation Service. Now, the question is, do you want to appropriate public funds to maintain in the War Production Board, a labor department that, for all practical purposes, is infringing and impinging upon the jurisdiction and authority of the regular agencies of Government in the Department of Labor, and actually not only duplicating the work, but impeding the efforts and work of the regularly established agencies that we have charged with responsibility in that field?

The supporters of this appropriation for the Labor Production Office will contend that there is no duplication of effort. I want to say to the Members of this Congress that I do not care what Mr. Keenan says in the testimony that he gave before this subcommittee. A careful analysis of his testimony read in connection with the testimony of Miss Perkins and Dr. Steelman before the Labor-Social Security Subcommittee is sufficient proof to me that there is absolutely duplication of effort. I went into this matter with the Secretary of Labor and with Dr. Steelman and I knew that it would be claimed that they had a working agreement with the Labor Production Office of the War Production Board so that there would not be any duplication of effort. The War Production Board, under its program, has a lot of men here in the office at Washington, 201; and about 100 or 125 out in the field. They are charged, so they say, with the responsibility of trying to get out production. The Army has a similar organization in the field, consisting of expeditors and other personnel. The Navy has a similar organization in the field. The testimony of Dr. Steelman is that so far as the Army and Navy are concerned there is no duplication of effort and they work in the strictest harmony, but a reading of his testimony

with reference to the conflict between his agency and the similar agency of the War Production Board does not disclose that situation to exist.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I merely wish to state, Mr. Chairman, that in my capacity as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor and Social Security, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and other Members, that everything the gentleman from Wisconsin is saying today is proven by the hearings we have just concluded. I want to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin for the splendid research and diligent work which he has done in this and many other matters which concern the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I rather anticipate the inquiry the gentleman from Michigan is going to make. Let me proceed 1 minute and I think I will answer the gentleman's question.

On page 691 of the hearings on the present bill Mr. Keenan made this statement. He was challenged by the chairman of the committee that there was duplication of effort. This is what he said:

As to what we have found in the Labor Department, at the last hearings a year ago there were some complaints about our overlapping with the Conciliation Service and some of the other functions of the Labor Department. We met with the Secretary of Labor and straightened it out. Our job is entirely confined to war production.

I asked Miss Perkins about that situation and specifically with reference to the \$200,000 appropriation for the working-conditions program to which I have heretofore referred, and this is what she stated. The question was:

Does this group operate in cooperation with a similar group of the War Production Board and one of the War Labor Board which have representatives apparently doing the same work?

I call your particular attention to this answer of Secretary Perkins:

The War Labor Board is not doing anything that remotely resembles this. What the War Production Board is doing I think I had better not talk about, because we have a very limited understanding of what they are doing. I cannot therefore speak for them.

When the situation was before the committee with respect to the Conciliation Service some questions were submitted to Dr. Steelman along this line, and I want to say to you Members who are all familiar with the way these committees operate, you know how difficult it is to get the head of an agency of Government to find any fault or be critical in any way whatsoever of any other agency of Government. The fight that developed between Mr. Wallace and Jesse Jones resulted in a Presidential decree, you will recall, which kind of put a damper upon any comment before congressional committees by one agency of the Government about another, and so it is very dif-



difficult to elicit information on the record from these men that might be critical of some other agency of Government. But I want you to listen to what John Steelman had to say about this situation:

Do you not think, for the efficient operation of the conciliation service that is charged with the direct responsibility and the primary responsibility of endeavoring to settle labor disputes, that it is a proper subject of inquiry to go into and ascertain how many other agencies of Government may be engaged in the same or similar activities?

And his answer was: "Yes."

Then I asked him this question:

Do you not think that all of these activities should be concentrated into one responsible agency?

His answer was:

Yes; I think it is very unfortunate that there is duplication. With all the good intentions we may have I think it is unfortunate for the Government to have different agencies doing the same job. I think whatever one is best fitted for the job ought to be recognized as the one to do that job. I think other people ought to come into the picture when they are requested or when they come make a contribution and as I say I am sure those are the instructions from the Army and Navy to their people. In recent months we have gotten along very well indeed with perhaps only one or two little misunderstandings.

Then I asked him about the War Production Board set-up and he said: "Yes; they had some difficulty in earlier days." Then I asked him this question:

I am not referring to earlier days but right now. Let us be fair and if they are not doing it say so and if they are without being critical of their activities at all say so. You are testifying in response to the request of a member of this committee.

Dr. STEELMAN. Yes; in spite of the instructions from Washington I think there will always be instances where people out in the field will become interested and involved in these matters. It is just unavoidable.

Then he was asked this question:

You mean to say they are involved in it to some extent today?

Dr. STEELMAN. Occasionally.

Question. Despite instructions to the contrary from Washington?

Dr. STEELMAN. That is right.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. That is what appears on the record, Mr. Chairman; but the realities of the situation are that the War Production Board does have these representatives all over this country out in the field in this Labor Production Office who are attempting to do exactly the same thing that John Steelman is charged with responsibility for. Their justification, they say, is that they have these people right out on the job in the factories so that when a dispute comes up they are on the job to handle it right away, and if it gets bad they can call in the conciliator. My opinion is that because of that meddling of another agency in the job of the conciliation service the situation frequently gets to a point where the conciliation service can-

not function due to the interference of the duplicating agency of Government.

Another thing, we have this Labor Standards Division in the Department of Labor. What is its job? What is it supposed to do? It is supposed to provide for the inspection of plants in this country for health, safety, and sanitation; that is the fundamental purpose of the operation of the Division of Labor Standards, to assist labor unions and management in sitting down and understanding the collective bargaining processes, to advise them as to their rights under the law, to advise them as to what the law is, to provide them with contracts and forms. Here we find part of this Labor Production Office right now in the language of Dr. Keenan himself, doing exactly the same work.

What are we going to do about this thing? Are we just going to say, "Well, here is the testimony of Mr. Keenan. Here it is. Here is what he says they are doing." Mind you, there is no testimony of anyone else who has looked into the situation, but I have taken it upon myself, Mr. Chairman, to look into the matter and I have gone into it at some length. I would not be here this afternoon were I not most thoroughly convinced that there is the most atrocious waste of money arising out of this duplication.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman would join me and other members of the committee in authorizing an investigation of this matter in order to secure the facts?

Mr. KEEFE. So far as the gentleman from Wisconsin who is now speaking is concerned, I have no authority to join the gentleman from Missouri in making any such request. The resolution providing for the appointment of investigators was prepared by the gentleman from Missouri in cooperation with the ranking Republican member of the committee, the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman well knows what the provisions of that resolution are. It does not require my signature as a member of the subcommittee, and so far as I am concerned, I do not intend to delay action upon this matter through the ruse or medium of some alleged investigation by a set of investigators who will go down here to these departments, talk with interested people, and check their files. So far as I am concerned, I have made my own investigation on my own responsibility as a member of the Appropriations Committee of this House and I am bringing to the attention of the House the facts that my investigation has found and which are fully supported and disclosed by the sworn testimony taken before a regular committee of the House when the witness was subject to interrogation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I trust the gentleman will join us in an investigation in view of the gentleman's statement there ought to be an investigation both here and in the field. Will the gentleman cooperate with us?

Mr. KEEFE. What cooperation does the gentleman want from me? Has not the gentleman the full authority to order an investigation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman approve the investigation?

Mr. KEEFE. I understand the gentleman's attitude. I have refused to sign such a request, so far as I am concerned, because I do not want the gentleman to put me, in his usually clever manner, in the position where the gentleman can get up and say, "Well, there is no need of doing anything about this now. We are going to have an investigation and the investigators will report next month or 6 months from now, then we will have an opportunity to pass upon it." In the meantime the bill which is now under consideration and must be voted on will have passed the House and we will have to rely upon sticking some language in a future deficiency bill in order to cure the evil. So far as I am concerned, may I say to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, this problem is before the House today. The gentleman's committee has reported this bill. Can the committee reporting this bill in good conscience come before the House and say, as the gentleman has said, "Yes; there may be something to what the gentleman from Wisconsin says, the gentleman is perhaps right, there may be and perhaps is duplication of effort." If that be true, I ask the gentleman, Why, then, was not an investigation made and ordered before his committee reported this bill to the House for consideration? That was the time to have that investigation, not now or some time in the future.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Let us have an investigation, let us call on the War Production Board and Mr. Keenan whom, apparently, the gentleman has not consulted.

Mr. KEEFE. I have consulted the hearings and the justification which was presented to the gentleman's committee.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MASON. Would the gentleman be willing to cooperate in this investigation if we returned this bill to the committee for further consideration?

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman I do not think that is necessary. I have the facts and I do not have to rely upon some investigator who perhaps is not as familiar with the facts as is the present speaker, who has made it his purpose and his object to ascertain the facts by consultation with the people who are involved.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RABAUT. Inasmuch as the gentleman has taken the facts from the hearings I will ask him to read page 691:

Our job is entirely confined to war production.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is now reading from the testimony of Mr. Keenan?

Mr. RABAUT. I am reading the hearings that guide the committee in bringing bills to the House.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is reading the testimony by Mr. Keenan.

Mr. RABAUT. It is one thing to talk a lot about it but it is another thing to take a look at what the facts are before the committee. These are the facts before the committee. The gentleman just finished saying that he based his statement on the facts. Read the facts, let the committee have the facts as they are set forth on page 691.

Mr. KEEFE. If I could have enough time to read Mr. Keenan's full statement I would be most happy to accommodate my valuable friend from Detroit.

Mr. RABAUT. To save time, put it in the RECORD.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me say this to the gentleman: If he knows so much about this situation and is so positive that he is right and that the committee's action is right, why is he now asking for an investigation, wanting to send investigators out to find out whether the action of the committee is right or not?

Mr. RABAUT. Because of the statement that the gentleman made in the full committee. Now, the gentleman will not go along, after he has made the statement very similar to the statement he has made on the floor of the House today.

Mr. KEEFE. This is a little dodge of the New Deal and the gentleman who speaks so volubly for it is just reiterating the thing which always happens when a situation of this kind arises.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, you are not going to put me in that hole. I have a responsibility as a Member of this Congress. I have made my investigation. If you want to make an investigation you go out and make it. I think you should have made the investigation before you reported this bill. That is as far as I am concerned.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman knows we do not make these investigations personally. No investigation made by any man with preconceived notions is of any great value. We have a wholly impartial, nonpartisan, non-political investigating force whose fairness or efficiency has never been challenged. It has never failed to get the facts. Now, why have an impartial investigation? The gentleman should

leave it to somebody who will secure authoritative data about which there will be no question. The gentleman should permit us to do that and should assist us in getting the facts directly and immediately from the War Production Board and Mr. Keenan. The gentleman has heard only one side of the case.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman recalls the time of my trying to do something about penalty mail. If the gentleman remembers, we had assurances given at that time if I would consent to withdraw the amendment which this House on three separate occasions by a record vote agreed to, legislation would be passed to take care of the situation. We got the legislation passed and it has been lying over there in a pigeon hole in the other body ever since. You cannot get any action at all. The thing goes on and on and on. Now, this bill is up here for consideration. Does the gentleman from Missouri think I am outside of my rights as a Member of Congress?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I think the gentleman ought to join us in an impartial investigation. We can all give our own views on it, but the need is for unchallenged facts.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman from Missouri dispute any of the facts I have submitted this afternoon?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not know anything about them. No authoritative agency has certified them.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, if the gentleman does not know anything about them how could he report this bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman ought to substantiate his own conclusions by facts secured through recognized and established agencies.

Mr. KEEFE. I have gone to the proper agencies and I have right here in my hand the answer to the whole situation.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman agree to have an investigation made by the investigators?

Mr. KEEFE. We have right here the answer to the whole situation, which is the field service manual issued by this Keenan organization and the subject is: "Relations of the War Production Board with other agencies handling labor disputes."

The situation was attempted to be put before the Committee on Appropriations that Mr. Keenan's organization had a contract relationship with the Department of Labor Conciliation Service by which their specific fields of activity were clearly defined.

I ask you to turn to the record on page 691, in view of the fact that my friend from Michigan has been so meticulous in calling attention to the record, and point out, if you will, from the list of contracts submitted by Mr. Keenan, where there is any contract with the Labor Department as to the operations of his agency in connection with the Conciliation Service. You will not find it. It is not there.

I do not intend to be dissuaded from the objective which I have in mind, and that is to ferret out these duplicating agencies of Government, and to eliminate them wherever they can be found. I hope the time will come sometime in

this Government of ours when the Congress of the United States will see to it that the matters affecting labor and labor relations are concentrated in the agency which we have set up to deal with that problem, and not find 15 or 16 other agencies of Government dealing with that very problem.

The complaint that I find emanating from labor itself is that there are altogether too many agencies of Government meddling with this intricate problem of labor relationships today. What I am seeking to do is to place in the Department of Labor the responsibility for handling these problems of labor-management relationship, and not have them duplicated and scattered throughout a dozen different agencies of Government, one overlapping the other, and many of them in conflict with the operations of the other.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I agree perfectly with everything the gentleman is saying, especially when he says he wants the regularly established departments of government to take care of the things they should take care of. I notice in the list of persons who are employed in the Office of Labor Production, who receive a salary of \$5,600 a year and over, is the name of one David Lasser. He is Assistant Director of the Plant Production Division. Is that the same David Lasser whom the Congress took off the pay roll at one time because it was proven very conclusively that he believed in the destruction of our American institutions by force? Is that the same David Lasser?

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the gentleman that I read that list of names inserted in the record, and I found a number of very familiar names, including among them David Lasser and Dave Sappos, and some others, on the pay roll of this agency. I am not attacking this item because of the character of any of its personnel. I am attempting to put that work where it belongs and to put the responsibility for carrying on those activities in the agency of government that is charged under the basic organic law with that responsibility.

Let me call your attention to another one. We have in the Department of Labor an organization known as the Wage Adjustment Board which is headed by the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Tracy. Time will not permit me to give an evaluation of the testimony of Mr. Tracy except to say this:

If you will read the testimony of Mr. Tracy as to the objectives of the Wage Adjustment Board, and what it is doing in the field of wage adjustment and labor relations in the building trades industry, you will find over here in the War Production Board an absolutely duplicating activity carried on by Mr. Keenan. That is another case where you have two agencies doing exactly the same thing. All you have to do is to read the justification of Mr. Keenan and you will see that he justifies that activity in almost



the identical language that Mr. Tracy justifies a similar activity in the Labor Department.

Now you are going to have a chance to put your minds to work on this proposition and determine on this pending appropriation bill where these issues are involved, whether we are going to continue to vote continuing appropriations to various agencies of government in order to provide jobs and duplicating work that is being done by the regularly established agencies of the Government.

I want it to be perfectly clear that I am not attempting to interfere with any investigation that the Committee on Appropriations or the Subcommittee on Deficiency sees fit to make. I have no responsibility in that matter. That is a matter in charge of the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member. If they want to go on with this investigation in an attempt to delay consideration of the facts which I have brought out, and which I defy anybody to controvert, then let them go ahead with the investigation. I shall stand upon my right, as a Member of the Congress, to bring these things out at the proper time, which long months of investigation have brought to my attention, and that time is when the appropriation under consideration is before the House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a correction in his last statement?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman says he has nothing to do with this investigation. The gentleman is a member of the Subcommittee on Labor and Social Security. The very matters that the gentleman is complaining about are matters that arise in both subcommittees, namely, the Subcommittee on Deficiency and the Subcommittee on Social Security and Labor. Under the circumstances, if you want a committee investigation—and the main complaint about duplication has come from the gentleman addressing the House—it should be signed by the members of both subcommittees. The gentleman should be willing to do that.

Mr. KEEFE. The distinguished gentleman from Detroit cannot disturb me at all by that statement. He obviously is not familiar with the rule. If he was, he would know that the request would come from the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking Republican member of that subcommittee and not from me.

Mr. RABAUT. Does the gentleman want one in a higher position than the chairman of the full committee to make the request?

Mr. KEEFE. You can make your investigation in this deficiency bill. You do not need me for that. Go ahead and make it, but in the future I hope you will make your investigations before you report the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the facts in the case may be properly presented in the RECORD, when we return to the House I will ask that certain language

in the hearings be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. KEEFE. Which language?

Mr. RABAUT. The language dealing with the debate that has just taken place. I would like to quote.

Mr. TABER. What page, please?

Mr. RABAUT. I will quote from pages 691, 693, and 694. Here is something that might be told to the House. Mr. Keenan said:

Where we find the Conciliation Service get out. We get complaints before they come to the Conciliation Service. Where we find production interfered with, or where there may be slow-downs, where management should know it, they call in some office in the industry division and notify them and then we are called to help settle the problem.

This whole activity deals with war production—

Mr. KEENAN. In 1941 when we got into the great building program we had conditions which were different all over the United States. Every little town had a different condition.

General Somervell called us into the office and asked us if we could not work out a stabilization program to apply to Government construction. We had a meeting and the first group that we met with included representatives of the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, and the Federal Works Agency. Later the D. P. C. came in. They set up a stabilization program in a building trades stabilization agreement, which I am submitting for the record. This stabilization program had a clause in it to the effect that any dispute which came up over this agreement would be decided by the board of review, made up of a man from the Government, a man from the building construction trade, and a man from the services.

The only thing that they act on is disputes that come up on the terms of the agreement. We have nothing to do with wages; that is handled by the wage adjustment board. All that this group does is to make interpretations of the agreement and to hear the disputes that come up under the agreement.

#### INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS DIVISION

The CHAIRMAN. I notice that the Industrial Relations Division is asking for some increase, 10 in personnel and about \$50,000 in funds. What is the program involved in this increase?

Mr. KEENAN. This is to take care of the changes in the War Production Board program and to meet production problems of critical product programs. From time to time, now as the war changes we are going to move into civilian production. We are going to increase civilian production. Most of this will be done where we have materials and manpower. There have been some investigations made. We will allow this increased production where there will be no interference with war work. These people are people who work in the shops and know the job that they will be doing and they will go out and make these investigations for us to be sure that we will not interfere with war production.

It is also to work on increased production problems of key products because today, with the Army drawing off people for the draft, we will be compelled from now on to get more production out of every person. In many cases we will have to increase hours. It may be that there will be contracts that have to be set aside. That is the type of job that these fellows will have to do and it will continue until this thing is out of the way.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very sensible thing.

Mr. RABAUT. I understand your work is confined to war production; that is what it has been confined to in the past?

Mr. KEENAN. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Now you are charged to make the adjustments involved in the reconversion program?

Mr. KEENAN. That is right.

Mr. RABAUT. That is what you are planning for?

Mr. KEENAN. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Have you assisted in the work of production to the point of really getting much greater production?

Mr. KEENAN. Yes, sir.

As to what we have found in the Labor Department, at the last hearing a year ago there were some complaints about our overlapping with the Conciliation Service and some of the other functions of the Labor Department. We met with the Secretary of Labor and straightened it out. Our job is entirely confined to war production. Most of the work that we have is before anything happens. We are in production mainly, and if we find that there is dissatisfaction in the plant we go in and try to find out what the dissatisfaction is and start to straighten it out so we can increase production. We are building up a relationship between labor and management. I know that you know that many of these plants have just been organized in the last 3 or 4 years and they have not much experience. There is generally a barrier between the two and we have been trying to get them to work together to increase production.

It is one thing to stand here and talk about it but it is quite another thing to get the production for the war effort to the maximum height to which it has gone in the United States, to the admiration of the world.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in the appropriation for the Labor Department and its various agencies we have included wartime appropriations for national defense to augment for national defense purposes the activities of every one of these agencies of the Government, and the appropriation carried two items—

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, but I should like to refer the gentleman to the extracts of the hearings above especially the reference to General Somervell.

What further evidence does the gentleman want? How many agencies does he want interested in the war effort and in the production of war goods? I am a little disturbed that this argument should have gone to the extent that it has, in view of the fact of the national emergency.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman familiar with the functions of the Wage Adjustment Board in the Department of Labor?

Mr. RABAUT. I am familiar with the matters that came before us in this hearing, but I asked the gentleman if he knew what was in the hearings and he said he quoted from the record. Then

he did not quote from the record at all, because if he had he would have known what General Somervell had said.

Mr. KEEFE. General Somervell did not even testify before the gentleman's committee, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. RABAUT. No; he did not testify. I am not trying to twist the facts for the House or for the gentleman. I said that General Somervell was quoted by the witnesses as having invited the witnesses before him and telling them what he wanted done in this regard, and that information has been told to the gentleman in truth and not twisted before this body.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman answer my question? Does he know the work of the Wage Adjustment Board?

Mr. RABAUT. I have just told the gentleman the answer to his question. I know the things I am supposed to know about, and I am speaking of them, but I do not believe that could be said of the gentleman who gave us the long talk on this subject.

Mr. KEEFE. Then the answer of the gentleman is that he does not know anything about the Wage Adjustment Board, which is doing the same thing?

Mr. RABAUT. There is another interpretation of his own that the gentleman is making.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to that part of the pending bill which provides for an appropriation of \$500,000 to be expended by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. In the first place, we have never authorized such an agency by direct legislative enactment. In the second place, its operations can have no other effect than to promote centralized and bureaucratic regimentation which will result in disunity and internal strife at the very time when harmony is vitally essential in speeding our war effort to victory.

The order which established this committee states that it is based upon the premise that—

It is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the war effort by all persons in the United States regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

In my judgment, the best way to assure such full participation is to refrain from stimulating such dissension as the activities of this very committee create. Upon it rests the responsibility for much of the strife and misunderstanding and disunity which have thwarted and delayed the uninterrupted progress of our war effort.

For a century and a half America has prospered under the dual system of government which the fathers founded. Now we see creeping in another and a spurious philosophy based upon the false theory that administrative agencies sitting in swivel chairs in Washington know better how to run the affairs of the respective States than the States themselves. The boys at the front are fighting and fighting valiantly to rid the world

of this very doctrine of centralized government which has wrought havoc for liberty-loving people wherever it has been practiced. We shall be unfaithful to them, and we shall be promoting the subversive systems against which they so bravely battle, if we do not put a stop to this unwarranted encroachment upon the sound and fundamental principles of freedom which have characterized our American life and accomplishment.

I believe, for instance, that the people in Texas know better how to run their own affairs than some emissary of bureaucracy coming to them from some other State or from Washington and usually unfamiliar with their history and their conditions and frequently out of sympathy with their ideals and purposes. Such pilgrimages of uninformed and unsympathetic administrative agents make for discord and not for unity. In our governmental capacity let us stop sowing the wind while there is still fair opportunity to avert the harvest of the whirlwind. Surely the operations of this Committee on Fair Employment Practice, the "fairness" being based upon the self-determined standards of the Committee itself, are retarding rather than speeding our triumph at arms. It is violating the very purpose for which ostensibly it was created.

Let us get on with winning this war and preserving our American way of life. The boys at the front are performing a wonderful service to this end. In the same spirit of victory which inspires them, let us banish from the land for which they fight the subversive principles and practices which imperil our present progress and our permanent security.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, in a totalitarian state where the power of the state rests in the hands of a dictator few the security of that power depends upon keeping the people in ignorance. In a democracy such as ours where the power of the state rests with the people the security of that power depends upon keeping the people fully informed. In the words of Justice Douglas, "Democracy will be as vigorous as it is informed." Particularly is this true in a time of stress and crisis such as our country is undergoing at the present moment.

The Office of War Information has the great responsibility to see that the people of the United States get as much information about the war as security will permit. It is the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information which exercises this function of seeing to it that public knowledge about the war is based upon complete and accurate facts. Never has the responsibility of O. W. I. and its domestic branch to keep the people informed been greater. All of us know that what may prove to be the turning point in the war is at hand. A great offensive has been launched in Italy. American troops, side by side with our allies are fighting fiercely in the jungles of Burma. In the Pacific our soldiers, sailors, and marines are moving

island by island closer to Japan. And on the perimeter of the Fortress Europe our boys are poised for a great assault which will crush the Nazis and free Nazi-occupied Europe.

Never has the need for an effective and efficient Office of War Information been so great. All that O. W. I. has done heretofore to keep the people informed is but a preliminary to the task that lies ahead. I have no doubt that with our support in giving O. W. I. adequate funds and personnel it will do its job thoroughly and well.

From the very beginning Mr. Davis and the successive heads of the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. have joined with the military authorities in an effort to get to the people every possible bit of news about military operations and about the war. The American people demand and deserve the facts. They want the hard facts. They want the bad news along with the good and I know and I think most of us know that O. W. I., in collaboration with the Army and Navy, has done its utmost to see that the facts were got to the people.

It has not been an easy job for O. W. I. and the Army and the Navy to give out the facts. It has been a job of balancing the value of security and surprise against the value of the strength that arises from a people fully informed. There have been criticisms that news was being suppressed. The average American put it bluntly that he was not getting his war news play-by-play. He wanted human interest. He wanted an action report on how his son and his neighbor's son gained their objective, what it cost in travail, agony, and death.

The armed forces were as aware of this situation as was the Office of War Information. The War and Navy Departments were prompt in responding to an appeal made by O. W. I. in its attempt to widen the scope of all war news coverage. In discussions with military authorities, O. W. I. held that if America thoroughly understood the character of its enemies, the nature of the fighting, the use to which its war matériel is put, it would work harder and longer to achieve victory than it would if the information is kept secret. It urged that the full story of the war be told, completely and realistically—within the limitations of military security—and it believed further that many of this country's domestic war problems would fall of their own weight. It urged that the story be told fully while it could be used as an effective weapon, instead of waiting 25 years for the historians.

Full credit must be given to the Navy for inaugurating a new policy of complete news coverage of combat. The attack on Tarawa was described in reports sent in such quantity and with such celerity that the American people on the very day of the attack were able to read the most comprehensive and intimate accounts of their sons under fire.

This was the turning point of the war insofar as war reporting was concerned. From that day to this the improvement has continued uninterruptedly. O. W. I. shares with the armed services credit for bringing this improvement about. The



Improvement is continuing. For example—

Victory is the first concern of military commanders in the field. These commanders carry a heavy burden of responsibility for the lives of many men and the success of operations. Their decisions, including those on publication of news, are influenced accordingly. Theater commanders, however, may not always be in a position to balance the relative importance of local problems against the need of giving the American people a full and accurate picture of the war situation as a whole. To insure the fullest possible flow of information without distorting the importance of either good news or bad, theater commanders have recent instructions based on an agreement reached by the Office of War Information and the War and Navy Departments that news of military and naval operations should be made public as soon and as fully as military security permits. Whenever a theater commander resolves a doubt in favor of withholding news, the facts will be submitted, according to the agreement, to Washington for review and decision as to release by officials of the War and Navy Departments and the Office of War Information.

When last winter the Allied leaders agreed to the establishment of a second front in Europe, O. W. I. realized that this would be the greatest news story of the war and planned immediately to offer its facilities and to coordinate facilities of the armed forces to bring about its proper coverage. An O. W. I. executive, long-trained in the newspaper and communications fields, is now in London arranging details of the coverage of this forthcoming mighty military event. His basic job is to see that correspondents are permitted to accompany and to follow the troops during the invasion and to have at their disposal extensive facilities to transmit their reports home with speed and completeness.

Working in close collaboration with Army and Navy public relations officers, representatives of O. W. I. have seen to it that the American press and radio were given every facility possible to bring the news of the invasion to the American people. Censorship of dispatches has been simplified. A stand-by radio channel supplied by the Signal Corps has been arranged for, for the handling of press copy. In negotiations with the British concerning the timing of communiques, O. W. I.'s representative has been in there arguing for the benefit of the American correspondents. It is in large part as a result of the efforts of O. W. I. that there are to be two invasion communiques a day instead of one, and that special communiques and announcements will be given out as the news breaks.

Thanks in large measure to O. W. I. the American press and radio, and the American people stand to get more news, more accurate news, and prompt news about the coming invasion of Europe than has ever before been made available to any people about so vast and critical an event.

Through its Domestic Branch, O. W. I. has lived up to Mr. Davis' promise:

This is a people's war, and to win it the people should know as much about it as they can. This Office will do its best to tell the truth and nothing but the truth, both at home and abroad. Military information that will aid the enemy must be withheld; but within that limitation we shall try to give the people a clear, complete, and accurate picture.

#### ARGENTINE FASCIST INTERVENTION IN AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, I read with great alarm this morning's Washington Post in which there was a story telling how the unrecognized Argentine Ambassador to the United States, Sr. don Adrian C. Escobar, had attempted to use the students of a Washington school to gain a blessing for the Hitler-like Fascist dictatorship in Argentina.

Argentina is the only country in the Western Hemisphere which has enthusiastically continued to give not only aid, but comfort as well, to the enemies of our Government and the United Nations.

Not so long ago, when the American Ambassador to Argentina attempted to lay a wreath at the statue of George Washington in Buenos Aires, he was attacked by an angry mob of Fascists incited by the anti-American demagogic speeches and actions of the military dictators who currently run Argentina.

We should be proud of the principal, teachers, and pupils of McKinley High School who refused to participate in the Argentine Independence Day ceremonies yesterday when they found that the unrecognized Argentine Ambassador was attempting to participate with them in their program.

The viciousness and hypocrisy of the dictatorship in Argentina has once again been exposed by courageous educators and the free American press. I would be derelict in my duties if I did not include in these remarks the highest praise for Francis C. McCarthy, commander of the American Legion of the District of Columbia, who was instrumental in forcing the cancellation of the celebration of Argentine Independence Day. The school children of the District of Columbia—yes, and all freedom-loving Americans—extend their hand in sympathy and friendship to the people of Argentina. However, for the Government of Argentina and its satellite agents here in Washington and all over the world, we have nothing but shame and contempt.

The article from this morning's Washington Post, revealing the latest miserable efforts of the agents of Fascist Argentina to use American school children as their propaganda dupes, is as follows:

#### PROTESTS HALT SCHOOL RITE FOR ARGENTINE HERO

(By David Karr)

Efforts of Argentine diplomats to use Washington school children to gain a spurious endorsement of the pro-Fascist Buenos Aires dictatorship failed yesterday when a chorus of angry protests caused cancellation of Argentine Independence Day ceremonies in which McKinley High School students were slated to participate with Señor Don Adrian C. Escobar, the unrecognized Argentine Ambassador to the United States.

The cancellation was announced yesterday afternoon by Frank C. Daniel, principal of the school.

Mrs. C. A. West, adviser to the Spanish Club of McKinley High, told the story of how the Argentine diplomats attempted to use Washington school children for propaganda purposes. She said the Spanish club has decided to lay a wreath on the statue of Jose San Martine, the "George Washington of Argentina," at Fourth and E Streets NW., yesterday as a demonstration of the friendship which the people of the United States have for the people of the Argentine.

"There was no suggestion that we had anything but contempt for the government in Buenos Aires," Mrs. West said. "However, I received a call Wednesday from the Argentine Embassy informing me that the Ambassador would be present at the ceremonies and would make a short address."

Mrs. West said that she didn't want to affront a diplomat and so had reluctantly assented. She declared, however, that she later arranged with her pupils not to recognize the Argentine Ambassador as a diplomat, because the United States and Argentina do not have diplomatic relations at the present time. He was to have been introduced at the ceremonies without mention of his title, Mrs. West said.

Francis C. McCarthy, commander of the American Legion for the District of Columbia, promptly issued a blunt protest against the participation of Washington school children in any celebration with officials of the Fascist Latin-American regime. It was prepared on the basis of this vigorous statement that McKinley officials announced the cancellation.

"In view of the representations of various persons and organizations, and at the specific request of the American Legion, the faculty and officials of the school have voted to cancel the celebration," Principal Daniel said.

Before the cancellation, Robert I. Haycock, Superintendent of Schools, said:

"I have no information which indicates there is anything wrong with the project."

However, students at McKinley had a different view. Barbara Benedict, 13, of 1329 Trinidad Avenue NE., president of the McKinley Spanish Club, said she was glad not to have been put in a position of having to introduce the Argentine Ambassador at the wreath-laying ceremonies.

"We thought we would be demonstrating friendship with the Argentine people and not with the Argentine Government until that Ambassador stuck his nose into the picture," she said. "We thought that if the Argentine people knew the United States people were for them and against their Fascist government, they might do something about the situation."

Richard Stanton, 17, who lives at 1517 Fort Davis Street SE., concurred with the view. Stanton, treasurer of the Spanish Club, said he was greatly surprised at the actions of the diplomats.

"The Argentinians who claim to be diplomats must be getting pretty lonesome and desperate for evidence to show their Fascist government what a great job they are doing over here, if they have to use a group of uninitiated high school students to prove that the Argentine dictatorship has friends in this country," Stanton said.

Another student, Patricia Joyce, 17, of 210 Rhode Island Avenue NE., said the Argentinians were attempting to use Washington school children to convince youngsters of like age in Argentina of the popularity the Latin-American dictatorship has gained here. Said she:

"They tried this trick so they could convince students in their own country who have so admirably opposed the dictatorship, that the Hitler-like Buenos Aires government has friends here. American students are opposed to Fascism in all its forms."

In conclusion I desire to compliment the members of the subcommittee who gave this subject their careful, comprehensive, and fair analysis and were very interested in the operations of the O. W. I. I think it is only proper that it be said to the credit of the Committee on Appropriations and particularly the subcommittee dealing with the Office of War Information, that they have given a very fair appraisal of the operations of the O. W. I. and have made a profound study of its functions and have accorded to its officials adequate opportunity to present their case and have shown their willingness and desire to cooperate with the Army and Navy and the whole Government program in affording to the Office of War Information adequate help and in their recommendation of appropriation, though cut \$6,000,000 below the estimate. In my judgment, the committee has done an excellent job, and I desire to compliment the subcommittee who have been handling this situation for the painstaking work which they have so well performed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] such time as he may require.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I have asked for this time in order to enter a protest against the inclusion in this bill of the appropriation for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. I understand the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] will offer a motion to strike this provision from the bill. I strongly favor the Tarver amendment to be offered and I hope very much that it will prevail.

This agency was established and its duties were outlined by Executive Orders, 8802 and 9346. The Congress has never passed any law to do this. In my humble opinion, it is causing more trouble and creating more discord in this country than anything else I know of. Persons in high places in this Government have repeatedly pursued a course with reference to our race relations which can have no other result than to bring on trouble and strife at a time when our people should be united behind the war effort. Any move which divides our people during the progress of this war can only hurt the war effort.

The Communists and other radical groups are taking advantage of the war to push to the front their own economic and social theories. These groups, aided and counseled by persons in the Government, are using this very Committee on Fair Employment Practice as their chief vehicle for undermining the economic and social fabric of this Nation and especially the South. If this committee, set up by Executive order, is sanctioned in this bill, it may undertake to control employment in every establishment in this Nation. What the end will be, nobody can prophesy. When the time comes that this committee in Washington, created by Executive order, and not by Congress, can reach into the businesses and perhaps the schools, and even the homes of the Nation and tell us

whom we can employ and whom we cannot employ, that is a great step toward dictatorship, and worst of all, the dictatorship of the minority.

I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that this so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee has in its Washington office 48 people, 35 of whom are of the colored race. I noticed reports from Dallas, Tex., a few days ago to the effect that this committee operating out of Washington had even told newspapers in Dallas that they could not use the word "colored" where some person in Dallas had advertised for colored workers only.

Mr. Chairman, this question is certainly one of the most serious issues presented to our Nation in many a year. It aims a dagger right at the heart of the South. Knowing the activity of Communists and other radicals who are pushing this, Southern Members of Congress cannot in good conscience support it. I repeat, it can only bring discord and trouble when we sorely need harmony in this Nation. The South is doing its best in the war effort. Our sons and daughters are in the services, our farmers are working long hours, our industries have been largely free from strife, and our people out of their meager resources are buying bonds and making every contribution to the war effort. This scheme can have no other effect than to bring keen resentment among our people. I warn the Members of this House that you will make a serious mistake if you undertake to put this over on the people. I would that you would stop and think before you do that. You are embarking upon upon a dangerous course. Now is the time for calm judgment to prevail.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] 15 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has just made a very potent argument. He usually and uniformly does. I was delighted with that speech because his argument was so perfectly applicable to the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee, and leads forcibly to the conclusion that no money should be appropriated for that infamous outfit. The gentleman is so honest and so sincere that I am sure he is also against this iniquitous F. E. P. C., and will, at the proper time, vote to cut out also that duplication of existing agencies. That is another scalp that he may add to his collection. So I am delighted that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has already come to our side of the issue and has so ably espoused it.

Today I am going to exercise the temerity again to address you in a rather serious vein with respect to some of the fundamentals of government. I hope that I may have your ears, and not only your ears but your minds as well, for the few minutes that I shall endeavor to hold your attention.

Particularly I beg to address my remarks to my friends, and they are my friends, as every Member of this House is, my friends on the Republican side of the aisle. I would, if I may, call your attention to the fact that your forefath-

ers and mine in the debates in the Constitutional Convention, time and time and time again, stressed these two points: First, that this was to be a government of laws and not of men; and second, that this Government would be imperiled to the point of absolute certainty of destruction if we allowed it to become a bureaucracy with all power centralized in Washington; so that the Government of the people, for the people, and by the people would be taken from the people and would inevitably perish from the earth. That was the burden of 4 months' debate. These founding fathers were certainly great men. They were pre-eminent in their wisdom, character, and patriotism. When they harped on those two warnings, they were not talking to themselves alone, nor to their generation, but also to those patriots of posterity who would love the United States enough to heed these injunctions and thus preserve this Nation as the land of the free, and the home of the brave.

Now then, what do we have here? An appropriation of a half million dollars to approve and maintain a national agency created not by law, but by man. Another bureaucracy added to the number of those that now make the people weary in well doing. With constitutional sanction? Oh, no.

There is not a word—not one word—I reiterate, not one word in the Constitution that even approaches justification for the creation of this committee. I hoped that some of you who favor this F. E. P. C. appropriation might challenge me on that, but you do not. You know I speak the truth.

Would some like to suggest the thirteenth amendment? The thirteenth amendment relates solely to slavery. Human slavery was thereby damned, and we all, with one accord, thank God that that curse and blot upon our civilization is gone forever. But that is no authority for this committee. The thirteenth amendment states that no man should be compelled to work. This is the reverse, that he must be compelled to work if he has the proper color of skin, the proper religion, or is of proper national origin. In other words, that, in itself, is almost a violation of the thirteenth amendment. What the F. E. P. C. is seeking is to make their pets work whether they are fitted to work, or not, and whether, or not, they are qualified for the jobs into which they are forced.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the brilliant and distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman for his compliment. I want to point out to the gentleman that an examination of the record of the F. E. P. C. will disclose that there is no such activity as compelling anybody to work. What the record will show is that the committee has confined itself to only one activity, that is to prevent discrimination in employment against anyone because of race, color, or creed. As for authority in the Constitution, the gentleman will find ample authority in the fourteenth amendment, for when you de-



prive a person of employment you are certainly depriving him of fundamental rights without due process of law, when you deprive him of employment because of his race, his color, or his creed.

Further than that, I am sure the gentleman will bear in mind that the F. E. P. C. was set up in the war emergency period. It is a part of the war program. It was set up primarily to promote the war program. Consequently it comes under the war powers of the President. I go further and say that there is ample authority in peacetime under the fourteenth amendment, and particularly under the enforcement clause of the fourteenth amendment.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman for that splendid contribution. He is right in one assertion, that the F. E. P. C. does not make anyone work. He might have added that they do not expect their pets to work, nor care whether their protégés earn their pay or not. Far be it from me, a country boy from Alabama, to disagree with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] on that point. But I do believe, and I submit in all candor, that I know a great deal more about the operation of F. E. P. C. than does the gentleman. I have seen its work in the field. I asked no questions of any partisan, pro or con. I have seen it with my own eyes. I know whereof I speak. I have shuddered at the manifestations of its arrogance, ignorance, and race prejudice against Caucasians in Alabama and elsewhere.

The gentleman says that the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution gives ample authority for the creation and work of the F. E. P. C. I welcome the opportunity this gives me to try to answer such a contention; I am delighted to do so, and in all humbleness, because I understand the gentleman is an authority on the subject, but I simply wish to advance some arguments in opposition.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. My point is this: The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has just stated that under the war powers, which is a vague and indefinite field, the President had the power and the right to issue his Executive order establishing this commission. Our distinguished Attorney General says that under an accumulation of powers, whatever that means, he has the power to do certain things. I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, if either under an accumulation of powers or under the war powers the President has any right to establish something that is not constitutionally and legislatively proper?

Mr. HOBBS. I think the gentleman's question must be answered with an emphatic negative. I think he is absolutely right in the argument that he makes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If the gentleman will be kind enough to yield once more.

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly, sir, for a question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman, but I think both the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Illinois agree on a supposition or on a hypothesis which is not founded either in fact or in law.

Mr. HOBBS. We are delighted to have your frank expression of that opinion, but we will attempt to disabuse your mind of it as we go along. The fourteenth amendment!

The gentleman might just as well cite the code of Hammurabi. The fourteenth amendment no more justifies the creation and the practices of the F. E. P. C. than it fixes the price of eggs on Mars. What does the fourteenth amendment say? Its pertinent parts, so far as the gentleman's argument is concerned, read as follows:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction, the equal protection of the laws. \* \* \* The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

The prohibitions of the fourteenth amendment relate solely to State action. Except to the blind, and there are none so blind as those who will not see, all may see at a glance that the fourteenth amendment relates solely to how the States must function. No prohibition therein contained applies to the Government of the United States nor to any department, agency, or agent thereof. No one except the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] even suggests that any State has done anything discriminatory; nor that any State has made or enforced any law that might abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor that any State has sought to deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor that any State has sought to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. So, since no State has been accused of any wrongdoing, there can be no possibility of any justification for the pending legislation on the theory that Congress has power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of the fourteenth amendment.

The gentleman's citation of the fourteenth amendment, therefore, reminds me of the story of a colored man who had a marvelous gift of prevarication, stimulated and implemented by a most vivid imagination. He came back from a wildcat hunt telling of a rabbit who climbed a tree and hurled himself into the face of a pursuing wildcat. One of his hearers remarked, "Why, Uncle George, you know rabbits don't climb trees." To this Uncle George replied, "Yas; I knows that rabbits don't climb trees, but this 'un was in sech a tight place he was jes' obleeged to."

Similarly the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] was in a tight place, having been challenged to cite any

constitutional authority whatsoever in support of the creation or practices of the F. E. P. C., so he was "jes' obleeged" to say something, and in his confusion he cited a part of the Constitution as foreign to the question at issue as it is for a rabbit to climb a tree or attack a wildcat.

Even if there were any pretense that any State had violated any provision of the fourteenth amendment—which there has not been and cannot be—the only possible application even by a tortured construction would be that the failure to employ someone considered for employment constituted a deprivation of property without due process of law.

Had the gentleman cited that clause of the fifth amendment which reads, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law," his citation would have been more nearly in point than his citation of the fourteenth amendment, which is utterly pointless in this connection. But under either citation the argument as to deprivation of property because of a failure to employ is utterly untenable.

Whoever heard of a job in expectancy, which one has never had, being called his property? There is no one, not even the distinguished gentleman from New York, on second thought, who would make such a foolish contention. It is absolutely unsound and preposterous. There never has been a hint of such a theory in the history of jurisprudence. If I have a job and you take it away from me, then there may be a question of my property right in that job; but no such question could possibly arise as to a property right in a mere hope of future employment.

However, I agree with you fully that discrimination is being practiced daily as to employment. It is being fomented and practiced by the infamous outfit known as the F. E. P. C. It is not being practiced against the ones you would serve, sir; not against the Negro; not against any whose skin pigmentation, nor race, nor creed makes them beloved in your eyes. It is being fomented and practiced against Caucasians—native-born American citizens, the bulk of our taxpayers. These are they who are being discriminated against in two very material ways every day that the F. E. P. C. is allowed to function. In the first place, they are ousting those who have the misfortune, in their eyes, to have a white skin, from employment that they already have. In the second place, they are discriminating against them because of the fact that they will not give them jobs, so that they may discriminate in favor of those who consort with and fawn upon, for obvious reasons.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will not yield any further. I want to make my own speech. If, when I have finished, I have not consumed my allotted time I will yield gladly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I challenge the gentleman to give a single illustration.

Mr. HOBBS. Oh, you cannot find one in New York, but you can if you go to the war plants.

It is the practice of this Fair Employment Practice Committee to prevent white people from obtaining jobs, and to get white people ousted from jobs they have, so as to make places for their pets.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean that this committee is promoting dislodgment of white citizens from their jobs?

Mr. HOBBS. Why, of course, sir.

Mr. TABER. And that as a result of it they have no jobs? Has the gentleman illustrations of that? I wish you would give them, because I think the House ought to have them.

Mr. HOBBS. I not only have illustrations of it, but I have seen it with my own eyes. The displacement of anybody they can, whose ouster would make room for a pet.

An illustration of the functioning of the F. E. P. C. is in the case of the Dallas Morning News, a privately owned newspaper published in Dallas, Tex. This newspaper desired to employ a helper in its plant and printed an advertisement in its newspaper which read as follows: "Wanted—Colored man to work at night as paper handler. Essential industry." The regional director of the F. E. P. C. wrote the Dallas Morning News a letter with reference to this advertisement from which the following quotation is taken:

The Committee on Fair Employment Practice, operating under Executive Order No. 9346, a copy of which is attached, considers that such advertisement is a violation of the order. It limits applications to a narrow field described in the advertisement, and automatically bars persons of other race or color from applying, even though these latter may also possess skill needed for your establishment. You are therefore requested to take immediate steps to remove from this and from any other advertisement for employees any features which are discriminatory as to race, creed, color, and nationality. You are further requested to advise your personnel office or hiring agent that they should disregard such specifications in considering applications for employment. This includes the United States Employment Service.

This is important because it appears to be a sincere effort on the part of the regional director to prevent the exclusion of members of the Caucasian race from an opportunity for employment. Of course the regional director overstepped the bounds of his authority because the advertiser offering employment was a privately owned newspaper and not yet within the control of the F. E. P. C., but he shows that his intention was good. He really tried to prevent even a minor discrimination against the Caucasian race. However, when the newspaper resented this unwarranted intrusion into the field of private employment, the chairman of the F. E. P. C. rebuked the regional director for exceeding his authority because private employment was beyond the control of the F. E. P. C. So, the only case that has come to light, as far as I know, in which anyone in the F. E. P. C. tried to

prevent discrimination against members of the Caucasian race, died aborning.

A glaring illustration of discrimination against members of the Caucasian race is right here in the District of Columbia. There are in the Capital of our Nation, hundreds of perfectly well qualified citizens of the United States who might have been employed in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds. Nevertheless, if my information be correct, there is not a single employee in that office who is not a Negro.

Information is current that directives issued in aid of the Executive orders under which the F. E. P. C. was created and is functioning, require that the percentage of Negroes employed in any office must equal the percentage of Negroes in the population of the community. The percentage of Negroes of the total population of the District of Columbia is not yet 100 percent, nor is it 100 percent of those who constitute the citizenship of the District of Columbia.

Similarly the Executive orders under which the F. E. P. C. was created and is functioning deal only with employment and seek to prevent discrimination solely by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin. But it is said that some of the directives require that there be no segregation among employees. The basis of the Executive orders is recited to be the desirability of promoting the fullest utilization of all manpower by maximum employment. Does this objective make imperative the abolition of segregation of those already employed? Does compulsory intermingling of employees promote the war effort? Even where all persons concerned prefer segregation? Or would the tendency be in the opposite direction?

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I would like to make my own speech. I do not mean to say that you gentlemen could not make a better one.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say that the gentleman from Alabama and other Members of the House need not get excited over the fact that the reason why Americans are discriminated against by this Communist bunch, known as the F. E. P. C., is because the white Americans are in hopeless minority on that conglomerate committee.

Mr. HOBBS. Let me call attention to the premises upon which the Executive order creating the F. E. P. C. is predicated:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes, and as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy—

With confidence I challenge anybody to point out one syllable or one word of such authority that he has, either as President of the United States or as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. His duties as President are clearly indicated in the Constitution, but there is not one of them that authorizes the creation of the F. E. P. C., either expressly or by implication, I submit, most humbly and respectfully. The Commander in Chief of the Army and

Navy has the duty to command the Army and Navy which the Congress, and the Congress alone, is, under the Constitution, authorized to create and maintain.

Be this as it may, it is not the words of the Executive orders as much as it is the maladministration thereunder that causes so much opposition. There is discrimination shown in our national employment picture, but it is not against but in favor of race, creed, or color—differing from that of the majority of our citizens. The majority of us are taxpayers and therefore interested in efficiency. These Executive orders are being administered so as to force employment of members of spoiled and petted minorities, wholly without regard to qualification.

There is only one question here involved. It is not whether or not we favor a fair, square deal to all alike, nor whether or not the F. E. P. C. should have been established, but whether or not we are going to make an appropriation of \$500,000 to keep the F. E. P. C. functioning for the next fiscal year.

Of course, this is legislation tacked on to an appropriation bill. This is contrary to the rules of the House and unpardonable. It should be rebuked and defeated.

A country carpenter, whom most of us worship as God, once asked a question so full of divine wisdom that no one ever thought an answer was necessary: "Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?"

If any one of you doubts that the F. E. P. C. has produced a crop of thorns and thistles, then you just simply do not know what has been going on.

And it is not by the claims in catalogs but "by their fruits ye shall know them."

The Executive order under which the F. E. P. C. operates proclaims the purpose for which it was created to be:

To promote the fullest utilization of all available manpower and to eliminate discriminatory employment practices; " \* \* \* the successful prosecution of the war demands the maximum employment of all available workers, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin;" \* \* \* It is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the war effort by all persons in the United States, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

These proclamations would require the fullest utilization, the maximum employment, and the full participation in the war effort of "all available manpower," "workers," and "of all persons in the United States, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin," and regardless also of health, education, skill, aptitudes, abilities, or the lack of any one or all of them.

You search in vain for any requirement or suggestion that any consideration should be given as to the particular job to be done or of ability to do it. No honest, fair, and conscientious discrimination based on these considerations must be taken into account. The injunction is clear and mandatory that there must be no discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin, but as silent as death on the subject of



qualification, or its lack. There is unutilized manpower; so stenographic places must be filled, whether or not those employed can write, spell, take shorthand notes, or use a typewriter. Of course, one who could not write, take dictation, or use a typewriter might be perfectly qualified to do some other work well, but such a person should be discriminated against when hiring a stenographer. One might be doing nothing in aid of the war effort, but unless qualified that person should be discriminated against when hiring an accountant. One who cannot read might be flattered by being employed as a proofreader, and might need the salary, but such a person ought not to be employed for such a job. If you are not a carpenter, you are not entitled to a carpenter's job or pay. The same is true as to every other job requiring a particular skill. However, according to the F. E. P. C., if there are in a community 10 Negroes out of each 100 persons, then 10 percent of those employed in each category of employment must be Negroes, regardless of every consideration save the color of their skins.

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

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

Mr. HOBBS. Thank you, sir. I want to call your attention to one point further: There is no policy of Government except established in one of two ways: It may arise, as this one has arisen, from the innate character of the American people—we believe in a square deal, a square deal to all without any question of race, creed, color, or origin, we believe that everyone should have an absolutely square deal. That is one source of policy; the other way, and the only other way, that it can arise is from the law or the Constitution. I challenge any man to dispute it; these are the only ways policy can come into being. But if there were policy it would not be in the discretion of the President, either as such or as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to enforce it by a committee created without constitutional or statutory authority.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I shall be so happy to yield.

Mr. ELMER. What is bothering me and what I want to know is whether if these two Executive orders, No. 8802 and No. 9346, are not upheld by Congress are we going to lose the war?

Mr. HOBBS. We not only are not going to lose the war because of any such action, but we may help the enemy if we do not. Not that any such idea was intended, but because of maladministration by the F. E. P. C. the results have proven divisive, and destructive of morale of our whole people.

Both major political parties have from time immemorial each had in their platforms in various and sundry wordings the same outcry against bureaucracy, the same pledges to cut it down, the same pledges of economy. I certainly welcome the test of whether we mean it or not.

Do we mean that our platforms are like railway coach platforms, just something to get in on? Or do we really mean to curb bureaucracy? Do we mean to economize? If there be any law to be enforced, why not leave its enforcement to the Department of Justice, for the maintenance of which we appropriate \$116,000,000 a year? Or to the three other agencies now functioning and charged with the duty of enforcing laws requiring that no discrimination in employment practices be permitted? Why should we countenance the continuance of the F. E. P. C. when the Department of Labor, the Labor Division of the War Production Board, the Public Welfare Division of the Bureau of Public Health, and the Department of Justice—all four—already enforce such laws? Why appropriate another half million dollars for the F. E. P. C. and its maladministration, creating discord, disunity, and worse?

We are not inveighing against law enforcement but against extravagant and confusing duplication of agencies to do that single job, especially against the maintenance of that fifth agency which has proven itself an enemy fifth column, misconceiving, misinterpreting and bringing into disrepute and disgrace the laws and the Executive orders it was established to enforce.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I shall be delighted to yield, sir.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to the two major political parties; I assume he referred to the Republican and Democratic Parties.

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly did, sir.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Was he also including the New Deal Party, the Labor Party, the Communist and other parties that are not major parties?

Mr. HOBBS. As far as that is concerned I have never read a New Deal platform. I do not recognize any such party, except as a part of the Democratic Party. Nor have I ever read a platform of some of our other so-called parties.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I shall be delighted to, sir.

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

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

Mr. ROWE. I find from the figures in this report that available for the year 1944 was \$474,933 for this activity. The gentleman has just indicated that with the passage of this appropriation bill containing this item we would be giving legal aspect to a commission created by edict. Did we not do that when we appropriated the \$474,933 last year?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir; no such appropriation has ever been made. This is the first time authority or money has been asked of Congress for the F. E. P. C.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. What I am about to say, I do not say for the purpose of undermining the gentleman's prestige as a great constitutional authority. For all the years I have known the gentleman, however, I have found that despite the vehemence with which he has urged certain constitutional positions in this House, the Supreme Court of the United States has unfailingly disagreed with him; has disagreed with him time and time again.

Mr. HOBBS. I am perfectly cognizant of the fact, sir, that that is the gentleman's opinion; but I want to say to you, sir, that the Supreme Court has upheld far more of the constitutional positions I have taken than it has blasted. But whatever my experience in this regard may have been, I rarely have agreed with you, sir. So, no condemnation of me from any source may impair your standing as a constitutional lawyer. I will follow the gleam as I conscientiously see it, and will, without too much apprehension, take the verdict of the record.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time for the sole purpose of securing information from members of the Appropriations Committee in charge of this particular legislation. I have always been a great admirer of good campaign literature; in fact every man in public life who must go before the people to secure votes is constantly trying to secure the type of literature that will attract the attention of the people. Some years ago in my home county a man was running for the office of sheriff. There were several candidates. He felt quite secure that he would win the election, and it was in those days when candidates were allowed to pass out cigars. He was driving along the road on the edge of his county and he saw a large bunch of men threshing grain. He stopped and passed cigars around to those men. They all promised to vote for him. But when the votes were counted he got very few and he was wondering about the men down in that particular area where he had passed out so many cigars who had promised to vote for him and what happened to them. He went down there and talked to them and he found out they were living in another county.

A short time ago a friend of mine over in Algiers sent me a very interesting document. It was so intriguing that I felt I should bring it up here today and try to get some information about it from the chairman of the great Appropriations Committee, a man for whom I have the utmost respect and I know that he possesses the answers to my questions. This document that this friend in Algiers sent me consists of 20 pages and is entitled "Histoire de la vie de Franklin D. Roosevelt, President des Etats Unis," which translated means "History of the Life of Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States." It is written in French and, as I stated, consists of 20 pages, having

66 illustrations of the life, character, and progress made by our great President. It would be a splendid campaign document for any candidate for President. The back of it shows it was printed by the Government of the United States of America. While I cannot speak French, I can read it and understand it and the pictures are very good and very clear. So it is apparent it was sent over to Algiers and distributed among the French people over there for a certain definite purpose.

It would make a splendid campaign document for any man in this House who is running for office if he could afford to get out such a document about himself. I recognize it would not be possible for any man in the House to go to the expense of publishing a document of this kind due to the tremendous cost and also due to the shortage of paper in this country. I notice, too, that the same document is probably published in 27 different languages, so that you may have your choice of whatever language you want. I only have the French version that was published last year.

I would like to know from the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, as to whether or not this publication is one of the publications of the O. W. I. for which an additional \$20,000,000 is asked in appropriations at this time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unfortunately, I am not familiar with the publication, but I am gratified to hear the gentleman say it is interesting because that was why it was published, that is, to be interesting. I suppose it states there what the publishing authority is. The gentleman prefaced his remarks by saying he proposed to offer something political. This publication could not be political for the reason that it cannot be distributed among United States troops at home or abroad. It could not be distributed to anyone but these natives over there who will have no voice in any election in the United States. But it is exceedingly important that we have their interest, their good will, and cooperation. Of course, those who have lived under the forms of government they have in Europe attach great significance and importance to the head of the government. Their first inquiry is, who is the head of this friendly Government? And this book answers that question and numerous others which impress the local people and insure their good will.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman permit this observation? This is put out by the Government of the United States, and I assume that documents like this are covered in the appropriation for the O. W. I.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Documents of this character are essential to our program of local conciliation and good will. In the furtherance of that purpose we have published and distributed all sorts of things which might be of interest to the local people and which have resulted in securing their friendship and cooperation which has been of inestimable value, both in our conquest of these occupied countries and in our occupation after they are cleared of the enemy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have had letters which have been read in this House from the American commanders testifying to the helpful reaction resulting from the dissemination of this and similar literature.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The gentleman from Missouri has answered the question very well. I can now see the usefulness of this document depicting the life and character of the President of the United States. He also concedes that the additional \$20,000,000 that is asked for in the O. W. I. appropriation will be used to extend this service to people of the other countries of the world.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Only a part of it. The remainder will be invested in other materials and activities which prepare the way for our armed forces, save the lives of American soldiers and expedite the close of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the people of this country should know where their money is being spent and for what purpose. That is one reason why I brought this up today. I am not claiming this is being used for a campaign document in Africa.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman's story is all right but it is not applicable to this case because this candidate is running for President of the world. He is running for President all over the world as well as in the United States and that is why those things go over there.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can admit it is very valuable in that respect, but I would hesitate to express that opinion as to the purpose of it.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the pamphlet was transmitted to him by a member of the armed forces of the United States overseas?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It was a captain in the United States Army. I would not want to use his name because there might be difficulties for him.

Mr. TABER. Then it evidently must be distributed to the troops overseas under those circumstances.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He said they were found generally throughout Algiers where he secured this particular copy.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I wonder if the author of this pamphlet will clothe the naked

and feed the hungry in starving Europe also?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is worthy of consideration. I know the people in occupied countries want our soldiers to come over there and free them from the tyranny of dictators and bring food for the hungry.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I note the picture of the President on the front cover. Can the gentleman find a picture of Uncle Sam any place in the book or a picture of the American flag?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Here are the pictures.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman find a picture of Uncle Sam in there?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am not certain. There are 66 pictures in the publication—all of Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. JENSEN. It should be noted that the picture of Uncle Sam who we respect very much or at least used to have almost disappeared from all the bulletins and signboards put out by this administration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When we read this bill for amendment I think this is something that should receive the consideration of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, discussing this matter from a serious point of view—and it is only from a serious point of view that we can afford to discuss such vital matters—the book was not issued this year. It was issued last year. It was issued while the Germans were still in north Africa.

It was not issued to the soldiers either in Africa or in the United States. It was distributed to the local civilian population for the purpose of winning their friendship and support, and it worked so effectively that it was undoubtedly one of the factors in winning their friendship and their cooperation in the campaign which drove the Germans out of Africa. If the pamphlet referred to by the gentleman was sent back by a member of the armed forces it was captured or bought from some of the natives, as there was no other source. It was an effective weapon of warfare. It saved the lives of American soldiers, and it assisted us in the organization and maintenance of the campaign in which Allied troops drove Rommel from the last stronghold in north Africa.

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

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to open my remarks with the statement that when we visited the Office of War Information in New York and saw pamphlets on the wall we were confronted with a pamphlet with a picture of Mr. Dewey, the Governor of New York, which had been sent overseas by the O. W. I. Do not deride these remarks of mine as you did the statement concerning the



President of the United States. Some sit here in this deliberative body and ridicule the leadership of the greatest of nations. If that is not something for Hitler to publish, there is nothing that ought to be published in Germany.

I am not proud of what took place here a few minutes ago, and there is not a man in this House who is proud of it now. It cries for shame; shame for belittling the President of the greatest Nation in the world, and the forced laughing at the mention of his name in the Halls of the American Congress. If someone else did it there would be a first-class brawl on the highway, but we are so important to ourselves and so intoxicated with politics at this time that we fail to even stand upon that which is known as decency.

I have here pamphlets that the O. W. I. has sent across the ocean to various countries, printed in many languages; pamphlets concerning which I am proud.

Here is one that shows interest in the youth of America. It pictures a soldier wrapped in his country's cloth and taking in his arms the wife of a foreign land. If you want to ridicule it the privilege is yours. For my part, I hold it high depicting the humanitarian blood that flows in the veins of America.

Here is one that shows the leadership of America. You may be ashamed of it; I am proud of it.

Here is one that shows the making of a ship by the industrial genius of this Nation in 4 days, 15 hours, and 25 minutes. This pamphlet was passed out in many languages in many parts of the world. You may be ashamed of it; I am proud of it.

Here is one that shows the creation of the American bombers that are seeking to restore peace to the world. You may be ashamed of these pamphlets of America that O. W. I. sends across the seas; I am proud of them, and I want the pride that I have for them printed boldly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am proud of this pamphlet exemplifying our ships: where they go, what they do, and of the story that will be written in history because of their performance. You may be ashamed of it, but I am proud of it; and I hope that that, too, will be recorded.

I hold in my hand a copy of Signal, a German publication, tearing apart American ideals. We have put out the counter publication—Victory. Perhaps you are proud of these German generals. I am not, but I am proud of the children of the United States of America and this publication depicting child life in America, put out by O. W. I.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, here is a picture of boys in Boy Scout uniforms singing God Bless America. You may be ashamed of it; I am proud of it.

Here is a story relating to the health of our children and the care which we give them. You may be ashamed of it, but I am proud of it.

Here is a boy who glories in the fact that he can play without hindrance, not under the Hitler Youth Movement, but in the freedom of the schoolyard of America. I am proud that that picture can be sent all over the world showing our interest as a nation in our children.

Oh, these pages are pregnant with everyday scenes in America; not pregnant with political chaos, but pregnant with facts and upright dealings of Americans with their own people, by which we seek to tell our story to the world.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on. No one is so unmindful as to be carried away with the type of hatred that has been shown here today making the O. W. I. the annual whipping boy in this body, for the facts will become known to the American people when these publications are brought to their door.

It was the action of this House that prevented domestic distribution and authorized the little sticker upon every one of these pamphlets. The little sticker reads: "Restricted. This publication is not for distribution in the United States."

Why? Because some were afraid even in these war days—victims of political fear. Afraid that the facts should be known in America of the good will, of the idealism, and of the determination of this country of ours to serve the downtrodden peoples of the world.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the item in this bill providing an appropriation of \$500,000 for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, and I reserve the right to vote against the entire bill if this item is left in the bill. In the first place, there is no legal authority for such a committee. Congress has never authorized such a committee and has never appropriated any funds for such a committee. It is a dangerous procedure for Congress to appropriate money for an agency never authorized by Congress and it is setting a dangerous precedent.

In the next place this so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee is not in fact a fair employment practice committee but rather a committee to discriminate against fair labor practices in favor of special groups and to attempt to enforce upon the people of this country social equality among the white and Negro races and other radical theories that are foreign to the standards and beliefs of the people of this country.

I am submitting for insertion in the RECORD at the close of this address a list of employees of the F. E. P. C. and the salaries they are getting. I understand that over two-thirds of those listed are Negroes. This within itself is rank discrimination, for upon its face it is absurd to talk about fair practices by a committee composed of two-thirds Negroes when Negroes compose only one-tenth of the population of this country. Negro domination of this nature is both unfair and intolerable.

Furthermore, I call attention to memorandum furnished by the Civil Service Commission, which I also have inserted, showing average salaries of F. E. P. C. employees to be \$3,015.40 against average salaries of all Government employees of \$2,000. This cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called fair practice but is rank discrimination.

So it can be seen that this unauthorized committee has been initiated under conditions of rank discrimination and operates without legal authority under conditions that carry with them every element of prejudice and discrimination.

I have had opportunity to investigate some of the activities of this F. E. P. C. group, and I refer you to the hearings held before the Special Committee of the House to Investigate Executive Agencies of the Government. The record clearly shows that they are attempting to run roughshod over established labor practices and in utter disregard of working agreements which have through the years been proven to be satisfactory to employers, employees, and the public. I call particular attention to the hearings before our committee on complaints filed by employees of the Philadelphia Transportation Co. I call your attention to the fact that it was the employees, the laborers, who filed this complaint in protest of the orders issued by the F. E. P. C. Similar complaints were filed by employees of 14 southern railroads, and by employees of the United States War Shipping Administration, and others. It was clearly demonstrated that the F. E. P. C. is attempting to force upon our people working arrangements among employees which would break down the satisfactory formulas and agreements that have been proven sound and practicable through the years; force the public to accept Negroes in places of tremendous responsibility, such as engineers on passenger trains, cause general dissatisfaction and unrest among both laborers and the public; and, worst of all, make it possible for administrative officers to force upon laborers and workmen a condition of social equality.

During our hearings a witness called attention to the fact that under F. E. P. C. regulations a Negro could have been engineer upon the engine pulling a passenger train which ran into another passenger train on the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, killing and injuring many passengers several weeks ago. What would have been the public reaction had the trains involved in this wreck been under the operation of Negroes?

This is only one typical illustration of the terrible consequences which can so easily result from some of the foolish ideas this irrational group is trying to put into effect.

Yet here is a proposal to appropriate \$500,000 to this group, who have no legal standing, for them to use in promoting their absurd and dangerous theories, stirring up unrest and bitterness and confusion among our people at a time when we are in the most terrible war in our history and when we should be doing all within our power to keep harmony and unity here at home.

There is no justification for the existence in our Government of any such unfair and discriminatory agency as the Fair Employment Practice Committee and this Congress should not appropriate 1 red penny for the support of any such committee.

There has been much said on the floor of this House and throughout the length and breadth of our country during recent months to the effect that our Federal Government is rapidly being transformed from a government of laws to a government of men. That such a condition prevails and that such thoughts exist among our people can no doubt be attributed to a large degree to the national crisis which confronts our country and to the terrible war which is now raging throughout the length and breadth of the universe.

I think that everyone will agree that under such trying conditions when we are being taxed to the utmost both in manpower and material resources in a titanic struggle against a powerful and aggressive enemy, it is necessary that the people delegate to their duly elected representatives powers and authority which are extraordinary in nature and beyond anything that the people would think of doing during normal, peaceful times. This has always been true in periods of grave national crisis when our Nation has been engaged in bloody warfare. In fact it appears from the very nature of the office of the President of the United States wherein he is not only the Chief Executive but also the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, that it was contemplated by the founding fathers that such extraordinary powers would be designated to, but not assumed by, him.

It has never been contemplated, however, that those in places of authority should take advantage of extraordinary conditions or use the extraordinary powers granted under these abnormal conditions to create such agencies as the F. E. P. C. or to place into effect theories of government or social and economic doctrines that are either revolutionary in character or foreign to the established principles and practices of our people.

It is, therefore, of greatest importance that those in places of authority under these abnormal conditions remain true and faithful to the ideals and to the political, social and economic philosophies which underlie our civilization and which have long prevailed among our people.

If the vicissitudes of war require to a degree a government of men rather than of laws then the greatest care should be exercised in the selection of the men who are to constitute such a government and who are to direct the affairs of our country during such times, and in providing funds for them.

It is well known that there are groups in this country who do not believe in our American system of free enterprise or our American standards of civilization and who have been preaching and promoting their theories and their doctrines for many years. It is not right nor fair

to the American people for men of such beliefs to be placed in key positions in our executive departments or agencies or to take advantage of any official position to which they may have been advanced during this period of grave national emergency to attempt to fasten their beliefs and their doctrines upon this Nation. Neither is it fair to make public funds available to them for these purposes.

Likewise, there are those in this country, as is well known to all of us, who do not believe in the social standards and customs of our civilization and who have been advocating and preaching a communistic doctrine of social equality among the races in this country for many years. It is not right for those of such beliefs to be elevated to positions of authority where they cannot only attempt but do force upon the American public their beliefs and doctrines or compel the individual citizen employed in essential war work to live in a condition of social equality while engaged in such employment. Neither should they be permitted to draw one penny salary from the Public Treasury.

Such official practices not only result in the planting of the seeds of discord and strife which will bear horrible fruits in the years to come, but at the same time strike a note of discord here on the home front. This tends to betray the confidence and trust of the American public and the men fighting in our behalf and to offer a grave stumbling block to our efforts at home to present a united front to our enemies.

I feel it my duty as a Member of this Congress to do everything within my power in support of the war and in preventing discord and dissension here at home, and in my opinion one of the effective ways of doing this is to bring to light any activities on the part of any public officials tending to harass our people and to cause unrest among those engaged in vital war activities and to attempt to keep them off the public pay roll.

There has recently been brought to my attention as a member of the Smith committee, which is investigating the activities of executive agencies, a glaring instance of this very nature, and it is my purpose here now to briefly set out some of the circumstances and to name some of the officials involved.

The particular case which brought this matter to my attention was a complaint filed by a group of laborers employed by the United States Maritime Commission in manning ships which are sailing with vital cargoes on the seven seas. This group of laborers, through the Seamen's International Union, made complaint to our committee that officials who have charge of supplying members of crews for the ships were engaged in a conscious attempt to force seamen to intermingle both in sleeping and eating arrangements on board the ships regardless of race or color. Living quarters on these ships are such that the members of the respective crews have to sleep in adjoining bunks, use the same facilities, live

in the same rooms and quarters and eat at the same tables. The conditions were made such as to force the members to commingle in a state of social equality.

The evidence is that it is not necessary to force such conditions upon members of crews in order to supply ample manpower.

There has been set up by Executive order without any legal authorization of any nature whatsoever, a committee known as the Fair Employment Practice Committee. This committee has issued regulations providing that men should be employed without regard to race, color or creed, and these regulations are supposed to be applied by the various Government agencies.

Craig S. Vincent was employed by the War Shipping Administration at a salary of \$7,500 per year. At that time the War Shipping Administration was experiencing no difficulty in providing crews to man the ships and insofar as I have been able to learn was not attempting to enforce the Fair Employment Practice Committee's recommendations where such employment would result in placing mixed crews of whites and Negroes on ships against the wishes of either the operators or the members of the crews themselves. Mr. Vincent, however, decided that special instructions should be issued by the War Shipping Administration calling for the strict enforcement of these regulations. He was then transferred to the official position as regional director of the recruitment and manning organization of the War Shipping Administration for the entire Atlantic coastal area which included the Port of Savannah, Ga., which I have the honor to represent in Congress. Among his duties is that of furnishing men for the crews of the ships of the War Shipping Administration when called upon to do so. In the course of the hearings upon the complaint filed by the representatives of the seamen to the effect that the checkboarding system of furnishing members of crews was forcing a condition of social equality among the white and Negro members of the crews against their wishes, Mr. Vincent was brought before the committee. In his testimony Mr. Vincent frankly stated that he believed in social equality among the whites and the Negroes. He further stated that he believed that the regulations or instructions which he himself recommended that the Maritime Commission put into effect which resulted in the checkboarding of the crews or the employment of both Negro and white members of the crews irrespective of whether or not such employment brought about a living condition of social equality against the will of the employer or the members of the crews should be enforced.

It is evident that the complaints filed with the committee are the direct result of Mr. Vincent forcing these men who are engaged in this vital and hazardous work of undertaking the manning of the crews of our ships to accept his belief in social equality of whites and blacks ir-



respective of their own personal views and beliefs.

This was further emphasized by the fact that other officials in this particular branch of the Maritime Commission activities stated before the committee that they made exceptions to the rules and regulations when they deemed it in the interest of the service to do so; thus it can be clearly seen that Mr. Vincent could have made exceptions so as not to force this condition of social equality upon these laborers had he cared to.

A further inquiry into Mr. Vincent's record and background, included a comprehensive personnel report upon him which was made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation which is some 60 pages in length. This report shows him as having belonged at one time or another to a number of organizations which have been defined by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive in nature, including the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, the American League for Peace and Democracy, and the Washington Book Shop.

All of these facts were brought to the attention of Marshall Dimock, Assistant Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, and other high officials of the War Shipping Administration. Mr. Dimock was present at the hearings held by our committee when Mr. Vincent freely admitted on the witness stand that he believes in social equality between the whites and blacks and that he believes that the regulations of the Fair Employment Practice Committee should be rigidly enforced even though such enforcement compels the members of the crews of the ships to live in a condition of social equality against their will.

It was further brought out in the hearing that this man, Vincent, had for a period of several months drawn two salaries for two separate and distinct official positions and that when this was brought to the attention of the proper officials it took the Government approximately 8 months to secure a repayment from him for the amounts due the Government.

Mr. Dimock was later placed on the witness stand and questioned as to whether or not he believed Vincent should remain in his present position,

in view of his connection with subversive organizations, his social-equality views, and in view of his forcing his social-equality views on the laborers engaged in vital war activity.

In the face of all this evidence, Mr. Dimock boldly told the committee that he believed that Vincent should remain in his present position. Mr. Dimock even stated that in his opinion Mr. Vincent had been "stupid" and "naive" in answering questions asked him as to his beliefs of racial, social equality.

In spite of the fact that the checkerboarding or intermingling of the members of the crews of the ships on the basis of social equality achieved by means of the activities of Vincent and his subordinates has resulted, according to the testimony of union officials in many labor disturbances aboard the ships of the merchant marine and in some cases to the actual delay of ships carrying vital materials of war.

This is a clear case of an individual given unusual powers and authority during the period of emergency attempting to put into effect social doctrines which have heretofore been entirely foreign to our American standards of civilization, and the man who is doing this has been declared by his superior officer as one of those Government officials considered by his superiors as indispensable. But Mr. Vincent himself admitted before the committee that there are those within his own acquaintance who could fill the job which he now fills.

This is a clear illustration of some of the things that are going on behind the curtain and some of the efforts that are being made by men in places of authority today through the F. E. P. C. to take advantage of the American people and of the men who are fighting the battles of our country, to bring into effect social and economic practices that are not only foreign to the ideals and beliefs of the American people but are destructive of the very heritage which we cherish so greatly and for the preservation which our men are now fighting with all their might.

This condition has been brought by our committee to the attention of the War Shipping Administration, and the evidence given before our committee has

been made available to Mr. Vincent's superior officers.

Marshall Dimock, in defending Mr. Vincent in his beliefs and practices, in my opinion, is accepting and embracing these same beliefs and practices, and is in this manner doing his part toward sowing the seed of disunity and discord among our forces here at home.

Mr. Vincent is to be commended, at least, for being honest and frank in his testimony before our committee, but he should not continue in office. Unfortunately there are many others in places of similar importance who refuse to be so straightforward and who through their very acts of evasion give rise to fears of similar sinister motives.

There is hardly a Member of this House who has not at one time or another during the recent months found this attitude prevailing among men in high key positions.

The case of Mr. Vincent is only one case that we have been successful in bringing to light and uncovering some of the real schemes that are on foot during these dark days of trouble, wars, and bloodshed.

As I have stated, it is the duty of each of us to keep peace and harmony at home and to preserve here in our own midst the ideals and the concepts of human relations which our men in the fighting forces believe in and expect to find whole and intact when they return from the battlefields. I am, therefore, convinced that men who believe as Mr. Vincent believes should be immediately removed from the responsible places they hold during this emergency period and be replaced by honest, fearless, efficient American citizens who believe in our American civilization and who believe in the rights of the individuals of this country and who believe in our great system of free government as guaranteed by our Constitution.

Such irrational groups as those composing the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee should not be tolerated in the administration of our Government.

In my stand on this I believe that I reflect the views of the people I represent as well as the best interests of our country and all our people.

*President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, schedule of personnel, Dec. 27, 1943*

Name	Title	Grade	Race	Base pay
<b>Departmental:</b>				
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	CAF-16	White	\$10,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy chairman	CAF-14	Colored	6,500
Bourne, St. Clair T.	Information specialist	CAF-9	Colored	3,200
Wright, Barbara H.	Report reviewer	CAF-7	White	2,600
Alexander, Dorothy E.	Secretary	CAF-7	Colored	2,600
Clifton, N. Jeane	Clerk stenographer	CAF-5	Colored	2,000
Brooks, Mary E.	do	CAF-3	Colored	1,620
Whiting, Margaret B.	do	CAF-3	Colored	1,620
<b>Administrative:</b>				
Jones, Theodore A.	Administrative officer	CAF-13	Colored	5,600
Douglas, Lela M.	Chief, mail and files	CAF-5	Colored	2,000
Foggie, Harriet A.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	Colored	1,800
Welch, Selena E.	Clerk, file	CAF-3	Colored	1,620
Hollomon, Irving B.	do	CAF-2	Colored	1,440
Pinn, S. Pauline	do	CAF-2	Colored	1,440
House, Marguerite H.	do	CAF-2	Colored	1,440
Holland, Edna E. (Temporary)	do	CAF-2	Colored	1,440
Gamble, Jessie G.	do	CAF-2	Colored	1,500
Sturdivant, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-3	White	1,620
Mitchell, Regina B.	Clerk, file	CAF-2	Colored	1,440
Vashti, R. Curlin	Clerk-typist	CAF-3		1,620

President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, schedule of personnel, Dec. 27, 1943—Continued

Name	Title	Grade	Race	Base pay
<b>Operations:</b>				
Maslow, Will	Chief, operations (field)	CAF-13	White	\$5,600
Mitchell, Clarence M.	Associate director	CAF-12	Colored	4,600
Davidson, Eugene	Assistant director	CAF-12	Colored	4,600
Bloch, Emanuel	Senior fair practice examiner	CAF-12	White	4,600
Metzger, Stanley D.	do	CAF-12	White	4,600
Gregory, Robert H.	do	CAF-11		3,800
Houston, Theophilus J.	Assistant fair practice examiner	CAF-7	Colored	2,600
Blanche, Vida G.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	Colored	1,800
Rogers, Eleanor	do	CAF-3	Colored	1,620
McMillan, Lucille S.	do	CAF-3	White	1,620
Smith, Delphia	do	CAF-3	Colored	1,620
<b>Review and analysis:</b>				
Davis, John A.	Director, review and analysis	CAF-13	Colored	5,600
Lawson, Marjorie M.	Associate director	CAF-9	Colored	3,200
Golightly, Cornelius	Associate compliance analyst	CAF-7	Colored	2,600
Davis, Joy P.	Report reviewer	CAF-7	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia B.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	White	1,800
Simmons, Walter L.	do	CAF-3	White	1,620
Hemphill, India W.	Junior professional assistant	CAF-5	Colored	2,000
Coan, Carol	do	CAF-5	White	2,000
Dumas, Joan S.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-3	Colored	1,620
<b>Consultants:</b>				
Marvin C. Harrison (Term)	Consultant	CAF-14	White	8,000
George E. Hayes (Term)	do	CAF-14	Colored	8,000
<b>Legal:</b>				
Hubbard, Maceo W.	Hearing examiner	CAF-13	Colored	5,600
Trimble, Ernest G.	do	CAF-13	White	5,600
Crockett, George W., Jr.	do	CAF-13	Colored	5,600
Reeves, Frank D.	Attorney	CAF-9	Colored	3,200
Bass, Dorothy O.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-3		1,620
Gordon, Jerneviene M.	do	CAF-3	Colored	1,620

## REGIONAL OFFICES

<b>New York, N. Y.:</b>				
Lawson, Edward	Regional director	CAF-13	Colored	\$5,600
Jones, Robert	Associate fair practice examiner	CAF-9	Colored	3,200
Morand, Edward V.	do	CAF-9	White	3,200
Madison Sumner Jones, Jr.	do	CAF-9	Colored	3,200
Risk, Samuel	Assistant fair practice examiner	CAF-9	White	3,200
Souffront, Dennis	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	Colored	1,800
Irish, Miriam	do	CAF-4	Colored	1,800
Ashepa, Tillie	do	CAF-3	White	1,620
Lewis, Alfred Baker	Consultant	Without compensation		
Frisch, Ephraim	do	do		
<b>Philadelphia, Pa.:</b>				
Fleming, G. James	Regional director	CAF-12	Colored	4,600
Manly, Milo A.	Fair practice examiner	CAF-9	Colored	3,200
Greenblatt, Mildred	do	CAF-11	White	3,800
Gorgas, Helen P.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-3	White	1,620
Weitzman, Shirley	do	CAF-2	White	1,440
<b>Washington, D. C.:</b>				
Hook, Frank E.	Regional director	CAF-13	White	5,600
Evans, Joseph H.	Fair practice examiner	CAF-12	Colored	4,600
Huggins, Buell D.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-3		1,620
Chisolm, Ruby F.	do	CAF-3	Colored	1,620
<b>Cleveland, Ohio:</b>				
McKnight, William Thomas	Regional director	CAF-11	Colored	3,800
Clare, Lethia	Associate fair practice examiner	CAF-9	Colored	3,200
Bressman, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	White	1,800
Walker, Lillian B.	do	CAF-3	Colored	1,620
Nobleman, Bernice	Clerk-typist	CAF-2		1,440
King, Hortense M.	do	CAF-2		1,440
<b>Detroit, Mich. (sub):</b>				
Swann, Edward McCallan	Fair practice examiner	CAF-10	Colored	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R.	do	CAF-11	White	3,800
McClure, Catherine E.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-2	White	1,440
<b>Chicago, Ill.:</b>				
Henderson, Elmer W.	Regional director	CAF-12	Colored	4,600
Gibson, Harry H. O.	Fair practice examiner	CAF-9	Colored	3,200
Schultz, Joy	do	CAF-9	White	3,200
Zeldman, Penny M.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-3	White	1,620
Bell, Minnie L.	do	CAF-3	Colored	1,620
<b>Atlanta, Ga.:</b>				
Hunt, Bruce	Regional director	CAF-12	White	4,600
Hope, John H.	Fair practice examiner	CAF-9	Colored	3,200
Bunting, Myra	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	White	1,800
<b>Kansas City, Mo.:</b>				
Hoglund, Roy A.	Regional director	CAF-12	White	4,600
Brown, Theodore E.	Fair practice examiner	CAF-9	Colored	3,200
Anderson, Clara O.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-3	White	1,620
Groves, Lonnetta A.	Clerk-typist	CAF-2	Colored	1,440
<b>Dallas, Tex.:</b>				
Brin, Leonard	Regional director	CAF-12	White	4,600
Castenada, Carlos E.	Fair practice examiner	CAF-12	White	4,600
Williams, LeRoy V.	do	CAF-9	Colored	3,200
Guttenben, Willetta G.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-3	White	1,620
Dubose, Helen H.	do	CAF-2	White	1,440
<b>San Francisco, Calif.:</b>				
Kingman, Harry	Regional director	CAF-13	White	5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair practice examiner	CAF-11	Colored	3,800
Rogers, Jewell E.	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-3	White	1,620
Seymour, Virginia R.	do	CAF-4	White	1,800
<b>Los Angeles, Calif. (sub):</b>				
Brown, Robert E.	Fair practice examiner	CAF-11	Colored	4,000
Burke, Jack B.	do	CAF-11	White	3,800
Calvaruso, Helen	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	White	1,800
Vetter, Vera G.	do	CAF-2	White	1,440



Mr. Mitchell, of the Civil Service Commission, advises that the average salaries for United States Government employees are as follows:

Average over-all salaries.....	\$2,000.00
Average salaries civil-service employees (plus overtime).....	1,900.00
Average salaries civil-service employees (without overtime).....	1,700.00
Average salaries F. E. P. C. employees (without overtime).....	3,015.40

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I had asked for this time about a half hour ago. I had possibly a different purpose in mind. I do not know now whether I can help this situation very much. I am mindful of the position of the first-term man in this body. But I do not believe there is total right, nor has there been total right, on either side of the aisle in many of the debates that I have heard since I have been here. I have tried since I have been here, at the expense of not being understood, to do the things that I thought I had to do, without regard to my personal feeling with reference to the President of the United States or his desire to remain in office for more than two terms. I think it should be remembered that free government and parliamentary institutions depend upon rules and upon principles and not upon men. I said something at Jeffersonville, Ind., on Lincoln's Birthday, on February 12 this year, that I would like to repeat here.

I am worried about this country because it is composed of too many people who think the President of the United States can do no wrong, and too many people who think the President of the United States can do no right. If you continue to personalize causes in this country you are sowing the seed out of which social disorder and disruption have risen all over the surface of the earth.

If we are to make progress in America this is the body which must make it, or one of the bodies. The Congress of the United States must do it. We have been discussing the Fair Employment Practice Committee. I have introduced a bill to make that organization permanent. I say to you in all candor I think it should be permanent. But until we reach a point where we make these parliamentary institutions, this one and the other one, flexible so that we may put to debate and discussion these questions which are bothering us, then we have to put up with certain Executive orders. As long as we do that we are establishing a principle of Executive order, which I abhor, because our parliamentary bodies are not flexible enough to meet squarely the social and economic issues of our time. So that we rather create the situation, do we not, out of which these issues arise? We cannot avoid them. They are here. I am not unmindful of some of the situations. Why, gentlemen on this side of the aisle, my country was copperhead country in the Civil

War. It was almost equally divided. I know something of these problems.

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

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I would rather not.

Mr. BROOKS. May I just say to the gentleman, since he has alluded to that, we are not fighting the Civil War. We are fighting the Second World War. What we want to do is win this World War, and we want to win the war without distrust aid dissatisfaction, and dissension.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

I am very sorry the gentleman misunderstood me. What I was trying to say to the gentleman is that the people who live in my district are very much like the gentleman's people. They have very much the same prejudices and the same thinking. But I know that we cannot overcome those prejudices unless we face them. We cannot avoid these things unless we meet them. The same way with this question of attempting to personalize progress. May I say to my friends on the right of the aisle, and I think I have a right to say this, do not boast too much about your progressiveness and the things that you have produced, as long as you have to tie all of that progress to the identity of one person. If you have really imbued America with the progressive spirit that I think it needs to be imbued with, you would spend more time selling the principles in which you say you believe than riding in every 4 years on the coattails of one man. Progress will not be made, my friends, in that manner.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep humiliation and with a strong spirit of revolt that I had to witness before this body Thursday of this week what is to me one of the most pitiful spectacles that could ever cast a shadow over a body that should hold as sacred its responsibilities to the peoples of the world, and especially of this Nation. It is inconceivable to even remotely presume that such a thing could happen within these Halls while our boys are scattered over the many far-flung and bloody battle fronts of the world, with no voice in the total making over of our Government.

While they are fighting to maintain the stability of a God-given democracy we find ourselves faced with the condition that faces us now.

I gave to this body in a speech on April 14, 1944, the facts about this damnable set-up designated and known as the Fair Employment Practice Committee. I will not at this point go into further detail with regard to its warped and unreasonable organization and dictatorial operations. The philosophy behind this pitiful governmental set-up, which is even too low to be given the loathsome name of a bureau, of course, is of

communistic birth, which has no more place in the orderly procedure of American democracy than a jackass in grand opera. Its purpose is to play to the prejudice of both the white and colored races in an effort to generate and magnify hatred between the races for the sole purpose of laying the foundation for a revolt in this country if they are not successful in taking over the Government by what they term "peaceful means." I would like to warn this body that unless there is more courage displayed by the membership of this august body, a real revolt will never be necessary. We are fast slipping into a communistic state, and if this progress is not halted, we shall soon be totally swallowed up by the damnable philosophy of communism.

Mr. ELMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ELMER. Who is it that established this policy of communism in this matter you are talking about now?

Mr. GIBSON. If I were to call names, it would be a multitude of about five or six million people, and I do not have time to name all of them.

Mr. ELMER. Did all of the people establish these orders you are talking about?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not think they did.

Mr. ELMER. Who did establish them?

Mr. GIBSON. If you have not kept up with the progress of your Government well enough to know, then I decline to yield further.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Does the gentleman know the name of the one person who made this order which brought about this Board?

Mr. GIBSON. I will answer that question by asking the gentleman a question. Do you know?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Yes; I do.

Mr. GIBSON. Why do you ask me, then?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I just wanted to know if you knew.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, this committee and its effects transcend any purpose of any person in advocating equality of races. If it were true that there was not but one race in this country, then this committee and its operations would be totally out of place in a democracy. When you have a committee set up in Washington which can go into private business throughout the land and tell employers whom they can employ and whom they cannot, then you have reached heights which Hitler and Mussolini never surpassed.

I would like to bring to the attention of the membership of this House the fact that one Brin, regional director of this Committee in Texas, recently instructed the Dallas Times that it could not, in its want ads, carry an ad of the following substance: "Wanted: Colored man, paper handler to work at night." Such an ad was run by the Dallas Times and this

dictator notified them that they could not in the future carry such ads, that they would not be permitted to designate in any ad any color, and the one running the ad must receive and employ those responding without discrimination. When this same bigot was requested to give an interview to the press he declined with the statement, in substance, that he had instructions from Washington that he could not give an interview without first submitting the questions to Washington and getting the answers therefrom. Of course, he had to come to this central pool of power and let an organization of 48, 35 of whom are Negroes, tell him what he could say. I have heard of people not practicing what they preach, but he certainly does. He denies to the press and the public the right of a free press and of free speech and he himself surrenders his right to answer a civil question until a bunch of Negroes in Washington has told him what he can say. In all his power, he is a lion minus his roar.

It is inconceivable to me to see any man stand up and cast his ballot and raise his voice in approval of such a condition in what we have through the ages, with pride, referred to as free America. Could someone please tell me for what our boys are fighting and dying? To come back and see perished and gone the liberties they fought to preserve and a state of anarchy running wild?

There is one thing that the record bears out which I want to bring to the attention of the American public, and I hope it is not forgotten. This appropriation of \$500,000 of the taxpayers' money to continue and expand this un-American, filthy agency designated as the Fair Employment Practice Committee was placed in this bill and put before this body by a member of the Democratic Party. I hope that no citizen of the United States will forget that this thing was dragged in here, and under very questionable circumstances, by a man who belongs to the Democratic Party.

Regardless of the opinion you hold of the committee and the merits or demerits of this appropriation for its operation, I appeal to my Republican friends to help us vote this portion of the bill down, and all of the bill if it takes that, to get rid of this item, clearly in disapproval and condemnation, if you please, of the means whereby it got into this measure. There are orderly and fair ways to get the issue before the House, and I appeal to both sides of the House to see that if it passes it does so in this manner. There is nothing so meritorious as to justify such means. In fact, if it cannot be passed without being done in this manner, then it should not be passed at all. The end can certainly not justify the means.

When will the time come when men will be men and forget their own political interest when the destiny of their Nation is hanging in the very balance? I say without fear of contradiction, that in the secret recesses of the hearts of the membership of this House, that there are not more than 20 that, as a matter of truth and fact, who actually favor this damnable organization. Is your seat in

Congress worth more to you than your Nation?

You boys who fly under the Democratic banner seem to think there is no limit to the abuse the South will endure at your hands, and from past observations I can easily see why you should so think. But let me tell you and this to many from below the Mason and Dixon's line, that if you do not cease to heap insult upon insult on our people, you are going to get the shock of your lives. Our people are about fed up; they have been booted about from pillar to post until they are near the breaking point. If you continue to sow the seeds of bitterness and yield to every whim of minority groups in the North for the sake of their few votes, you may have occasion soon to repent your sins. If this Democratic Party does not begin to sober up it is going to lose its own soul.

I warn the membership of this House, and the populace of this great Commonwealth that there are only two things that are going to save this Nation. One is ballots and the other is bullets. If the ballots of the Members of the House, who have been entrusted with the destiny of the Nation, do not have courage enough to save the Nation, then I ask the people of the United States to think deep enough and have courage enough to save this Nation by their ballots, that it may not have to be saved by bullets.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all deplore the level that the debate has taken here today. Here in wartime, here with the galleries filled with the men wearing our uniforms, we are engaged in hot debate, with tempers running wild, religion being injected into the debate, and everything that would create disunity rather than the one goal we all seek—unity. What is the reason for this? What brought all this on, and what is the cure for it?

I have here the RECORD for Tuesday, May 23. Here on page 4917 of that day is a request by the distinguished chairman of the great and powerful Committee on Appropriations asking unanimous consent to waive all points of order against a tremendous appropriation bill full and replete with controversial issues many of which were not authorized by law.

What happened?

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

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman will permit I prefer to proceed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Just one question: Why did not the gentleman make similar protests on the numerous other occasions I have submitted such requests? Why does he pick out the one request of yesterday?

Mr. COLMER. I may say to the gentleman from Missouri that I have risen as a member of the Committee on Rules in the well of this House and served notice that I was going to try to stop the procedure; and that is the purpose of my being here now, to try to stop that kind of procedure.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman stops it, he stops a procedure that has been in use for a hundred years.

Mr. COLMER. Permit me to have my 3 minutes; the gentleman has had 2 days in which to state his position; he stated it on yesterday, restated it, and again restated it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But the gentleman has referred to me by name.

Mr. COLMER. I am taking only 3 minutes in which to state my position on the matter.

What happened? At page 4917 there appears the motion to adjourn. Adjournment, at what time? Five o'clock and 28 minutes p. m. Now we know as a matter of practical knowledge that when the business on the Speaker's table is completed we go to our offices and sign mail and attend to our congressional duties.

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

Mr. COLMER. Pardon me just one moment. I am not charging anything; I do not want to add anything to the temper of this debate; I am merely saying that if that is to be the rule of procedure in this House it ought to be changed, and I for one propose to try to do something about it. Follow that analogy: If the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of this committee, was within his rights—I am not arguing that; I do think it was bad practice; that is my opinion—but if that was correct practice what could he do? He could come in here when this Congress reconvenes after election, when the Seventy-ninth Congress comes in next January, he could come into the well of this House and ask unanimous consent and no doubt get it to waive points of order against every appropriation bill to come up in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Is that good practice?

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

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman pardon me, please.

Mr. HARE. For just one observation.

Mr. COLMER. I cannot, of course, resist my friend; I yield.

Mr. HARE. I want the gentleman's judgment on the matter of whether the chairman of the full committee was acting within his rights, because he was not acting as chairman of the full committee but as chairman of a subcommittee and asked to waive points of order against a bill that had not yet been presented to the full committee and therefore could not have been a bill of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would yield me 2 more minutes?

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

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for his generosity.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina is a member of the Committee on Appropriations; he has the



right to say what he pleases about the chairman of his committee. As I said, this evidently is bad practice; it is responsible for all of this debate and this furor and this rumpus that we have had here. Some of us do not, of course, like some of the provisions that they are trying to ram down our throats through this procedure, because we thought we had the parliamentary right to invoke parliamentary procedure. We know, of course, what will happen here today; we have an election in November; we realize how some of these gentlemen who criticize the executive powers and the Executive orders will vote when it comes to a vote on this question. So we had a right to rely upon the legislative parliamentary situation to protect ourselves; but in the stealth of night that was taken away from us. "All right," they say, "why did you not object to the unanimous-consent request?" I will ask any Member why he did not object. He did not object, and I did not object, because we did not know what was in the bill; it never had been written at that time, and if it had been written, bear in mind that this great Committee on Appropriations is the one committee in this House that conducts its sessions in secret. There was no opportunity to object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Surely; will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. As was pointed out on the floor yesterday, and the gentleman from Missouri himself admitted that they were executive sessions, and he could not tell what went on.

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

Mr. COLMER. I must certainly yield to my generous friend.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Ways and Means Committee never releases its bills until reported.

Mr. COLMER. I believe we can settle this if the gentleman can answer one question for me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is a practice we have followed for at least a hundred years.

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman would just answer one question that would be all that is necessary. The hearings and proceedings conducted in the Committee on Appropriations are not made public until after the bill is reported to the House; is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly, but the gentleman was asking about another committee which follows the same custom and in reply I name the Ways and Means Committee. Anybody who knows the rules at all knows it has been the rule from time immemorial, from a time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary.

Mr. COLMER. This House ought to do something about it. It may hurt somebody from my State or somebody else's State this time; it may hurt your State the next time. The chickens will surely come home to roost. If you permit this kind of practice to continue you might just as well bear that fact in mind.

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

Mr. COLMER. Of course, I yield to my good neighbor.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that if they continue this crazy F. E. P. C. there may be no country to hurt.

Mr. COLMER. I, of course, am opposed to some of these things but I still am trying not to add anything to the furor of the debate. I merely want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I believe the practice and the procedure of the House ought to be changed. As a member of the Committee on Rules I propose to try to do something about that. I want to see the rights and privileges of the Members of this House protected, and there is nobody who can justify the procedure that has been had in the handling of this matter. It is reprehensible.

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

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

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to corroborate what my colleague has said about this Fair Employment Practice Committee. I happened to be at home when this outrageous unjustifiable directive from the regional director of F. E. P. C. was issued to the Dallas morning newspapers, that they could not mention the color of an employee whom they seek.

The next step of such radical, communistic interference with private enterprise would be to say to the person who advertises for an employee that, "You must accept the first one who calls." Bear in mind this advertisement sought a colored employee. The regional director insists that that was a discrimination against white employees. Many people down in our part of the country prefer colored maids. The next step in line with this policy is this: You advertise for a maid. You cannot specify whether you want a white or colored maid. Suppose a white maid shows up at your home and she possesses all of the qualifications except as to color. Then you have got to hire her. If you do not hire the white maid then you have violated the policies laid down by this F. E. P. C. I submit to you such a thing would not take place in communistic Russia. I doubt that Hitler would issue such an edict to the people in the Reich. I say to you we should call a halt to such practices. The F. E. P. C. promotes unfair practices, it breeds discrimination, it stirs up trouble, it constitutes a menace to democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a telegram received from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, now in Dallas, Tex., which reads as follows:

I have just come in contact with one of the activities of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice and the result of its hurtful interferences in the affairs of this community.

The Dallas Morning News, engaged in the ordinary activities of publishing a newspaper, printed in its paper recently this advertisement: "Wanted colored man to work at night as paper handler. Essential industry."

The paper received a letter from the regional director here with regard to this advertisement from which I quote:

"The Committee on Fair Employment Practice, operating under Executive Order No. 9346, a copy of which is attached, considers that such advertisement is a violation of the order. It limits applications to a narrow field described in the advertisement, and automatically bars persons of other race or color from applying, even though these latter may also possess skill needed for your establishment. You are therefore requested to take immediate steps to remove from this and from any other advertisement for employees any features which are discriminatory as to race, creed, color, and nationality. You are further requested to advise your personnel office or hiring agent that they should disregard such specifications in considering applications for employment. This includes the United States Employment Service."

Other employers have been similarly directed. Many of them have complied under apprehension of adverse governmental action should they refuse.

The confusion, accumulating resentment, inconvenience to people seeking employment, and interracial irritation from the activities of this agency has become a most serious matter. Fair me against continuing appropriation for this activity.

HATTON W. SUMNERS.

Mr. Chairman, if this is a democratic country, then we will strike from this appropriation bill any money whatsoever for any such outfit. We must get rid of such ridiculous bureaucratic meddling with the reasonable and orderly proceedings of legitimate business.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I concur in all my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] has said, and all my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has stated in his telegram. I am very much opposed to the item in this bill which would make money available to the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. This Committee is causing in time of war much friction and disunity by its unwise and senseless acts. No men have worked harder and done a better job than our railroad employees; this Committee has them disturbed; by all means, this Congress should abolish the Committee; I am opposed to its existence.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

For all expenses necessary to enable the Committee on Fair Employment Practice to carry out the functions vested in it by Executive Orders Nos. 8802 and 9346, including salary of a Chairman at not to exceed \$10,000 per annum, and six other members at not to exceed \$25 per diem when actually engaged; travel expenses (not to exceed \$63,800); expenses of witnesses in attendance at committee hearings, when necessary; printing and binding (not to exceed \$4,800); purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed \$500); and the temporary employment of persons, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws (not to exceed \$8,900); \$500,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Page 9, strike out lines 11 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, as I advised the House during general debate, I offer this amendment for the purpose of giving the Committee of the Whole an opportunity to vote on the question of whether they will eliminate from this bill the proposed appropriation for the Fair Employment Practice Committee. So far in the general debate, and I have endeavored to listen to all of the speakers, no member of the Committee of the Whole has undertaken to say one word in defense of the Fair Employment Practice Committee, unless the interruption of speakers by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] could be construed as a defense or unless the speech made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] could be so construed. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] for whom I have profound respect, indicated in his remarks that he has introduced a bill proposing to legalize the Fair Employment Practice Committee and he also indicated that while he recognized by the introduction of the bill that that committee and its activities are not authorized by law he feels that under the circumstances now existing the Congress should proceed to appropriate money for this unauthorized activity notwithstanding lack of legal authority so to do. I do not agree with him and I hope you will not agree with him. It is uncontroverted here, I think, that this is an organization which is contributing greatly to lack of unity, to disunity on the part of the American people. It is an organization which is not operating in accordance with law because despite the assurances of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] it is perfectly clear to any lawyer who has given any study to the proposition at all that there is no statute on the books which authorizes appropriations to this activity.

The question is, Are you—after complaining, as many of you have done, especially on the Republican side of the House, about the appropriation of money for activities not authorized by law—you who have complained about the setting up of bureaucracies in the Government, the carrying on of activities with which the majority of the American people are not in accord, the waste of public money along these lines; are you, because of your desire not to go on record on a question as to which your attitude might be offensive to the Negroes up in Philadelphia, New York, Pittsburgh, and Chicago—are you Republican Members of the House going to rise against this amendment which I have offered and refuse to strike this illegal appropriation from the bill?

You will recall that when the agricultural appropriation bill was up, when the school-lunch program and the Farm Security Administration appropriations were involved, which were not authorized by law, we left them out of the bill. We did not undertake to have the House

insert them in the bill despite the lack of legal authorization, and when the Senate inserted them by amendment we postponed action on the conference report. We are continuing in conference with the Senate now, awaiting the coming before this House of the conference report on the Pace bill which proposes to authorize the school-lunch program and the Farm Security Administration, in order that this House may have an opportunity first to say whether it will legislatively authorize making such appropriations before we undertake to come in and suggest that money be appropriated out of the Public Treasury for these purposes. Why should not the same procedure be followed here? The Committee on Labor is considering this matter. Why not wait until it brings in a bill and then vote on the question of whether you want to authorize this activity or not before you undertake to appropriate money for it?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman has made a very able presentation and it is very convincing. I think under the circumstances the amendment should be adopted. I surely hope the House will adopt this amendment and bring this question up in a different way if at all.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I feel that if the Members of this House will vote according to the dictates of their consciences—and I am not intimating that any Members would not do that—they will vote for this amendment and will strike this unauthorized appropriation from the bill. Certainly, no Member can undertake to get on this floor—or has so far undertaken to get on the floor—and point out where one single item of benefit has been derived by anybody in the war effort from the moneys which have been expended for this purpose heretofore. Even if these activities were authorized by law, since it is undoubtedly the fact that they produce no benefit, and since the activity is contributing to disunity rather than unity, it ought to be eliminated and no money appropriated for it.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Does the gentleman recall where any agency has been established by Executive order, either in peace or under the War Powers Act, that it has ever been held by this House that it was an authorization for an appropriation without legislation to that effect?

Mr. TARVER. Not only that, but I understand the independent offices bill contains a proposal, inserted in the Senate, to bar the expenditure of moneys appropriated to the President's emergency fund, or in any other way, for activities for which the Congress has not specifically made appropriation or established legislative authorization after a period of time following their establishment by Executive order. It is under-

stood that that bar, if adopted by the Congress, will eliminate the activities of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice unless you make this appropriation.

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

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who are opposed to appropriations for purposes not authorized by law, but since the discussion of this particular section on fair-employment practices began, I have been looking into the books a little bit.

I find that under the fourteenth amendment there is a requirement that no State shall "deny to any person the equal protection of the laws." Section 5 of that amendment provides that Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article.

On May 31, 1870—74 years ago—the first one of the civil rights statutes was passed. Let me read it to you:

All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other (8 U. S. C., sec. 41).

This 74-year-old law is very broad. It guarantees equal security under the law, for all races, and would bar almost every conceivable form of economic racial discrimination.

I find since 1933 that the Congress has enacted for relief, public works, and other provisions, 24 different requirements forbidding discrimination because of race, color, or creed. I find that since the national-defense program started, Congress has enacted, for instance, in the Selective Service Act, and I quote:

There shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color—

September 16, 1940.

In the defense public-works appropriation, June 28, 1941, was the requirement:

Public works shall be provided on the basis of need and in determining need no discrimination shall be made on account of race, creed, or color.

During the war period there has been a provision for training of defense workers. I quote:

No trainee under the appropriations provided for . . . shall be discriminated against because of sex, race, or color.

We enacted this October 9, 1940, and again on July 1, 1941, and again in 1942.

The Congress would not have provided for training defense workers without discrimination as to color if they had not expected those defense workers to be hired after they were trained without discrimination under the general laws for war contracts that Congress enacted.

Thus the Executive had and has, I submit, the duty, the obligation of executing the laws that Congress has enacted un-



der the constitutional provisions of the fourteenth amendment.

The Executive could point out these laws to all of the agencies and authorize and direct them to prevent discrimination, but instead of that the Executive has appointed one committee, without any coercive power, with only persuasive power, to enforce these provisions. There may have been abuses of that power. There may be places where this committee is not functioning properly, but from the records of the hearings I find that the result is that at the present time only about 7 percent of Negroes are employed in war industries, although the population figure is about 10 percent. I find that in only two cases have they taken the most drastic action the committee can take, and that was to refer the matter to the Chief Executive. They say that all they are doing is to make sure that war contractors carry out an antidiscrimination provision in war contracts, which the Executive has the right, and probably the duty to insert, to carry out the fourteenth amendment as implemented repeatedly by Congress.

If we want to look into this thing on its merits, this would be one instance where the Executive is executing laws which the Congress itself has enacted over a period of 74 years; 24 of these laws in the last 10 years and a great many of them in the past few years during the war emergency period. Therefore, I cannot see where this argument comes from that there is no authorization in law for the work of the F. E. P. C. This is simply an appropriation to see to the carrying out of laws we have made. Laws against discrimination do little good on the books. To be effective, they must be carried out in action. That is what this committee is for. In my judgment this is not comparable to a number of other agencies that have sprung up without any authority in law. If this agency is abusing its powers we should limit it, but not destroy it.

This matter of racial discrimination is no easy matter to handle. We cannot change human nature by law. We cannot, by law or by Federal agencies, force people to like to work with people they do not like. We have the power, however, to take steps to persuade people who receive Government contracts from acts of racial discrimination in the employment of people to carry out those contracts and, in this way, to give many members of minority groups a chance to show to their employers and to their fellow workers their worth as individual workers. I am not in favor of, or against, certain races. I think every American, regardless of his race, color, or creed, should get a chance to be considered according to his individual worth. This is what we are trying to accomplish in carrying forward the work of the F. E. P. C.

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

Mr. TABER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if we cannot get an agreement on closing debate on this amendment. How would 30 minutes do?

Mr. BROOKS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TARVER. I hope the gentleman will withhold his objection for a moment. May we not call the attention of the Members to the fact that we are attempting to close debate, and let all who want to be heard rise, and then set a time for closing debate?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

Mr. TARVER. Will not the gentleman make that an hour and 30 minutes?

Mr. TABER. I think we have had a good deal of debate. An hour will allow 4 minutes apiece for each Member who is now standing seeking recognition. That would seem to be a fair allotment of time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move as a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from New York that the time be fixed at 1 hour and 30 minutes, to be equally divided between the gentlemen who have risen.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia, that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The substitute motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 1 hour.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, it is already 5 o'clock. I move that the Committee do now rise. Let us see whether or not the gentlemen would not rather return tomorrow and finish this matter then.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken and; the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 56, noes 99.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia. I do not want anyone to get the impression from what I shall have to say that anyone is not going to vote according to the best dictates of his own conscience, but I feel that the Members of this House, regardless of how they may feel about the merits of this particular agency, should at this time vote in favor of the amendment if for no other reason than to maintain the legislative integrity of this body.

It has been only a year or a little more since we had the Agricultural Appropriation bill before the House, and there were at least forty or fifty items in that bill that had been carried in the appropriation year after year, almost as long as long as we have had a Congress, without any specific authority of law. In order to establish once and for all the integrity of the legislative committees, the members of the Committee on Ag-

riculture, of which I happen to be a member, rose on the floor of this House and objected to item after item that had been carried year after year, simply because there was no legislative authority for those items. As a result, we this year brought before the House what was known as the Pace bill, to authorize those many items.

What do you have here today? You have the Committee on Appropriations bringing in this highly controversial item for which there is no authority of law, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORHIES] to the contrary notwithstanding, and I do not believe he was serious in his contention when he attempted to say that, that under section 5 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, legislative authority is authorized for this appropriation. It is so utterly ridiculous as to not warrant serious consideration and just a further subterfuge on the part of those who seem to be willing to permit government by Executive directives to continue in this country.

That is one of the troubles, as I see it, in the country today. I do not care whether we are Republicans or Democrats, there are certain fundamentals that, if this Nation is to stand, must be adhered to. We cannot as legislators, Republicans or Democrats, afford to adopt these short cuts. This Congress should either function or else completely abdicate in favor of the Executive. I do not propose to abdicate for political expediency. Legislation is now pending before the proper legislative committee involving this very agency, that has heretofore been set up by Executive order. Are you Republicans, who have been howling so loudly about constitutional Government, and the functions of the Congress, who have been asking the country to return our party to power on the theory that we will cut out this government of the people by Executive orders, are you going to abandon ship now for the sake of what you believe to be political expediency.

As one Republican, I am going to practice what I have been preaching, namely, to quit voting these huge appropriations that are not essential to the war effort, and refuse to approve additional boards and bureaus set up by the Executive order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is recognized.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, but before addressing myself to the matters involved I want to register my protest against the parliamentary procedure adopted to bring this bill with this provision before the House for consideration. It was shown here yesterday that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee obtained your unanimous consent last Tuesday to bring up this bill for consideration yesterday, but I want it clearly understood that this unanimous request was not made by the gentleman from Missouri as chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, but it was made as chairman of a subcommittee

because the bill at that time had never been submitted to the full committee and while the bill may have been prepared by the subcommittee there was really no bill at that time to submit by the Appropriations Committee. The chairman of the subcommittee, therefore, had not and could not have been given authority to make the request in behalf of the full committee. It did not show proper consideration of the other members of the committee or the membership of this House. I want to insist that the procedure should never be resorted to again in this body.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that the program involved in this appropriation was inaugurated without the knowledge or consent of the legislative representatives of this country, but we know further that we are now being called upon to endorse it and ratify the actions of this agency to appropriate \$500,000 to continue its operations for 1 year. I happen to be 1 of the 11 members of the Appropriations Committee who protested against its inclusion and voted for its elimination a few days ago when I stated as clearly as I could my objections to the proposal and now I welcome an opportunity to state as definitely and as clearly as I can within the time allotted some of the reasons I am going to support the motion to eliminate this item.

In the first place, the program was predicated upon the theory that in order to promote unity of purpose and action in our war effort and war production program there should be no discrimination in the employment of persons engaged in the program on account of race, creed, or color. As a matter of fact, those who sponsored the program and those who have been in charge of its administration have shown conclusively that they were not interested in preventing discrimination against persons on account of race, creed, or color, but their main objective was to secure authority and power to demand discrimination in behalf of such persons and this conclusion is based upon the hearings and unsolicited evidence submitted from time to time.

I think it is common knowledge that the F. E. P. C. has demanded and succeeded in having many positions in many or practically all of the Government agencies here in Washington filled with persons who are not qualified to do the work to which they have been assigned, and the appointments are due wholly to the fact that they happen to be colored or happen to have a particular creed. There is not an agency that has come before the various subcommittees for appropriations but what has admitted there has been an unprecedented turn-over in the personnel and that the qualifications of their personnel is now far below that demonstrated at any time in our history. One of the witnesses before my committee some time ago testified there were a large number of colored people employed in his agency and that in his judgment the average training of these persons would not exceed that obtained in the fourth or fifth grade of our public schools, and this gentleman did not come from one of the Southern States, where we have a large percentage of colored

people. Another gentleman testified off the record that the policy adopted under the F. E. P. C. had actually retarded the work of his agency for he said it took more time for the efficient clerks in his office to correct the errors and mistakes of such inefficient employees than it would have taken them to do the work in the beginning. Now if these witnesses are to be believed, the only conclusion I can reach is that these people would never have been employed if the F. E. P. C. had not insisted and, in fact, directed that there should be discrimination in favor of appointing these people instead of appointing more capable and efficient white persons in their place.

It is not a discrimination for or against anyone for the Government to undertake to select the most capable and most efficient persons available for its work. In fact, the Congress many years ago created an agency, the Civil Service Commission, and charged it with the duty and responsibility to adopt plans and methods for use in securing for employment in the Government service the most capable and efficient persons available, but simply because there was not a sufficient number of colored people to qualify for these positions under an established rule to satisfy the egotism or the desire for social equality, the promoters of this agency have taken advantage of the war situation to have the President exercise what they thought was his right and authority to set up an agency to displace the Civil Service Commission and thwart the purposes of Congress in an effort to secure efficient governmental administration and attempt to clothe this agency with authority and power to supercede the rights and authorities of the Civil Service Commission and compel Government agencies to employ people not qualified for the work simply upon the ground that such person had been discriminated against on account of race, creed, or color. Now for the Congress to permit a continuation of such a policy or program is a reflection upon its announced purposes heretofore when it insisted that Government agencies should be required, in making appointments, to secure persons who could render the greatest amount of efficient services for the compensation paid.

In further support of my contention that this agency is not trying to protect persons "against" discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, but is engaged primarily in insisting upon discrimination in "favor" of such persons, I want to quote from the hearings before the subcommittee to which I have referred but do not happen to be a member. The quotation is found on page 528 of volume II of the hearings where the Chairman of the F. E. P. C. is testifying and says by way of illustration of the work and functions of his agency as follows:

Again, Latin-American workers in an aircraft plant are being kept at work below their capacities. Their complaint to F. E. P. C. leads to an interview with the employer who concedes the injustice and upgrades the workers. This is direct F. E. P. C. action.

Certainly it is direct action and it is action upon direction. The Latin-American workers were upgraded at the "direction" of the F. E. P. C., which I call discrimination in favor of a race. I have on my desk this morning a complaint from a white man in my district saying that he worked at the Charleston Navy Yard this last spring for 3 months or longer and had to retire because of a refusal to upgrade him, but if he had been a Latin-American or a man of color he would have been upgraded. The discrimination would have been in his favor.

Another illustration, and I quote from the Chairman of the F. E. P. C., Mr. Ross, as follows:

Or again, a Negro worker complains to the War Manpower Commission that a completed training course ended with white trainees assigned as welders and himself at the end of a broom. War Manpower Commission, which holds no specific authority to investigate complaints of discrimination filed with it, attempts unsuccessfully to have this needed and available worker placed at his proper skill, then turns the case over to F. E. P. C.

Why was it turned over to F. E. P. C. if it were not for the purpose of having the F. E. P. C. exercise authority claimed under an Executive order to direct this Negro worker to be given employment equal to others or similar to others irrespective of his fitness or qualifications? In fact, the work of this agency is really retarding the work of our war program, particularly in the administrative agencies of the Government by insisting and directing that persons be employed simply because they happen to belong to a particular race or color.

There has not been one single argument submitted here today or yesterday that will refute my conclusions or justify this appropriation and I insist that if we want to promote our war program and be fair and just to the taxpayers of this country we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] is recognized.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to register my most emphatic protest against the Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice has created confusion, discord, and dissension in the South. It has done this in many ways and has tremendously impeded the war effort. Its recent decision about the 12 southern railways is an outstanding example of what I speak. I was at home several months ago when news of this decision reached the country; and I talked to many railway men who were much concerned about its effect upon the transportation system of the country. Men who had railroaded for years understood that this decision would do away with their seniority rights which had been built up by the blood, sweat, and toil of railway workmen over many years of time. Others with less seniority were informed that there would be more outside interference and official



meddling with the resulting deterioration in railway performance and service to the Nation during the critical period of this war. We cannot have meddling in our railway management and employment during this period. The Nation cannot afford to experience a breakdown in its transportation system. We cannot continue to have bureaucratic intermeddling in industry of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, this committee has done nothing good. The expenditure of \$500,000 of public money for this purpose cannot help the war effort and is purely and simply a waste of money. I am against this appropriation as being hurtful to the war effort, and I condemn official interference from Washington in the racial situation in the South.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe ordinarily in indulging in post mortems; but I feel that a practice which is most unfortunate has grown up in this House. It is the practice of reporting bills to the House of Representatives on the very day they are to be debated and voted and before they have been studied by the House of Representatives. In this particular instance, I was anxious to find out what was being placed in this appropriation bill. Several days before it came to the floor, I discussed the matter with other Members who were ignorant of what was expected to be in the bill. I asked the chairman of this committee the day before the bill came to the floor for a copy of it or for some idea of its contents. This was refused. A \$1,000,000 appropriation bill not completed and not available for study by Congress the night before it comes to the floor for debate! This is a most unfortunate practice which does not reflect credit upon Congress and I am certain will not meet with the approval of the country. I hope the Rules Committee will make suitable changes in our rules. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak most emphatically against the Fair Labor Practice Committee. In this bill is an appropriation for \$500,000 for this committee. This appropriation is placed in this bill in spite of the fact that Congress has never approved this committee and has never authorized its creation. It is created by Executive order. It does not have the approval or legislative sanction of Congress.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is it not true in our particular locality it brought about probably more disunity than any other one thing?

Mr. BROOKS. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to reiterate any of the things that have been said thus far in this debate. But I would like to call your attention to the fact that for a long time, 160 years, this Nation got along under a government of law. Now, even the procedure under which the law has been made in the past is undergoing rapine and being ravaged. As a matter

of fact, Mr. Chairman, I have lots of friends among all of the varied races that make up this country. It does not require this particular committee to keep me on the basis whereby I will continue to give them a square deal, both as a Member of Congress and as a citizen. I have considerable pride in my kinfolk, Mr. Chairman, as I know all of you do in this committee, and my purpose in rising in support of this amendment is that it is a step in the direction of keeping one of my most beloved relatives, the most loved of all of them—Uncle Sam—still with gray whiskers. I do not want them painted pink. I do not want to have those whiskers shaved off, Mr. Chairman, and when remarks are directed to Democrats and to Republicans as such, in my earnest opinion, there can be no man regardless of his party affiliations who can take offense at the statement that this amendment is purely an amendment to continue the American system of law whereby the laws are written by representatives of the people and whereby the various agencies of government have funds appropriated for their activities under the regular order and procedure, and not by Executive order. I shall vote to support this amendment looking toward continuation of the system which has made this Nation great.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is recognized.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation under consideration involves an appropriation without authorization by law. The only authorization that has been attempted to be cited thus far is the contention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYSE] that if a proposal is not in conflict with laws that may be passed under the Constitution of the United States, an appropriation is authorized if an Executive order provides for it, although there is no statute authorizing the appropriation. If we can dignify that contention by argument, there would be no occasion for any laws whatsoever. All appropriations could be made under the edict, fiat, and orders of the Executive. I challenge any Member of this body to produce any precedent or any rule that justifies an appropriation under an Executive order of the President, made either in peacetime or wartime, under the War Powers Act, or under his authority as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. There is no such rule, precedent, or authority. There can be no such authority. Under the section that we are considering, appropriation is made for carrying out the functions under Executive Order No. 8802, as amended by Executive Order No. 9346. The first was issued on June 25, 1941, long before Pearl Harbor. The second was issued on May 2, 1944. This is the first time that Congress has been asked to make an appropriation for this purpose. This agency was established by the Chief Executive and it has been financed out of emergency funds allocated to him for the prosecution of the war.

The Executive has been criticized for usurping authority, on both sides of the aisle. If there be no authority for an

appropriation under an Executive order, it is time for the Congress of the United States to say so in no uncertain terms, or forever hereafter cease complaining about usurpation of authority not conferred by the Constitution or the laws of the country.

I favor the amendment to strike this appropriation because there is no authority of law for the appropriation. An Executive order is not the equivalent of a statute carrying such authority. Moreover, I oppose the appropriation on the merits of the question. The Committee on Fair Employment Practice is hindering the war effort and is rendering a distinct disservice to the country.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tarver amendment which, if adopted, will strike from the pending bill an item of \$500,000 for the Fair Employment Practice Committee.

This bureau was created by Executive order a year ago and has never been authorized by any act of Congress. During the past year a total of \$432,525 has been expended by the F. E. P. C. That money was never authorized by any act of Congress to be spent for that purpose. It was paid out of the President's emergency fund.

Therefore, this Congress now for the first time has the opportunity to vote on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why I am opposed to the F. E. P. C., but in my limited time I shall mention but two or three of them.

In the first place, we are in a war, and there is ample evidence to show that the F. E. P. C. has proven to be an instrument that arouses racial feeling and disunity at a time when we can least afford it.

In the second place, I cannot believe for a moment that any Member can read the hearings on this item and not conclude the F. E. P. C. is wholly unnecessary. Its activities are duplicated by the War Manpower Commission, as anyone can see by turning to page 539 of the printed hearings on this bill.

In the third place, Mr. Chairman, I am committed to a policy of reducing—not increasing—the number of unnecessary bureaus, and I am also committed to opposition to nonessential Government expenditures during wartime.

Therefore, it follows that I shall vote for the Tarver amendment and in favor of killing this useless bureau.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most serious questions that ever confronted Congress. It is one that goes to the very roots of our form of government, our way of life.

This so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee, with headquarters at 1006 U Street, which is in the Negro section of Washington, and which was set up without authority of law, is one of the most dangerous communistic agencies ever created to annoy and harass the

white people of this country. It has assumed the powers of a dictatorship by attempting to compel the white people of this Nation to employ people of other races, and to promote them to positions of trust and responsibility, whether they are wanted or not.

It has attempted to force the railroads of the country to place Negroes in positions of conductors and engineers. It is attempting to force business establishments to employ Negro clerks, and even managers, and place them beside, and even over, the white men and white women they have always employed.

This is revolution, if you please, and dictatorship of the most dangerous and revolting character, and you have no right to vote money out of the Federal Treasury to support it. If you do, then do not ever let me hear you again complain about bureaucracy or the radicalism of the New Deal.

You heard that article read from the Dallas News. They had this advertisement in the paper:

Wanted: Colored man to work at night as a paper handler; an essential industry.

This so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee, with all the arrogance of a Hitler, told that paper it could not publish such an advertisement.

You cannot advertise for a Negro, a Chinaman, a white man, or a native American, according to the F. E. P. C., This will prove to be the worst thing that has ever happened to the Negroes of this country. It will cause more of them to walk the streets, or tramp the highways, for want of employment than anything else has ever done. You are not helping them by voting for this appropriation, but you are helping communism to destroy the Government that you swore to uphold.

If you place an advertisement in the paper that you want a Chinaman to do your laundry, that you want a Negro as a truckman, a tenant, or a workman about the house, or that you want a Japanese or a Mexican, or that you want a native-born American, or that you want a white man, you will be subject to prosecution under this edict of this dictatorial committee, called the F. E. P. C.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I am wondering if this edict is only applicable to the Dallas News, because I just finished reading the want ads in the local papers and I find hundreds of them advertising for colored help.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh! This is the beginning of a communistic dictatorship, the like of which America never dreamed. They want to dictate to you who shall work in your factory, who shall work on your farm, who shall work in your office, who shall go to your schools, and who shall eat at your table, or intermarry with your children.

It is sponsored by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, headed by Sidney Hillman, a Russian-born racketeer whom the anticommunist American of his own race literally despise, and who is raising money by the shake-down method with

which he is now trying to control our elections. He wants to be the Hitler of America.

This is the same element that wrecked practically every country in Europe. Now it is out to wreck or control the United States. This is the same gang that is promoting strikes in our war industries and slowing down the production of the weapons our soldiers need in fighting for their lives, and for the life of this Nation.

Listen to this article from the Dallas (Tex.) News:

#### FEDERAL BUREAU ASKS NEWSPAPER ADS OMIT ANY MENTION OF RACE

The Dallas News has been requested by Leonard M. Brin, regional director, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, not to ask specifically for Negroes when advertising for employees.

The offending advertisement appearing in the help wanted column under male (miscellaneous), and occupying one-half inch of space, read:

"Wanted: Colored man to work at night as paper handler. Essential industry. See Martin Josch, pressroom, Dallas News, after 7 p. m."

Brin said in part in his letter to the News: "The Committee on Fair Employment Practice, operating under Executive Order No. 9346, a copy of which is attached, considers that such advertising is in violation of the order. It limits applicants to the narrow field described in the advertisement and automatically bars persons of other race or color from applying, even though these latter may also possess skills needed by your establishment."

"You are therefore requested to take immediate steps to remove from this and from any other advertisement for employees any features which are discriminatory as to race, creed, color, or national origin. You are further requested to advise your personnel office or hiring agent that they should disregard such specifications when considering applicants for employment. This includes the United States Employment Service."

"The need for using all available man and woman power during wartime is great, and becoming greater. By planning along practical lines we believe that there should be no difficulty in utilizing workers on the basis of their skills, or adaptability to training, and we believe that you are willing and anxious to assist in the furtherance of this in the interest of the total war effort."

#### DECLINES TO BE INTERVIEWED

Brin, when called on by a Dallas News reporter in the regional offices of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, 1001 Mercantile Bank Building, said he had received instructions to give no newspaper interviews unless the questions and answers had been approved in Washington. He suggested that any questions in regard to the plans and policies in applying and enforcing the Executive order be submitted in writing, either to him to be forwarded to Washington, or direct to Malcolm Ross, chairman of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

Brin was told that he undoubtedly could answer the questions the reporter had in mind without referring them to Washington and that he should be better acquainted with the local situation than would be a Washington official. Brin replied that he had definite orders concerning submitting to interviews.

The management of the News said that the want ad followed the News' long-established policy of not running advertising that is discriminatory or misleading.

The News insists that all advertisements, in addition to being truthful, be specific and fully informative, the management stated. The position of the News is that if a mother wants a white girl to take care of her children that is exactly what she wants, not a Negro, or if she wants a Negro girl, that also is what she wants, and that this rule holds true in all of the categories of things wanted as advertised in the want ad columns.

The News adopted rules several years ago on personal discrimination. All employees handling advertising were told to discourage advertisers from using any wording or phraseology that might be considered discriminatory toward any sect, race, or creed and to refer to the management any such copy which the advertiser might not be willing so to modify. No discrimination beyond that recognized by law and custom is involved in the usual handling of advertisements differentiating between the white and black races.

The rule book of the News says that "all employment ads should clearly indicate the nature of the work and conditions of the applicant." The News holds that not specifying white or colored for jobs that might be patently for whites or for colored constitutes a very serious form of misleading which would result in a lot of lost motion on the part of the public, loss to the individual or firm advertising.

#### EXECUTIVE ORDER

The News has been criticized at times because a distinction is not drawn in the classification of many want ads between the wants of whites and Negroes. Negroes can advertise in any or all of the various classifications. This is not the case with many papers, the News is informed. There is one classification, "For rent to colored," which has been used for years by whites advertising servant quarters for rent.

The order establishing the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice is a wartime Executive order of the President, not backed by any legislation. Its purpose ostensibly is to make full use of manpower. Its letters in the forms of requests have gone to firms with war contracts or engaged in other essential businesses.

The Dallas Better Business Bureau Bulletin of last March 27 carried the contents of a letter received by a Dallas firm from Brin concerning advertising that Brin said is discriminatory. The Bulletin article was headed, "Dallas advertisers for essential industry must eliminate color discrimination—says committee."

The laws of Texas as approved by the Supreme Courts of Texas and of the United States permit and require segregation of white and Negro Races as applied to many activities, legal authorities have informed the News. It is their belief that any Executive order ought to be applied in the light of State segregation laws and embedded social practices.

In addition to these legal requirements of segregation, a practice of segregation exists in the Southern States that is of long standing and is widely approved by Negroes and whites alike as aiding in satisfactory relations between the two races. Because of that practice, which is a part of the social structure, employers want whites for some jobs and Negroes for others. Whites choose to work in some jobs and not in others, and Negroes likewise. An advertisement which ignores that difference is considered confusing and misleading.

The want ad to which the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice objected was run in The News by The News management a second time on May 10. A Negro man was employed on that day, causing the ad to be discontinued.

Who is this F. E. P. C.? Who compose the personnel of this powerful group of



radicals who are attempting to reverse the laws of nature by their edicts, at the risk of stirring up a revolution in this country in these critical times, when our white boys, whose people are being harassed and insulted by this outfit, are fighting and dying on every battle front in the world?

Who compose the personnel of this group of Negroes, aliens, and crackpots who are fomenting strife, stirring up race trouble, and attempting to wipe out everything for which our brave men are fighting?

Here is the list of its members furnished by its Chairman, Malcolm Ross, only a few days ago:

Malcolm Ross, Chairman, white; Boris Shishkin, member, white; Milton P. Webster, member, colored; Sara Southall, member, white; John Brophy, member, white; Charles Horn, member, white; Charles H. Houston, colored.

The Chairman receives an annual salary of \$10,000, and the other members of the committee receive a per diem allowance of \$25 per day when working, and according to the chairman the committee meets about once every 2 weeks.

You will note that on this committee there are two Negroes and four white people, one of whom, at least, Charles Horn, has an American name. One of the white men composing this committee is John Brophy. He has a long list of affiliations with Communist-front activities. In August 1938 he wrote an article for a publication called Equal Justice, the official organ of the International Labor Defense, which was cited by Attorney General Biddle as subversive. In 1937 Brophy sent greetings to the National Negro Congress, which organization was also branded by the Attorney General as subversive. He has been affiliated with a large number of other activities that have been branded as subversive by the Dies House Committee on Un-American Activities.

I will not burden the RECORD with the recital of all those activities, but they are available to any Member who is sufficiently interested in the welfare of his country to look them up.

Another member of this Committee, Boris Shishkin, was connected with what was called the Washington Book Shop, located at Seminary Hill, Alexandria, Va., according to the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities. This Washington Book Shop is known to be a Communist-front organization, and was also branded by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive.

Another member of this Committee, Charles H. Houston, colored, has a long record of affiliation with Communist-front movements that have been branded as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, as well as by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Members of one of these subversive organizations picketed the White House in protest against our preparation for war during the time of the Stalin-Hitler pact.

Now, let us take the chief employees, the powers behind the throne—the ones who really run the show. Here they are:

#### Office of the Chairman

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm.....	Chairman.....	White...	\$10,000
Bourne, S. Claire....	Associate fair-practice examiner.	Colored..	3,200
Wright, Barbara H..	Report reviewer.	White...	2,600
Alexander, Dorothy E. (Mrs.).	Secretary.....	Colored..	2,600
Whiting, Margaret B. (Mrs.).	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	Colored..	1,620
Sturdivant, Evelyn.	.....do.....	White...	1,620

You will observe that in the office of the chairman there are three white people, the chairman, a report reviewer, and an assistant clerk stenographer, and three Negroes. One of the Negroes is the associate fair practice examiner.

They preside over the destiny of every enterprise in America. Their chief function seems to be to harass the white people, and especially the white businessmen of the Nation.

Now, here is the personnel of the Administrative Office:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore A..	Administrative officer.	Colored..	\$5,600
Douglas, Lela M. (Mrs.).	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored..	2,000
Foggie, Harriet A....	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	Colored..	1,800
Jackson, Rosalee A. (Mrs.).	Clerk-typist (fiscal).	Colored..	1,620
Hollomon, Irving B.	Junior clerk—file.	Colored..	1,440
House, Marguerite H. (Mrs.).	Receptionist-typist.	Colored..	1,440
Gamble, Jessie G. (Mrs.).	Junior clerk—file.	Colored..	1,500
Mitchell, Regina B. (Mrs.).	Messenger.....	Colored..	1,440
Phillips, Rose Louise Simms.	.....do.....	Colored..	1,320
Jeter, Sinclair.....	Administrative assistant.	Colored..	3,200
Baker, Vivian D....	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	Colored..	1,620

You will note that every single one of them is a Negro.

They administer the laws, rules, and regulations laid down by this outfit. No wonder they are stirring up strife among the white people of the Nation.

And here is the personnel of the Operations Section:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will.....	Director of operations.	White...	\$5,500
Mitchell, Clarence M.	Associate director of operations.	Colored..	4,600
Davidson, Eugene L. C.	Assistant director of field operations.	Colored..	4,600
Bloch, Emanuel.....	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White...	4,600
Metzger, Stanley D.	Fair-practice examiner.	White...	4,600
Kahn, Alice R.....	Junior fair-practice examiner.	White...	2,000
Blanche, Vida G....	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored..	1,800
Rogers, Eleanor F....	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	Colored..	1,800
Landes, Ruth S....	Fair-practice examiner.	White...	3,800
McMillan, Lucille S. (Mrs.).	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,620
Smith, Delphia (Mrs.).	.....do.....	Colored..	1,620
Hart, Evelyn.....	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored..	1,620
Ricks, Rebecca.....	.....do.....	Colored..	1,620

You will note that six of them are registered as white and seven of them as

Negroes. Read those names again and see how many of them you would classify as white Americans.

The Director of Operations, Will Maslow, has been connected with the Consumers National Federation, which was cited as being subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, as well as a contributor to a publication called Health and Hygiene, which was founded as an extension of the Communist Daily Worker.

Emanuel Bloch is shown by the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to have addressed the citizens committee to free Earl Browder, on March 16, 1942, which committee was cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States. Bloch was also one of the sponsors of another organization, the National Federation for Constitution Liberties, which was found to be subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

One of the Negro members of this operations section, Eugene Davidson, has been connected with at least four activities that have been branded as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

Now let us take the review and analysis section. Here they are:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A. ....	Director, Review and Analysis.	Colored..	\$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie M. (Mrs.).	Associate Director.	Colored..	3,800
Golightly, Cornelius L.	Associate compliance analyst.	Colored..	2,600
Davis, Joy P.....	Report reviewer.	Colored..	2,600
Hoffman, Celia B..	Secretary.....	White...	1,800
Welch, Selena E. (Mrs.).	Docket clerk.....	Colored..	1,800
Simmons, Walter L.	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,800
Hemphill, India W..	Junior professional assistant.	Colored..	2,000
Coan, Carol.....	.....do.....	White...	2,000
Dumas, Jean S.....	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	Colored..	1,620

Only three of them are registered as white, and seven of them Negroes. One of the whites is a secretary and another one is an assistant clerk-stenographer.

At least one member of this division, Marjorie Lawson, colored, is shown by the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to be a member of a Communist front organization, known as the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which has been branded by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive.

Now we come to the legal division. Here they are:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Johnson, George M.	Assistant to the chairman.	Colored..	\$5,500
Clifton, Jeanne N....	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored..	2,000

You see, this division has only two members—both Negroes. They pass on all legal questions that arise concerning the activities of the white people of this Nation as they affect so-called fair employment practices.

But look at this list of hearing examiners:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Hubbard, Maceo...	Hearing examiner.	Colored.	\$5,600
Trimble, Ernest G.	do.	White...	5,600
Crockett, George W.	do.	Colored.	5,600
Reeves, Frank D...	Associate fair-practice examiner.	Colored.	3,200
Brooks, Mary E. (Mrs.)	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	Colored.	1,620
Gordon, Jerneville M.	do.	Colored.	1,620

This division is composed of five Negroes, including the chairman, and one white man.

This brings us to the regional offices, the ones to which the people in the various sections of the country must appeal, or before which they must appear whenever interfered with or imposed upon by this outfit.

The first one is the New York regional office. Here is its personnel:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward...	Regional director.	Colored.	\$5,600
Jones, Robert.....	Associate fair-practice examiner.	Colored.	3,200
Morand, Edward V.	Associate field examiner.	White...	3,200
Jones, Madison S. Jr.	Associate fair-practice examiner.	Colored.	3,200
Risk, Samuel.....	do.	White...	3,200
Souffront, Dennis.	Secretary.	Colored.	1,800
Irish, Miriam.....	do.	Colored.	1,800
Bullock, Evelyn, J.	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	Colored.	1,620
Ashepba, Tillie.....	do.	White...	1,620

You will note that it is composed of three white people and six Negroes, including the chairman, a Negro named Edward Lawson, who draws a salary of \$5,600 a year, and who signed the Communist Party petition in New York in 1942, according to the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and was a participant in the All-Southern Negro Youth Conference, which was affiliated with the National Negro Congress, which latter organization was cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

The only white examiner in this regional office is Samuel Risk, who also was a signer of the Communist petition in New York in 1939-1940, according to the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

But let us take the next one, the Philadelphia regional office:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, James G...	Senior fair-practice examiner.	Colored.	\$4,600
Manly, Milo A.....	Field examiner.	Colored.	3,200
Greenblatt, Mildred.	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White...	3,800
Fernheimer, John S.	Fair-practice examiner.	White...	3,800
Gorgas, Helen P....	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,620
Weitzman, Shirley.	Junior clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,440
Cunningham, Willard T.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored.	-----

You will see that it is composed of three Negroes and four whites; practically every one of the whites has a foreign name. I just wonder what chance an old-line firm of white Americans would have before that group.

You will also observe that the chairman in charge of this Philadelphia regional office is a Negro named James G. Fleming, who receives a salary of \$4,600 a year. According to the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, he is a guest lecturer of the Philadelphia School of Social Science and Art, which is a successor to the Philadelphia Communist Workers School.

Here is the Washington regional office:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Hook, Frank E.....	Principal fair-practice examiner.	White...	\$5,600
Evans, Joseph H. B.	Senior fair-practice examiner.	Colored.	4,600
Houston, Theophilus J.	Assistant fair-practice examiner.	Colored.	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby F...	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	Colored.	1,620
Saito, Otome.....	Clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,620

You will see that it is composed of three Negroes and two whites, and one of them who is registered as a white person is merely a clerk-stenographer, and his name is given as Otome Saito—which sounds Oriental to me. This is the group that presides over the destinies of the people here in the District of Columbia and the surrounding States.

The chairman of this group is Mr. Frank E. Hook, a former Member of Congress from Michigan, whose opposition to the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities is well known to every Member of this House. If any of you have any doubt about Mr. Hook's leanings, read his speech against the Dies committee and also look up a publication called Equal Justice for October 1938, which is the official organ of an outfit called the International Labor Defense, which was cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

One of the colored members of this group, Theophilus J. Houston, is listed by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a discussion leader of the National Negro Congress, which has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

And here is the Cleveland regional office:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William T.	Regional director.	Colored.	\$4,600
Weitz, Morris.....	Associate fair-practice examiner.	White...	3,200
Clare, Lethia.....	do.	Colored.	3,200
Donovan, Daniel R.	Fair-practice examiner.	White...	3,800
Bressman, Mildred.	Clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,800
Walker, Lillian B...	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	Colored.	1,620

You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and three whites,

the regional director being a Negro named William T. McKnight, who draws a salary of \$4,600 a year.

He is listed as being a member of the Lawyers Guild, which was cited as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944; while another Negro listed with this Cleveland office, Lillian B. Walker, is listed as one of the signers of the petition of the Communist Party in Ohio in 1940, when Earl Browder was running against President Roosevelt.

Here is the subregional office in Detroit:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Swann, Edward M...	Fair practice examiner.	Colored.	\$3,800
McClure, Catherine E.	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,620

This is evidently a branch of the Cleveland regional office. You will note the examiner is a Negro, but the stenographer is a white woman.

Now the Chicago regional office:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elmer W.	Senior fair-practice examiner.	Colored.	\$4,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Associate fair-practice examiner.	Colored.	3,200
Schultz, Joy (Mrs.).	Fair-practice examiner.	White...	3,200
Zeidman, Penny M.	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,620
Bell, Minnie L. (Mrs.).	do.	Colored.	1,620

This group is composed of three Negroes and two whites—Mrs. Joy Schultz and Penny M. Seidman. Both of the examiners are Negroes. I just wonder what chance a white American enterprise would have with that group.

One of the members of this group, Minnie L. Bell, colored, is listed as being a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which is known to be a Communist-front organization, and which was cited as being subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

Now, let us move down into the deep South, and take the Atlanta regional office:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, Bruce.....	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White...	\$5,400
Hope, John, Jr.....	Associate fair-practice examiner.	Colored.	3,800
Tipton, James H....	do.	White...	3,200
Bunting, Myra.....	Clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,800
Horton, Thelma.....	do.	Colored.	-----

This is the office that covers the area I represent. You will see that this group is composed of three whites and two Negroes; one of the whites is a clerk-stenographer, while one of the Negroes is associate examiner, with power to harass the white businessmen of the Southern States.



This will explain a great deal of the resentment that now prevails among the white people of the South from the Potomac to the Rio Grande.

The Kansas City regional office:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A...	Regional director.	White...	\$4,600
Brown, Theodore E.	Associate fair practice examiner.	Colored...	3,200
Anderson, Clara O.	Clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,660
Groves, Lonnetta A.	Clerk-typist.	Colored...	1,440

You will note that this group is composed of two whites and two Negroes—the only examiner being a Negro.

The Dallas regional office:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Brin, Leonard.....	Regional director.	White...	\$4,600
Castenada, Carlos E.	Senior fair practice examiner.	White...	4,600
Ellinger, W. Don...	Associate fair practice examiner.	White...	3,200
William, LeRoy V.	do.	Colored...	3,200
Gutleben, Willetta G.	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,620
DuBose, Helen H.	Junior clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,620

This group is composed of five whites and one Negro. Remember that this is the group that prohibited the Dallas News from publishing an advertisement asking for Negro help. I have already given you the comments of the Dallas News on that incident.

Here is an editorial from the Dallas Times-Herald of Friday, May 19, 1944, backing up the Dallas News:

#### THE NEWS WAS WITHIN ITS RIGHTS

The Dallas Morning News was within its legally constituted rights to hire a Negro for a special job which it deemed a Negro best qualified to fill.

The News was within its legal rights to advertise for a Negro in its own newspaper, even though it is designated as an essential industry.

The Times-Herald is confident that, in hiring the Negro, the News management had no thought in mind of race discrimination. That management, we are convinced, was engaged in an orderly operation of its business.

No discerning white Texan is fooled by the fact that the issue was turned around so that it would appear to protect him from discrimination. That, of course, is an insult to his intelligence.

The raising of the race issue at this particular time by a Federal employee on a flimsy technicality bodes no good for either whites or Negroes. Those God-fearing men and women of both races who are trying to solve social problems on a just and tolerant basis are getting no help from thoughtless raisers of incidents which, though small and insignificant in themselves, add to the serious flame of prejudice and hatred.

The Times-Herald does not hesitate to endorse the stand of its competitor, the Dallas Morning News, on this issue that confronts, not only the Texas press, but the people of both races in Dallas and the entire Southwest.

THE EDITOR.

Here is the San Francisco regional office:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry...	Senior fair practice examiner.	White...	\$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored...	3,800
Rogers, Jewel E.	Clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,800
Seymour, Virginia R.	Senior clerk.	White...	1,800
Pestana, Frank S.	Associate fair practice examiner.	White...	3,200

You will note that this office is composed of four whites and one Negro—the Negro being the examiner-in-charge.

The subregional office, Los Angeles:

Name	Title	Race	Salary
Brown, Robert E.	Fair practice examiner.	Colored...	\$4,000
Burke, Jack B.	do.	White...	3,800
Calvaruso, Helen.	Clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,800
Vetter, Vera G.	Junior clerk-stenographer.	White...	1,440

This group is composed of one Negro and four whites, all of whom have foreign names. It is true that Jack B. Burke does not sound alien, but the truth is his real name is Jack Burton Burkowski. I understand he had his nose operated on and his name changed in Pennsylvania, but failed to pay the doctor who did the facial operation; so the physician exposed him by threatening to bring suit against him. He is listed by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, and also the Washington Book Shop, both of which were cited as being subversive, by the Attorney General of the United States.

These people, Mr. Chairman, constitute the personnel of this so-called Fair Employment Practice set-up that is stirring race trouble throughout the country, exercising the powers of dictatorship, and attempting to force their communistic policies upon the decent people of America.

This outfit is causing strikes instead of preventing them. It is being supported by Sidney Hillman, the racketeering head of the political action committee of the C. I. O., which is raising money by the shake-down method to try to get control of this country by corrupting the electorate of the Nation. As I said, this foreign-born, alien-minded racketeer wants to be the Hitler of America.

Let me read you an Associated Press article from Detroit, Mich., under date of May 16, 1944:

#### STRIKE SHUTS CHRYSLER PLANT—THREE MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS THROWN OUT

DETROIT, May 16.—Chrysler Corporation's Highland Park plant was closed, with 3,000 idle today, after a dispute during which a company spokesman said, three management officials were thrown out of the factory and three union stewards were discharged.

The company said the dispute was precipitated when employees, members of the

United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.), objected to deliveries of soft drinks by a member of the A. F. L. Teamsters' Union, which is engaged in a jurisdictional dispute with the Brewery Workers of America (C. I. O.).

U. A. W.-C. I. O. officials made no comment pending an investigation. The plant produces assemblies for Bofors guns, trucks, and bombers.

This gives an account of 3,000 strikers, members of the C. I. O., walking out because a member of the A. F. L. delivered a truck load of cold drinks to the workers in the plant.

This plant was producing guns, trucks, and bombers that are so direfully needed by our soldiers at the front.

I wonder what your boy will think who lies dying upon the battlefield, slain for the want of the very weapons this group of strikers was supposed to produce. Suppose our soldiers at the front should strike because a member of the wrong union was bringing up the ammunition.

And remember, these strikers in this Chrysler plant are the highest-paid workers in the world.

This same article goes on to say:

A walkout involving 3,800 workers at the Graham-Paige plant, in protest against a War Labor Board ruling, today halted production of amphibian tractors and precision parts for aircraft and marine engines and naval torpedoes.

While our boys are bleeding and dying for the want of these amphibious tractors which are so badly needed in this, the most critical hour of the war, this group goes on a strike and slows down the production of the very instruments our men must have unless untold thousands of them are to die for the want of them.

This same article goes on to say:

At Flint (Mich.) more than 1,400 workers were idle at the aluminum foundry of General Motors' Buick motors division in what a company spokesman described as a "slow-down that led to a walkout." The foundry produces castings for aircraft engines.

Think of that. A group of the highest paid workers in the world putting on a strike to slow down the production of airplane parts while our boys are dying in flaming airplanes over Europe, or crashing to their death for the want of this equipment.

But, Mr. Chairman, here is the worst one of all:

#### PRODUCTION OF DRUGS HALTED; STRIKE IS STILL ON

DETROIT, May 24.—Production of blood plasma, penicillin, and smallpox vaccine for the Army and Navy was at a standstill today in two Detroit plants of Parke, Davis, & Co., one of the Nation's largest producers of these essential drugs, as 1,900 employees extended their strike its second day.

The strikers are members of Local 176 of the C. I. O. Gas, Coke and Chemical Workers' Union.

In any other country in the world, under such circumstances, these people who promote these strikes would be shot for treason.

American soldiers, sailors, and Marines, are dying all over the world, on every battlefield, on the high seas and in the far-flung hospitals, for the want of this penicillin or for the want of small-pox

vaccine to prevent the spread of that terrible disease.

While this is going on, this so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee continues its communistic drive to harass the white people of America and to stir race trouble throughout the country.

The best thing President Roosevelt could do for his administration, for the American people and for the maintenance of peaceful relations between the races, would be to abolish this so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee at once.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have not raised my voice on this question or many questions recently. I am coming to you today not as a Democrat, not as a Republican, but the same as you, an American. It so happens I live in the South, and God knows I want each of you to know that I have no resentment to any of you. This is my country and this is your country. As I said here some time ago, whenever somebody pricks my skin it might hurt you; I have the same feelings and the same inherent characteristics. You cannot kick me without sometime it might hurt you. My prosperity is contingent upon yours, and your prosperity is contingent upon mine. Nobody in this Nation has a pipe line on unity or patriotism, nobody has that market cornered.

The people in my part of the world resent the stigma that some of these contemptible bureaucrats are heaping upon our defenseless shoulders. They have marched our sons off to war and they come in with the strong arm of bureaucracy and try to destroy us. I am astonished at this most terrible spectacle, the utter humiliation of my country by my own party's committee, being a party to this insidious tragic episode. And so I come to you as an American asking you as another American for God's sake to help us. My party I think has sold me down the river and there is not much I can do alone, but I appeal to you: Let us stop this F. E. P. C. If we do not, gentlemen, I say with every ounce of sincerity within me there is going to be bloodshed in my part of the world the like of which has never happened before in the history of this country. This thing is the embarking on a program of destruction and it is bound to come if you do not stop it. Give us a hand; we need it.

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

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the record of this debate will demonstrate that the opponents of F. E. P. C. have not dealt with the facts. They have refused to discuss the record of F. E. P. C. They have refused to discuss the fact that F. E. P. C. has handled 2,200 cases and they have failed to tell you what the record is in connection with these cases. They have failed to tell you of the excellent record F. E. P. C. made in these cases. They have failed to re-

veal what exists in the hearings and they have failed to tell you that F. E. P. C. has at all times exclusively concerned itself with one problem and one problem alone, and that is the problem of discrimination in employment because of race, color, or creed. That issue they have dodged; they have dodged it deliberately because they dared not discuss that issue. They have raised here false issues, and let me say to the Members who have been arguing against F. E. P. C. on the ground that there is no authorization, that they would vote against F. E. P. C. if there was authorization a million times. You would never support it, no matter how valid the authorization. And why will you not support it? Is it because F. E. P. C. has not been legislated into existence? Oh, no; that is not the real reason.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have only 3 minutes.

The real reason is because you want to perpetuate a Hitlerite concept of race supremacy in this country; that is the real reason. However, you will not successfully be able to resist the march of progress. You speak about revolution. The record so far will show that insurrectionary language was used by the opponents of F. E. P. C. One Member threatened that Negroes would walk the streets jobless if F. E. P. C. were continued. Another opponent of F. E. P. C. had the temerity to stand in the well of this House and say that if the ballots failed they would resort to bullets. Just what is revolutionary? F. E. P. C. or its enemies? It is the first time I have heard language as extremely insurrectionary on the floor of this House, and it came from the opponents of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, this F. E. P. C. is carrying out war purposes. Your railroads were not delivering the goods on time, not delivering men on time because of lack of manpower and yet they refused to upgrade highly skilled Negroes who are so essential to the delivery of goods and soldiers to their destinations. The fundamental issue involved here is the principle of the equality of man, the very foundation of our Nation. You oppose F. E. P. C. for one reason and one reason alone, the very same reason that the Emancipation Proclamation was opposed in these United States. F. E. P. C. is a continuation of the Emancipation Proclamation; it is democracy in action, the democracy for which men are fighting and dying everywhere in this world.

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

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, we have had a deluge of oratory on the Fair Practice Committee today. Blood pressures have been running high. Let us look at the facts calmly and dispassionately. I do not believe that any fair-minded person can carefully read the hearings on the fair employment practices estimate without reaching the conclusion that during the brief 8 months of the existence of this activity

it has made a real contribution to the national welfare and to the cause of the United Nations in two directions, first, in the direction of the national unity that is so essential to winning the war, and, second, in the direction of uncovering and utilizing reserves of manpower so much needed in our all-out war production.

The facts speak for themselves. Some of the salient facts in regard to the operation of this agency and the success it has had in settling racial disputes and removing the barriers to the utmost utilization of manpower are set forth in the hearings from page 526 on. The Federal Employment Practice Committee does not engage in any fishing expeditions. It acts on the basis of complaints received which are directed to the one and only point of discriminations, or threatened discriminations, in the matter of employment on account of race, creed, color or national origin. It is concerned only with discriminations in employment in the Government and war industries.

The bulk of its work is in the field, where complaints are received and examined. If the complaint is deemed valid an effort is made quietly and without blare of trumpets to adjust the difficulty. The committee has no punitive powers. It cannot impose sanctions. It can order hearings which sometimes are effective in bringing into operation the corrective influences of publicity, but under no circumstances can it say to an employer, "You must do thus and so." It can bring extreme cases of discrimination to the President for such attention as he cares to give them under the exercise of his war powers, but only in very few instances has it gone that far. Only 2 percent of the cases ever reach the hearing stage. The others are settled in the field. It is surprising how many cases have yielded to the persuasive influence of the committee's agents in the field. It is in this quiet, unostentatious work, which never gets into the public prints, that most of the good results of the Committee on Fair Employment Practices are accomplished.

Since July 1, last, 2,596 complaints have been docketed and 1,636 cases have been closed, leaving a balance of 960. Among the closed cases were 630 satisfactory adjustments. Roughly speaking, two-thirds of the cases have been dismissed and the remaining one-third have been satisfactorily adjusted.

The 630 satisfactory adjustments made by this committee have brought into satisfactory and effective employment relations many thousands who had not been employed in defense plants and many thousands more who had not been making their maximum contribution to the war effort. Certainly this is an important achievement from the standpoint of America and the United Nations. As evidence of the most impressive character on this point, I call attention to the following testimony on page 563 of the hearings:

Mr. Ludlow. You spoke of 630 cases being satisfactorily adjusted. How many persons would you say, roughly, were affected by those satisfactory adjustments, Mr. Ross?



Mr. MALCOLM ROSS. This is somewhat of an indirect answer, but I would like to say that I have a list here of firms, of large firms that did not employ Negroes before the defense effort started, but who now do. For instance, North American Aviation of Englewood employs 1,700 Negroes; Western Electric employs 6,000 where before it had never employed Negroes; the Federal Cartridge Co., a firm headed by a committee member, Mr. Charles Horn, had never employed Negroes before, and it is now the largest employer of Negroes in Minneapolis; the Wright Aeronautical Corporation employs nearly 3,000; Curtiss-Wright in New York employs 1,100 Negroes; Winchester Repeating Arms Co. employs 1,400, and others such as the Sun Shipbuilding Co. and the Glenn Martin Co. in Baltimore, and many in the deep South.

The testimony in the hearings showed that in many instances management has been entirely willing to employ Negroes but has been restrained by local prejudices and the Committee on Fair Employment Practice has stepped in and broken the ice and that with the employment of a few colored persons the feeling has disappeared and as the management and the community have become oriented to the new conditions the number of colored persons in that plant has grown to thousands, with the result that everybody is satisfied and the contribution to effective war manpower has been greatly enhanced. That was notably true at the Glenn Martin plant in Baltimore and at many other plants.

I assume that the city of Indianapolis may be regarded as being in all respects a typical American city. Most impressive evidence has come to me of the value and success of the Fair Employment Practice Committee's work in my home city.

I have the honor of representing a great industrial center in which we have thousands of factories of all kinds, and the industrial fabric out there has been greatly strengthened and increased as a result of the war, and I would just like to say that in our Indianapolis community the operations of this committee have been very helpful and very satisfactory, and I should like to read into the record a letter from Mr. William H. Book, executive vice president of our Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, bearing date of March 21, 1944, in which he submits this testimony:

Soon after the reorganization of the Fair Employment Practice Committee the field representatives of the agency visited Indianapolis, and since that time we have been able to maintain contact and observe the manner in which the work of the committee has been carried forward in this community. I am pleased to state that it has been conducted on a constructive basis which has already produced substantial beneficial results, and I confidently believe will be progressively more effective. We have been pleased to extend our fullest cooperation and to obtain cooperation from the management of many important Indianapolis industries in a better understanding of (1) the need for greater use of Negroes in war production and (2) the importance of carefully selecting and training of such Negro employees and their supervisors so as to effect this employment with the minimum of disturbance to production schedules.

Mr. Book stands very high in our community as a leader in industrial and civic

enterprise and I do not know anyone who is better qualified to evaluate the work of F. E. P. C. in Indianapolis and Indiana than he is.

On the whole the evidence that has come to me through our committee hearings and from all other directions convinces me that the Fair Employment Practices Committee is doing an outstanding job in promoting national unity, in improving and sustaining the morale of the tenth or more of our people who comprise the minority groups and in opening up reserves of manpower so much needed to win the war that would otherwise have remained untapped. Sincerely believing, as I do, that the Committee on Fair Employment Practices is a vital war agency, I hope that the amendment striking it down will not be adopted and that it will be implemented with the funds carried in this bill which are the minimum to enable it to carry on its work.

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

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to every word that has been spoken upon this subject since this bill was brought to the attention of the Congress.

If we vote on the roll-call vote as everything indicates, the item providing the appropriation for the F. E. P. C. will be stricken.

Every consideration should be given in amending the rules of the House to where a repetition will not recur in the future. It may necessitate those of us in opposition to this item to continue until the gavel falls for adjournment. I cannot understand for the life of me why we should have such rules in Congress as the one that was invoked in the present case. That of itself is sufficient, regardless of the merit of the measure, to vote this item out of the appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, am a rather strong advocate of a free press. I publish a small country newspaper and usually say what I want to so long as it is the truth. I do not want to be hamstrung too much by a bunch of these radicals in what I have to say, and that could happen. It is like the little want ad that appeared in the Dallas paper. You do not know how far F. E. P. C. will go. This is a runner-up of the emancipation and the proclamation of the old South, so says the gentleman from New York. How far are they going to run up emancipation proclamation before they stop?

Mr. Chairman, this is a part of the program of the present campaign. I received an ad today designed and drawn by an opponent of mine, and four other Congressmen have had a like ad written and they, like unto myself, are opposed by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. Possibly a lot of C. I. O.'s are officials of this F. E. P. C. Now, I am just about fed up on suppressing the press and free news. My seat in Congress is not worth my vote for this item. If that is the cost and penalty they can have it back. However, I believe my constituents will

say, "More power to you" when they know the workings of the F. E. P. C. This not only applies to the South, it is Nation-wide. It is a matter of principle and when a Member can come here at a late hour in the evening, with only a half dozen Members present, and destroy a rule of Congress, by unanimous consent, it is time to amend the rules if possible. That sort of practice should not be indulged in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I, too, am an American and in making my claim to that I apologize to no man. By every rule that you may measure men, apply it to me and see if I measure up to the test. This mark on my brow coming down here is the burn of mustard gas in the last war. This left arm of mine is a slip joint today, from raiding German trenches in the last war. I volunteered then because I was an American. So when we stand here today and talk about our country, I can speak for more than a million Negro Americans fighting today with our armed forces and more than 13,000,000 here at home—all Americans. They, too, have a part in this country. The F. E. P. C. was created as a war measure. Ten or more years of depression had caused the majority of 13,000,000 of our citizens to be on relief and to walk the streets jobless. They were unemployed, broke, and disheartened. Many of them were men with high skills and qualifications. Then the war emergency came and men and women of the other races went back to work. Still this large well of unemployment among Negroes remained because of bias and discrimination. They were called to the colors but they were not called back to work. They called upon the Government and upon every agency known to give them some relief from the system of unemployment. Then this Fair Employment Practice Committee was appointed. Without power of subpoena, without power to compel any man to obey its orders, armed only with the power of persuasion and the belief that, in the final analysis, the majority of the people of this country believe in the ideals of fair play and real Americanism, it undertook the task of integrating Negro manpower into war production. This committee has no power to compel anyone to do anything. So when I hear some Members stand here and refer to it as a dictatorial committee, bent on making people do something that they do not wish to do, I know they are not stating the facts to you. They are merely making statements in order to carry out their own purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you that this Fair Employment Practice Committee has had thousands of cases before it. They have gone into management, they have gone to the unions, they have talked—not the dictatorial talk of force—but they have talked Americanism. They have called upon the employers to give these people work; to employ them because they are Americans. There was no question where

Negroes stood in the war effort. You have but to look at them to know that they are loyal. You have but to look at them to know that they were born in this country and would stand by our flag. This Fair Employment Practice Committee went to work and, as I say, they have settled thousands of cases successfully. Their work should be continued and this amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Tarver amendment. Our fighting men are about to face a supreme test—the like of which, we who are secure can hardly imagine. I speak of cracking the western front. We have the stupendous example behind us of the raging land battles of our allies. It is our turn now—to take on the full massed army of the enemy, in attack. We shall break him with all the physical being, technical skill, and material power which we have brought together and developed in the past years. We have been warned in advance by those conducting this campaign that our personal loss will be dreadful. It will mount into the hundreds of thousands. No battle of ours until now compares with what lies ahead for us. It is our turn now.

In the face of this impending sacrifice, let us examine with the honesty of a surgeon's scalpel what we have contributed to real democracy to compensate for this bitter loss. How much is there undone? What of the unfinished democracy here in the Republic?

In losing the best of a generation to the Nazi brute are we attacking discrimination with boldness and righteous scorn befitting our soldier-liberators?

In honest truth, we can say that in these days the Bill of Rights and the "four freedoms" are being excoriated by some in America, who have never caught the real meaning of democracy. If we do not turn the tide of this force our fighting men will return to find the choking vines of discrimination obliterating the American worker for whose very existence he is fighting abroad—and who has sustained him with arms as he made the fight.

The men who are about to attack are one—to the enemy. The enemy will know the power of his fire—not his race, creed, or the origin of his forebears.

F. E. P. C., the one practical Federal agency which has met the minority question with a real answer—jobs, not words—is itself under salvo here in the Congress, its real function being diverted by the age-common game of might-is-right politics. This should not and cannot be the case in a free nation. The question concerns the working existence of our own citizens. This question concerns three-quarters of the peoples of the earth's globe who look to us for judicious leadership and revitalization of the meaning of popular government.

Ben Franklin was succinct with respect to who we are and what we mean

to the peoples of the world about us. Let us hear him again:

The eyes of Christendom are upon us, and our honor as a people is become a matter of the utmost consequence to be taken care of. If we give up our rights in this contest, a century to come will not restore to us the opinion of the world; we shall be stamped with the character of poltroons and fools.

The F. E. P. C. is war government.

The Executive order by which it was established is an expression of equity and cold-blooded reality war marked by the constitutional authority of the President as Commander in Chief.

Our Constitution is minorities. The stature of our moral leadership grew immeasurably through the statesmanship and vigorous equalitarian stand of the President when he issued this order. The order as amended in May 1943 reads in part:

It is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the war effort by all persons in the United States, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, in the firm belief that the democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders.

This order has provided equal opportunity for all Americans to participate in the production of battle weapons. To fight a far and tyranny as was organized by our enemies, we must call all hands on deck or go under. Previous discrimination as we had known it had to go by the board for reasons of survival and by the very nature of our democratic doctrines. We could not cut back the right of some 30,000,000 of minorities to share in the flood of work growing out of our war effort because of his or her particular custom or color of skin. Total war demanded total mobilization of manpower.

Because of our gigantic effort, hitherto untapped natural resources had to be forced out of our continent. To date the income of this Nation amounts to \$160,000,000,000 per annum compared to \$40,000,000,000 per annum of a decade ago. This new wealth made ruthless demands on every available pair of hands. The threat of distinction made no fine line of difference—youngsters and the aged; Irish, Polish, Negro, Scot, and even the infirm—we needed them all desperately. To have deliberately denied any person work and promotion would have been to sabotage ourselves as a whole.

Apart from the reality of plain work to be done let us never underestimate the morale of the minority in relation to war.

Thirty millions of people subject to discrimination is a vast number. It is 20 to 25 percent of the Nation. Disillusionment and frustration among neglected people was the cause in great part of the collapse in Western Europe. The Fascist mind resorted to endless invention and finally abducted the spirit of millions who had been discriminated against—economically or otherwise.

As to ourselves, how could our professions to democracy square with our induction of minorities into the armed services while at the same time deny them right to produce weapons of war to protect their sons, our kin, and neighbors.

It is only logical that once the need for labor was established, any person occupied in war work should receive pay on an equal basis with his coworkers. This is the labor standard of the land.

This is the meaning of economic democracy and proper in a nation abounding in wealth such as ours.

F. E. P. C. has the support of progressive labor leaders whose main preoccupation and task is to guide the practical and political affairs of the American workers. On the other hand, there are those labor leaders who would pull their own house down rather than admit a dark-skinned coworker to the full privileges of a federation for workmen.

I quote from the statement of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at their sixty-third convention held in October 1943:

The direct and whole-hearted participation of the representatives of the American Federation of Labor in the work of the Fair Employment Practice Committee has been based on the recognition of the fact that race discrimination in war employment is inconsistent with the Nation's foremost objectives in war for the survival of democracy. Such discrimination is not only contrary to individual human rights affirmed by our Constitution and basic to our institutions, but is also a threat to national unity during and after the war. Differential treatment of minority groups, and especially Negroes, at the time of maximum employment induced by the war, is bound to establish and perpetuate basic differentials in the Nation's wage structure solely because of race. When employment is curtailed after the war, the creation of a reservoir of cheap labor among Negro workers can only serve to destroy the established wage standards for all labor and result in racial strife. Insistent need for elimination of race discrimination in employment and wage standards is thus dictated, not only by the democratic principle to which the labor movement is pledged, but also by the need to assure economic stabilization.

The labor movement will crumble and crash if any segment of organized labor allows the resolutions and pledges taken in convention assembled to become a mere scrap of paper and allow words issued in convention to become a mere pap.

If responsible labor leaders have gone down the line in support of F. E. P. C. it is because of reason and a desire for healthy economics. Democratic principle is their pump-primer. A wise labor organization is not dry rot in the land, but a live organism. It cannot help but recognize the minority workers. These millions have and will work into the labor system and in turn become the consumers of the goods it fabricates.

I wish to quote at this point from President Philip Murray's report to the sixth constitutional convention of the C. I. O. held on November 1, 1943. In endorsing F. E. P. C., he has said:

Two years of practical experience in dealing with problems of discrimination in employment on grounds of race, creed, color, and national origin by the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice prove that these undemocratic and socially destructive practices can be controlled if approached with vigor and honesty—there is much ground yet to be covered, of course, for deep-seated habits and prejudices cannot be changed overnight. But a basic orientation has been achieved and we have a gen-



eral understanding now of the policies which must be followed in the long pull—from the time of the establishment of the first committee, C. I. O. has given strong support to this work. It was instrumental in obtaining the issuance of Executive Order 8802. It pressed for vigorous enforcement without fear or favor. It has urged full and prompt investigations and hearings in all situations where discriminatory practices have taken place.

The idea of an American minority sounds strange to most of us. Who is he? It is hard to think that we are anything but plain Americans—all of us. But there are those who have been standing on the fringe of equal opportunity for generations, or who have been discriminated against for fear of aiding the enemy. There are the million refugees who have fled the Axis combine to seek freedom and work within our shores. There is the American Indian, who receives only a minimum share in our industrial system—but whose inherent craft skill no one questions. Some 20,000,000 of our people are immigrant or first- or second-generation Germans, Italians, Jews, Finns, and French-Canadians. There are in America approximately 7,000,000 or more persons of Polish descent immediate or remote.

One person in ten in the United States is a Negro. There are 13,000,000 people in this largest minority group.

A major portion of 3,000,000 Spanish-Americans are located in the Southwestern States. These people's forebears helped settle New Mexico, Arizona, Texas, and southern California. New Mexico bore the highest loss of the 9,000 men who went to Bataan in April 1941. The Two Hundred and Five Hundred and Fifteenth Coast Artillery of New Mexico was made up of Spanish-speaking men in ace antiaircraft units. Many are Japanese prisoners now.

The F. E. P. C. is a fair yardstick to measure minority percentages by. Of the 3,000 complaints filed with the committee last year, 81 percent alleged discrimination because of race or color, 9 percent because of religion, 5½ percent because of alienage, and 4½ percent because of national origin.

The F. E. P. C. is not trying to impair the traditional employee-employer relationship of 30,000,000 persons in the United States but by adjusting complaints it is setting patterns for a greater slice of democracy than they ever received before.

As matters stand today a member of a minority group has one-eighth as good a chance of getting placed in skilled or semiskilled occupations as a member of a majority group.

F. E. P. C. has a big job cut out ahead. This Congress has a big job cut out ahead and the duty of making America a place of equal job opportunity for the men and women who are now returning or who are still overseas. The men and women in the fighting services are not a majority—they are everybody. They are the four freedoms in living, acting, fighting reality. They will want to see democracy work because they are fighting those who have discriminated against freedom.

Discrimination against a fellow citizen is unethical. Labor leaders and legis-

lators have aided in protecting the minority against economic exploitation to some extent—they have improved his general welfare, but for long centuries he carried his grief to the churches and synagogues. If he had a poor chance elsewhere he took comfort in religion. Today religious leaders are increasingly concerned with the practical measures to attain the ideal of the brotherhood of man. On November 13, 1943, the administrative board of the Catholic Welfare Conference at the direction of the archbishops and bishops who attended the annual meeting of the hierarchy in Washington issued an important statement on the essentials of a 'just peace. While the statement was concerned with international relations it significantly enough singled out the problem of extending equal justice to all groups of American citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. I quote the hierarchy:

It would be inconsistent to promote a world reconstruction in which all nations great and small, powerful and weak, would enjoy their rights in the family of nations, unless in our own national life we recognize an equality of opportunity for all our citizens and willing to extend to them the full benefits of our democratic institutions.

This statement was quoted in the January issue of Catholic Action and went on to say:

In the province of God there are among us millions of fellow citizens of the Negro race. We owe to these fellow citizens, who have contributed so largely to the development of our country, and for whose welfare history imposes on us a special obligation of justice, to see that they have in fact the rights which are given them in our Constitution. This means not only political equality but also fair economic and educational opportunities, a just share in public welfare projects, good housing without exploitation, and a full chance for the social advancement of their race.

Mr. Chairman, the thinking and desire for action in this instance has underlined the lot of the American Negro. The same applies to the Spanish-speaking population—it applies to the Jew who is discriminated against—to the Polish-American who carries his accent to the graveyard shift—to the Seventh-Day Adventist who worships on Saturday.

The kind of thinking I have just quoted is based on tolerance and love for the dignity of man. This is the foundation of our civilization. It is not original, but is being further implemented today by men of good will who know that the destiny of the world is democracy.

I should like to dwell on the subject of the Negro at this point—there is much said about him which only partly reveals his position in our war economy.

Out of a total of 14,000,000 war workers in the plants and factories reporting to the War Manpower Commission the actual number of Negroes making the necessities of war as of last July was a little more than 1,000,000.

This figure carries a good deal of significance. It is no mere abstract term for war workers punching time clocks. There is a history of evolution and re-

doubled effort of a loyal citizenry to receive their just due in real jobs.

During the last war when the Nation stepped up its production, thousands of Negroes proved their adaptability to industrial working conditions, although historically their source of livelihood stemmed from the land. During the last war they were the last hired and the first fired. When the war boom spiraled down into a depression, the Negro went down with it. What he had gained in higher standard of living was short-lived. He retained the new dignity but lost the proper standard of living. Later, during the world-wide depression of the thirties the members of his race weighted the relief rolls, in what seemed, to abnormal extent. But what private jobs there were went to others; consequently the public supported him on relief. In this war his race has come forward again in an attempt to hold down bona fide jobs, earn regular pay according to standard conditions set down for all who work in war. The Government policy of non-discrimination has supported this urge to come forward to work.

With the aid of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, 1,000,000 are contributing directly to the production of war essentials. Without discrimination approximately one-half million more could produce goods for the armed forces. This would be within the 10-percent ratio which the Negro bears to the whole population, and which could save management, government, and the whole war effort from the present exasperating search for adequate labor.

Discrimination has a strong foothold here on the home front and if F. E. P. C. for reasons of myopia among special groups is discouraged from doing its proper job, we shall lose critical numbers of willing and able workers now in war and for the reconstruction job which lies ahead.

Some still question the Negroes' capacity for industrial-type work. As far back as November 1942 the American Management Association discussed the Negro worker in a special research report. Enlightened personnel officers concluded these following points:

First. Negro workers have great potentialities; they have responded to training for industrial employment.

Second. Regardless of race, creed, color, where accepted, good personnel procedures are employed, workers respond, and satisfactory production may be expected.

Negro workers in war industries are still, for the most part, employed below their maximum or potential skills, but in many instances restrictions have been lifted to the benefit of production. Skilled Negroes have been recruited in a shipyard in Brunswick, Ga. In the area of Hampton Roads, Va., 4 Government establishments and the largest private contractor employed 2,000 skilled and 7,000 semiskilled Negroes. Shipyards in Mobile, Ala., recruited Negro welders, traditionally one of the highest skills. In Baltimore a leading shipyard has employed some 10,000 Negroes. Of these over 2,000 were skilled men in a wide variety of occupations. Two years prior to this only a few had been employed,

and they had been restricted to unskilled work. In the summer of 1943 over 65,000 Negro men and women had found employment in the aircraft industry. Thousands were in production jobs. From the fall of 1941 to January 1943 Western Electric increased its Negro employees from none to over 1,200. A large proportion of these were women, and Negro workers were employed in technical, clerical, skilled, and semi-skilled capacities.

This is something of the record where the barriers of discrimination were let down to the benefit of the whole country. Discrimination would have chalked the loss of these workers to the "too little and too late" side of the war ledger.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to point out the positive and negative sides of the question of discrimination. I believe that a long-run national program for combating discrimination must dig down to the basic causes. One of the most important of these is economic. It stems from the fear of job insecurity and competition. We know, for example, from studying the causes of the Detroit riots that in instances where white and Negro workers were engaged in essential and well-paid jobs—working side by side—there was no alarm and physical antagonism. In fact, there were numerous instances of rescue by white men of Negro coworkers.

The problem of discrimination, Mr. Chairman, will finally be settled in an American way, by American methods—as we have settled many diverse and angry problems before in our history. We are still a great and united Nation because in the final decisions all which is healthy and of integrity of the majority decides for the general welfare.

History and the evil abroad is challenging us to make our decision. We will accept that challenge by voting against the Tarver amendment.

We must take care of this problem. Is the Bill of Rights at home to be an all-encompassing doctrine—broad as our continent is broad, deep as the spirit of the good-neighbor policy, and universal as the agreements of Cairo, Moscow, and Tehran—or shall we deliberately and cynically intend to keep 30,000,000 of our own people limping at our side? The answer is that the country is already responding. This is America, the land and principles upon which is founded democracy, the guiding light of freedom and peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, there is a regional office of the F. E. P. C. in my district, in Atlanta. I have therefore had opportunity to observe the operations of this committee. I have no desire to play politics with the race question. It is too serious a matter to play politics with.

For whatever it may be worth to anybody who will listen, I just give to you as my sincere, candid opinion, that this committee has done more harm to the Negro race than anything that has happened within my memory; that it has created more racial prejudice in this

country than anything that has happened within my memory. I think it is a mistake. I believe that sincerely.

I think this is a problem that can be handled only by education, by mutual understanding, and by the people in the local communities.

Last year I spent 2 weeks in Indiana and Ohio with Senator BURTON, talking about post-war collaboration between the nations, and in every city I went to in those States the people talked to me constantly about the friction between the races that has been created recently. Neither one of these States can be considered as being in the South.

So I say to you as sincerely as I know how that in my judgment no greater mistake has been made in this country with relation to the race question than the creation of this committee, staffed as it is by crusaders, who do not understand the problem. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to endorse all that the gentleman has said in the first part of his speech, and join with him in striking this section from the bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have great admiration and respect for the gentleman who just spoke [Mr. RAMSPECK], the chairman of my committee. I have very high regard for him. I know that the sentiments as he expressed them here are sincere. But I feel that he is mistaken. The forces here, which are arrayed in opposition to the F. E. P. C. are the forces that represent intolerance, and who have been behind every reactionary movement, and have been opposed to all liberal, forward-looking legislation that has come before this House in my time. The same Members have been opposed to legislation to outlaw the poll tax and in favor of restrictions on organized labor.

There has been much talk here about the fact that the procedure is bad; that we ought to have legislation for such a committee, and then appropriate funds.

We have such a bill pending, and as a member of the Committee on Labor I am very happy to state that we are going to hold hearings, beginning June 1, on a permanent F. E. P. C. But I feel that the same Members who are opposed to this legislation will be opposed to that particular legislation. Coming, as I do, from a district in the city of New York representing all nationalities, I can state with assurance that we have found, in my district at least, that it is possible to get along without any discrimination, and in complete harmony. However, nobody can deny that there has been discrimination in certain parts of the country. If there is discrimination, then we should have some law, some committee, some commission, whatever it may be called, to outlaw such practices.

There is no compulsion about this committee, as has been stated before. It has no disciplinary powers. It cannot do anything more than hold up to public opinion the perpetrators of any act to prevent which, it has been created. It cannot mete out any punishment nor compel the cessation of such activities.

I hope the House will vote this amendment down and permit this committee to continue the fine work it has been doing.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the matter before the Committee deals with the subject of jobs; jobs in the war effort and jobs in Government service. The language as set forth in the report—and I would like to stay with the facts on this important subject—reads as follows:

It is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the war effort by all persons in the United States regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin—

So it deals with several groups of people—

in the firm belief that the democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders and that the successful prosecution of the war demands the maximum employment of all available workers regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

In this connection I will ask, when we return to the House, that a letter written by the Right Reverend Monsignor John A. Ryan, D. D., director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Department of Social Action, Washington, D. C., under date of March 20, be inserted. The letter follows:

NATIONAL CATHOLIC  
WELFARE CONFERENCE,  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL ACTION,  
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1944.  
Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RABAUT: I am glad to note that you are a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which is considering an appropriation for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. Since I know that you favor the appropriation, I am not writing to urge that course upon you but merely to say that I sincerely hope the appropriation will be made. It is a long time since Congress had before it a more worth-while proposal. The task and aims of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice are among the most humane and just that have ever been undertaken by any agency of our Government.

Sincerely yours,  
Rt. Rev. Msgr. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.,  
Director.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I regret the emotional disturbance created over this F. E. P. C. appropriation. It has been repeatedly charged that there is no legislative sanction for it. Since when have we become so terribly disturbed over legislative sanction? I recall many appropriations under war powers granted to the President that were scarcely noticed by this body.



Why are not we honest about this subject? Why try to camouflage the issue? We have sent our men to fight all over the world that all peoples might be free—to preserve the traditions we believe necessary to continue that freedom—freedom of religion, equality of opportunity regardless of race, color or creed. Are we logical in this debate today? Why should we deny to our own people the equality we insist is necessary to maintain a free world? Our soldiers are fighting and dying beside men of every color, of every religion. They are not concerned with the petty debate that we have heard here today. They are concerned with larger things. Things of supreme importance if we are to live as free men.

The Labor Committee intends to conduct hearings on bills to make F. E. P. C. a permanent organization. We shall begin these hearings on June 1, and we believe they will be revealing. If we really believe in the "four freedoms" we should not hesitate to face any issue concerned with these freedoms. The Labor Committee does not intend to sidestep. We intend to hold fair hearings and develop all the facts. We shall then be in a position to present a bill for your consideration as a result of those hearings. Until we do this the present appropriation will be continued for this very worthy cause.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to read to the House two short paragraphs from an editorial appearing in the Dallas News.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. These paragraphs are as follows:

If white and colored people can be segregated in schools, on streetcars, and elsewhere on the basis of our State laws, sustained by a United States Supreme Court decision, it is absurd for a Federal agency, having no more authority than Presidential ukase, to transcend the theory held by the Supreme Court, in its directives to employers in their private business. For, certainly, under any theory or law, more liberty in the choice of associates is permitted in private than in public service. It would be easily possible for the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee to perform its legitimate function of seeing that Negroes get a fair deal in war-industry employment, yet without attempting to break down the time-honored southern tradition of segregation. With such a policy the News would be in entire sympathy.

Not only does the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee attempt to abolish segregation, it ignores the fact that, in the long-standing traditions and practices of the South, a considerable difference has been established in the actual skills of white and colored people. To the extent that it would abolish precise advertising, it would create confusion and bring about wastage of manpower.

In my opinion, this proposal goes far beyond the question of industrial employment, as pointed out by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. I repeat that I shall vote to strike the provision from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, my views on this amendment follow very closely those which have been so well expressed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY]. Since he has already stated the same reasons which I myself am following in voting against the pending amendment, I shall not consume all of my time. It seems to me that as an act of economic justice the appropriation for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice should continue.

The CHAIRMAN. This concludes all debate except the 5 minutes reserved for the committee. Does the chairman of the committee desire recognition?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Since 5 minutes is left before debate is concluded, I ask recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has already been concluded except the 5 minutes reserved for the committee.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the proponents of this amendment. I fear that it is sort of a theatrical storm that they are raising. Their facts and opinions are out of kilter and accuracy.

I should like to quote to some of the proponents of the amendment something that was written a great many years ago, and I quote from the Bible the words of the great book of Leviticus. If you go to Philadelphia you will see inscribed on the Liberty Bell these words of Leviticus:

"Proclaim liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

That wise book did not limit its phrase to proclaiming liberty throughout the land. The author knew that rulers might abuse that dictum and would not give proper administration to the "proclaim liberty throughout the land." He carefully added "to all the inhabitants thereof."

All that the President's directive did in the setting up of this Committee on Fair Employment Practice was to try to give that liberty to all the inhabitants of the land, regardless of race, of creed, or of religion. The President in setting up the committee spoke of the "firm belief that the democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders."

We know that we need approximately 100,000 men more every quarter in the plants producing munitions, but we are keeping them away from those plants because of racial bias and prejudice, which is sought to be struck down by this Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

It goes without saying that a Negro or a Jew or a Latin American or a Catholic

in certain quarters is denied war employment entirely, and in other cases is forced to clean cuspidors, when he is amply qualified to run a turret lathe. This creates tremendous discontent and weakens morale on the home front, which is just as important as the battle front.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN), there were—ayes 139, noes 95.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 141, noes 103.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of War Information, including the employment of a Director and Associate Director at not exceeding \$12,000 and \$10,000 per annum, respectively; not to exceed \$75,000 for the temporary employment in the United States of persons by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil service and classification laws; employment of aliens; employment of persons outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to the civil service and classification laws travel expenses (not to exceed \$400,000 for travel within the continental limits of the United States); expenses of transporting employees and their effects from their homes to their places of employment in a foreign country and return to their homes in the United States; purchase of radio time and purchase or rental of facilities for radio transmission; purchase, rental, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of facilities for radio transmission and reception, including real property outside the continental limits of the United States and temporary sentry stations, guard barracks, and enclosures for the security of short-wave broadcasting facilities within the continental limits of the United States without regard to the provisions of section 355, Revised Statutes (40 U. S. C. 255), and other provisions of law affecting the purchase or rental of land and the construction of buildings thereon; advertising in foreign newspapers without regard to section 3828, Revised Statutes (44 U. S. C. 324); printing and binding (not to exceed \$2,710,389, for such expenses within the continental limits of the United States), including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase or rental and operation of photographic, reproduction, printing, duplicating, communication, and other machines, equipment, and devices; exchange of funds without regard to section 3651, Revised Statutes; purchase of 486 motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the United States which may be acquired without regard to statutory limitations as to price and authority to purchase; acquisition, production, and free distribution of publications, phonograph records, radio transcriptions, motion-picture films, photographs and pictures, educational materials, and such other items as the Director may deem necessary to carry out the program of the Office of War Information, and sale or rental of such items by contract or otherwise to firms or individuals for use outside the continental limits of the United

States; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for use by porters, drivers, messengers, watchmen, and other custodial employees outside continental United States; such gratuitous expenses of travel and subsistence as the Director deems advisable in the fields of education, travel, radio, press, and cinema; not to exceed \$125,000 for entertainment of officials and others in the fields of education, radio, press, and cinema of other countries, payment of the United States' share of the expenses of the maintenance, in cooperation with any other of the United Nations, of organizations and activities designed to receive and disseminate information relative to the prosecution of the war; \$58,625,367: *Provided*, That, exclusive of the contingency fund mentioned in the last proviso hereof, not more than \$48,562,101 (including living and quarters allowances) shall be allocated to the Overseas Operations Branch and not more than \$2,200,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch for the following functions only: Office of the Director, including book and magazine coordination sections; Office of Program Coordination; News Bureau; Bureau of Special Services; Radio Bureau; Motion Picture Bureau, not exceeding \$50,000; *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Office of War Information is authorized in making contracts for the use of international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators or said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose, against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$600,000 of this appropriation shall be available to meet emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Director, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified: *Provided further*, That \$5,500,000 of this appropriation shall not be available for expenditure unless the Director of the Office of War Information, with the approval of the President, shall determine that such funds, in addition to the other funds provided herein for the Overseas Branch, are necessary for carrying on activities in conjunction with actual or projected military operations and that accounts for these funds may be merged with regular accounts.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DWORSHAK:

On page 18, line 24, strike out "\$58,625,367" and insert "\$53,125,367."

On page 18, line 24, strike out all after the word "provided."

On line 25, strike out all of the line up to the words "not more than."

On page 19, line 24, strike out the word "provided" and the remainder of the paragraph through line 7, on page 20.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to eliminate \$5,500,000 from the appropriation for O. W. I. and to eliminate a proviso, which I read:

*Provided further*, That \$5,500,000 of this appropriation shall not be available for expenditure unless the Director of the Office of War Information, with the approval of the President, shall determine that such funds in addition to the other funds provided herein for the Overseas Branch are necessary for carrying on activities in conjunction with actual or projected military operations and

that accounts for these funds may be merged with regular accounts.

You have probably observed during the extensive debate on O. W. I. yesterday and today that the committee has recommended an increase of \$20,402,000 over the appropriation for the current year which was \$38,222,000.

I do not have time to go into the details and discuss the merits of this entire appropriation but I submit this amendment solely on the basis that the proviso constitutes a blank check. The report submitted by the committee says that it cut \$4,500,000 in the contingency fund from a requested \$10,000,000 for allocation when approved by the President to the Overseas Branch in conjunction with actual or projected military activities; and that the remaining sum of \$5,500,000 shall be available as the fiscal year progresses if needs develop. There has been no justification by O. W. I. to make it available now.

We have heard a great deal about the publications which have been distributed and circulated by the O. W. I. This amendment is not concerned with that activity. But I call attention to the fact that during the year the O. W. I. has had for domestic and foreign operations, 7,557 civilian employees and is asking for an increase of 2,300, to 9,803, exclusive of this \$5,500,000. In April of this year the ranking minority member of this committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], vigorously assailed the spending by O. W. I. and displayed to the House a copy of the Handbook on the United States of America, that was circulated overseas.

I should like to go into the details on that, but, on page 2, I want to quote from one paragraph. I quote from this Handbook circulated by the O. W. I. as follows:

Even in less critical periods the Nation in the twentieth century has come to expect the President to take the lead in formulating general domestic policies for the country. Increasingly, the President has become the legislative leader, setting a definite program before Congress and using his influence to secure its enactment into law.

By this amendment I propose to eliminate \$5,500,000, for which no justifications have been submitted to the subcommittee which brought in this bill. If during the next year there should be any need arising whereby the O. W. I. should require additional funds, then I submit to you it will be time for Elmer Davis and his agency to come before the Congress and ask for a deficiency appropriation.

There are few Members of this body who have not, during the past few years, condemned the practice which has been followed on various occasions, of issuing these blank checks to the President to spend funds, if and when he thought it necessary. The O. W. I. has in this bill \$20,000,000 more than this year. If we eliminate this \$5,500,000 O. W. I. will still have \$15,000,000 more than during the current year.

We know that O. W. I. has been waging psychological warfare; but if that program is successful—and it has been in some respects—and additional funds

are needed, this Congress will be in session, or a succeeding Congress will, and the representatives of O. W. I. can come here and ask for additional funds. That is the only issue at stake in this amendment, whether we are going to surrender our control over the purse strings, or whether the Congress is going to take the position that it is our joint responsibility to control the expenditures of Executive departments of the Government.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have consulted with Members on both sides of the aisle. They seem to favor as brief debate as possible on the remainder of the bill. For that reason I move that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] be recognized for 2 minutes and that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] be recognized for the remaining 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman read that proviso. This is a limitation. It reads:

*Provided further*, That \$5,500,000 of this appropriation shall not be available for expenditure unless the Director of the Office of War Information, with the approval of the President, shall determine that such funds are necessary—

And so forth. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the Congress, like many people in this country, does not realize that we have 10,000,000 people in the armed forces; that we are on the verge of an invasion. They do not realize that we are engaged in the greatest war the world has ever known. In April we had 25,000 casualties. Every minute of the month of April there was a casualty. As I speak here now for 2 minutes, on the basis of what happened in April, two of our American defenders are listed as casualties.

It seems to me that it is time for all of us to get together and do what we can on the home front to support the armed forces and the defeat of this amendment is a way to help do it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. But opposition has 7 minutes where the proponents have but 5.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield briefly.

Mr. PLOESER. I merely wanted to clarify the statement made by the gen-



tleman from Missouri. The amendment did not call for reducing the \$58,000,000 appropriation \$5,500,000; it went on to cut out that particular proviso to recommend that \$5,500,000 be cut. The statement was in error and in misunderstanding of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the statement of the gentleman from Missouri is correct. This is a proposed cut on the part of the gentleman from Idaho of \$5,500,000 from the gross amount. That amount was agreed to by the members of the subcommittee after we had all argued back and forth for a long time on it. Some of us thought it should be more and others thought there should not be any cut, but that was the amount agreed on in the committee.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Let me say that this item in this bill has had as careful consideration on the part of the deficiency committee as could be given to it. We were so much interested in it that many members of the committee made a special trip to the city of New York to look at the overseas operations. We considered the matter, we advanced our own opinions, and the judgment of the subcommittee was that the amount of funds reported in this bill ought to be passed by the Congress.

I admit that the committee is not infallible, that the House and the Committee of the Whole has a right to do whatever it wishes to do notwithstanding the recommendation of the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Massachusetts, and other minority members of the deficiency committee, as well as the rest of us. It seems to me that our deliberate, considered judgment after careful hearings ought to have some weight in the Committee of the Whole. The Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information today is performing a vital, critical function in the war effort and in this particular invasion which we are momentarily expecting. I should like to read from the report. Here is what Deputy Chief of Staff General McNarney, speaking for General Marshall, said. We asked him their opinion about this thing, how it fitted into the war program, and its usefulness, and here is what he said:

The War Department believes that both the Office of War Information and the Office of Strategic Services are performing essential functions overseas. Approved plans do call for increased activity on the part of both of these organizations, and as military operations expand, it is to be expected that their work will increase.

No further militarization of the Office of Strategic Services and the Office of War Information is planned. As you know, the Army is finding it difficult to remain under the present manpower ceiling of 7,700,000 men and still furnish all military personnel and units required for planned operations. Because of our manpower limitations, it is mandatory that the Office of Strategic Services and the Office of War Information be manned so far as possible by civilians.

The military commander says this function is necessary.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to finish. Under the specific man-

date of the military commanders in the field, O. W. I. is setting up 35 new outposts in connection with the present advanced and extended military operations in the field. Right today, right tonight, every hour of the day and every hour of the night, the new radio broadcasting station set up in London carries the voice of General Eisenhower to the nations and to the underground, giving the information relative to the impending invasion.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I cannot yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I submit there is a misrepresentation. I am not taking any money away from that \$48,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I know, but the gentleman is trying to reduce the emergency fund by \$5,000,000 and our committee has already reduced it \$6,000,000. We took \$4,500,000 from the emergency fund, took \$1,000,000 from general funds, and took \$245,000 from the domestic branch of O. W. I.

Mr. Chairman, it would be taking a great chance to cut this any further than it has been cut and I want to appeal to the Committee and to the House to back the deliberate ultimate judgment, the considered judgment of the deficiency subcommittee which brings this item to you as a vital critical war necessity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DWORSHAK) there were—ayes 69, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation herein made for the Office of War Information shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1945 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source except by reverse lend-lease.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope that when the Tarver amendment reaches the floor of the House for a roll-call vote that it will be defeated.

I will not take the balance of my 5 minutes at this time but ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.)

The Clerk read as follows:

#### WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the War Production Board, including salary of the chairman at \$15,000 per annum, and salaries of six vice chairmen or principal officials at \$10,000 per annum each; the employment of aliens; the employment of expert witnesses; not to exceed \$20,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service or classification laws; not to exceed \$5,000 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifically author-

ized or approved by the Chairman; reimbursement at not to exceed 3 cents per mile, of employees for expenses incurred by them in performance of official travel in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations; not to exceed \$4,625,000 for travel expenses, including travel to and from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Standardized Travel Regulations, including travel in privately owned automobile (and including per diem in lieu of subsistence at place of employment) of persons employed intermittently away from their homes or regular places of business as compliance commissioners and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis; not to exceed \$1,217,000 for printing and binding; not to exceed \$4,500,000 for scientific research on materials, material substitutes, and other subjects related to the functions of the Board, without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes; and the rental, maintenance and operation of one airplane; \$67,500,000: *Provided*, That the requirement in section 301 of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1943, and in section 201 (a) of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, that the payment of expenses of travel of employees on transfer from one official station to another must be authorized in the order directing the transfer is hereby waived with respect to such travel performed, with the approval of the Chairman of the Board, or his designee, in the fiscal year 1943, and in the fiscal year 1944 prior to November 1, 1943.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 22, line 6, strike out "\$67,500,000" and insert "\$66,839,300"; and after the period in line 16 insert the following: "*Provided*, That none of the funds herein provided shall be expended for the purpose of paying any salaries or expenses in establishing, operating, or maintaining a labor production office."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I addressed the Committee this afternoon upon this subject. I shall not detain the Committee at length in connection with this amendment now.

The purpose of this amendment is to remove from the War Production Board appropriation \$600,700 which is asked for to carry on the activities of a labor production office in the War Production Board.

I attempted to demonstrate this afternoon that this agency in the War Production Board is a complete duplication of the regular established agencies in the Department of Labor.

My purpose in offering the amendment is to try to protect and guarantee the integrity of the agency of Government that has been set up to handle labor problems, which is the Department of Labor. The purpose of the amendment is to protect the Wage Adjustment Board in the Department of Labor. The purpose of the amendment is to protect the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor. The purpose of the amendment is to protect other agencies in the Department of Labor whose work is being duplicated, impinged on, and interfered with by a competing and duplicating agency set up in the War Production Board.

Mr. Chairman, the Members may get tired, they may think this is the usual perfunctory amendment, but may I say

now that here is an opportunity to save six-hundred-odd-thousand dollars by doing away with an agency that makes absolutely no contribution to the war effort but simply provides a lot of jobs for people to interfere with and duplicate the work of an established agency of Government, the Department of Labor.

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

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

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Would not the gentleman say also that more important than the saving of money is the building up of the standard of Dr. Steelman's office and not having a competing organization built up against him?

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman from New Mexico is absolutely right. This matter has been given some consideration by those who are familiar with it. The gentleman who just addressed the House, a member of the subcommittee that has charge of the Labor appropriation bill, knows that I am absolutely right in this situation. Anyone else who is familiar with the facts must know that if we are to stop this expenditure of public money, here is one crystal-clear opportunity to do it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COCHRAN. During the hearings on the bill that the gentleman refers to was it clearly brought out that this branch of the War Production Board was duplicating the work of an agency of the Department of Labor?

Mr. KEEFE. The hearings I referred to, which are the hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Labor and Social Security makes that conclusion inevitable.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that some overlapping is bound to occur in a department connected with labor production in this emergency. I have talked with Mr. Steelman today and he advises me that since Mr. Keenan has been in charge of the Office of Labor Production he has worked with Mr. Keenan harmoniously and for the benefit of both. They have worked out a cooperative understanding and arrangement whereby they are responsible for conciliation work. Mr. Steelman in his conciliation department, and Mr. Keenan and his staff in labor production and other special problems entirely apart from conciliation work in the Labor Department.

I think most of you gentleman know that I would not take anything away from the Labor Department that belonged properly there.

There is complete cooperation between these two agencies and no overlapping. I note on pages 690 and 691 of the hearings when Mr. Keenan was before the subcommittee and was asked about this overlapping he testified as follows:

I considered this question, which has been suggested here today, very fully when I became head of the Office of Labor Production and I determined that we would not duplicate the work of any other agencies that were concerned with labor problems. I thereupon began discussions with the Department of Labor, the War Manpower Commission, and other agencies, to work out mutually satisfactory operations that would not involve duplication. For the record I am submitting a list of the agreements that were made with these agencies.

Then a list of the agreements with other agencies follows, on page 691 of the hearings, after which Mr. Keenan testified as follows:

Mr. KEENAN. As to what we have found in the Labor Department, at the last hearing a year ago, there were some complaints about our overlapping with the Conciliation Service and some of the other functions of the Labor Department. We met with the Secretary of Labor and straightened it out. Our job is entirely confined to war production. Most of the work that we have is before anything happens. We are in production mainly, and if we find that there is dissatisfaction in the plant we go in and try to find out what the dissatisfaction is and start to straighten it out so we can increase production. We are building up a relationship between labor and management. I know that you know that many of these plants have just been organized in the last 3 or 4 years and they have not had much experience. There is generally a barrier between the two and we have been trying to get them to work together to increase production.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], will be defeated.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I earnestly solicit the attention of every member of this Committee? This is the most devastating amendment that has yet been offered or that will be offered to this bill. It is a proposition of the most serious import. I doubt whether many members of the Committee realize what disastrous effects would follow the adoption of such an amendment. It is aimed directly at production; it is potentially a handicap to production in every factory in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this war is a war of production. We are winning and we are going to win simply because we have out-produced the enemy nations.

This amendment proposes to strike out the entire labor section of the War Production Board. It eliminates every labor administrative activity of the Board. It strikes out the administrative leadership

of 6,000 of the labor-management committees. This is not a mere political amendment. It strikes at the heart of essential war production. If this provision should go out it would peril the production schedule of every war plant in the United States. The function of this section, which this amendment strikes out, is a function second to none. It keeps friction down and it keeps production up.

Let me read just one paragraph from the hearing in proof of what this amendment may be expected to do. Here is the testimony before the committee, and I hope you later read it yourself. You are dealing here with perhaps the most serious question that has come before the committee in the 2 days we have devoted to the consideration of this bill. Here it is. Mr. Keenan said:

I know of a particular case that we worked on in Republic Steel where for a year they were getting 450 or 500 tons of plate, and suddenly it dropped to 325 tons. We found out what was wrong and after working together with management and a man from the War Production Board we found where the difficulty was and got production up again. That is a job that a man from the conciliation service never could have gotten into.

That is the possible situation in every factory in the United States. You are running the risk of cutting down production at the most critical period of the war. Our armed forces are now asking for more armaments; for more ordnance. They are asking for heavier field guns. They are asking for vast supplies of additional munitions. The request came only yesterday. They need more planes. They must have these supplies. The factories must produce them. We are burning up planes over there at a rate which few fully realize.

I sincerely hope the Committee will consider seriously this far-reaching amendment. It should be voted down.

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

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

Mr. COCHRAN. As presented by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], he developed an argument to show that there was duplication. As presented by the gentleman from New Jersey, and the gentleman from Missouri, there is absolutely no duplication.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There can be no duplication.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentleman and I think the amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

War Shipping Administration, revolving fund: To increase the War Shipping Administration revolving fund, \$450,000,000, which amount together with other funds heretofore or hereafter made available to such revolving fund, shall be available for carrying on all the activities and functions of the War Shipping Administration (not provided for under other appropriations made to said Administration), under Executive order of Feb-



ruary 7, 1942 (7 F. R. 837), and heretofore or hereafter lawfully vested in such Administration, including costs incidental to the acquisition, operation, loading, discharging, and use of vessels transferred for use of any department or agency of the United States, for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112 of March 26, 1942, and for all administrative expenses (not to exceed \$14,500,000 in the fiscal year 1945), including the employment and compensation of persons in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, such employment and compensation to be in accordance with laws applicable to the employment and compensation of persons by the United States Maritime Commission except section 201 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (49 Stat. 1985); expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Administrator, at meetings concerned with the work of the Administration; actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving while away from their permanent homes or regular places of business in an advisory capacity to or employed by the Administration without other compensation from the United States or at \$1 per annum; printing and binding; lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals and newspapers; teletype services; purchase, maintenance, repair, rental in foreign countries, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; travel expenses, including transportation of effects under regulations prescribed by the Administrator, of employees from their homes to their first post of duty in a foreign country; rent, including heat, light, and power, outside the District of Columbia; necessary advance payments in foreign countries; and the employment, on a contract or fee basis, of persons, firms, or corporations for the performance of special services, including legal services, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the civil-service and classification laws: *Provided*, That when vessels are transferred or assigned permanently by the War Shipping Administrator to other departments or agencies of the United States Government for operation by them, funds for the operation, loading, discharging, repairs, and alterations, or other use of such vessels may be transferred from this fund to the applicable appropriations of the department or agency concerned in such amounts as may be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to transfer the sum of \$100,000,000 from the marine and war risk insurance fund to the War Shipping Administration revolving fund.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, under the rules of the House, permission having been previously granted, I have permission to revise and extend my remarks or I can follow a course which is often followed of stating in the Record that they will appear later. However, I believe in direct action on all occasions, and at this time I ask unanimous consent that I may omit from the Record the remarks made earlier in the day.

The CHAIRMAN. That permission will have to be obtained in the House and not in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be

agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 119, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

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, and was read the third time.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KEEFE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEEFE of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: "Reduce W. P. B. \$600,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 58, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—247

Andersen,	Bates, Ky.	Butler
H. Carl	Bates, Mass.	Byrne
Anderson, Calif.	Bender	Canfield
Anderson,	Bennett, Mich.	Cannon, Mo.
N. Mex.	Bennett, Mo.	Carlson, Kans.
Andresen,	Bishop	Carrier
August H.	Blackney	Carter
Angell	Bloom	Case
Arends	Bradley, Mich.	Celler
Arnold	Bradley, Pa.	Chapman
Auchincloss	Brown, Ohio	Chenoweth
Baldwin, Md.	Buffett	Chipperfield
Baldwin, N. Y.	Burchill, N. Y.	Church
Barrett	Busbey	Clark

Clevenger	Horan	Pittenger
Cochran	Howell	Ploesser
Coffee	Izac	Plumley
Cole, Mo.	Jennings	Poulson
Cooley	Jensen	Pratt,
Cooper	Johnson,	Joseph M.
Courtney	Anton J.	Priest
Crawford	Johnson, Ind.	Rabaut
Crosser	Johnson,	Ramey
Cunningham	J. Leroy	Reece, Tenn.
Curtis	Johnson,	Reed, Ill.
D'Alesandro	Luther A.	Reed, N. Y.
Davis	Johnson, Ward	Rockwell
Dawson	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Day	Judd	Rohrbough
Dewey	Kean	Rolph
Dickstein	Kee	Rowan
Dilweg	Kefauver	Rowe
Dingell	Kelley	Sabath
Dondero	Kilday	Sadowski
Dworshak	Kirwan	Sasser
Eberharter	Klein	Sauthoff
Elliott	LaFollette	Scanlon
Ellis	Lambertson	Schiffler
Ellison, Md.	Landis	Schwabe
Ellsworth	Lane	Scott
Elmer	Lea	Sheppard
Elston, Ohio	LeCompte	Sheridan
Engel, Mich.	LeFevre	Simpson, Ill.
Engle, Calif.	Lemke	Simpson, Pa.
Fay	Lesinski	Slaughter
Feighan	Luce	Smith, Ohio
Fellows	Ludlow	Smith, W. Va.
Fenton	McCormell	Somers, N. Y.
Fitzpatrick	McCord	Spence
Flannagan	McCormack	Springer
Fogarty	McCowan	Stanley
Forand	McGregor	Stefan
Ford	McMurray	Stevenson
Gale	Maas	Stewart
Gamble	Madden	Stigler
Gifford	Magnuson	Stockman
Gillespie	Maloney	Sullivan
Gillette	Mansfield,	Sumner, Ill.
Gillie	Mont.	Sundstrom
Goodwin	Mansfield, Tex.	Taber
Gordon	Marcantonio	Talle
Gore	May	Tarver
Gorski	Michener	Thomas, N. J.
Graham	Miller, Conn.	Thomason
Gregory	Miller, Mo.	Tibbott
Gross	Miller, Nebr.	Tolan
Gwynne	Miller, Pa.	Torrens
Hale	Mills	Voorthis, Calif.
Hall,	Monroney	Vorys, Ohio
Edwin Arthur	Mott	Walter
Hall,	Mruk	Welch, Ohio
Leonard W.	Mundt	Welch
Halleck	Murdock	Wene
Hancock	Murphy	White
Harness, Ind.	Murray, Tenn.	Whittington
Hart	Murray, Wis.	Wickersham
Hays	Myers	Wigglesworth
Herter	Norman	Willey
Hess	Norton	Wilson
Hill	O'Brien, Ill.	Wolcott
Hoch	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolverton, N. J.
Hoeven	O'Brien, N. Y.	Woodruff, Mich.
Hoffman	O'Hara	Woodrum, Va.
Hollifield	O'Neal	Wright
Holmes, Wash.	Outland	Zimmerman
Hope	Phillips	

NAYS—58

Abernethy	Harris, Ark.	Ramspeck
Allen, La.	Hendricks	Rankin
Beckworth	Hobbs	Richards
Bland	Jarman	Rivers
Brooks	Keefe	Rizley
Brown, Ga.	Kleberg	Russell
Bryson	Lanham	Satterfield
Burch, Va.	McGehee	Short
Camp	McKenzie	Sikes
Colmer	McMillan	Smith, Va.
Cox	McWilliams	Sparkman
Cravens	Mahon	Starnes, Ala.
Drewry	Norrell	Thomas, Tex.
Fisher	O'Konski	West
Fulmer	Pace	Whitten
Gathings	Patman	Winstead
Gibson	Peterson, Fla.	Winter
Gossett	Peterson, Ga.	Worley
Grant, Ala.	Poage	
Hare	Price	

NOT VOTING—123

Allen, Ill.	Bonner	Burgin
Andrews, Ala.	Boren	Cannon, Fla.
Andrews, N. Y.	Boykin	Capozzoli
Barden	Brehm	Carson, Ohio
Barry	Brumbaugh	Clason
Beall	Buckley	Cole, N. Y.
Bell	Bulwinkle	Compton
Bolton	Burdick	Costello

Curley	Jackson	Patton
Delaney	Jeffrey	Pfeiffer
Dies	Jenkins	Philbin
Dirksen	Johnson,	Powers
Disney	Calvin D.	Pracht,
Doughton	Johnson,	C. Frederick
Douglas	Lyndon B.	Randolph
Durham	Johnson, Okla.	Rees, Kans.
Eaton	Jones	Robertson
Fernandez	Kearney	Robinson, Utah
Fish	Kennedy	Robison, Ky.
Folger	Keogh	Rodgers, Pa.
Fulbright	Kerr	Scrivner
Fuller	Kilburn	Shafer
Furlong	King	Smith, Maine
Gallagher	Kinzer	Smith, Wis.
Gavin	Knutson	Snyder
Gearhart	Kunkel	Stearns, N. H.
Gerlach	Larcade	Sumners, Tex.
Gilchrist	Lewis	Talbot
Granger	Lynch	Taylor
Grant, Ind.	McLean	Towe
Green	Manasco	Treadway
Griffiths	Martin, Iowa	Troutman
Hagen	Martin, Mass.	Vincent, Ky.
Harless, Ariz.	Mason	Vinson, Ga.
Harris, Va.	Merritt	Vursell
Hartley	Morrow	Wadsworth
Hébert	Monkiewicz	Ward
Heffernan	Morrison, La.	Wasielewski
Heldinger	Morrison, N. C.	Weaver
Hinsaw	Newsome	Wells
Holmes, Mass.	O'Connor	Welchel, Ga.
Hull	O'Toole	Wolfenden, Pa.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Grant of Indiana for, with Mr. Robertson against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Harris of Virginia against.

General pairs:

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Carson of Ohio.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Randolph with Mrs. Smith of Maine.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. King with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Jones.

Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Scrivner.

Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Pfeiffer with Mr. Griffiths.

Mr. Manasco with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Monkiewicz.

Mr. Heffernan with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Green with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Patton with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Newsome with Mr. Jeffrey.

Mr. Welchel of Georgia with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Gilchrist.

Mr. Folger with Mr. Rees of Kansas.

Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Powers.

Mr. Furlong with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Kinzer.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Troutman.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. DAVIS changed his vote from no to aye.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. CANNON of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed and lay that motion on the table was agreed to.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 230, Rept. No. 1524) authorizing the Committee on Labor to conduct and investigate the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped, and for other purposes which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (1) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped, (2) to study and investigate the diffusion within the United States of such aid to the physically handicapped, (3) employment opportunities for the physically handicapped, and all other questions in relation thereto which would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The said committee or any subcommittee is authorized to obtain and use for statistical purposes only, confidential information (1) from the record of the Selective Service System, (2) records from the War Manpower Commission and (3) from the records of the Bureau of the Census subject to the restrictions of 46 Statutes at Large 25, section 11 (U. S. C. 13: 211).

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed or has adjourned, to hold hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpoena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the committee today

and to include therein certain extracts from the hearings and from the report.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. BATES of Kentucky, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report (No. 1523), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 551, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass with the following amendment:

"Page 1, line 1, after the word 'Resolved', strike out all the language thereafter, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That a special committee of seven members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1945, with respect to the following matters:

"1. The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

"2. The amounts subscribed and contributed, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobile and other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1944 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

"3. The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

"4. The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any corporation or labor organization, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation or labor union.

"5. The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

"(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

"(b) Title 18, sections 61 to 61t, inclusive, United States Code, 1940 edition, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

"(c) The provisions of section 9, Public Law 89, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 144, first session, referred to as the War Labor Disputes Act.

"(d) Any statute or legislative act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

"6. Such other matters relating to the election of President, Vice President, and Members of the House of Representatives in 1944, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involv-



ing the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

"7. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee shall be public.

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

"8. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may authorize any one or more persons to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any person so authorized may hold such public hearings, issue such subpoenas, and provide for the service thereof, require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, administer such oaths, and take such testimony, as the committee or any such duly authorized subcommittee, may from time to time authorize. Every person, who having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

"That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1945, as hereinabove provided."

#### CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL AND PLANT PESTS AND DISEASES

Mr. FLANNAGAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate

the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

#### INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I understand that President Roosevelt has finally called an international conference to perfect the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme to give away to foreign countries a large portion of our stock pile of gold that is now stored at Fort Knox; to hand over to an international body the power to regulate the value of our dollar and to surrender to that body other sovereign powers which we now hold.

This conference is to be held in a secluded spot in the north part of New Hampshire called Breton Woods beginning July 1 and extending over a period of several weeks.

I shall again warn the American people of the dire peril to our Nation that is involved in this movement.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the remarks I made today I might include therein a short editorial from the Washington Post.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a synopsis of the soldiers' voting act as passed by the State of Pennsylvania.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an address by Mr. F. A. Banks, Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record and to include

therein an editorial from the Cumberland News, Cumberland, Md., of May 24, 1944, and also on behalf of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] I ask unanimous consent that he may be given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record and include an address given by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as the keynote address at the Maryland State Republican Convention, Baltimore, Md., May 23, 1944.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO EXPUNGE REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to expunge certain remarks he made this afternoon.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Michigan is continually making intemperate statements on the floor of the House and I think it would be much better if he would do a little mature thinking before he indulges in these intemperate remarks continuously. We would then not have to go through the process of taking his remarks from the Record. I do not see the gentleman from Michigan himself present to make the request and I would prefer that it come from him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that the gentleman from Michigan did request the gentleman from New York to make the request for him. He attempted to do it in the Committee of the Whole but he could not do it.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks which I made in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and to include therein a list of the personnel of the Fair Employment Practice Committee, and also to include some editorials and newspaper clippings from certain Texas papers.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole today and to include therein a list of employees of the Fair Employment Practice Committee and also to include a memorandum from the Civil Service Commission showing the comparative salaries of the Fair Employment Practice Committee and other Government employees.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of our

distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Chester Bowles addressed to the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, and another letter. I also ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD a statement by Elmer Davis, Director, Office of War Information, in connection with the debate on the floor in reference to the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO EXPUNGE REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw my objection to the request just made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] because of the intercession of various Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] renew his request?

Mr. TABER. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I renew the request on behalf of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that he may be permitted to expunge certain remarks that he made this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that certain remarks I made this afternoon be expunged from the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made following the gentleman from Michigan be expunged from the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on June 7 I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes after disposition of business on the Speaker's table, and at the conclusion of any special orders that may have been heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by James Morgan which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe, Boston, Mass., under date of December 19, 1943, and I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., under date of May 24, 1944.

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

There was no objection.

#### ATTITUDE OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD IN RE STEAMSHIP PARTICIPATION IN AERONAUTICS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at this time and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested recently that Congress has been misinformed as to the attitude of the Civil Aeronautics Board upon the most important problem of steamship participation in aeronautics. The undeniable conviction of that administrative agency which controls the destiny of American commercial air power, precluding as it does the maritime industry from rights in international aviation unless a steamship company applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity can overcome an alleged presumption that Congress wishes aviation rigidly restricted to aviation companies, has led to a particular factual situation which is surprising and unfortunate, both from the standpoint of our foreign commerce, and our national security.

On December 19, 1940, an American steamship company filed an application for the right to use the air and to fly planes to the Caribbean as an integral part of its steamship company business. The Civil Aeronautics Board, after approximately 4 years, was about to hold a hearing on this application and set June 1, 1944, for the date of exchange of exhibits between the parties in interest. The docket number of this particular case is 525 and there are three or four steamship companies seeking aviation rights to the Caribbean area in this proceeding. About a week ago the Civil Aeronautics Board again postponed the date of the exchange of exhibits and once again the right of the steamship companies to be heard upon this vital deterrent to the prosperity of the maritime industry has been procrastinated. The Civil Aeronautics Board has not only stated that steamship company participation in aviation should be rigidly restricted, but it has prevented steamship companies the right to be heard on their applications in the instant case since December 19, 1940.

The intent and purpose of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, as stated in the congressional declaration of policy therein, has been frustrated by the apparent refusal of the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant a hearing on this steamship application filed in 1940.

Section 401 of the Civil Aeronautics Act states:

Upon the filing of any such application, the Authority shall give due notice thereof to the public by posting a notice of such application in the office of the secretary of the Authority and to such other persons as the Authority may by regulation determine. Any interested person may file with the Authority a protest or memorandum of opposition to or in support of the issuance of a certificate. Such application shall be set for public hearing, and the Authority shall

dispose of such application as speedily as possible.

The least the Civil Aeronautics Board can do in this important national and international problem is to give the steamship companies their day in court. The provisions of the congressional mandate in this regard are mandatory, not discretionary.

There is an interesting comparison to be drawn between the treatment received by American maritime interests seeking aviation rights and the Royal Dutch Air Lines.

On May 1, 1943, as a result of an application filed by the Royal Dutch Air Lines—K. L. M.—a foreign air line, for a temporary certificate of convenience and necessity, the Civil Aeronautics Board granted this foreign company a temporary permit to engage in foreign air transportation with respect to persons, property, and mail between the terminal point Willemstad (Curaçao), Netherlands West Indies, and the terminal point Miami, Fla., via the intermediate points Kingston, Jamaica; Port-au-Prince, Haiti; Camaguey, Cuba; Habana, Cuba; and Oranjestad—Aruba—Netherlands West Indies. This area permitted to K. L. M. is the area within which American steamship companies have been requesting rights since 1940. L. Welch Pogue, chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, in testifying on this matter before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House on January 26, 1944, stated:

I am glad to explain the facts on the K. L. M. service. We did not issue them a certificate; we issued them a permit. It is a temporary wartime permit originally issued for 6 months because of a very heavy congestion of traffic in the Caribbean area, subject to renewal for a period of 3 months, and in no event to extend more than 6 months after the end of the war. That permit was issued because of the very great congestion down there, the loss of shipping facilities in the Caribbean, and the shortage of equipment of our own lines which, as you know, is very acute.

K. L. M. was granted rights which American shipping interests had sought 3 years previously. K. L. M. is now advertising its service to the Caribbean in American newspapers. The published advertisements do not make pleasant reading to the maritime industry of America which has not been able to obtain a hearing, let alone a certificate of convenience and necessity.

K. L. M., reportedly owned by foreign shipping interests, operating an air line from Miami to South America, has obtained from an agency of this Government, valuable rights in aviation which have been deprived our own citizens. Sometimes the workings of our Government are inexplicable. Are the magnificent ports of Boston, New York, New Orleans, and San Francisco built by steamship companies through foreign commerce to be open only to foreign steamship air-transportation interests?

#### 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 to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

To Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. CHAPMAN), indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

To Mrs. SMITH of Maine, for the 26th and 27th of May, on account of official business.

To Mr. WEISS (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin), until May 30, on account of official business.

To Mr. LYNCH, for May 27, on account of death of relative.

To Mr. LARCADE, for 4 days, on account of official business.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have leave of absence for 1 week.

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

There was no objection.

#### SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

S. 198. An act to amend further section 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

S. 267. An act relating to marriage and divorce among members of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 338. An act for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 873. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1093. An act for the relief of Fermin Salas; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1240. An act to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1080), relating to estates of certain deceased Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1451. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

S. 1453. An act for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1461. An act for the relief of Frederick G. Goebel; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1465. An act for the relief of Dr. A. R. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugene W. Randall; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1481. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Marino Bello; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1501. An act for the relief of the Raw Motor Sales Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1572. An act for the relief of Frank Robertson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1580. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the nonreservation Indian boarding school known as Sherman Institute, California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1593. An act for the relief of the heirs and assigns of Widow Cesaire De Blanc; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

S. 1597. An act to amend section 1, act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 703), for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Grand Coulee Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1602. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winnie Left Her Behind, a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1605. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Borrego; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Silva; the legal guardian of Frank Borrego; the legal guardian of Rueben Silva; and the legal guardian of Rudolph Silva; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1710. An act to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Helen Halverson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1763. An act for the relief of the Square D Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1782. An act to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 1795. An act to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1809. An act to remove the limitation on the right to command of officers of the Dental Corps of the Army which limits such officers to command in that corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1826. An act to amend section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714) relating to the exportation of certain commodities, and to continue said act in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1847. An act to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1881. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fire at the naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1894. An act to provide for the transportation to their homes of persons discharged from the naval service because of under age at time of enlistment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1934. An act to provide for abandonment of the project authorized in the act of October 17, 1940, for a seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor, Mass.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution relating to the invitation to the Congress of the United States to send a delegation to visit the British Parliament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1029. An act to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4646. An act to provide for simplification of the individual income tax; and

H. R. 4793. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 29, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 4486, relative to the post-war disposition of merchant vessels, on Tuesday, June 13, 1944, at 10 a. m.

Persons desiring to be heard should notify the clerk of the Committee in writing as soon as possible.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to as follows:

1577. A letter from the War Shipping Administrator, transmitting the seventh report to Congress by the War Shipping Administration of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (Public Law No. 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1578. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

#### 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. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3750. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the third circuit, and to permit the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 1518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4833. A bill to extend, for 2 additional years, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar; without amendment (Rept.

No. 1519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3384. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 566. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3442, a bill to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103); without amendment (Rept. No. 1517). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 551. Resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1523). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 230. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor to conduct and investigate the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1524). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 4890. A bill to provide for the display in the lobbies of post offices of placards containing certain information with respect to the legislative representatives of the people; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4891. A bill to provide during the present war for certain additional compensation for star-route contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4892. A bill relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MCKENZIE:

H. R. 4893. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. R. 4894. A bill to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code, as amended (relating to certain nonmailable matter); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give preference to governmental agencies which are wholly supported by public funds in the disposition of the surplus material, equipment, and ma-

chinery which will remain in the possession of the United States of America at the conclusion of the present war; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4895. A bill for the relief of James E. Monaghan as administrator of the estate of Katherine Monaghan, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4896. A bill for the relief of Florence E. Bower, Hulda Bower, and Christopher Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 4897. A bill for the relief of Joseph C. Eastland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4898. A bill granting a pension to William I. Ray; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

5759. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Cold Spring Businessmen's Association protesting the enactment of Senate bill 1161; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5760. Also, resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Niagara Falls, N. Y., having to do with the disposition of public war housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5761. By Mr. COLE of Missouri: Petition of Julia B. Hines and 58 other citizens of Buchanan County, Mo., protesting against the consideration of any type of prohibition legislation until the conclusion of the present war and the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5762. Also, petition of Clarence O. Smith and 29 other citizens of Buchanan County, Mo., protesting against the consideration of any type of prohibition legislation until the conclusion of the present war and the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5763. Also, petition of Bertis D. Johnson and 31 other citizens of Buchanan County, Mo., protesting against the consideration of any type of prohibition legislation until the conclusion of the present war and the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5764. Also, petition of Harry F. Miller and 27 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the consideration of any type of prohibition legislation until the conclusion of the present war and the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5765. Also, petition of Henry P. Curtin and 56 other citizens of Buchanan County, Mo., protesting against the consideration of any type of prohibition legislation until the conclusion of the present war and the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5766. By Mr. DAY: Seventy-one petitions, comprising approximately 1,800 names of citizens, relatives, and friends of Japanese war prisoners, supporting House Joint Resolution 252 and House Joint Resolution 253, introduced by Representative JESSIE SUMNER of Illinois; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5767. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of 159 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against House bill 2082, providing for the return of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 29, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 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:

O Thou God of the living and of the living dead, Thou hast set us to play our part in a struggling world where there is no gain except by loss and no life except by death. With tenderness and gratitude we think of those quiet acres, some fringed by gently waving palms, all marked by the sacred cross of sacrifice, where at home and abroad sleep the mortal forms of the crusaders of liberation who in youth's high elation marched and sailed from this free land which has solemnly pledged its all that freedom may not die. Shadows of sorrow darken our hearts with the consciousness that they will come not back, for on alien sod they gave up the years and joys to be. But we rejoice with them that their souls will go marching on in a world cleansed of the bestial abomination whose blighting breath pollutes and desecrates but whose destruction is pledged by the sword of the unenslaved, in the name of the holy God and a holy humanity.

Make us worthy of those whose graves we garnish on our Day of Remembrance, "Who more than self their country loved And mercy more than life."

We ask it in the name of that One whose truth makes us and all men free. Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], heretofore named by me to perform the duties of the Chair, being, as I am informed, absent from the Senate today on official business.

CARTER GLASS,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. DOWNEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 25, 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