

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6063. Also, petition of Edna I. Hunt and 35 other citizens of Hermon, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6064. Also, petition of Anna Fleming and 49 other citizens of Gouverneur, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6065. Also, petition of Mrs. R. F. Walker and 37 other citizens of Rome, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6066. Also, petition of Mrs. Henry Ryder and 99 other citizens of Mineola, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6067. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. L. N. Free, Route No. 2, Teague, Tex., favoring House bill 4846; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6068. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petition of Mrs. Hester Sautter and a number of other prominent citizens of Geary County, Kans., in support of legislation for refunding wheat penalty payments and opposing subsidies on farm commodities and demanding a fair marketing price for everybody; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6069. Also, petition signed by Mrs. Freida York and a number of other farmers of Geary County, Kans., urging refunds on penalty collected unfairly by the United States Government from farmers who raised more wheat than was allocated by the Government program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, November 1, 1944)

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

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

Our Father God, in times of cruel violence and dense darkness in every generation Thy word of truth and freedom

has been made flesh and dwelt among men. In the living present Thou dost speak through the lives and lips of those whose hearts are moved with compassion at the want and woe of their fellows. Once more our Nation mourns the loss of a servant of Thine and of the commonweal who for twoscore years in this temple of democracy was a pillar of the people's hope. We thank Thee that by faith he removed mountains, harnessed rivers, exalted valleys, and wrought reforms by the strategy of wise statesmanship, venturing valiantly on the expanding frontiers of social welfare, scorning the consistency that is forever led to the stake of a dead past.

Teach us anew that these prophets of the rights of man are as unpredictable as the light which shone when Hope was born above an eastern inn where there was no room for the heavenly guest. We never know where to look for them till they come. Nevertheless, in Thy good grace they come, with their frank and refreshing candor, out of the deep springs of our common humanity, sun-crowned, living above the crowd in private living and public thinking. Such men as they serve their day and generation, and, honored, falling on sleep, speak to us in their life and in their death, reminding us still that honesty and goodness and kindness and labor are our common birthright. May these starry ideals lend their sure and high distinction to our little day and tie our small endeavors to the mighty majesties of time and eternity. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, September 1, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HAROLD MAURICE KENNEDY TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 13, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Harold Maurice Kennedy, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, vice Marcus B. Campbell, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GEORGE W. NORRIS, FORMER SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Saturday evening we heard over the radio the sad announcement of the death of former Senator George W. Norris. It seems only a few brief weeks since Senator Norris was here in the Senate, taking part in the debates and actively and vigorously participating in the work of this body.

For 10 years he served in the House of Representatives and for 30 years he labored in the Senate. I shall not at this time attempt to review his monumental work or to tell what his life meant to America and to the world, but I shall reserve this privilege for a later and more propitious occasion.

I do wish to bespeak the deep sense of personal loss that I feel in Senator Norris' death. He meant much to me as he did to countless thousands throughout our country. I believe that I voice the sentiments of every Member of the Senate with whom he served when I express profound sorrow over his passing.

He set an example of integrity, of courage, of devotion, and of magnificent service for all of us. He stood in his strength like Gibraltar, with each receding wave leaving him steadfast and immovable in the power and majesty of his statesmanship. He will stand through the years as one of the great men in our history.

George W. Norris was ever the friend of the poor and the distressed, ever the warrior fighting for the underprivileged and the oppressed. He carried high the torch of Jefferson and Lincoln, lighting the way that men might know the truth and that they might be free.

Today in the Tennessee Valley we see unfolded in brighter outline, in more golden color, the fundamental justice and the wonderful possibilities of the dream of George W. Norris. So long as the waters of the Tennessee River roll to the sea, they will chant his requiem and proclaim the glory of his struggles, that common men might enter into their inheritance.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I listened with deep attention and emotion to the words which were uttered this morning by the acting Democratic leader [Mr. HILL] paying tribute to the late George W. Norris, former Senator from Nebraska. I recall him in days far gone. Not many of my colleagues who are here now were here then. I wish to recall some words I uttered on December 19, 1924, when he was taunted by the then Democratic leader because of what he termed "the dream of Senator Norris," his dream of the Tennessee Valley Authority. After the taunt had been given and the jibe proceeded, I said a few words in relation to Senator Norris. I shall read them now because I saw him then as I always like to see him and as I have always thought of him. It was, as I have said, on December 19, 1924, 20 years ago, when I spoke these words in his behalf:

Mr. President, to one who holds the views that I hold—the views of a lifetime that have been confirmed with the passing of the years—the discussion that has been indulged here has been singularly interesting and illuminating.

The very distinguished Senator from Alabama, Mr. Underwood, with his usual clarity and with great emphasis, has presented one side. The earnest Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, with all of his enthusiasm, has presented another. I think fundamentally, Mr. President, this is a question of two warring philosophies of government, not wholly so, perhaps, but as the Senator from Alabama said the other day, two conflicting ideas of what might be done under circumstances such as are presented by the Muscle Shoals proposition; and it is on the fundamental idea thus presented that I reach the conclusion that I have reached in this matter.

It seems to me, sir, without discussing in detail what may be sought in the one case or the other, this is plainly a proposition of whether or not, when the United States Government has expended \$150,000,000 in a project it shall continue with that project for the benefit of the people of the United States.

I do not quarrel with the view that is presented by the Senator from Alabama or the view that is presented by those who advocate his course. I recognize that they are just as earnest and just as honest in the view they present for the turning over of this particular project in the manner that they suggest as we who believe that when the Government itself has expended the people's money it should have been expended for all the people, and that the Government should carry on the enterprise whenever necessary for the benefit of all the people.

I heard the Senator from Alabama say the other day that the Senator from Nebraska was dreaming dreams. Maybe he is right. Perhaps the Senator from Nebraska, in what he asks, is dreaming dreams; but since man emancipated himself, Mr. President, men have been dreaming dreams for man and mankind, and it is the dreaming of these dreams that has marked the mile posts in human progress during all the centuries past.

I can recall historically that Galileo dreamed dreams. He dreamed his dreams, and, though compelled to recant under the threat of torture, his frightened lips yet told the immutable and the unchangeable truth.

Newton dreamed a dream as he lay upon the ground and saw an apple fall. He dreamed a dream that now we all understand.

Columbus dreamed a dream of another world far beyond the oceans that then were known—a dream at which every court scoffed and every courtier laughed. We are here today because Columbus dreamed that dream.

The men who landed at Plymouth Rock and those who came to Jamestown dreamed a dream of a new empire and a great, new nation. That dream we of this generation realize in part.

Garrison and Wendell Phillips dreamed a dream—a dream that resulted in one of them being mobbed in New York and another chased by a populace in Boston. Just think of it. But Lincoln brought the realization of that dream. Roosevelt dreamed a dream of the Panama Canal. Today it is the greatest engineering feat in all the world.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Couzens] dreamed a dream in the city of Detroit—of Detroit public ownership there. Today that public ownership exists profitably for the city of Detroit.

Down in the city of Los Angeles a self-educated engineer named Mulholland

dreamed a dream that water might be brought for domestic purposes 250 miles, over gorges and canyons and impassable mountains. First he was laughed at. That dream today is a realization, and Los Angeles draws its great water supply from the Owens Valley, 250 miles distant.

Some men in the city of San Francisco years ago dreamed a dream when the city was in the grip of a street railroad that wrought its own will as it pleased. They dreamed a dream that San Francisco might operate a municipal road. Today San Francisco operates that road, operates it on a 5-cent fare, and the municipal road there, in opposition to that privately owned, is operated successfully, prosperously, advantageously.

So it has been, Mr. President, with dreams of real men during all the years. Dream on, you Senator from Nebraska, for your dreams mean but one thing. Your dreams, sir, mean that humanity may benefit, people may prosper, and human beings may be a bit happier.

So the dream of the Senator from Nebraska I can appreciate. I trust he will continue iterating and reiterating. I regret the note of discouragement that I observed the other day in his remarks. Oh, be not discouraged, sir. Never mind the temporary defeat or the temporary disaster. Never mind what ephemeral catastrophe there may seem to be, for dreams such as are yours ultimately will prevail, for the truth prevails. Sometimes it is as dangerous to preach the truth as to enter a powder magazine with a lighted torch, but, nevertheless, truth yet exists; and all history has taught us, all people's governments have taught us, that whatever may be the check, whatever may be the defeat, whatever the haltings, the heartburnings, and the disappointments, they are but ephemeral, and ultimately, finally, the truth will prevail.

Mr. President, on December 19, 1924, I addressed those words to George Norris. I believed what I said. Such as they are, and ill-spoken as they may have been, I leave them as my tribute to his character.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed \$150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5154. An act relating to dual employment in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5181. An act to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. MCKELLAR) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED BY WAR DEPARTMENT FOR GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relat-

ing to the furnishing of transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 238 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

#### LEGISLATION BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

#### PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for The National Archives for the quarter ending December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of Post Office, Navy (8), Commerce, and Agriculture (2); The National Archives, and the Federal Works Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports from the chairmen of certain Senate committees, made in response to Senate Resolution 319 (agreed to August 23, 1944), relative to persons employed who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports laid down earlier today by the Acting President pro tempore which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is not now on the floor of the Senate. I know that if present he would desire and ask to have them printed in the RECORD. I therefore make the request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The reports requested to be printed are as follows:

## COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

*To the Senate:*

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of

August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

| Name of individual        | Address   | Name and address of department or organization by whom paid                       | Annual rate of compensation |
|---------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Helen A. Rice.....        | 1324 Monroe St. NW. (Apartment 44), Washington, D. C. | War Department, Legislative and Liaison Division, Office of Chief of Staff.....   | \$2,000                     |
| Theodore B. Stothart..... | 3801 4th St. SE. (Apartment 3), Washington 20, D. C.  | War Department, Adjutant General's Office, Civilian Personnel Division, Branch 3. | 1,800                       |
| Col. David A. Watt.....   | Clinton, Md.  | War Department, General Staff.....  | 6,000                       |
| Col. Lewis Sanders.....   | 1911 R St. NW.  | War Department.....   | 6,000                       |

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, *Chairman.*

## WAR CONTRACTS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,  
September 1, 1944.The VICE PRESIDENT,  
*United States Senate,*  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319 I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time

employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the Department paying the salary of such employee and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,  
*Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.*  
By CHARLES A. MURRAY,  
*Executive Secretary.*

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

*To the Senate:*

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

| Name of individual       | Address  | Name and address of department or organization by whom paid | Annual rate of compensation |
|--------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Marian Banner.....       | 1302 Gallatin St. NW., Washington, D. C.                   | Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.       | \$2,300                     |
| Kurt Borchardt.....      | 1385 Nicholson St. NW., Washington, D. C.                  | Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.           | 5,600                       |
| Marion Postner.....      | 60 Elm Ave., Takoma Park, Md.                              | Navy Department, Washington, D. C.                          | 2,600                       |
| Grace Mayer.....         | 3610 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.                 | Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.           | 2,000                       |
| Maj. Wm. E. Nefflen..... | Army-Navy Club, Washington, D. C.                          | War Department, Washington, D. C.                           | 3,000                       |
| Vernice O'Mullane.....   | Alcott Hall, West Potomac Park, Washington, D. C.          | War Production Board, Washington, D. C.                     | 1,620                       |
| Doris Phippen.....       | Frankfort Hall, 40 Plattsburg Court NW., Washington, D. C. | Navy Department, Washington, D. C.                          | 2,040                       |
| Omer J. Regnier.....     | 209 Franklin Ave., Silver Spring, Md.                      | Farm Security Administration, Washington, D. C.             | 3,800                       |
| Sigmund Timberg.....     | 2215 42d St. NW., Washington, D. C.                        | Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.          | 6,500                       |

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

## SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

*To the Senate:*

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of

August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

| Name of individual           | Address                                       | Name and address of department or organization by whom paid | Annual rate of compensation |
|------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Boyce, Virginia W. ....      | 2030 Fort Davis St., Washington, D. C.        | Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.               | 1,800                       |
| Gertler, Ann S. ....         | 3721 29th St. NW., Washington, D. C.          | do.   | 2,000                       |
| Heslep, Hope G. ....         | 2 East Maple St., Alexandria, Va.             | War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.                  | 2,000                       |
| Larson, C. Theodore.....     | 3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va.            | National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.                  | 5,600                       |
| Mancel, Fritzie P. ....      | 1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C.             | War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.                  | 3,800                       |
| McConkey, Darel.....         | Rural free delivery, Box 153, Alexandria, Va. | War Production Board, Washington, D. C.                     | 4,000                       |
| Moore, Cora L. ....          | 5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.          | Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.           | 2,000                       |
| Moore, Walter Louis.....     | 2220 Perry St. NE., Washington, D. C.         | National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.                  | 1,440                       |
| Oleksy, Elizabeth H. ....    | 1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.        | War Production Board, Washington, D. C.                     | 2,600                       |
| Rosenberger, Francis C. .... | 5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md.           | Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.           | 4,000                       |
| Schimmel, Herbert.....       | 3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.    | War Production Board, Washington, D. C.                     | 8,000                       |

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

## COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

*To the Senate:*

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of

August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

| Name of individual  | Address                             | Name and address of department or organization by whom paid                 | Annual rate of compensation   |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).              | 4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md.   | Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C. | \$6,000 per year plus \$162 per month subsistence and rental allowance.   |
| Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson, (AA) U. S. Naval Reserve. | 2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J. | Potomac River Naval Command, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.             | \$1,512 per year plus \$91.50 per month subsistence and rental allowance. |

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of

August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

| Name of individual   | Address                             | Name and address of department or organization by whom paid   | Annual rate of compensation   |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Lt. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.          | 5305 41st St. NW, Washington, DC    | Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C. | \$2,400 per year plus \$132 per month subsistence and rental allowance.   |
| Lt. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.                 | 2745 29th St. NW, Washington, D. C. | do.   | Do.   |
| Yeoman (2d cl.) Eleanor W. St. Clair, U. S. Naval Reserve. | 2134 R St. NW, Washington, D. C.    | do.   | \$1,152 per year plus \$91.50 per month subsistence and rental allowance. |
| Yeoman (2d cl.) Loretta F. Jochman, U. S. Naval Reserve.   | do.                                 | do.   | Do.   |

These employees are representatives of the Naval Bureau of Personnel to assist the Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of

August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

| Name of individual | Address                                | Name and address of department or organization by whom paid | Annual rate of compensation |
|--------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Louis J. Meyerle   | 612 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md. | Veterans' Administration                                    | \$5,000                     |

JAMES M. TUNNELL, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

AUGUST 31, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of

August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

| Name of individual           | Address           | Name and address of department or organization by whom paid | Annual rate of compensation |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Claire Cahill <sup>1</sup>   | Washington, D. C. | Bureau of Census  | \$3,700                     |
| Miles L. Colean <sup>2</sup> | do.               | Starrett Bros. & Eken, Washington, D. C.                    | ( <sup>3</sup> )            |

<sup>1</sup> Miss Cahill performed approximately 4 days of statistical work in connection with a study of post-war housing and was not compensated from committee funds.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Colean is compensated from committee funds at the rate of \$25 a day for work performed as an adviser to a subcommittee of this Committee on Housing and Redevelopment, of which Senator TAFT is chairman. He performed approximately 4 days' work during the month of August.

<sup>3</sup> Unknown.

WALTER F. GEORGE, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO  
STUDY PROBLEMS OF  
AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,  
September 1, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT,  
*United States Senate,*  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319 I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small

Business who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,  
*Chairman.*  
By CHARLES A. MURRAY,  
*Executive Secretary.*

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

| Name of individual | Address   | Name and address of department or organization by whom paid | Annual rate of compensation |
|--------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Ruth B. Abrams     | 2515 K St. NW., Washington, D. C.               | Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.          | \$3,200                     |
| J. Russell Boner   | 4207 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md.           | Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.           | 4,600                       |
| Agnes E. Crivella  | 1408 Buchanan St. NW., Washington, DC           | War Production Board, Washington, D. C.                     | 2,700                       |
| Emerald G. Devitt  | 2425 27th St. South, Arlington, Va.             | do.   | 2,000                       |
| Elsie A. Digges    | 120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C.                | do.   | 1,800                       |
| F. Preston Forbes  | 510 Four Mile Rd., Alexandria, Va.              | Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.                   | 4,600                       |
| Carol M. Fuller    | 2101 S St. NW., Washington, D. C.               | Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.           | 2,100                       |
| Scott K. Gray, Jr. | 119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C.           | Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.       | 4,600                       |
| Stella J. Groeper  | 1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.         | War Production Board, Washington, D. C.                     | 2,000                       |
| Dorothy M. Heckard | 2828 Buena Vista Terrace SE., Washington, D. C. | do.   | 2,000                       |
| Kathleen Kimball   | 1701 Park Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.            | do.   | 1,800                       |
| Elizabeth P. Lucas | 1730 Quincy St. North, Arlington, Va.           | do.   | 1,800                       |
| Lois M. Miller     | 3120 Massachusetts Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.  | do.   | 2,600                       |

## SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of

August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

| Name of individual                 | Address                                     | Name and address of department or organization by whom paid | Annual rate of compensation |
|------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| John W. Nelson.....                | 1445 Ogden St. NW, Washington, D. C.        | War Production Board, Washington, D. C.                     | \$5,600                     |
| Jessma Oslin.....                  | 2205 S St. SE, Washington, D. C.            | do.   | 1,800                       |
| Grace F. Purdy.....                | 230 Rhode Island Ave. NE, Washington, D. C. | Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.           | 3,200                       |
| Arthur G. Silverman.....           | 719 D St. NE, Washington, D. C.             | do.   | 5,600                       |
| Lt. (Jr. Gr.) George H. Soule..... | 4020 Beecher St. NW, Washington, DC.        | Navy Department, Washington, D. C.                          | 2,000                       |
| Lillian Evelyn Spicer.....         | 1433 Decatur St. NW, Washington, D. C.      | do.   | 2,600                       |
| Frederick W. Steckman.....         | 4000 Cathedral Ave., Washington, D. C.      | Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.                      | 4,600                       |
| Allen G. Thurman.....              | 201 East Shepherd St., Chevy Chase, Md.     | do.   | 6,500                       |
| Alfred J. Van Tassel.....          | 1622 Mount Eagle Place, Alexandria, Va.     | War Production Board, Washington, D. C.                     | 6,500                       |
| Olga Yelencsics.....               | 2400 13th St. NW, Washington, D. C.         | do.   | 2,000                       |

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

## COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of

August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

| Name of individual     | Address                   | Name and address of department or organization by whom paid               | Annual rate of compensation |
|------------------------|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| John F. Feeney.....    | 1425 Rhode Island Ave. NW | General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.                              | \$6,400                     |
| Harold E. Merrick..... | 906 Aspen St. NW          | do.   | 4,800                       |
| Thomas J. Scott.....   | 3500 14th St. NW          | Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. | 4,800                       |

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Acting Chairman.*

## PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Civic Reform League of Puerto Rico, favoring the prompt enactment of certain proposed amendments to the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

## ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT—RESOLUTIONS BY VERMONT AND NEW YORK FEDERATIONS OF LABOR

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, American labor is keenly alert to the need of preparing a program to take up the unemployment slack after the war. This concern is reflected in the resolutions adopted by the various State labor conventions. It is plain that the desire of labor is not alone for a program to provide jobs to ease unemployment during the reconversion period but also for a program that will add materially to the wealth of the Nation and make possible a great expansion of private industry and trade and bring about permanent employment.

During recent years many State organizations have endorsed the St. Lawrence seaway and power-development project. This year other States have joined their ranks. I ask consent to present to the Senate a resolution adopted by the Vermont State Federation of Labor at its forty-first annual convention held at Burlington, Vt., on August 12, 1944, and also a resolution adopted by the New York State Federation of Labor at its annual convention held at Syracuse, N. Y., last month, the exact date not being indicated on the resolution. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the

RECORD and referred to the proper committee.

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

RESOLUTION ENDORSING S. 1385 ADOPTED BY THE VERMONT FEDERATION OF LABOR AT THEIR FORTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION, HELD AT THE CITY OF BURLINGTON, VT., ON AUGUST 12, 1944

Whereas there is pending before the Congress a bill sponsored by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, which bill embodies a project known as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project;

Whereas the construction of this project would bring about greatly reduced transportation costs in shipping from the Great Lakes area and that territory adjacent to and bordering on the St. Lawrence basin;

Whereas the economic production of power that would be generated and distributed through the surrounding area and Vermont would contribute directly to the economic well-being and improvement of farmers and small industry in Vermont and this would be reflected in the general welfare of labor;

Whereas the construction of this project would furnish employment to a large number of people, both veterans and workers in the post-war period and thereby materially contribute to the relief of unemployment during that time; and

Whereas the benefits resulting from this project would favorably affect the national economy so profoundly, and thus permeate and raise up the economic well-being of agriculture, industry, and labor: We therefore

Resolve, That the Vermont Federation of Labor endorse this legislation and urge the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as soon as possible.

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America;

That a copy be sent to Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont;

And further copies be sent to Senators WARREN R. AUSTIN and JOHN H. OVERTON; Congressmen CHARLES PLUMLEY and WILLIAM A. PITTENGER.

ANDREW MITCHELL,  
*President.*  
ROBERT SINCLAIR,  
*Secretary.*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NEW YORK FEDERATION OF LABOR, AT ITS ANNUAL CONVENTION HELD AT SYRACUSE IN AUGUST 1944

Whereas a bill is now pending in Congress, Senate bill 1385, authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects; and

Whereas S. 1385 is designed to:

1. Develop more than 2,000,000 horsepower of electricity by creating a power plant in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, on the boundary of the State of New York;

2. Open the Great Lakes for ocean navigation by deepening the St. Lawrence River and connecting channels of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the completion of this development, already largely improved, has been strongly recommended by every President since World War No. 1 because of its benefit to the entire country and its value as a permanent asset to our national defense; and

Whereas the construction of the works needed to complete the project will create tens of thousands of jobs at the site in New York and throughout the country during the critical post-war period; and

Whereas on completion, the project will provide cheap and ready power for millions of consumers, as well as a great new artery of commerce connecting our midwestern area with the sea: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this organization go on record in full support of S. 1385; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to approve S. 1385 without further delay; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, to the Governor, and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1688. A bill to authorize the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1071).

By Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Henry White; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1072).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 1680. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge; without amendment (Rept. No. 1073);

H. R. 3722. A bill to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival; without amendment (Rept. No. 1074); and

H. R. 4257. A bill to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1075).

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. MALONEY), from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2509. A bill for the relief of Marie Engert; without amendment (Rept. No. 1076); and

H. R. 4271. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1077).

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. HOLMAN), from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 312. A bill for the relief of Freda Utley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1078).

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2134. A bill for the relief of Paul Szeliga; without amendment (Rept. No. 1079).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 1434. A bill for the relief of Anna M. Kohler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1080).

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRESIDENTIAL, VICE PRESIDENTIAL, AND SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 322, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 322) submitted by Mr. GREEN on August 22, 1944, was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the special committee authorized by Senate Resolution 263, Seventy-eighth Congress, to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various Presidential candidates, Vice Presidential candidates, and candidates for the United States Senate, and facts relating thereto, is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate \$40,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the Senator from Arizona asking for immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The committee is out of funds.

Mr. WHITE. That is perhaps a common affliction.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee has work to do, and it cannot function without funds. If granted, the amount proposed would allow the committee a sum of money equal to that which was allowed 4 years ago.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senate authorized the appointment of the committee. The committee has been functioning, and I suppose it has spent substantial sums of money. I believe that we must provide for whatever funds the committee may need. Of course, the proposal places an individual Senator in a somewhat embarrassing position because he knows nothing about the circumstances justifying the request. But I think that we must assume that the committee is either right or wrong, and that it is carrying on its duties. I do not object to the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

#### INVESTIGATION OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER DEVELOPMENT AND IRRIGATION PROJECTS—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 313, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution has been amended so as to reduce the amount of money originally requested.

Mr. WHITE. How much of an appropriation does the resolution propose?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution originally provided for an appropriation of \$10,000 and the committee reduced the amount to \$5,000.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 313) submitted by Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HATCH) on June 19, 1944.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "by", to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the limit of expenditures of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation under Senate Resolution 155, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 26, 1943, as amended by Senate Resolution 304, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 5, 1944 (relating to an investigation with respect to the need for development of irrigation projects and with respect to the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power), is hereby increased by \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

#### REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on September 1, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1508. An act to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action, to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; and

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.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Brig. Gen. Raymond Stallings McLain, National Guard of the United States, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law; and

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army.

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

Sundry officers for temporary appointment and/or promotion in the Navy; and  
Several officers for temporary appointment and/or promotion in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2128. A bill for the relief of Gussie B. Bacon;

S. 2129. A bill for the relief of Florence Jackson;

S. 2130. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Jettie Smith, a minor; and

S. 2131. A bill for the relief of Oscar Spencer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 2132. A bill for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 2133. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands within the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., to the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GUFFEY (for himself and Mr. TRUMAN):

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed \$150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5154. An act relating to dual employment in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

## RECOGNITION OF WORK OF DRAFT BOARDS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the selection of men to serve in the armed forces of this Nation is at once a vital and a difficult task. That that task has been well performed is attested by the magnificent Army and Navy which have been built up in this Nation in the comparatively short period of 4 years.

The men and women who serve on the local draft boards throughout the Nation have done a commendable job, and their distinct contribution to the war effort should be recognized and commended by the Government which they serve.

In the State of Pennsylvania the local draft board of my own district, which comprises the borough of Carrick and other surrounding boroughs in the Pittsburgh area, has performed its job effectively and well; so well, in fact, that the members of that board—board No. 29—have been cited by both State and Federal authorities for the high standards of efficiency and fairness which have attended their efforts thus far. This board, like the vast majority of other boards throughout the country, has studied well the problems of its registrants and has done its utmost to reach fair, impartial, and reasonable decisions.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that the Government of the United States should approve some type of certificate or emblem to be presented to the members of the local boards, in order to signify that the Government and its people appreciate the contribution which the members of these boards have made to the winning of the war.

As an indication that the value of the service of the members of these local draft boards is being recognized, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on Sunday, September 3, entitled "They Have Done a Good Job."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

## THEY HAVE DONE A GOOD JOB

They didn't get any compensation for it. In fact, the job cost most of them money out of their own pocket.

They did get a great deal of criticism, most of it unwarranted.

And they were plagued to death with red tape, conflicting directives, and the plethoric pronouncements of Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey.

They were the members of the country's draft boards.

They have been on the job since October 1940. Nearly 4 years of tedious, painstaking work, often full of heartaches, generally full of headaches, and many times, no doubt, desperately discouraging.

Some made mistakes. Some few—very few—did not bring to the task the high order of intelligence, fairness, and diligence which was the general average.

But the system worked amazingly well and in genuine democratic fashion.

Now that draft quotas have been materially reduced, it is proposed to consolidate draft offices. The purpose is to curtail paid personnel and save rental costs. These are legitimate reasons for the action contemplated by the State selective service headquarters.

The boards, however, will stay on the job, each functioning as a separate unit although their burdens now have been greatly lightened.

Between now and the actual end of the war these boards will get what might be termed a relative respite. They have earned it. They will need a rest for the even bigger job which faces them after victory.

For the Selective Service System and the local boards are charged with the responsibility of helping returned servicemen restore themselves to civilian life.

We have built up a powerful Army and Navy in a short time. In this the draft boards played an important part. We face an even greater test in demobilizing that Army and Navy to peacetime pursuits. Here, too, the draft boards will play an important part.

The best that we can hope is that they do as good a job on the second half of their assignment as they have done on the first.

## DEFINITION OF THE NEW DEAL

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD a definition from the New Merriam Webster's International Dictionary which I read last night for the first time. The definition is as follows:

New Deal: A number of measures of President F. D. Roosevelt, designed to promote economic recovery and social security. Some of the most important of these measures are the National Industrial Recovery Act, farm relief, public works, control of public-utility holding companies, old-age pensions, and unemployment insurance.

## PROPOSED EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT—NOTICE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, while I have not conferred with the distinguished majority or minority leaders, I wish to announce at this time that it is the intention of the sponsors of the so-called equal-rights amendment which is Calendar No. 272, Senate Joint Resolution 25, to call it up for consideration by the Senate sometime during the coming week.

## PRODUCTION AND THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF AMERICAN LABOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on Friday last I asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a table showing the production and the work performed by American labor during the war. Inadvertently there were omitted from the table I placed in the RECORD at that time certain other facts and figures which I ask to have printed in the RECORD of today at this point, and then for the permanent RECORD that they be added to the table presented by me on Friday last.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

In spite of the absence of 8,400,000 men, the pick of the Nation's manpower, to the armed forces since the attack upon Pearl Harbor labor has made up this loss and added 5,700,000 workers; 3,000,000 workers of this number are women who have left their homes to help produce the weapons and equipment with which we are winning the war:

## Military forces:

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| December 1941.....                        | 2,100,000  |
| January 1944.....                         | 10,500,000 |
| Men withdrawn from Nation's manpower..... | 8,400,000  |

## Labor forces:

|                          |            |
|--------------------------|------------|
| January 1942.....        | 56,300,000 |
| January 1944.....        | 62,000,000 |
| Labor forces gained..... | 5,700,000  |

Additional figures on production clearly demonstrate the success of the determined effort American labor has made and is making to win the essential battle of production:

## 1. Over-all production

Total production war and nonwar:

|           |                  |
|-----------|------------------|
| 1941..... | \$93,900,000,000 |
| 1943..... | 146,900,000,000  |

Total production war goods:

|           |                |
|-----------|----------------|
| 1941..... | 1,400,000,000  |
| 1943..... | 67,000,000,000 |

## 2. Naval vessels

Naval vessels owned:

|                    |        |
|--------------------|--------|
| December 1941..... | 2,500  |
| January 1944.....  | 23,700 |

## 3. Airplanes

|                               | Weight of<br>airframes,<br>pounds |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Military airplane production: |                                   |
| 1941.....                     | 83,500,000                        |
| 1943.....                     | 667,000,000                       |

## 4. Gasoline

|                       |                  |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| High octane gasoline: | *Barrels per day |
| 1941.....             | 40,000           |
| 1944.....             | 400,000          |

## SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE BY SENATOR TRUMAN AT LAMAR, MO.

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech delivered by Senator TRUMAN at Lamar, Mo., August 31, 1944, accepting the nomination for Vice President of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY BEFORE INDIANA BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him before the Indiana Bar Association at Indianapolis, Ind., on September 1, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ISSUES IN THE NOVEMBER ELECTION—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR SCHOEPEL, OF KANSAS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the issues in the November election, delivered by Gov. Andrew Schoepel, of Kansas, on September 1, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

## GOVERNOR DEWEY AND FOREIGN POLICY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, one from the issue of August 19, 1944, entitled "Old Man" Hull in Shirt Sleeves," and the second entitled "Governor Dewey's Reverberating 'No,'" which appear in the Appendix.]

## SANCTUARY FOR JEWS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Must Give Jews Sanctuary," writ-

ten by Harry H. Schlacht and published in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of September 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TRIBUTES TO HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Hawkeye-Gazette, of Burlington, Iowa, of June 13, 1944, entitled "Still a Strong Man," and an editorial from the Pawtucket, (R. I.) Times, of June 12, 1944, entitled "Mr. Farley Steps Down," which appear in the Appendix.]

#### CIVILIAN PUBLIC SERVICE CAMPS— LETTER FROM RUTH SUCKOW

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Miss Ruth Suckow, of Cedar Falls, Iowa, relative to civilian public-service camps, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### FOUNDRIES—THE BOTTLENECK IN MANUFACTURE OF FARM MACHINERY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the real bottleneck in the manufacture of farm machinery, over and above the historical quota basis of production, is the shortage in the manufacture of castings and foundry supplies for such machinery. This has been brought about solely because of the shortage of manpower in such foundries due to the insufficient wages paid the foundry workers. This has seriously interfered with the production of the farmer. These supplies have been badly needed in order to offset the loss of manpower to the armed forces and to the munitions manufacturers. The same shortage has also greatly interfered with the manufacture of repair parts for farm machinery.

In recent weeks we have seen press releases by General Somervell, General Clay, and the Office of War Information with reference to the shortage of heavy trucks, bulldozers, tractors, and heavy munitions. An examination of the facts brings me to the conclusion that the real shortage of such war material comes from our inability to produce in our foundries of America. This bottleneck in the foundries is nothing new; it has existed for months. It appears that the various agencies recognize the real cause, which is the shortage of labor in the foundries due to the low wages paid the workers; but nothing has been done to remedy this condition.

As part of my remarks I wish to have placed in the body of the RECORD some factual data which are contained in a letter I wrote on August 31, 1944, to Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, in order that Members of the Senate may be familiar with these facts.

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

AUGUST 31, 1944.

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES,  
Director, Office of War Mobilization,  
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUSTICE: There is one thing that has been troubling me greatly for the past month in connection with our war effort and that is the problem of the bottleneck in foundries. In almost all of the hearings held by our committee in connection with the investigation of shortages we run into this question.

I am setting down here a few of my thoughts and am wondering whether the problem cannot be solved, for it seems so im-

portant to me and so easy of solution if we will recognize the real trouble.

Why are men in our foundries paid an average of 87 cents per hour when men in similar work in war plants get \$1.15 per hour, and for many months we are told that lack of manpower makes the foundry the bottleneck in our war productions?

I have just received a letter from the War Manpower Commission, Detroit office, with these quoted paragraphs:

"Labor shortages have affected most seriously the output of such vital war industries as foundries, forge shops, nonferrous metal plants, heavy ordnance, trucks and truck tires, and steel mills; industries characterized as hot, dirty, low-paid work which the average worker is understandably reluctant to enter. Most of these facilities are seriously behind schedule, some as much as 2 or 3 months.

"Employment in foundries and forge shops has continued downward despite the apparent halting of the over-all drop in employment. The decline in employment in these plants was over 600 from July 1 to August 1 and over 5,000 between December 1943 and August 1944.

"Foundry and forge shop employment continues to decline, however, and this situation may not improve materially so long as wage rates in these industries continue relatively low."

Heavy duty military trucks have been lagging for 8 months. Industry experts attribute the lag to the shortage of labor in key foundries. Yet we find that over one-half of all foundries have increased their capacity from 25 percent to 50 percent. Much of this expansion took place without regard to the fact that production could have been increased if labor had been made available to the existing foundries by offering higher wages. It can be definitely proved that foundry facilities have been expanding in many cases, while the production has been falling off steadily because of the shortage of manpower.

The shortage in farm machinery is caused by the same shortage of labor in foundries. Common labor in foundries was frozen under sweeper's wages in some war plants; wages of 87 cents in foundries, \$1.15 for similar work in war plants. The wage scale for foundry workers has been below that for plant sweepers and janitors due to the wage ceilings in foundries, which are from 20 cents to 40 cents lower than an intelligent laborer can obtain in nearby plants for much more pleasant and healthful work.

In most cases the ceiling prices on purchased castings for established manufacturers of these products is low compared to the ceiling prices of castings used directly for the Army and Navy so that pressure must be put on the foundries to have them produce the lower ceiling-priced casting.

The increase in plant facilities alone will not do it. The Defense Plant Corporation has approved for expenditure for land, buildings, and machinery for iron castings the sum of \$16,237,767.88.

One plant with maximum capacity of 800 tons of castings in November 1942, after building and equipping additional facilities designed to produce 2,500 tons in May 1943, produced only 700 tons because of the shortage of labor.

In some cases where new foundries with the latest and most modern equipment have been added, the new alone is producing, the old foundry is wasted. It has cost the Government the additional investment and all the additional manpower for the construction.

Ceiling prices fixed by O. P. A. have not helped the situation. Here is what O. P. A. did. It placed ceilings on prices paid by regular foundry customers but not on prices to be paid by new customers or by Govern-

ment agencies. As a result, foundries have refused old customers work to take on new work at higher prices, an increase as much as 150 percent. As the foundrymen had to learn the new jobs, their output decreased, the percentage of rejections increased—in some cases from 5 percent to 35 percent of total. You have less output per man and consequently a need for more men plus the fact that work has to be done in distant cities with its cost of transportation.

The Government tried to meet the situation by building more plants and new machinery, taking more manpower for this, only to be faced with still lower production as more men leave the foundries for better paid war jobs.

The War Manpower Commission finally admitted its labor shortage of 20,000 men in foundries. It stated that the wages were low and working conditions dusty. Wages were not increased as an industry as they were in shipyards. So foundries did not get men and even lost men.

Here are the United States Department of Labor manpower figures:

|  | June 1944 | May 1944 | April 1944 | June 1943 |
|--|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|
| Gray-iron and semi-steel castings..... | 73,100    | 73,400   | 74,600     | 81,900    |
| Malleable-iron castings.....           | 24,600    | 24,600   | 25,000     | 26,800    |
| Steel castings.....                    | 74,500    | 75,600   | 76,900     | 83,900    |

These figures indicate what has happened in manpower in foundries.

These situations have been called to the attention of the W. P. B. and Government agencies, but there is no real improvement in the situation simply because the fundamental difficulty of low wages has been ignored. The agencies will try anything, except the one thing to solve the difficulty. All agree the foundry is the bottleneck in many of our present critical war materials.

Why is this low wage ignored as the cause? Labor itself recognizes it, for the Labor Section of the W. P. B. asked labor union representatives to come to Washington to see if they would permit the importation of Mexicans for foundry work, and labor said, "That is not what we need—we want more money paid in the foundries."

They wasted 3 days here. They finally agreed to permit Mexicans to come in with the vague understanding that wages and hours in the foundries would be investigated.

The State Department didn't permit the Mexicans to come in for foundry work, 80,000 having come in for farm work and 40,000 for railroad work.

Now some relief is being received from labor from the West Indies.

There are some cases to increase wages in foundries pending before the W. L. B. They are individual cases, some sponsored by both labor and management, some disputed.

The War Labor Board says nothing will be done in the industry as a whole, but each individual case will be handled separately. Judge Vinson says 45 cents may be paid in the South and \$1 in Detroit.

Why these low wages? Is it really the War Labor Board or Judge Vinson? Or is it that some of the industries do not want to increase the wages, thinking of the future when they will not have war orders? In the meantime the war effort suffers. General Somervell tells of the shortages—August 1, 1944, release. General Clay followed with a release—August 28, 1944, O. W. I.—repeating the story of our shortages. All agree the bottleneck is the foundry. The foundry needs up to 12,000 men.

With best personal regards, I am,  
Sincerely,

HOMER FERGUSON.



## AIR BASES FOR POST-WAR AVIATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, America has had a most tragic lesson in the potentiality of aviation. We were blasted into this World War by the lack of intelligent leadership and understanding of the power of destruction from the air. As a result, our fleet and air power in the Pacific were sunk and destroyed at Pearl Harbor. A part of the terrible result was the unbelievable suffering, starvation, and final surrender of an American Army in the Philippines. The blame for this failure still hangs heavily on those responsible not only for the plight of the troops stranded and deserted in the Philippines at that time, but for the deaths reported daily of our gallant men in the Pacific who must now pay with their lives for this tragic mistake.

The Japanese also made a mistake when they underestimated the potential ability of the United States to awaken to the importance of air power. The gigantic strides being made daily in the Pacific and in the amazing blitz the Allies are making against the German armies are made possible by our supremacy in the air.

Facing complete disaster, the American people turned to the production of air power. The best brains in the country began to design and build airplanes; great assembly lines were set up; hundreds of thousands of men and women by day and night trained and turned their inventive genius to the building of ships for the sky. In August of this year more than 7,700 airplanes were produced in America alone. Almost 100,000 planes in 1 year was the answer of free America to the challenge of the despotic dictators of the earth.

The youth of America responded to the call for pilots, navigators, gunners, radar and radio operators to man these new ships. So many of them responded and qualified that today both the Army and Navy have had to curtail their pilot training. Thousands of young men are bitterly disappointed as they are transferred out of or denied admission to pilot training courses in our armed forces.

These American planes and pilots have played a magnificent part in the liberation thus far of the world. They are not only the eyes of the Allied armies, but they are flying cannon protecting and paving the way for our gallant forces to advance on land and sea.

When we read and rejoice over the news of the advances of the Russian armies, it is well to recall that they are racing to victory by the aid of American equipment. More than 300,000 American trucks and other military motor vehicles, and in excess of 11,000 American planes have been sent to Russia to aid in her brilliant achievement.

More than 10,000 airplanes from America have been flown to the United Kingdom by United States Army Air Transport flyers in the last year. These great planes and pilots from America have not only helped save Great Britain, but are helping lead the way for their troops on the European Continent.

Australia was saved and the enemy driven back by the brilliant air force under General MacArthur's direction.

The only supplies to reach China for months have been flown in by American airmen in American planes over the world's most dangerous air route. Flying over the "hump" of the Himalaya Mountains, sometimes 22,000 feet in the sky, these American planes, piloted by American airmen, are carrying into China daily a considerably greater tonnage than was ever carried over the Burma Road.

To make this magnificent contribution to the winning of the present wars of the world, great changes and advances have been made in both airplanes and air routes. Hundreds of millions of American dollars have been expended in the development of airports and bases. In addition, great radio communication facilities have been constructed by American brains, blood, and finances. These lessons of desperate necessity have been severe and costly in war, but they can pave the way for tomorrow's progress. These lessons and achievements have changed our thinking and will develop our future habits of transportation in commerce as well as future pleasure and national defense.

A straight line is the shortest distance between two points—provided the two points are on a flat surface. But the shortest distance between two distant points on the surface of this planet, which is curved and global, is a great circle flight. This will necessitate a change not only in our thinking, but our future maps. Just as speed pays great dividends in the saving of human life in war, it will pay great dividends in maintaining peace and peacetime commerce. The world always has and always will pay high premiums for faster, more efficient ways of doing its daily business.

When this war is over we will face the problems of peace as well as prosperity in the light of these lessons learned in war. Taking the city of Chicago, Ill., as a hub, the shortest route to London, Paris, Berlin, Moscow, or Tokyo will be directly over Canada, where great airports have been built by the forces and finances of the United States. Yet the War Department has already disposed of all of them by sale without first having our country enter into a treaty which will establish our right to future use of these strategic air bases.

Nine of these bases were constructed by the United States along the northwest staging route at a cost of more than \$37,000,000. Five of these bases were constructed along the northeast ferry route at a cost in excess of \$34,000,000. Flight strips were constructed throughout Canada at a cost considerably more than \$4,000,000.

Already, before the war has been won, our War Department has sold all of these bases and flight strips at a price of almost \$14,000,000 less than the cost to us.

In the light of the unprecedented experience and advances made in air power during this war, it is doubtful if there is a single area or country on earth where future air rights will be as necessary and beneficial to the defense of the United States as those in Canada. We have several treaties, long leases, and agreements with Canada pertaining to

water, railroad, and limited air rights, but having spent almost \$90,000,000 to build these strategic air bases and facilities in Canada, creating the latent air routes to the principal areas of the world to save humanity, it would only be good common sense to demand future rights in them to protect ourselves in the future.

The potential possibility of air power in the future of mankind is self-evident, and yet it is in its infancy. America has contributed more to modern aviation in material, men, money, and scientific skill than any other country and will have developed approximately one-third of the air power of the entire world by the end of the present wars. This was our contribution to save liberty-loving peoples everywhere. Surely we are entitled to and should have the right to use these air bases and air power developments as we prepare to perform our full part in developing the future peace and prosperity of the world.

The Congress has given complete cooperation and unquestioned appropriations to the War and Navy Departments to build whatever facilities were necessary for the prosecution of the war. But the Congress cannot shirk its full responsibility to safeguard the future rights and protection of the American people after the war.

One of the most remarkable and enlightening trips among the many taken by millions of Americans during this entire war was taken by five distinguished Members of the United States Senate—the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and former Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts. This trip was taken around the world in 9 days' flying time. Without exception, they expressed their concern about our future rights in and access to these strategically located air bases in the world.

I quote from their report.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] stated:

All of us are concerned about American rights in air bases and air facilities which have been constructed at our expense all over the world. There should be no delay in having some definite understanding and agreement as to the post-war rights of commercial aviation. Certainly we occupy a better position to negotiate such understandings now than we will have after the war is over. We cannot expect to have sovereignty over all bases that we have constructed for military purposes, but we should assure to American enterprise an equal chance with others in these bases we have paid for, and the right to operate in all parts of the world.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] reported a year ago:

We had already spent more than \$500,000,000 on airfields and equipment all over the world. In most places we have no right except to get out when the war is over. We have constructed these fields and placed these installations on the land belonging to other countries.

It is obvious that this situation must be remedied, as practically all of our bases outside of continental United States are on this basis. We must hold bases in the islands of

the ocean which, in possession of hostile nations, would constitute a threat and a menace to the people of the United States. Many of these bases have been won by the blood of American soldiers. We gave up our right to these bases after World War No. 1 and came home. This time we must keep them. The men who are making the sacrifice want it that way.

Former Senator Lodge, in speaking of his trip, stated:

Perhaps one of the most striking physical phenomena to a modern world traveler are the huge airfields which have been constructed with American money and American labor, at the farthest corners of the earth. Most of these have not been constructed in territory belonging to the United States, and military secrecy forbids my stating just where they are. Estimates of the amounts expended on these airfields run as high as \$500,000,000. So far as I could learn, we have no post-war rights of access to any of them. We do not seek dominance; we abhor imperialistic domination over native people; all we want is an even break.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], in speaking about these air bases, stated:

That leaves the matter of the air bases that have been constructed for military purposes by the Army and Navy in foreign countries since our entry into the war open for negotiation so far as their post-war use is concerned.

Here, again, I am of the opinion that the members of the United Nations who have been working harmoniously on the same team in a military sense will be able to reach agreements for the use of these fields which will prove satisfactory to all parties at interest.

Here is an instance in which it will be necessary for the Congress to determine a policy with reference to post-war aviation which will serve as a guide for those in the executive branch of the Government whose responsibility this problem becomes.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] stated:

Considerable consternation has been expressed at the strong and unanimous report of the five members of our senatorial committee concerning the future of America in the air. The language of our unanimous report to the Senate and the country upon this point is as follows:

"The United States has constructed huge airfields all over the world at tremendous cost to our people. The use of some of these fields in the future may be just as essential to our security as battleships or divisions. We have no post-war rights of access to these fields outside the Western Hemisphere at the present time. These rights of access are also indispensable to the vitally important growth of commercial aviation."

The Senator from Maine further stated:

The surprise which has been expressed on both sides of the Atlantic at our conclusions on this score are extremely revealing as to the lack of realization in the United States as to what is here involved.

This situation was first brought to my attention in December 1942, as a result of heated debates upon the subject in the British Parliament.

In these discussions very great concern was expressed as to the position of America and as to the necessity of Britain taking action to insure her position in commercial aeronautics in the post-war world. Assurance was given that the matter was being carefully considered and explored and accumulating evidence is at hand as to the customary

thoroughness with which the British have approached this global problem.

Their consideration culminated in the holding of an Empire conference this past month in London, at which their program for meeting this situation was carefully considered, and the announcements at the conclusion indicated that agreement had been reached regarding the part which all parts of the British Empire would play in developing post-war commercial aviation.

Certainly it is proper that America should similarly give attention to the determination of its policy in order that our people may be fully informed and that Congress, in collaboration with the Administration, may determine the form of our policy in this highly important field.

Certainly the Congress and the people of this country were very well informed by these five distinguished Senators as to the specific problem of our future air rights. This report and warning was made almost 1 year ago, on October 7, 1943. Since that date millions of men and women and billions of dollars of supplies under lend-lease have gone to our allies all over the world. We have built additional air bases and have flown thousands upon thousands of additional planes to aid our allies over the area visited by the Senators on their trip; and yet no provisions have been made to guarantee to the people of the United States the use of these bases and facilities longer than 6 months after the war. No provision was made for the right of Americans to use these American-built bases for commercial purposes even during the war. No provision has been made for the use of these air bases by the United States for any purpose beyond 6 months after the close of the war.

This is another flagrant example of giving away the substance and rights of the American people, while millions of American sons and daughters are fighting, suffering, and dying all over the world to defend and preserve their beloved country.

I realize full well that whenever one speaks of protecting and demanding rights for America there are some who always shout that to do so would disrupt the war effort or help our enemies. This I deny.

We all remember how Mussolini bombed poor little Ethiopia into submission; but as soon as the Ethiopians were liberated with the aid of American funds and equipment, the British quickly negotiated a treaty with Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia, which provided in part:

His Majesty the Emperor will not permit foreign aircraft other than British to fly to, in, or over Ethiopia without the concurrence of the Government of the United Kingdom.

It was not too early for Great Britain to secure all future air rights over liberated Ethiopia, and it did not hinder the war effort.

After we have sent millions of men and spent more than \$12,000,000,000 of America's money to provide munitions, materials, medicines, and food to save beleaguered England, Lord Beaverbrook assured the House of Lords as late as May of this year that we acquired no commercial rights in the bases we received in return for desperately needed

destroyers when England was in her darkest hour of this war. He stated:

These bases are leased only for military purposes. They cannot be used for civil aviation except with our consent. They do not pass under the general conception of bases for civil aviation. What may be the intention of the government in the future remains to be seen, but at present the question of civil aviation in connection with these bases never has arisen so far as I know. They are good people to deal with—the Americans.

Again, on August 26, 1944, Prime Minister Churchill reassured a member of Parliament that there is not the slightest "question of any cession of British territories" in the leasing of bases to the United States.

Mr. President, after we guaranteed with our troops and material that no possible invasion of Iceland could take place by the barbarous Nazi in their westward march, Iceland's Foreign Minister, Vilhjalmur Thor, is reported to have stated recently that Iceland is going to grant no military bases after the war "by lease or outright ownership."

After we purchased the output of Canada's factories with American money to help save her economy and sent many of these same products to the British Empire under lend-lease, Canada bought with this same money these air bases which we built with no definite provision being made for our future right to use them after the Empire is no longer in danger.

All of this is eloquent proof that the British Empire is moving with greater speed than we are in this all-important question.

The sale of these all-important air bases in Canada brings forceful evidence of what will probably happen throughout the world, and soon, unless the Congress acts with dispatch to prohibit the further sale of any American-built base anywhere until the Senate has had a chance to pass upon any treaty with any foreign country in which our future rights are protected and guaranteed. It is the duty of Congress to stop immediately the further disposition or sale of these valuable and vitally important air bases built by Americans throughout the world, and it is the duty of the administration to immediately negotiate treaties with each country wherein these bases are located, which will permit America to use and maintain these airports after the war.

Just as air power today has been a key to victory, air power tomorrow will be a key to peace. It is incredible that we should have built such strategically important air bases throughout the world and incurred this tremendous debt that will be carried by our troops when they return from war, along with the rest of the American people, without securing future rights to use these bases. The future lives, happiness, and prosperity of generations to come will depend upon our ability to turn these sacrifices for and strides in aviation to the benefit of future America.

This subject should be of prime importance to the representatives of the United States who are now participating

in the all too secret Dumbarton Oaks Conference. Certainly there is nothing more important to be considered, and America truly needs a spokesman today who will fight for American rights as forcefully as the leaders of our allied countries protect the rights of their people.

The American people are a peaceful people. They want peace and they want to insure it.

No nation in all recorded time has ever contributed so much or gone so far to defend others and themselves. We were able to make this unprecedented sacrifice and contribution in war because we were a strong, free, and independent Nation. It is our solemn and sacred duty to demand and secure our just rights to guarantee our future freedom and independence and thus insure our strength in a war-torn world.

INVITATION TO STATE DEPARTMENT TO DISCUSS INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], who has spoken today on a subject which has given me concern for a number of years. I have repeatedly made radio addresses over national hook-ups on the question of making America safe in the future by seeing to it that the island bases of the world are kept in our possession, or at least that we have partial control of them. I have made reference to the bases in the Far East, the islands which Wilson literally surrendered to the Japanese, and which we have spent thousands of lives and millions of dollars to recapture. Those bases are on the air lanes of the world, and those islands are the outposts and the outer ramparts of our defense. I refer to the islands in the Pacific. Mr. President, I did not rise to speak on that subject, but because the subject is somewhat akin to that which has been discussed by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, I wish to inquire just where our country finds itself at this time in relation to its dealings with its allies and in relation to the problems which will be thrown in our laps in the next few weeks.

Mr. President, the past week has been the greatest week for the Allies since the war began. Bradley, Montgomery, Patton, Eisenhower, and millions of our fighting sons are demonstrating the superiority of American manhood and American weapons. These sons of ours are fighting their way through towns in Belgium, France, and Germany, where their fathers fought 26 years ago.

Finland is dropping out of the war. Rumania becomes one of the Allies. Bulgaria is wobbling. Hitler is retreating from the Peloponnesians. The Russians are on their way to Berlin, and we, too, are on our way there. It is a race to see who will get there first. The Philippines invasion is only a few days or few weeks ahead, and in Germany and the lands still occupied by Hitler his slave army is arising. In France only mopping-up operations remain to be carried on by our forces.

All of this means that before we know it Germany will be suing for peace. Where does that place us? Where are we at? We were told that the conference at Dumbarton Oaks was to consider the machinery only, and we were told something about a council and a general assembly and a court.

But, Mr. President, when our war job is finished, when our enemy has quit, then the real job begins in Europe. I should like to know what machinery is available to handle the tremendous number of post-war problems in Europe. What are our commitments in relation to the rehabilitation of our Allies? By rehabilitation I mean helping France, Poland, Belgium, Holland, Norway, so they may become competent to help themselves.

We learned the lesson of too little and too late in war, although now apparently we are getting plenty of what it takes into the battle against Germany. But, Mr. President, there is another war. There is the war of diplomacy. As has just been suggested by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, there is the war of control of the air bases of the world. There is the conflict in international affairs. Above all, I, as a Senator, wish to know what we have been doing since Pearl Harbor in relation to the world picture, and what plans, what understandings, and what mechanics exist.

On February 14, 1941, which was a long time ago, I submitted a resolution, and I am going to offer another one today, calling upon the Senate to proceed with closed doors, in executive session, and asking that the Secretary of State and his Under Secretaries be requested to attend, to discuss the eastern situation and other related matters. No attention was paid to my first resolution. I wanted to find out the condition of our fleet and especially of the coordinating air arm in the Far East. I said so on the floor of the Senate. I wanted to know if it was like the Russian Fleet was in the Japanese War. Later, when Pearl Harbor came, we found that it was. I wanted to know whether our fleet had a coordinating air arm such as the war had recently demonstrated every fleet should have. I wanted to know our military position and our condition in the Philippines, and whether we had sufficient airplanes, and whether we were ready for any eventuality. All that is to be found in volume 87, part II of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 1714.

Mr. President, in July 1943, after war came upon us like a thief in the night, the Washington Post, in commenting upon my resolution, made the following editorial statement:

Ten months before Pearl Harbor, Senator WILEY introduced another resolution asking the Secretary of State to report in executive session to the Senate on the threat of war in the Far East and our preparations to meet it. At that time the State Department knew that war in the Pacific was rapidly approaching.

Let me say parenthetically that when the white paper was issued in 1942, it showed that in January 1941, Ambassador Grew had informed the President

and the Secretary of State that the Japs were ready to attack at any time.

Mr. President, was my resolution simply a shot in the dark, so far as I was concerned? No. For the first time, I shall relate why my resolution was offered. I happened to have friends in New York who told me—and the Secretary of State knew this—that in January and February the Japanese government and Japanese businessmen, instead of depositing credits in the New York banks to meet their obligations there, were withdrawing money. To my mind that indicated quite clearly that there was a "nigger in the woodpile" somewhere. I wanted to find out.

I read further from the editorial:

But the resolution was pigeonholed. The Senate did not get the information sought. No adequate preparations to meet an attack were made. The United States was humiliated at Pearl Harbor, and a great sacrifice of human life will be necessary to regain what we have lost in the Far East. No one can say with assurance how the situation would have been changed if the information in the hands of the State Department had been conveyed to key Members of Congress. This much however, is certain—

I wish to have the Senate bear this point in mind, because it is directly in line with the remarks made today by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois—

the withholding of such information makes it impossible for the representatives of the people to act intelligently in the face of a global crisis.

Mr. President, I have just read an editorial printed in the Washington Post on July 19, 1943. I repeat its closing words:

The withholding of such information makes it impossible for the representatives of the people to act intelligently in the face of a global crisis.

Again, Mr. President—this time on September 7, 1942—I offered a resolution which is to be found in volume 88, part VI, page 7164 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

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

In the resolution I was seeking the creation of machinery for collaboration between the State Department and the Congress. Secretary Hull dismissed the suggestion, and in reply I said:

It was elementary that the grave deficiency of machinery for collaboration between the State Department and Congress in the inception steps of the treaty cannot be casually dismissed by a faith in the efficacy of the congressional friendships of the Secretary of State. Such friendships are not an adequate substitute for a carefully planned machinery for collaboration between the executive branch and the Congress.

My statement was prompted by the fact that Secretary Hull had said in his

letter to me, "I have friends in the Senate with whom I can talk." My suggestion was brushed aside and we carried on in the same old way for more than a year and a half. Then Secretary Hull set up what some called a liaison committee, like the one I had suggested.

Mr. President, in speaking on behalf of my resolution on November 25, 1942, I said:

New occasions in the lives of individuals as well as in the lives of nations create new responsibilities, and new duties, and when such new responsibilities and duties arise we should have adequate governmental machinery so that we can properly function. America has a tremendous job ahead of her. She must be equal to the task. She must become equipped to do the job.

On numerous occasions I stated on the floor of the Senate that the suggested Foreign Relations Advisory Council would provide a clearinghouse for ideas, not merely the ideas of the Secretary of State, but of the best thinkers in America and the rest of the world—ideas relating to the very things which are now upon us. In some quarters no attention was paid to my suggestion, but magazines and newspapers saw the validity of it.

On September 24, 1942, the Christian Science Monitor stated that the resolution was "the most important, constructive, and forward-looking suggestion in behalf of the future peace which has come from Congress since the United States formally entered the war."

The representatives whom the Secretary of State has chosen from the Foreign Relations Committee sit and listen to what he thinks the idea should be. That is not what I had in mind. I had in mind that we have been facing the situation which has been referred to by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. We are facing a thousand problems. Certainly Members of the Senate should not be disregarded. The mere fact they have been called in to have a little tea is not the important thing to consider. The best brains of America have been thinking about this matter for months and years. The best brains of the world have been thinking about it. I stated that the committee could well be a clearinghouse to which the ambassadors of other countries could come and confer. Out of such conferences we might be able to find the best way to handle the multitude of problems which are now coming upon us.

The informal gatherings during the past 6 months of the Secretary of State and a few chosen buddies does not come within a thousand miles of the suggestion I had in mind, and now we have Dumbarton Oaks and Europe ready to be thrown in our laps.

Mr. President, there was a time when people everywhere looked to us as the hope of the world. That was when I submitted my resolution. Then was the hour to start planning. Then was the hour when we could have put America's ideas into the mechanism for peace. Then was the time to have obtained agreements ceding to America the outer ramparts.

I repeat, if Germany cracks up, what machinery will be available? Are we

again too late with too little? We were told that the Dumbarton Oaks conference was only a preliminary meeting and that afterward the "Big Three" would meet. In the meanwhile, Mr. President, Europe may be in our laps. Without question Russia is now assuming the position in the European picture which France assumed after the last World War.

Following the last war we wanted nothing but to live in peace with the rest of the world. Since then the world has been contracted and made smaller. The islands surrounding our continent are our outer bulwarks. The time to strike has passed. In the First World War we loaned billions of dollars which have not been repaid to us. We are now merely one of the victors. We can sit around and talk. But whose job was it? Who was acting for the American people? Who was supposed to design and execute plans as a trustee in behalf of our Government? I repeat, Whose job was it? As suggested by the editorial in the Washington Post, there was no collaboration with this body, which is the constitutional body representing the Government with which a treaty must be made.

I again ask, If Germany cracks up, what machinery will be available? Are we again too late with too little? We have been told that the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is merely a preliminary meeting, and that afterward the Big Three will meet. It is a preliminary meeting now, Mr. President, when Europe's house is being thrown into our lap. Europe will be in our lap, and in the meantime those of us who know our history know that Russia is now in the same position that France occupied following the First World War. We also know that France and England had considerable discussion through the years as to who should dominate Europe. We are facing realistic problems, and we should realistically approach them. What plans do we have? What are the mechanics? What are the understandings? Are there to be any treaties?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred. It reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business with closed doors and the Secretary of State and his Under Secretaries be requested to attend to discuss with the Senate the European situation and other related matters.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 326), submitted by Mr. WILEY, was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILEY. The other related matters may involve the question of air bases as well as other questions. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is still a branch of the Government of the United States, but the Senate is still being disregarded. A few Senators have met. What plans, what pledges, what commitments, what understandings, and what mechanics exist?

Mr. President, it appears that no machinery has been set up. We can expect that, when Germany cracks up, there

will be revolutions and counterrevolutions in a number of the Balkan states. I suggest that at Geneva there is still available considerable of the wreckage of the League of Nations which might be utilized as a stopgap until our Government and the other governments finally have the vision to establish the necessary machinery.

#### RELIEF OF SUFFERERS FROM PORT CHICAGO EXPLOSION

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, a bill has just been sent over from the other House, where it was passed unanimously. It relates to an accident which occurred very recently in Port Chicago, in the State of California. It was one of the worst accidents which has ever plagued us. It not only caused great loss of property but blew human beings apart so that their remains could not be identified. I shall not try to picture that accident because words would fail me entirely if I attempted to do so. But the bill which was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives to provide relief for individuals who sustained damages as a result of the explosion at Port Chicago, Calif., has been sent to the Senate. It is an emergency measure; if we do not act upon it today, we probably will have no opportunity to act before January next. So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be laid before the Senate and considered at this time.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.  
Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think the facts and circumstances surrounding this proposed legislation constitute such a real emergency that speedy action is to be greatly desired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is, indeed.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator's request will be granted and that the bill will be passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 5181) to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., was read the first time by its title and the second time at length as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation of the merits of those claims against the United States for compensation for property damage, death, or personal injuries alleged to have been caused by the explosions which occurred at the naval magazine at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, which shall have been submitted to the Navy Department in writing within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act.

Sec. 2. The appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year 1945 shall be available for payment, and payment is hereby authorized, upon approval of the Secretary of the Navy or his designate, of claims referred to in section 1 hereof (a) for disability or death resulting from personal

injury sustained by persons not then members of the armed forces or civilian employees of the United States: *Provided*, That settlements shall not aggregate in excess of \$3,000 with respect to the disability or death of any one person nor shall any such settlement be made in amounts which would not be allowable, or for beneficiaries who would not be eligible, under the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, if the disabled or deceased person were an employee of the United States; or (b) for property loss or damage: *Provided*, That settlement shall not be made in excess of \$3,000 for injury to any one building or structure.

SEC. 3. Any settlement made under the provisions of section 2 hereof shall be in full settlement of all such claims against the Government of the United States.

SEC. 4. In connection with any settlement authorized by section 2 hereof, the Secretary may require assignment to the United States of any right of action against third parties arising from the death, injury, or property damage with respect to which such settlement is made.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Navy shall transmit to the Congress each claim submitted the Navy Department in accordance with section 1 hereof not settled by him, with supporting papers and a report of his finding of facts and recommendations thereon and also a report of each claim settled and paid by him pursuant to section 2 hereof. Such reports shall contain a brief statement of the character and justice of each claim so transmitted or settled, the amount claimed, and the amount found due.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, almost a year ago, in an article published in the Chicago Sunday Tribune, I proposed an association of nations patterned upon the Pan American Union for the purpose of dealing with post-war peace administration. Today the President has a plan of his own—a plan so shrouded in secrecy that there is no official report on its vast ramifications; its far-reaching potentialities. But there are leaks which show that we Americans are to be called upon to surrender our sovereignty and our liberty to the caprice of one man. I do not believe Americans will approve such a proposal.

The Conference at Dumbarton Oaks to form a new league of nations, now meeting in the city of Washington upon the call of the President of the United States, and consisting of representatives of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, with China hiding behind the curtains in order not to offend the aesthetic sense of sensitive Japan, has been in session many days. Despite the fact that the newspapers have repeatedly and urgently requested permission to attend the Conference, or receive some information about its activities and proposals, the only recognition of that request was an invitation the other day to attend a press conference which, as described by one of the representatives of the press, was "a run-around," and "we were told nothing."

Now, however, we have been furnished some enlightenment upon the work of the Conference. On August 22 the New

York Times published the following statement:

WASHINGTON, August 22.—The United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia outlined today to the delegates at the Washington Conversations on International Organization their broad proposals for the creation of an international league to prevent and repel aggression.

In two executive sessions in the Renaissance music room at the Dumbarton Oaks mansion, which was surrounded by military police and barred to reporters, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Under Secretary of State, and Sir Alexander Cadogan and Ambassador Andrei A. Gromyko, chairmen of the British and Russian delegations, proceeded from general statements on the problem of securing the peace to the much more difficult task of defining how it was to be done.

An official communiqué disclosed that the three plans had been discussed and that Mr. Stettinius had been selected as permanent chairman of the conversations, but it did not say anything about the proposals or about the questions asked after the reading of each plan.

The New York Times, however, has obtained from an unimpeachable source the following digest of the three plans, which were drafted by the governments recently and exchanged for study and comment.

As is well known, all three powers propose the creation of an international security organization having an assembly of all the powers; a council, controlled by the United States, Britain, Soviet Russia, and China, who have primary authority and responsibility for preventing and repelling aggression; an international court of justice and a general secretariat.

The American plan is careful to emphasize that the United States has no intention of proposing a four-power dictatorship on the rest of the world, but it makes quite clear that the authority of the assembly of all the powers shall be limited.

The purpose of the assembly, the American plan is understood to state, is to assist the executive council, upon request, in enlisting all states toward giving effect to the actions of the council." Each of the United Nations would be represented on the council by six members, each nation would have one vote, and the assembly would meet once a year, probably in a different capital each year.

The "executive council" (which the American plan calls it) would have four permanent members—the United States, Britain, Soviet Russia, and China. Provision is also made for several additional members. This council, the American plan states, would be primarily responsible for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and for the security of the nations.

Moreover, it makes clear, the four permanent members would have authority in the council in proportion to their obligation to provide most of the money, men, and force to repel any aggression which might occur. Consequently, the American plan stipulates that in order to use force to prevent aggression, the four permanent members must vote for it unanimously and in addition to this, that there must be a majority vote of the entire council before military sanctions can be applied.

Thus, if there were eleven members of the council not only the four permanent members of the council would have to apply force against an aggressor, but two other powers would also have to favor it. This latter stipulation is designed to quell the fears of the other powers that they would not have a voice in the major decisions of the proposed league.

The most important part of the American plan is contained in the proposal that the powers should enter into a general agreement on the number and type of forces they

are obligated to put at the disposal of the executive council. This agreement would evidently limit the number of forces and facilities which each member nation was obligated to provide for the use of the council, but the Senate of the United States—

I call particular attention to that sentence—

but if the Senate of the United States approved the treaty in which this agreement was contained, these forces would, under the American plan as it now stands, be available for the use of the security league without the necessity of returning to Congress for approval every time the American delegate and a majority of the council voted to apply force to prevent aggression.

Mr. President, I realize that this is not an official report, but more than a week has elapsed since its publication and no denial has been made. Certain Members of Congress have seen the American plan therein described and they agree that the report of the New York Times is substantially correct. Under that plan, the President will have the power to declare war without the consent, the knowledge, or the approval of Congress. I should like to know, Mr. Roosevelt, whether that is your demand. I should like to know whether that is the platform upon which you are running for the fourth term as President of the United States. It must be because the so-called American plan was prepared either in your office or that of the Secretary of State with your approval and submitted to the Dumbarton conference as the proposal of the American Government.

You did not always believe in such entanglements as you now propose, Mr. Roosevelt. Reading back through your public statements, we find these words spoken on December 28, 1933:

The definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention. We are not members of the League of Nations and we do not contemplate membership.

On January 3, 1934, you said:

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

On August 14, 1936, you said:

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

And yet, Mr. Roosevelt, you have prepared and presented to representatives of the Allied Nations a proposal for a new League of Nations far more comprehensive than the League of Nations which you heretofore have condemned.

Let me call your attention to article 10 of the Covenant of the old League of Nations, which said:

The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

Article 10 of the old League of Nations was debated for months and was defeated. Subsequently, in the next Presidential election the American people ap-

proved that defeat by an an overwhelming vote.

Now you propose that Congress turn over to you, one individual, the full and complete power as a member of this new League of Nations to take this Nation into war in any part of the world and send our sons to enforce your orders.

Do you, Mr. Roosevelt, base your campaign for a fourth term upon the despotic and extraordinary power outlined in this so-called American plan?

The practical administration of such a proposal to declare war carries with it the right to spend money; to supply and provide for the military and naval operation.

Likewise, the implication of this proposal is that this Congress undertakes to bind the hands of every future Congress. This right of every Congress to determine its own policy is one of the fundamentals of democracy.

If the New York Times article really be the language of the so-called American plan proposed by the President, it can mean only one thing. It means that if he can secure the approval of the Senate to this plan, then thereafter whenever the League Council decides the use of force against any nation shall be undertaken, the President has the power, without going back to Congress, to send troops and ships and planes to invade or attack any nation; and that means war by Presidential order.

Mr. Roosevelt, you have said much in recent months about the "peace-loving nations." All the Allied Nations are presumably peace-loving nations. The American people are peace-loving people; but when you propose a new League of Nations that gives to you, or to the President of the United States, whoever he may be, power to declare war and send our soldiers anywhere in the world, I ask in all sincerity, is that your campaign issue?

Every war in history has been started by some king or ruler who had the power to do the thing you now propose. War is never started by the people. If this power is granted to you, we will have taken the last and final step of laying the foundation for the next war.

Under this plan proposed by you, who is going to decide what aggression is? Who is going to decide when it is necessary to send troops into some distant part of the world? You, Mr. Roosevelt. And suppose that you issue an order sending an army against Canada, or Mexico, or Brazil, on the statement by you that aggression is contemplated or has taken place, who can deny your assertion? What power can override your order? Under the provisions of your proposal, you become the absolute despot of the American people; a true dictator in all sense of the word.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the able Senator from South Dakota with respect to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. I shall not undertake to make any detailed reply to his remarks, since they seem to be very largely of a political nature. Several times he referred to the candidacy of the President and the election in No-

vember. My efforts have been in the direction of trying to keep the issue of foreign relations out of politics, so I shall not fall into the trap so skillfully set by the Senator from South Dakota and discuss this question from a partisan standpoint.

Mr. President, no international conference ever adopts proposals unanimously. With rare exceptions, the Senate never adopts any proposal unanimously. There is always some particular feature about any bill or policy which does not suit us in its details; but in the final analysis we regard the measure as an entity, as a whole, and sometimes waive our objections.

We can make no intelligent discussion of the work of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference at this time, or even when it adjourns, in my view, because it is merely a technical conference. The main conference will be held at a later time, on what is called a higher level, with the foreign ministers of the governments concerned, and with representatives of all the United Nations that desire to participate. That will be the meeting which will really determine the shape, structure, and form of whatever international machinery may be established. So I shall withhold any discussion of the matter at the present time, because no one knows exactly what the final instrument will contain.

I remind the Senator from South Dakota and other Senators that whatever may be adopted must come back to the Senate, the forum selected by the framers of the Constitution. It must come back to the Senate and run the gauntlet of the most searching scrutiny and the most careful and meticulous examination, not only in the Committee on Foreign Relations, but on the floor of the Senate itself. I remind the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that the minority is represented on the Foreign Relations Committee by an unusually able group of very distinguished Senators. They have the faculty of inquisition developed to a very high degree, and he need not fear that anything will get through the Foreign Relations Committee until the distinguished Senators, both of the majority and of the minority, examine the instrument, take it apart, analyze it, take out all the wheels, and unwind the spring. He need not fear that anything will be put over on the Senate without its knowledge or consent. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will bear his excitement in patience. The "higher level" will probably not promulgate the instrument until after the November election. In fact, it is an international conference, and is supposed to be indifferent to local elections in the various countries; and I assume it is.

I remind the Senator from South Dakota that this is a matter which ought to be above partisan politics. In the field of foreign affairs there is a rather trite saying that "politics ends at the seashore." Mr. President, we hope that this war, which has grieved us and robbed our land of some of its finest and richest blood, and which has required the pouring out in unstinted measure of

our treasure, is about to come to an end, at least so far as one aspect of it is concerned, by the triumph of American arms.

What would it profit me as a Democrat, or what would it profit the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] or the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] as Republicans to aid in the construction of an international tribunal to preserve the peace of the world and to prevent another war? What political advantage would it be to us? It would interest us only as Americans, hopeful of keeping our country out of another war. I am not speaking of other countries. I am not speaking of Russia, Great Britain, or China, although I entertain for them all a very high regard and admiration. I am speaking of America itself. We are not engaged in a Sir Galahad mission in this respect. We are acting in the interests of America itself. It is the red blood of our sons that we do not want spilled again. It is the treasure of our people here at home that we do not want to be wasted again. We are in this fight to create an international tribunal to preserve the peace of the world because that means our peace, our security, and our safety. I hope no Senator will approach this problem bearing the emblem of his party. It is not a political question. It is not a domestic question. It is a question of the highest national importance.

When the casualty lists come from the Office of the Chief of Staff, they contain names such as Sgt. James Smith, of Tennessee, or Corp. Henry Johnson, of South Dakota. They contain the serial number, the names of the parents or survivors, the name of the particular organization, and the branch of the service, such as Infantry, or paratroops. But the list does not contain any information as to whether or not the man was a Democrat or a Republican. It is of no significance to the Nation whether he was a Democrat or a Republican. He goes out on the battlefield, sheds his blood, or gives his life for his country, without regard to whether he is a Democrat or a Republican.

So, Mr. President, I refuse to discuss this question at this time from a partisan angle. I wish to say to the Senator from South Dakota that when the work of the conferences shall have been concluded, I shall discuss these matters. I shall not run away from them, and I am sure other Senators will not run away from them. When the treaty comes before the Senate all of us are Senators and all of us are able to stand upon our own feet. All of us are representatives of great commonwealths. If a Senator does not approve of the treaty, it will be his duty to vote against it, and I shall not impugn the motives or the patriotism of any Senator who does so. I wish to associate with men who have minds and convictions of their own. I do not expect every one to agree with me, because anyone who did so would be wrong a part of the time, no doubt.

So, Mr. President, there is no occasion for excitement now. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference has not concluded its work. It has been well advertised that

the Conference is merely a meeting of the technicians to more or less put into proper form the plans, under a general outline, that are to be agreed upon. But they have no force, they have no prestige, they have no compulsion, until the main conference shall have convened, after the Dumbarton Oaks Conference shall have adjourned.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does the Senator care to answer the question whether he has seen the plan which is called the American plan?

Mr. CONNALLY. - I do not mind saying that I have and that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] have seen it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to ask a further question, if the Senator will yield to me again.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does that plan contain the statement, as alleged in the New York Times, that after the Senate has approved the general agreement or treaty, the President or the executive member for this country will have the power to designate the area in which the forces maintained by the council will be used?

Mr. CONNALLY. It does not make provision in that form, I may say to the Senator. I do not wish to dodge the question. Some months ago the President made a statement outlining the general characteristics of the so-called league. Here is what it provides: It provides for a council. It provides that the four major nations shall be permanent members of the council. Does the Senator object to that?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Not at all. But does the Senator approve of the statement which has been made by the—

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment, Mr. President; I wish to obtain a little information from the Senator, so that I can answer his question. Does the Senator object to having the four great nations be permanent members of the council?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Not at all. But I wish to see the plan, and the American people wish to see the plan, before it is agreed to and decided upon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly; and I will get to it. Of course, the only way to meet the Senator's wishes would be to have him sit in the conference. None of the rest of us are sitting in it. I do not see why the Senator from South Dakota should claim the right to something which all the rest of us are denied.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Why should any of us be denied that?

Mr. CONNALLY. For the simple reason that the Senate can never negotiate the treaty. Why, Mr. President, we cannot successfully negotiate a bill for the disposal of surplus property after the war; we cannot successfully negotiate a post-war unemployment measure. However, I do not wish to get into frivolous discussion.

Let me answer the Senator's question. The Senator has said that he thinks the

four great nations should have places on the council. Why? Because the four great nations are the ones which have fought this war. It is their blood which has been spilled, it is their treasure which has been wasted, on the fields of battle. God knows, if there is another war, the armies and navies of the great nations will either have to fight it or stop it, one or the other.

I will say to the Senator that the plan provides that on the council there shall be four permanent members. It then provides—I am not certain; I do not think there has been any final agreement on this point—that there shall be other members of the council who shall be elected by the general members of the assembly. That means all the countries, both small and large, in addition to those four.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does the Senator call France a small country?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say that France has played the part of a small country in this war. I have always admired France. When I was a school-boy I sympathized with her in her Hundred Years' War with Great Britain. I have always sympathized with France. But France has played a very sorry spectacle in this war, and the Senator knows it. She had an army of 5,000,000 men, armed and supposedly trained and equipped. But they collapsed like a house of cards before the marching armies of Germany.

What has France done since then? I think France should prove her ability to sit on the council. She may be elected by the other nations. I understand that a great many of the nations that are concerned in this matter wish to put her on the council at once. But I would say let her serve an apprenticeship for a while.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield, but I have not yet answered the Senator's first question. However, I shall be glad to take on another one; I shall make up an agenda of the Senator's questions.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In the article which appeared in the New York Times—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator's newspaper was the Chicago Tribune. I did not know he had gone over to the New York Times. He quoted the Chicago Tribune at first.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I appreciate the humor of the Senator's remark; but if he will answer—

Mr. CONNALLY. I will answer if I can. But when the Senator asks first one question and then another, the point he has in mind is difficult for me to grasp.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to refer to the article which appeared in the New York Times.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; I am glad to have the Senator proceed.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The article says that—

The most important part of the American plan is contained in the proposal that the powers should enter into a general agreement on the number and type of forces they are obligated to put at the disposal of the

executive council. This agreement would evidently limit the number of forces and facilities which each member nation was obligated to provide for the use of the council, but if the Senate of the United States approved the treaty in which this agreement was contained, these forces would, under the American plan as it now stands, be available for the use of the security league without the necessity of returning to Congress for approval every time the American delegate and the majority of the council voted to apply force to prevent aggression.

Does the Senator approve of that?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will answer the Senator's question. In the first place, the tentative agreement provides that in no case can armed forces be employed without the unanimous vote of the four major members of the council and, I understand, probably in addition without the approval of a majority of the council. What would that do? It would give the United States a veto power on the use of armed forces in any dispute or quarrel. That meets the argument that was successfully made on the floor of the Senate against the League of Nations and article X of the covenant. The great argument then was, "Oh, we shall never join one of these organizations that can order our boys to foreign fields without the consent of the United States." So we provide that they cannot do that if the representative of the United States vetoes it.

That is all there is to it. The assumption is made by the Senator from South Dakota and, I assume, by other Senators, that without saying anything more, the plan means that the international organization would have the power to call on the various governments to send troops and to intervene. But if the Senator will read the agreement he will find that one of its provisions is that the governments which are supposed to furnish troops must, under the agreement, make another agreement among themselves as to the number and kinds of troops which each country shall supply and as to the terms and conditions upon which they shall be supplied. That agreement has not been worked out. I do not know what it will contain. But there is a requirement that that agreement must be negotiated and must be made a pact between the nations that are members of the council. If I am not correct in that statement, I shall be glad to be corrected by any Senator who is familiar with the matter.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Much as I have enjoyed the richness and the eloquence of the distinguished Senator's remarks, I must point out that he still has not answered the question I asked.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have undertaken to do so.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. My question was this: After the agreement or treaty, or whatever it may be called, has been finally adopted by the United States Senate, will the President or his representative on the council be able to order our troops here and there over the world without any action by the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I tried to answer a minute ago by saying that the agreement requires the formulation of another agreement covering that point. I do not know what will be in that agreement; and, without knowing what will be in it, I cannot answer that question specifically. But I will say to the Senator that he puts his question in the most extreme fashion. I do not know whether the President will be our representative in this League; but he would not have authority to order our troops anywhere, even under the restricted construction which the Senator has used, unless all four of the other powers joined in the action and unless a majority of all the nations composing the council were to do so. I do not agree, however, that that necessarily follows at all, because, as I have said, one of the conditions of the whole plan is that the nations which will be called upon to furnish troops must make among themselves another agreement with regard to the kinds and numbers of troops and the conditions under which they will be employed. That agreement has not as yet been made.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Who will make the agreement about which the Senator has just been talking?

Mr. CONNALLY. That agreement is supposed to be, as I understand—I do not have the draft before me; it is in my office—among at least the four great nations, the members of the council.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would it be made by our representatives in the Assembly or the council, or would it come back to the Congress in any form?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure it would come back before the Senate. It would be a treaty, and I am sure it would be submitted to the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Under the structure of the plan developed so far, and so far as the Senator knows about it, if the council decided that we should engage upon a military venture could the matter develop in such a way that the United States Congress would be put into the position of running out on the representative of the United States if it did not acquiesce in the views of the representative in regard to the matter?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has propounded what sounds like a \$64 question. What would constitute running out would depend upon the language of the treaty, and upon how far our obligations extended. The whole thing depends upon the discretion of the council. It is not an absolute grant.

Does the Senator from Maine desire me to yield to him?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I was about to suggest that, as I understand the situation, an obligation will be placed upon the council to negotiate the agreement under which armed assistance might be called forth, and the agreement specifying the terms, conditions, and the extent to which we might be called upon to contribute force would have to come back to the Senate for approval in a constitutional manner.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is my understanding of the matter.

Mr. MILLIKIN. To the Senate, may I ask, or to the whole Congress?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would say the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not quite understand the theory by which it would come back exclusively to the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would be in the nature of a treaty, would it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. A declaration of war—

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, it would not be a declaration of war. It would not be a declaration of war. It would be a declaration of peace. Senators become excited about armed forces. Where have armed forces been sent by Presidents of the United States heretofore without any action having been taken by Congress? In the Boxer Rebellion in China—

Mr. BUSHFIELD. How about Iceland?

Mr. CONNALLY. How about Iceland? It is very cold there.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The question may seem to be a very amusing one, but American troops were sent to Iceland before war had been declared by the Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. The President is the Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator asked where troops had ever been sent without a declaration of war having been made. I merely wished to remind him.

Mr. CONNALLY. What the Senator has said is another instance which proves what I am saying. When the Boxer Rebellion took place in China who was President of the United States then? William McKinley, was he not? Mr. McKinley was a great man. I admired him. America sent an army to China in cooperation with armies of other nations such as Germany, Great Britain, and France. The American Army performed its functions and protected American representatives, and then withdrew. No one objected. No declaration of war was made in that instance. The United States did not declare war on China. Our troops were sent to China because it was felt by the representatives of our Government that the interests of Americans required the presence in China of our armed forces.

What about troops in South and Central America? What about the marines? I cannot recite all the instances which I have in mind. There were occurrences involving Santo Domingo, under Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents as well. There was the instance of Nicaragua under Republican and Democratic Presidents. There were countless instances of our Army and Navy being sent into foreign lands.

I do not wish to weary the Senate, but there seems to be an inquisitive spirit here. I wish to give Senators all the information which I can give them.

In 1817 freebooters took possession of Amelia Island in the name of the Governments of Buenos Aires and Venezuela, proclaimed the independence of East Florida against Spain, and so forth. By direction of President Monroe the uprising was suppressed by military forces

of the United States. The action was not taken in concert with the Spanish Government or the local authorities in Florida.

Was there a declaration of war on the Barbary Coast pirates?

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish to venture. In the case of the Barbary Coast pirates I am not clear as to whether there was a declaration of war against the Bey of Algiers.

Mr. HILL. It was the Bey of Tunis.

Mr. CONNALLY. I refer to the Bey of Tunis. However, we sent our fleet abroad and we suppressed the uprising.

I shall not name the various places in detail which I have in mind.

During the War of 1812 British forces occupied Pensacola, and the Spanish Government either could not or would not prevent them from doing so. Early in November 1814 General Jackson marched to Pensacola and took possession. Do we want to repudiate old Andrew Jackson at this late hour? [Laughter.] I do not think so.

In December 1817 the President assigned General Jackson to command the troops acting against the Indians in Florida. Jackson found that the Spanish officials were in collusion with the Indians. He seized St. Marks and Pensacola and by the end of May 1818, Florida was in the military possession of the United States. Jackson could not wait until the President had called into session a recalcitrant Congress, the Members of which were running for reelection, and spending time in order to obtain votes. He had to act. Under the direction of the President, he acted.

In July 1823, men from two United States barges landed on the coast of Cuba in pursuit of pirates who were seeking to escape from their vessel, which had been attacked by the two barges. Men from the barges and local authorities killed, wounded, or took prisoners all who reached the shore. That was almost war if it was not war. It involved killing almost everyone in sight.

There was also an incident in Puerto Rico. Because of an insult to Lieutenant Platt of the United States Navy, Commodore Porter landed 200 men at Foxardo, P. R., in 1824.

In 1831 three American schooners were seized and their crews imprisoned, while taking seals on the Falkland Islands.

I shall not mention all of the various places where our armed forces have visited.

In 1831, while the American vessel *Friendship* was engaged in taking on cargo at the island of Sumatra, natives succeeded in taking possession of the vessel. We attacked them and stormed the town and fort located there. A considerable portion of the town was burned.

There were incidents in the Fiji Islands in 1840, in Samoa in 1840, and in Japan from 1853 to 1854. What did Admiral Perry do to Japan? He steamed there and sent diplomatic word to the authorities that he wanted to enter, and the Japanese said they did not want him to enter. He told them that if they did



not open up the gates he would open them up with cannon. They opened them up. There was no declaration of war in connection with what took place then. Our State Department representatives wanted a commercial treaty with Japan. They obtained one. That was in 1853 and 1854.

In April 1854, there were collisions between Chinese Imperial and revolutionary forces. Forces were landed from British and American ships and 150 British and 90 Americans participated in an engagement with the Imperialists.

There were also incidents in Greytown, Nicaragua, in 1854, in Uruguay in 1855, in China in 1856, in Uruguay in 1858, in the Fiji Islands in 1858, in Shanghai in 1859, in Africa in 1860, in Panama in 1860, in Japan in 1863 and in 1864, in Formosa in 1867, in Japan again in 1868, in Uruguay in 1868, in Korea in 1871, in Mexico in 1876, in Egypt in 1882, in Korea again in 1888, in Samoa in 1888, in Haiti in 1888, on Navassa Island in 1891, at Valparaiso, Chile, in 1891, at Honolulu in 1893, at Rio de Janeiro in 1893, at Seoul, Korea, in 1894, in Samoa in 1899, at Bluefields, Nicaragua, in 1899, and the Boxer uprising in 1900. I have already adverted to the Boxer uprising.

In 1900 the so-called Boxer uprising in China created a demand for United States troops and marines to protect the lives and property of American citizens at various points in China. Two detachments of marines were sent to China early in 1900 for the purpose of serving as a guard to the American legation. They remained there from the time of their arrival to the capture of the city by the Allied forces. Later, American troops, under the command of Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, and American marines participated in the operations against Tientsin and Peking. That was in 1903. At that time Theodore Roosevelt was President of the United States. I do not doubt that the Senator from South Dakota was one of his enthusiastic supporters in 1903. He probably quit him in 1912, but in 1903 I believe he was one of the closest supporters of Theodore Roosevelt, who was a great American.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am greatly obliged to the distinguished Senator for placing himself in the position in which he has placed himself in the last few minutes. He is now defending the action of the Executive in starting wars without any action of the Senate or the Congress. So I am obliged to the Senator for placing himself in that position and on record.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not a question. I understood the Senator to state that he wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Very well; I shall ask the Senator a question now.

Mr. CONNALLY. That was not a question; it was an accusation.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator stated he had in his possession a copy of the so-called American plan proposed by the President or the State Department which would deny some of the statements I have made. Why did not the Senator

offer that for the RECORD so that we could see what it says?

Mr. CONNALLY. All the Senator need do is to mention the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and others. The President made a speech on the subject.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator declines to offer it for the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do because it was given to me in confidence. Does not the Senator recognize the obligation of confidence?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not know how it was given to the Senator, but he has not given it to us.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am telling the Senator how it was given to me. I am answering the Senator's question.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator has not answered the question yet.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may not answer it to the satisfaction of the Senator from South Dakota; I can only answer it within my own poor capacity and in accordance with the facts. I cannot make facts. Every time the Senator asks a question I cannot make a new fact and shoot it at him and then make up another fact and put that to him. I can only discuss matters within known facts and known information.

Puerto Plata, Dominican Republic, 1904.

President Roosevelt, Teddy Roosevelt, was then President of the United States. I do not think that President Theodore Roosevelt sent the marines to Santo Domingo for any improper purpose. I think he sent them there because he believed that it was in the interest of peace to send them there, to compose order, and enforce respect for property and respect for American lives. I do not believe that Theodore Roosevelt had any improper motives.

Habana 1906. \* \* \* American vessels had been sent to Cuba by order of President Roosevelt—

Theodore Roosevelt. I do not think that he acted improperly then.

Cuba again in 1906.  
Trujillo, Honduras, 1907.  
Honduras, 1910-11.  
Bluefields, Nicaragua, 1910.  
Nicaragua in 1912.  
Cuba, 1912.  
Vera Cruz, 1914.  
Haiti, 1915.  
Dominican Republic, 1916.  
Cuba, 1917—

And so on and so on—

Punitive expedition, Mexico, 1916.

We did not make any declaration of war against Mexico when General Pershing marched his expedition into Mexico in an effort to capture Villa, who had made an attack on Columbus, N. Mex. The Senate knows the story.

Mexico, Ciudad Juarez, 1919.

We did not declare war. They were shooting across the border and our troops returned the fire, I suppose. According to the Senator, they ought to have waited; Congress should have been called into session; but in the meantime they would all have been dead.

Mexico, 1919.  
Panama, 1918, 1919, 1925.  
Honduras, 1919, 1924.

Guatemala, 1920.  
Smyrna, 1922—

Smyrna, away over yonder in the eastern Mediterranean—

China, 1901-27.

And so on, and so on. I shall not weary the Senate by further recitation of the incidents.

Mr. President, why can we not approach this matter in an orderly way? As has been so well pointed out by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the use of troops is going to be governed by the agreement which the council shall have negotiated among the members of the council who are expected to furnish armed troops or armed ships, and it will delineate the quotas of troops, how they will be employed, and when and where.

If the Senator from South Dakota is so excited about this matter, let me say that any treaty which may be framed will come to the Senate, and if he should want to put a reservation on it he would have the right to offer one, and the Senate would have a right to adopt it if it saw fit to do so. Let me suggest, however, Mr. President, that there will never be constructed any instrument of international peace or international anything else which in every detail will please every man or every Senator.

I have a watch here which is supposed to be a very fine one. I did not buy it; it was given me by a member of my family. It is a Swiss watch, made by one of the most famous makers of Switzerland, fabricated with great care after years of experience, yet it does not please every watchmaker in Switzerland. A factory across the street is making a different kind of watch; some little gadget in my watch does not suit that factory; some little springs are not adjusted as the springs in the watches of the other factory are adjusted. Across the street is another watch plant which is just as famous and which produces watches which have just as fine a reputation as my watch. Going on down the street, every three or four doors there is another kind of watch made, a different brand of watch, and each maker claims that he produces the best watch in the world.

So, Senators, we are not going to be able to construct any kind of an international instrument which in every detail, in every sentence, in every phrase, in every paragraph, is going to meet the approbation of every Senator.

Now, let us, for the sake of the argument only, assume the Senator's position. If when Hitler hurled his armies into the Rhineland—and that was the beginning of the devilment—England and France and the other peaceful nations had had the authority and the will immediately to throw their armed forces into the Rhineland, and had done so, Hitler would not have taken possession of the Rhineland, and it is within the possibility that this war might not have occurred. Let us assume that when Hitler drove into Poland a similar situation was presented. If the Senator's theory is correct we could not have participated. It would have been said, "Wait a minute; we have got to call Congress into session." Well, the Congress is busy with a campaign; it is impossible to get a

quorum in the Congress, and then when a quorum is obtained someone speaks for 2 weeks discussing the matter. In the meantime Mr. Hitler has gobbled up Poland just as he did gobble it up.

I admit that this is a very difficult and very intricate matter. So far as I am concerned, I am going to approach it, I hope, in a spirit of nonpartisanship, in a spirit of trying to serve my country and trying to serve my country first. I have, of course, an interest in other countries; I have an interest in the great nations and in the small nations; I want to see the people of the world, whether they are white or black or yellow or red, comfortable; I want to see them have an economic life; I want to see them enjoy the blessings, insofar as they are capable of enjoying them, of free government and free institutions. But, Mr. President, my first affection is for my own country. This is the land that gave me birth. My ancestors have lived in America since 1748, and in every war in which my country has been engaged some member of my family has worn its uniform. I want it to be the place that shall cover my ashes when I am gone; I want it to be the place where my son will carve out for himself a career and a reputation of his own. These old United States of America are my first love, above all other nations of the earth. What I may do with respect to this treaty and what I may undertake to do here in the Senate, I pray God, may always be prompted and guided by my affection and my love for my great country, the United States of America.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I would not have participated in this debate today but for the fact that the Senator from Texas has twice identified me as being familiar with the text of the American plan. Because of the injunctions of secrecy which necessarily were placed upon the members of the Foreign Relations Committee with respect to it, I do not feel free now to discuss any phase of the matter which is dependent upon the information given me in confidence. But in the course of this debate today at least a few hypotheses have been publicized, and I want to comment very briefly only upon those hypotheses, because I think the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is entitled to a square answer to his question.

Mr. President, I suggest to the able Senator that the question which he raises is not one which involves the work of the conference at Dumbarton Oaks at all, except as the conferees at Dumbarton Oaks might proceed under a misapprehension as to what our own ultimate American policy will be as respects the authority to be exercised by our American delegate on the council of the new international security organization. So far as the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is concerned, it can only set down the rules under which all delegates to the council of the new organization from all countries shall operate and vote. It has no jurisdiction over instructions that any individual country shall give to its own delegate in respect to whether or not he shall be a free agent in voting. In other words, the question raised by the Senator

from South Dakota will be fairly raised when the Senate is asked to ratify this document, because it is at that moment that we must either define the rules under which our delegate shall operate in connection with this international organization or in good conscience forever after hold our peace.

Now, the question raised by the Senator is: What shall we say in respect to the rules which we shall lay down to govern our own American delegate when he is called upon finally to vote in respect to the use of force under the new international organization? The Senator correctly says that if he is a free agent to vote as he pleases or as the President directs in respect to ordering the use of force, he has committed us to follow through with that use of force, and if it results in war, his act has been equivalent to a declaration of war, in my judgment, without the constitutional concurrence of Congress.

Mr. President, that will raise a very interesting question which will have to be settled by us. It cannot be settled at Dumbarton Oaks. It cannot be settled at any international conference. It is nobody's business but ours as to how we shall order our voice to be registered in the international organization when this grave question of the use of force arises.

The document itself will undoubtedly require that this authority shall be voiced through the regular constitutional procedure of any given country, but that is not enough, because, so far as we are concerned, that still leaves the question wide open, for, under the constitutional procedure of the United States, as the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has just indicated, there is a distinction between the rights of the Chief Executive as Commander in Chief to use the armed forces for the emergent defense of the country and the right to declare war, which is an exclusive congressional function. I do not know whether it is possible to draw a line between those two things by textual definition.

In contemplating the subsequent use of this authority, so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to let the President of the United States, whoever he may be, use, on his own primary authority, the preliminary armed forces of this country in whatever emergencies are of a nature such as we have always heretofore permitted him to use these forces and which have always been considered constitutional. I think the only rule that I, for myself, can establish, which would make it clear, is to put this preliminary use of force upon a regional basis, and to say that he can exercise that power in North and South America, in pan-American partnership, which is simply a reiteration of the jurisdiction of the Monroe Doctrine, so far as we are concerned. It seems obvious to me that there may be many minor regional disturbances in the future as in the past, which should be promptly handled on a regional basis and which do not mount to the dignity of a declaration of war and which, as a matter of fact, have never been heretofore considered by us as mounting to the necessity for a decla-

ration of war. Such a conception, of course, would envision similar primary, regional responsibilities for other powers elsewhere.

But, Mr. President, I want to make it very clear to the Senator from South Dakota that, so far as I am concerned, when this delegate, sitting in this international organization, and speaking for us, is proposing the use of force outside of our normal zone at a level which is tantamount to a declaration of war, I cannot agree that this be done, and I do not believe the American people will agree that this be done, without the joint action of Congress, as required by the Constitution of the United States. That is my answer to the Senator's question.

But I do not want to leave it there, because it seems to me that the great error which is being made today in the discussion of this entire world security program is the error of putting all the emphasis upon the question of the use of force, though the final use of force must always be in sight.

Mr. President, if there is nothing more effective than the use of force developed through this new great adventure, developed as an instrumentality to keep the peace of the world, the thing will be a miserable failure. Peace finally is a state of mind. Peace is a moral and spiritual conviction. Peace is a matter of world-wide education. Peace is a matter of developing international law, mediums of investigation and arbitration, rules of reason and every possible instrumentality for the substitution of justice for force. Force may finally be unavoidable. If it is, it must be used. Plans can constantly be made for its use. It can always be ready. In my view—perhaps I should say in my expectation and hope—the exhaustion of these rules of reason will make any future aggressor so clearly criminal and so clearly outlawed that there will be no hesitation on any nation's part, our own included, to join voluntarily in military suppression. But I do not believe that we can put peace in an automatic steel strait jacket. If we go to war 25 years from today as the result of the declaration of a new international organization, it will not be primarily because of any agreement we entered into in 1944, but it will be because the occasion then arising justifies it, in the conscience of our countrymen.

The thing I want to say with respect to this great undertaking upon which we are embarking is that the greatest emphasis should be placed on the instrumentalities which are in process of creation for the purpose of exhausting the rule of reason before there is any necessity for resort to the rule of force at all. In the present state of mind of the civilized world, and in the presence of the physical fact that the weapons of mass murder will scientifically improve at such a rate in the next 20 years that another World War will represent the decimation of civilization, I am convinced that the world is ready to undertake to exhaust rules of reason before there is another resort to force.

So, Mr. President, I wish the emphasis in this thing we are trying to do might

be put upon the creation of these instrumentalities to exhaust the rules of reason, rather than to put all the emphasis, as is too often done, exclusively upon the exercise of force. I agree that force has always got to be finally available in some form. I agree that we must never be out of touch or out of sight of force. But in the prospectus which I can see the possibility of developing, Mr. President, in respect to organizing the security of the earth, I believe that in the presence of the awful catastrophe the world has just suffered these rules of reason will go infinitely far toward reducing the ultimate necessity for the use of force to an utter minimum, particularly if we have sense enough in the interim to make absolutely sure once and for all and forever that the Axis aggressors never again can reaccumulate the physical means of becoming aggressors.

If we eliminate them, then where are the aggressors of tomorrow? They must be among the Allies of today. I decline to indict the Allies of today as being unwilling to live under rules of reason, and that is why I insist again and again and again that the hope of this great international organization, to which we look forward, is not in the ultimate final reliance upon force; the hope is upon its creation of instrumentalities which will make the rules of reason omnipotent upon this earth rather than the rules of force. But when we finally get to the use of force, except as that rule is regionally applied under the historic constitutional precedents of this country, so far as I am concerned, no President, no delegate speaking for any President, can vote this country into war without the joint approval of both Houses of Congress. I know of no other attitude which can be faithful to the Constitution of the United States. But, despite this final limitation, I believe America can go forward in wholehearted cooperation in the creation of an international organization which will be a blessed benediction upon international security in a free world of freemen—particularly if we base the whole adventure upon the indispensable foundations of a just peace. Under such circumstances no Congress, in the final analysis, will ever fail to do its voluntary duty.

There may be some better rule than the regional rule for the initial use of force. I throw that out merely as a suggestion—merely to illustrate my point. But above all I want to see this tremendous peace enterprise launched upon a basis which has the wholehearted support of our people so that it may have a maximum chance to serve the security and welfare of humankind, ourselves included.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I join in the remarks of the Senator from Michigan, and I want to say that the Senator from Michigan has been of very great service in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and in the conferences we have been having from time to time with the Secretary of State, with respect to this whole plan. I have very great respect for his ability and appreciate his deep interest in the subject.

Let me say to the Senator, however, that while I share with him his hope that peaceful measures may render it unnecessary to use force, and while I admire the optimism with which he believes that reason and logic will insure peace, and that peace is a state of mind, I think we must go further. Of course, peace is a state of mind, and if we could persuade everyone to be of that state of mind we should have peace. The trouble is that the state of mind is in the wrong people. How much good does anyone think it would have done to address beautiful homilies to Mr. Hitler? Would it have been sufficient to have said, "Adolf, be a good fellow, do not jump on the Poles. Do not go into the Rhineland. Do not take Austria. Do not bother Czechoslovakia." How long would the rules of reason and persuasion have influenced Mr. Hitler? How long would Hirohito have entertained similar persuasions in his course?

Mr. President, I point out that this plan does the very thing which the Senator from Michigan says he wishes to see done. We read in the newspapers this morning about plans for a world court, to be more comprehensive, and to have a wider jurisdiction than any other such court which has gone before, in an effort to settle controversies without war, by means of equity, law, and logic. The function of the council is to undertake to settle international disputes without the operation of force, through conciliation, diplomatic measures, and arbitration. All those things are embraced within the conception of this international instrumentality. We have no right to overaccentuate force. Force is only the last resort. Force is to be used against a nation which cannot be reached by peaceful measures. It is to be employed against the nation to which reason does not appeal.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree completely with the Senator's analysis. However, let me add that it seems to me under this new conception, if all the intervening instrumentalities for the rule of reason are exhausted, the next aggressor will be so obviously a criminal because of this intervening process that there will be no doubt about the necessity of crushing him by force, or about the attitude of the American Congress in respect to participation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I am glad he holds such views.

Force is to be employed only as a last resort; when reason fails, when persuasion fails, when humanitarian considerations fail, when all the noble conceptions and precepts of law and logic fail, and we have before us the bloody-handed criminal bent upon the conquest of peaceful nations, force, at the point of a bayonet, is the only rule which will master such mad ambitions.

I agree with the Senator when he says that the nations which have brought on

this war must be permanently disarmed. But we cannot disarm them with persuasion; we cannot disarm them with logic; we cannot disarm them by sending them Sunday-school tracts; we cannot disarm them by reading to them the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. We must disarm them at the point of the bayonet in their vitals, or by bombs from aircraft, or by cannon which hurl metal from their throats into the ranks of those who oppose these principles.

After all, we must have force as a last resort, just as the policeman on the beat must have force as a last resort. Two women can quarrel over the back fence about chickens getting over the fence, children throwing stones across the fence, or about pouring dishwater over the fence; but, after all, when they cannot settle their dispute by peaceful means, the policeman on the beat must be appealed to. When he arrives, he must bring his stick with him, not necessarily to use it, but to have it available, so that it can be seen.

So it is with this international instrumentality. It must ultimately have force behind it, as a last resort, so that we can say to those who rely upon force, those who swear by the sword, those who worship armies and navies, not for self-defense, but for the accomplishment of their ambitions, the satisfaction of their greed for more territory, and their hunger for more subjects, "You misplaced your worship; you have bowed down to force; but there is a mightier force than yours, and that is the combined force of the nations which propose to preserve peace and to overwhelm you in your mad ambitions and bloody dreams of power and conquest."

#### THE DISTRICT'S NONSUFFRAGE STATUS— DENIAL OF VOTE TO DISTRICT SERVICE- MEN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a post card which calls attention to one of the most inequitable situations on the home front. I doubt that many Senators have seen these post cards with the two red bands across the face. The Army has had 3,500,000 of them printed, and they are being handed to each of our soldiers overseas. They are applications for ballots under the soldier voting law with which the Senate struggled this spring.

This is the application of Col. E. C. Morse, commander of the Fortieth Station Hospital, now in Corsica after functioning throughout the north African campaign. Before Pearl Harbor Colonel Morse was Dr. Morse, an orthopedic surgeon operating at the Emergency Hospital in Washington. He was born in Washington and has had his home here for 54 years.

Colonel Morse was probably in something of a quandary when handed this card. Instructions for filling out the cards are shown to the soldiers in big charts posted at every overseas headquarters. Opposite the name of the District of Columbia the charts say: "No provision for absentee ballots for citizens of the District."

These cards are addressed to the secretary of state of blank, blank, blank. Desirous of voting, Colonel Morse wrote in the blanks "District of Columbia, care of the Evening Star, Washington, D. C.," and mailed the card.

A lifelong resident of Washington, Colonel Morse knew that the Evening Star has constantly supported the fight waged by generations of civic-minded Washingtonians who wanted the right to vote for President and Representatives in Congress for themselves and their fellow citizens.

This card was brought to me by George Kennedy, a reporter for the Washington Star, to see what could be done about getting a ballot for Colonel Morse and some 75,000 other Washington, D. C., men in uniform. The reporter asked about the Sumners-Capper resolution empowering Congress to grant national representation for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Judiciary Committee at the opening of this Congress. This is a joint resolution authorizing an amendment to the Constitution empowering Congress to allow the citizens of the District to vote for President, Vice President, and as many Members of Congress as the Congress shall by legislation allow them. As it is an amendment to the Constitution, and an amendment is necessary to allow citizens of the District to participate in our national elections, I am afraid that with the greatest good will on our part we would be unable to get a ballot to Colonel Morse for the coming election.

But we could give the vote, the highest privilege of citizenship, after their return, to Colonel Morse and the 75,000 young men who have gone from Washington into the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the merchant marine, in recognition of what these neighbors of ours in this big city have contributed to victory.

Mr. President, Washington's contribution has not been small. As in the last war, the number of soldiers who have gone from Washington homes exceeds that of several of the States.

There was a militia type of military organization here called the Fifth Marines, a reserve group. They used to drill on Tuesday nights in an abandoned church a few blocks northwest of Capitol Hill, near the new Municipal Building. They were Washington lawyers, policemen, clerks, printers, and others. There were more than 200 of these Washington men from the Fifth Marines in the first landings on Guadalcanal. They were a sizable portion of the dogged detail of leathernecks who held on there when our Navy could not get in and the Jap Fleet tried to blast them off the island.

As the history of our Pacific war is released we will come to realize what we owe to those men of Guadalcanal who carried out our first offensive against the enemy and did not fail. I think the Congress owes it to these Washington boys to put them on a par with others in the service by making them full-fledged citizens.

All except the very newest Members of the Senate will remember the old National Hotel building, that crumbling relic of the fabulous fifties which stood on the Avenue at Sixth Street. The National Guard of the District used to drill there, also on Tuesday nights. The integration of the National Guard placed the District units in the Twenty-ninth Division. We remember reading about the Twenty-ninth Division on D-day. It was one of those divisions in the initial landings. Washington boys, combat engineers, were in the very first wave ashore, where they busied themselves removing German obstacles and mines, ignoring the deadly German artillery fire which kept shrapnel bursting about the beach.

Paris is liberated today, and Allied exterminators are ridding the valleys of the Seine and the Somme of the verminous swarms that ruined every countryside they descended on. Mr. President, Europe as well as America owes something to those Washington boys of the Twenty-ninth who helped breach Hitler's wall. I am sure that Europeans who will visit here in the days of peace to come will find it very hard to understand that the frontline veterans from Washington are not full citizens.

What about the parents who brought them up to be such good soldiers? We all know some of them. Would it be amiss to include them in the roll of some 130,000,000 Americans with the full privilege of citizenship?

Mr. President, I have always said that apathy was the principal reason that the people of Washington do not have the full privilege of citizenship. But during this war there has been a new awakening of the meaning of being an American. That apathy is disappearing. When those boys come home, the boys who were given one of these red-barred post cards and did not have anything to do with it because they were citizens of the District of Columbia, apathy will have changed to demand. It is not right, Mr. President, to have a population of nearly 1,000,000 Americans denied participation in the democratic process, denied the right to vote.

Mr. President, many Senators probably saw in Sunday's Star the statement that the reporter who called on me with this card polled the Judiciary Committee. He found little opposition to the proposal to let our fellow citizens in the District of Columbia vote in national elections. Two members of the committee said they were against it. One opposed it because of Negro suffrage. The other who said he was against it confined himself to constitutional grounds.

I shall pass over the first ground. There are larger groups of Negroes voting in New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago without dire consequences.

As for the constitutional grounds, we have all observed the difficulties of the courts in determining the intent of Congress as to the application of legislation passed a year or two ago. That should give us pause in attempting to divine the intent of the founding fathers. It is very hard to determine what their thought

was about each section and clause. We know one thing they never thought: That in setting aside 10 square miles as the seat of government they were denying suffrage at some future date to a million people.

Seven members of the Committee on the Judiciary said they would vote to report the joint resolution or one similar to it to the floor if it ever was brought up in committee for consideration. The senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is acting chairman of the Judiciary Committee, expressed his readiness to submit the question of District of Columbia voting in national elections to this body and to the States.

Four members of the committee refused to commit themselves. Five were out of the city.

It appears that this joint resolution would be reported by the committee if given consideration. In time of war I believe we all feel stronger about the right of citizens to vote.

Mr. President, there is no pressure behind the joint resolution, as we have come to know the term. No Member of the Senate will have his tenure of a seat in this Chamber strengthened or weakened by his vote on this measure. It is a matter of simple right, of pure justice, of the American way.

For these reasons, Mr. President, at this time I respectfully request that the Judiciary Committee favorably report Senate Joint Resolution 33, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia.

#### CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL AND PLANT PESTS AND DISEASES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, several months ago the Senate considered and passed House bill 4278, authorizing by statute a number of expenditures for which appropriations have been made by the Congress for the Department of Agriculture for several years past. Three Senate amendments were attached to that measure. One of them provided for the extension of the Farm Security Administration for a period of 2 years. Another provided for the extension of the so-called school-lunch program for a period of 2 years. Another, the third, allowed a tolerance of one-fifth of an acre in the tobacco acreage for this year's crop.

The House of Representatives rejected the tobacco amendment and reduced to 1 year the time limit of the Farm Security Administration extension and the school-lunch program extension.

A number of conferences have been held between the two Houses on these three items, which have been in disagreement. I am convinced that the House will not accept any extension beyond 1 year of the important Farm Security program and the school-lunch program.

However, there are in the bill a number of items which should be enacted into law at the earliest possible date. It is

important to have the law enacted because it will have a great deal to do with the formation of the budget for the coming year for a number of agricultural activities such as the program relating to the control of Bang's disease and a number of other programs which are embraced within the bill and have been approved by both Houses.

The most important item in the entire bill, and the one which makes it most necessary that it be enacted into law at the earliest possible date, is that which relates to the rural electrification program which extends the time of the amortization of Federal loans for rural electrification and which reduces the interest rate on the loans which are made by the Rural Electrification Administration to the local cooperatives.

Mr. President, I am, of course, as all Members of the Senate know, greatly interested in the Farm Security Administration and in the school-lunch program. But I do not think it is fair to the other activities of the Department of Agriculture to hold up this measure any longer. I do not think there is the slightest possibility of having the House of Representatives to agree to the Senate amendment extending these activities for 2 years.

In the 1945 appropriation bill, provision has been made for both of them for 1 year. The Farm Security Administration is now in operation under this provision in the agricultural appropriation bill, and the school-lunch program will be carried on during the fiscal year 1945, just as it has been in the past, by virtue of an authorization in the appropriation bill. I do not see that it would serve any useful purpose to longer insist on the Senate's position on these amendments.

The papers are on the clerk's desk and I should like to call up the measure, if it is agreeable to do so, in order to have the Senate recede from these amendments, so that the bill may be enacted into law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to 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, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

June 3, 1944.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to 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 agricul-

tural 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, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

SEC. 303. That all purposes and objects of expenditure which are provided for under the item "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, are hereby authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in the manner, in the detail, and under the conditions, authorities, restrictions, and limitations as are contained in the item referred to, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated and to be otherwise made available such sums as Congress may deem necessary for the purposes of this section: *Provided*, That no part of such sums be available for the promotion or aid of any program of medical care which prevents the patient from having the services of any practitioner of his own choice so long as State laws are complied with, except that this provision shall not be applicable to the promotion or aid of a program of medical care where a majority of the participants within the program group elect to confine their choice of practitioners to a list of available licensed practitioners selected by them.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 3, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

SEC. 403. Section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, is hereby further amended by the addition of the following language:

"Not exceeding \$50,000,000 of the funds appropriated by and pursuant to this section may also be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, to provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade or under and for child-care centers through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed form and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine: *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the purposes of this program shall be apportioned for expenditure in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in accordance with school enrollment and need, as determined by the Secretary, except that if program participation in any State does not require all funds so apportioned, the Secretary may re-appportion such excess funds to such other States in consideration of need, as he may determine: *Provided further*, That benefits under this section to schools or child-care centers shall in no case exceed the cost of the agricultural commodities or products thereof delivered to the school or child-care center as established by certificates executed by the authorized representative of the sponsoring agency: *Provided further*, That such sponsoring agency shall maintain accounts and records clearly establishing costs of agricultural commodities or products furnished in the program and that such accounts and records shall be available for audit by representatives of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for, or to make payments in connection with, the purchase of such agricul-

tural commodities and for exchanging, distributing, disposing, transporting, storing, processing, inspection, commission, and other incidental costs and expenses without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and without regard to the 25 percent limitation contained in this section: *Provided further*, That not more than 2 percent of the funds made available under this amendment shall be used to provide food for children in child-care centers. The amount of funds used in any State during any fiscal year under this paragraph shall not exceed the total amount otherwise furnished for the same purpose by or on behalf of the State and local school authorities and other sponsoring agencies in such State including the value of donated services and supplies, as certified by the respective schools, care centers or agencies having control thereof.

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts for the purposes of this amendment as the Congress may deem necessary."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to said bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I am not as familiar with this legislation as perhaps I should be. But it is my understanding—if I am wrong, I wish the Senator would correct me—that this legislation has been pending in the House, in the Senate, and in conference since early in the year.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct in that understanding. I will ask the Chair to state just when the bill passed the Senate. It has been several months since it was passed. The bill has been pending in the two bodies for more than a year.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was passed by the Senate on May 2, 1944.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I further understand that the primary purpose of the bill is to write into permanent law certain authorities which the Department of Agriculture has asserted from time to time in the past.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department of Agriculture has done so by virtue of authority contained in appropriation bills approved by the Congress.

Mr. WHITE. And the Appropriations Committee has met the problem and the doubt by acting.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Appropriations Committee has approved the bill. I may say to the Senator that I do not recall that there was any objection whatever to the portion of the bill which is not affected by the motion which I shall make, that the Senate recede from its position on these amendments. It was generally agreed by all Members of the Senate, as well as by the other body, that these matters should be clarified by statute and that standards should be fixed and restrictions imposed by statute. That has been done in the bill.

Mr. WHITE. The effect of what the Senator proposes is to have the Senate recede from its position on certain amendments which it heretofore has adopted; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether I am to understand that unanimous consent is

required at this time in order to take up the message.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is not correct. The message has been laid before the Senate. Only a majority vote is now required.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Am I to understand that the Senator from Georgia has proposed that the Senate recede from its position on the amendments?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was proposing to make such a motion as soon as I could get the floor, Mr. President. I had stated that it was my purpose to move that the Senate recede from its position in agreeing to the amendments.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I had understood that the message had been read for the information of the Senate, and I assumed that the Senator from Georgia was going to request unanimous consent for present consideration of the amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not my purpose to call the matter up if there is any objection to its consideration. Of course, I know that any Member present may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that in that event the Senate would be compelled to recess until a later date.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned I have no objection to the consideration of the matter at this time; but the Senator from South Dakota may have a different idea about it, and I do not want his rights to be foreclosed by anything which I may have said.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have discussed the matter informally with the Senator from South Dakota and I do not understand that he has any objection to the consideration of the matter.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I have no intention to ask for a quorum call. I realize the situation now confronting the Senate. However, I had understood that in order to bring the bill before the Senate unanimous consent would have to be obtained.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the rule of the Senate on the subject. It is upon such rule that the Chair acts.

Paragraph 7 of rule VII reads as follows:

The Presiding Officer may at any time lay, and it shall be in order at any time for a Senator to move to lay, before the Senate, any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose. Any motion so made shall be determined without debate.

In view of such rule, the Chair laid the message before the Senate. Unanimous consent was not required.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in order to present my point of order, it is necessary that I comment very briefly upon what has happened in connection with the bill.

The bill was passed by the House. It came to the Senate and, as I recall, three amendments were offered. One of the amendments was one in which I was in-

terested. It was an amendment to section 303. During the discussion on the floor of the Senate I offered an amendment at the end of section 303. The amendment was as follows:

*Provided*, That no part of such sums be available for the promotion or aid of any program of medical care which prevents the patient from having the services of any practitioner of his own choice so long as the State laws are complied with.

That amendment was adopted unanimously by the Senate without objection. The bill was sent to conference. Conferees were appointed. When the bill finally got back to the House from the conference, Representative TABER said:

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the conference report on the ground that it is beyond the range of the conference.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator from South Dakota whether the amendment which he proposed was an amendment to an amendment which was subsequently adopted by the Senate, or was it an amendment to the bill itself?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. An amendment to section 303 of the bill was proposed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator's amendment was an amendment to an amendment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. So if the Senate should recede from the amendment as adopted by the Senate, the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota would be unnecessary.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It would be eliminated, as I understand.

When the conference report came before the other House, Representative TABOR raised a point of order. He was sustained by the Speaker, and under the rules of the House the conference report was rejected. It was the duty of the conferees—I am sure I am right about this—so to report the matter to the Senate. As I recall, that was done on May 6; and on May 18 the House got the bill back into its own hands and added an amendment at the end of my amendment completely emasculating the amendment which the Senate had previously adopted. As I have already said, my amendment was as follows:

*Provided*, That no part of such sums be available for the promotion or aid of any program of medical care which prevents the patient from having the services of any practitioner of his own choice so long as State laws are complied with.

The House then added the following language:

Except that this provision shall not be applicable to the promotion or aid of a program of medical care where a majority of the participants within the program group elect to confine their choice of practitioners to a list of available licensed practitioners selected by them.

Such language would mean that the individual borrower of the Farm Security Administration would not have anything

to say about his choice of physicians. He would come under the complete control of the majority of the group of borrowers and, if they saw fit, they could limit the person's choice to one or more physicians.

Remember that the Senate passed section 303 of the bill with the amendment to it which I had proposed. The bill went to conference. It finally got back to the House and the House amended it, adding the language which I have just read, namely, the amendment of Representative FLANNAGAN.

The point I desire to make is this. Have we any jurisdiction to recede from the position taken by eliminating section 303 with my amendment? The House has already adopted the provision. It is a part of the bill which has come to us.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has not acted upon the amendment. A motion to recede from the Senate amendment, if carried, would eliminate the language.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. How can we recede and destroy something which the House has already acted upon? That is the point in which I am interested.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate can do as it pleases. On a vote it can either recede or sustain.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Can it do so after the House has adopted the language as a part of the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; even after the House has adopted the language as a part of the bill.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to recede from certain amendments.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

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

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is the Senator about to proceed with a somewhat lengthy discussion in opposition to the motion?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No.

Mr. HATCH. If there is to be extended opposition, perhaps we should wait until we have a larger attendance of Senators.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have no objection to waiting. I should like to have a larger attendance of Members of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to considering the matter now, or letting it go over to any date that is agreeable. I am here as *amicus curiae*, attempting to complete action on the bill. I do not think there is any question involved which should provoke extended discussion.

This is the whole situation: There was an amendment to extend the Farm Security Administration for the fiscal year 1945. Three months of that year have now practically passed. What possible purpose could be served, when the appropriation bill already contains such a provision, by fighting over a dead horse, namely, an amendment which relates to

some subject matter which would have little effect on the statute, and would merely clutter up the statutes with an authorization which is already in the appropriation bill? An amendment was offered by the Senator from South Dakota. It was adopted by the Senate. It related to a very small phase of the so-called medical program of the Farm Security Administration.

I am perfectly willing that the matter go over, but I do not see how any useful purpose could be served by discussing the amendment at any length. The fiscal year is already under way. It would be most unusual if we were to attempt to go back retroactively to the first of the present fiscal year and impose other rules and regulations, and a new system of administration of Farm Security Administration legislation. I have no quarrel with the purpose of the Senator from South Dakota. I believe that his amendment perhaps created a situation which even he himself did not anticipate. So far as his purpose is concerned, I am in accord with it. But contracts have already been entered into, and the proposed legislation cannot affect the situation at all. We can debate it, but it is a wholly moot question. If there is a desire on the part of any Senator to postpone consideration of the matter until Friday or any other date, it is perfectly agreeable to me. I was merely interested in straightening out the matter of a low-interest rate for the rural electrification program, because the proposed legislation would tremendously benefit that program. I do not think the program is one concerning which we have any argument. There certainly has been no fight made against it. When the bill was pending the matter was explained and the bill was passed without any objection being made to it. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to have the matter go over if there is any disposition on the part of any Senator to object.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the matter is now before the Senate. I take it, if we recess until Thursday or Friday or some other day this week, it will be immediately in order before the Senate when it reconvenes. In the circumstances, and especially in view of the fact that there are relatively few Senators present at the moment, I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that he let the matter go over and take it up afresh when the Senate reconvenes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am always glad to accede to any request made by the distinguished minority leader, and I am perfectly willing to have the matter go over.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I understand that the matter goes over until the next meeting of the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; until next Friday.

#### REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the college of agriculture of the University of

Wisconsin has made some outstanding contributions to science and to the welfare of mankind. Many of these have been in the dairy world. They include the work of Dr. Babcock, inventor of the Babcock butter test, as well as that of his coworkers, such as Prof. E. H. Farrington and the present-day professors. Among these is the outstanding record of Dr. Hugo H. Sommer.

Mr. President, there is pending before a Senate committee a bill which would remove the tax on oleomargarine, enable that product to be colored and sold as a substitute for butter, and thus make it possible to perpetrate a fraud upon the American consumer. Dr. Sommer appeared before the committee of the Senate and his exposition of the subject is so excellent that I am about to ask that what he said be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. Dr. Sommer called attention to the fact that, because of the advance in science, fatty foods might now be made even from coal. However, he gave ample evidence as to why the lawmakers of the country should guard their footsteps and not foster legislation which would ruin the dairy industry of the Nation. As everyone knows, the dairy industry of this country, from the standpoint of money return—money invested, that is, farms and equipment—is the largest segment of farm life in our country. I now ask that the testimony of Dr. Sommer be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The testimony is as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. HUGO H. SOMMER, PROFESSOR OF DAIRY INDUSTRY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Dr. SOMMER. My name is Hugo H. Sommer. I am a member of the faculty of the college of agriculture, University of Wisconsin, with the rank of professor of dairy industry. My duties are teaching and research in this field. I was trained in the science of agriculture, and in my graduate study specialized in biochemistry and bacteriology.

Senator ELLENDER, Senator GILLETTE and Senator WILLIS, I neglected to state to you that if you desire to ask any questions of the witnesses, we will be glad to have you do so.

Senator GILLETTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WILLIS. Thank you, Senator.

Senator ELLENDER. Proceed, Dr. Sommer.

Dr. SOMMER. The doctor of philosophy degree was conferred upon me in this field in 1922. I am the author or coauthor of a number of scientific papers on subjects relating to dairy products. I am the author of two books on dairy subjects, and these books are used as texts in all of the leading dairy schools in this country. One of them has been translated into Russian.

I am appearing in opposition to S. 1744 with the specific authorization of our administrative officers, and I am here at their direction. At the outset I want to make it clear that our opposition is not based on the question of nutritive equivalency between fortified oleomargarine and butter. I want to make it equally clear, just to keep the record straight, that we do not concede any such equivalency. The final chapter on nutrition has not been written and there are still unanswered questions in this field. The conclusions which have been introduced in support of this bill must be regarded as provisional, and it is more nearly correct to speak of approximate nutritive equivalency.

Our opposition to S. 1744 is based upon the firm conviction that repeal of the tax on yellow oleomargarine would have the following consequences:

1. Extensive fraudulent sale of colored oleomargarine as butter would result.
2. The price of butter and of all dairy products would be depressed with resulting decrease in milk production.

Senator ELLENDER. Dr. Sommer, on what basis do you argue that the elimination of the tax will eliminate fraud?

Dr. SOMMER. It is just the opposite. The elimination of the tax will encourage fraud. Senator ELLENDER. I am sorry. What is your reasoning for that statement?

Dr. SOMMER. The profit motive in such case would be much greater.

Senator ELLENDER. As I understand, the price of oleomargarine, say in Vermont, as Mr. Brigham testified, is 25 cents per pound.

Senator AIKEN. I think he said about 25—25 to 29.

Senator ELLENDER. Yes; and 52 cents, as I recall it, for butter, or a difference of 27 cents. If you put the tax on, it would make the oleomargarine sell for 35 cents as against 52 cents for butter. Do you think that the 10-cent difference would cause fraud not to be practiced to the same extent since the difference in the price of butter and margarine is still very substantial with the tax?

Dr. SOMMER. It would certainly tend to be a limiting factor, and I think past performance would bear me out in saying that it has been a fairly effective deterrent to fraud. And if it should develop that a higher tax is necessary to deter fraud, I would be in favor of the higher tax.

Senator ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, you would be in favor of a tax to eliminate oleomargarine altogether; would you not?

Dr. SOMMER. I would not say to eliminate oleomargarine altogether. That is one or my reasons for wanting to tax colored margarine, and I am very frank in stating it.

Senator ELLENDER. I understand. I am not trying to find fault with your view. What the committee is trying to do is to get both sides of the picture and find the fundamental reasons for the difficulties that are brought to our attention by the different witnesses. And as I have expressed on two or three occasions, I cannot for the life of me see how the elimination of the tax would be more conducive to fraud. I would rather have you base your argument on commercial reasons, which are to me really the real reasons. And if you are not in agreement with that—

Dr. SOMMER. Well, pardon me, the elimination of the tax would make it more conducive to fraud.

Senator ELLENDER. That is what I stated.

Dr. SOMMER. Because the profit motive would be definitely greater, to the extent of the 10 cents per pound.

Senator ELLENDER. The difference between the price of oleomargarine in Vermont and butter is still about 17 cents?

Dr. SOMMER. That might be under certain conditions, and it might encourage fraud as experience would develop because it has been true in the past experience. I would be definitely in favor of increasing the tax, in the interest of defeating fraud.

Senator ELLENDER. I do not know. I do not question your motives, but I am of the impression that many would like to increase the tax not so much to eliminate fraud as it would be to eliminate the production of oleomargarine.

Dr. SOMMER. That is why I said and why I frankly state that eliminating the fraud is only one reason for the position we assume.

Senator ELLENDER. Dr. Sommer, do you or do you not believe it will be possible for the Congress to enact some legislation which would eliminate, as far as possible, as has been done in respect to the manufacture of other products, fraud?

This has been done with respect to liquor and to any number of products which are manufactured.

Dr. SOMMER. Well, I do not know.

Senator ELLENDER. In other words, could we not attain that goal to a better extent by passing laws sending a man to the penitentiary if he should sell oleomargarine for butter? Would that not be more conducive to having the article sold as margarine than this little tax that you speak of?

Dr. SOMMER. It is conceivable.

Senator ELLENDER. Yes.

Dr. SOMMER. And for the other reasons as I will develop, we will still be opposed to the eliminating of the tax.

Senator WILSON. Mr. Chairman, going back to the price in Vermont, as I understand it, it is 25 cents now, uncolored?

Senator AIKEN. Compared with 51 cents for butter.

Senator WILSON. So, if you take off the present restriction of 10 cents per pound, they could continue to sell their oleomargarine colored for 25 cents and they would have a difference of 27 cents, instead of 17 cents?

Senator AIKEN. That is right. If you take it off. But what we have in mind, Senator, is to that which is now sold the difference under the law is 17 cents.

Senator WILSON. Yes, sir.

You would have the margarine colored to look like butter, and according to his testimony in the manufacture it would not increase the cost of margarine in any respect by leaving the color in, so you would have colored margarine at 25 cents as against your butter that was around 52 cents, and the margarine would not be more than 27 cents.

From a competitive standpoint the competition would be greater; you would, therefore, have a differential of 27 cents instead of 17 cents, margarine being 25 cents and butter being 52 cents?

Senator ELLENDER. I grant that. But I am saying this: The omission of the tax is no deterrent, just as the imposition of the tax is no deterrent to fraud, as has been said by many witnesses here.

Senator AIKEN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as Vermont has been brought into this a great deal from both sides, I should like to say that Vermont adopts a very tolerant attitude toward oleomargarine. Vermont sells a great deal of fluid milk, and when the price of fluid milk is high a great deal of oleomargarine is consumed in the State by the farmers of the State as well as others.

At almost every session of the legislature some enthusiastic individual introduces a bill to curb the sale of oleomargarine, and the Vermont Legislature, comprised for the most part of dairy farmers, every time votes it down. Six hundred and twenty-five licenses for dealers have been issued and, I think, have been on the books a long, long time. As far as I know, it has been a very long time since these people have been selling oleomargarine, and as far as I know, they have not asked that it be rescinded; possibly they have, but that is not a deterrent, as far as I know.

Dr. SOMMER. I was enumerating the basis for our opposition to the bill, S. 1744. The third point is a shift in our agriculture in the direction of less livestock and more field crops would take place, with accompanying losses in soil fertility by soil mining and erosion.

Senator WILSON. What was the second point?

Dr. SOMMER. The price of butter and of all dairy products would be depressed with resulting decrease in milk production.

The first point was extensive fraudulent sale of colored oleomargarine as butter would result.

Fourth. There would be a loss in terms of human health because the effect of a decrease

in milk solids production would outrank any possible benefit that is visualized in support of the bill.

Fifth. A dangerous precedent would be set in the field of imitation food products.

Sixth. The greatest common good would be adversely affected when all consequences are taken into consideration, including the effects on the consumer, the dairy farmer, and the producer of oil crops.

I shall not dwell on all of these points in detail. The extreme likelihood of fraudulent sales has already been covered. Certainly the incentive for fraud is obvious when we consider that the ingredient fats in oleomargarine normally cost only one-fifth to one-fourth as much as the milk fat in butter.

The potential profit in imitating the higher-priced butter is so great that it stimulates considerable ingenuity. It is difficult to draft legislative control measures that foresee all possible evasions. For example, several years ago a product appeared on our markets in Wisconsin in two packages—one contained the fat and the other contained the other ingredients in water, so planned that by blending the two together in the home a typical oleomargarine resulted. It was necessary to amend our State law to bring this product clearly under its jurisdiction.

I understand that the economic phases of the subject will be presented in detail by others. In studies of economic control measures applied to fats and oils in European countries, the conclusion is outstanding that there is a close relationship between fats and dairy products. It is inescapable that expanded use of vegetable oils will depress the price of dairy products.

A great deal could be said about the place of livestock in a well-balanced permanent agriculture. It is axiomatic in the science of agriculture that livestock is essential to maintaining soil fertility and is the most economical means for rebuilding depleted soil. Even the advocates of oleomargarine recognize this fact. For example, Whitehead, in a publication from the University of Georgia, entitled "Margarine and Georgia," says:

"It is only too clear that Georgia needs a livestock industry, and needs it badly."

We need only look at the declining cotton yields per acre to appreciate what Whitehead is talking about. Obviously, we cannot shift our dietary more and more to field crops without decreasing livestock products. Such a shift in the type of agriculture will increase soil mining and erosion. Crops such as soybeans are especially bad offenders as far as erosion is concerned. Their root system is such that the soil is loosened, and it washes away very easily. Unless the fields are very flat and level this causes very serious erosion.

A sound national policy with respect to agriculture requires that the proper balance between field crops and livestock be established in deficient areas and thereby a permanent agriculture be created and maintained, rather than to encourage practices which deplete and erode the soil and then spasmodically and uneconomically spend public funds to repair the damages. Actually this is the significance of Whitehead's plea when he said, "Georgia needs a livestock industry, and needs it badly."

This policy of maintaining a proper balance between livestock and field crops is not only important to a sound, permanent agriculture but is also directly important to human health. From the reports of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, held at Hot Springs, Va., May 18 to June 3, 1943, it is evident that malnutrition is widely prevalent throughout the world and especially in sections where such products as milk, meats, and eggs do not constitute an adequate part of the dietary. The outstanding deficiencies, aside from actual under-

nourishment or starvation, are in the proper quality of proteins and in minerals and vitamins. Vitamin A, with which we are concerned here in fortified oleomargarine, is only one of the important vitamins involved in this picture.

I have listened with interest to the testimony offered in support of S. 1744. The conclusions on the nutritive value of fortified oleomargarine are based on reports from the New York Academy of Medicine, the American Medical Association, and the food and nutrition board of the National Research Council. It is claimed that fortified oleomargarine is the nutritive equivalent of butter and that repeal of the 10-cent tax on yellow oleomargarine is in the interest of adequate nutrition of low-income families.

The most direct answer is that the yellow color contributes nothing to the food value of the product. Furthermore, there is no assurance that the yellow oleomargarine would be fortified with vitamins. Mere repeal of the tax would not make it compulsory to add the necessary vitamin A dosage assumed in these reports. Under the standard of identity promulgated under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, the addition of vitamin A is purely optional. Even if we assume that the oleomargarine industry as now constituted has every intention of fortifying adequately, there is still no assurance that newcomers, who are sure to enter the field if the Federal tax is repealed, will abide by such a policy. If the 10-cent tax were repealed, consumers might then be fooled into believing they are eating butter, and would be doubly injured by the unjustified price they are paying, and by failing to get the vitamin A content they have been led to expect.

No matter how you approach this problem, the only sound solution and adequate control is found in sharply discouraging the ultimate step in the imitation, by keeping the present tax on yellow oleomargarine in force. Further, the fact that the favorable conclusions by the three named scientific organizations is based on fortification makes the present tax on both uncolored and yellow oleomargarine all the more justified. The fortification, which is done at significant cost, should actually be there, otherwise we are doing low-income families real harm when we encourage them to use the product.

Senator ELLENDER. At that point let me ask you this: Why is it that you add color to butter? You do not have to do it, yet you do.

Dr. SOMMER. That practice developed many, many years ago, long before there was even a suspicion that the yellow color had any nutritional significance, so the practice definitely had for its only purpose equalization of the seasonal variation in color.

Senator ELLENDER. It does not make it more palatable.

Dr. SOMMER. It makes it more acceptable. Uniformity is necessary for the successful marketing of any product.

Senator ELLENDER. I presume that that is one of the reasons why the oleomargarine people would like to have the same privilege, in fact, the very same privilege, Mr. Sommer, as is accorded butter.

Dr. SOMMER. There is no question about it. It would add to the appeal of their product.

It would seem just to tax the imitation product so as to bear the cost of the special supervision that is required to assure compliance with the approximate nutritive equivalency claims. I should add before leaving the three scientific reports on fortified oleomargarine that they are qualified in several important respects. The report by the American Medical Association closes with these words:

"Since the nutritional factors have not all been identified, and since butter contains numerous additional fatty acids of unknown nutritional significance, the consuming public has a right to demand that the practice



of identifying oleomargarine and butter so that anyone can differentiate between them should be continued."

Senator ELLENDER. In that respect, Dr. Sommer, I think that the members of the committee are in full accord with that.

I am wondering if you would feel more kindly to the bill if it should be provided that nothing but a specific kind of oil could be used, and that such oil must be produced within the confines of continental United States?

Dr. SOMMER. For the moment, I was speaking from the development of the consumer's interest in this problem. I think as I discuss this matter the other points will make that rather clear.

Senator ELLENDER. I did not say you would not be against it, but I was wondering whether or not you would not feel more kindly toward the bill by the utilization of home-grown products?

In other words, to develop home industries, as it were, and let the tax remain on margarine made from foreign oils that are used in its manufacture.

Dr. SOMMER. Such measures undoubtedly would enlist more sympathy.

Senator ELLENDER. Yes, I think so.

Dr. SOMMER. The New York Academy of Medicine report states:

"The committee has looked into the matter solely from a nutritional and social viewpoint, without regard to the economic aspects of the situation."

Its first recommendation is that the fortification of oleomargarine be made mandatory, and its other recommendations are apparently predicated upon that requirement. It should be added that their recommendations were also limited to the duration of the war.

The food and nutrition board report closes with the clause in conclusion dealing with taxes "but the implications of these taxes are so extensive and complex that no recommendation with respect to them can be made in this report."

The implications which might have been mentioned are concerned with fraud prevention, adequate enforcement, sound national agricultural policy, and also nutritional problems aside from fats and vitamin A.

It is probably true that many nutritionists, physicians, and home economists are favorably inclined to the idea of removing all taxes on oleomargarine. Likewise, many housewives and consumer organizations are in favor of such a policy, especially under rationing conditions. Their sincerity cannot be questioned, but neither can't be questioned that their outlook on the problem is narrowed down to a single thought. Either consciously or subconsciously they assume that we can alter just this one factor and leave everything else fixed and undisturbed.

These groups see in the repeal of taxes on oleomargarine a means of improving the nutrition of low-income families. Even if we make the most favorable assumption, namely, that most of the oleomargarine will continue to be fortified, which is not assured, we have another nutritional consequence which apparently does not occur to them.

Extensive sale of oleomargarine will inevitably depress the price and the production of butter and of all dairy products. That means that there will be less milk solids as a byproduct of the butter industry and by virtue of discouraged dairying generally. Milk solids are considered so essential that their compulsory inclusion in bread is demanded. This bread program is also conceived in the interest of low-income families and their adequate nutrition. Low-income families subsist on bread and cereal products to a great degree, and it is held, rightly so, that milk solids should be included in the bread to supplement the deficient cereal proteins and to provide essential minerals and vitamins. The present price structure in the

dairy industry is supporting this bread program by providing relatively cheap milk solids not fat. Even if the price structure could be changed to one with less of the value on the fat and more on the solids not fat and thereby maintain milk production, it is highly questionable whether the bread program could be advanced under such price conditions. We cannot consistently have a greatly expanded use of oleomargarine and a greatly expanded use of milk solids to enrich bread. Of the two, the latter is recognized as nutritionally more important and significant.

There is no gain if in attacking one nutritional deficiency problem we intensify another problem of equal or greater importance. The fact remains, as most nutritionists agree, that the improvement in nutritional status must come chiefly through education aimed at dietary habits, and through improvement in economic status. There is no assurance that those who most need improved dietaries will be reached by either the fortified oleomargarine program or the fortified bread program.

Under a moderate tax on uncolored oleomargarine and a discouraging tax on yellow oleomargarine, both programs can go forward in a balanced manner and to the best advantage of human health, insofar as it may be possible to improve the general dietary status through programs rather than education.

Dr. Carlson testified that he would propose nothing that would decrease the amount of milk available to our consumers, and admitted that more, rather than less, milk solids should be used. His entire position in the matter under consideration here is therefore predicated on the false assumption that repeal of the 10-cent tax would not decrease the production of milk solids, and on his opinion that no such decrease would result.

In my contact and discussions with pure nutritionists, and such contact has been quite extensive, I find that they are inclined to oversimplify commercial interrelations. For example, in a sizable committee meeting with nutritionists where this general subject was under discussion, the view was quite freely expressed that a decrease in the market value of milk fat need not cause a decrease in milk prices and milk production. They pointed out that all that would be necessary would be to attach more of the value to the skim milk, going on to say that nutritionally the skim milk is worth much more than its present prices. All very true, but the only catch is that commercially the skim milk is worth only as much as you can get for it.

It has also been implied that the dairy industry has not used proper ingenuity and diligence in seeking to promote the sale of butter and of skim milk. On the contrary, educational leaders in the dairy industry have stressed the food value of the skim-milk portion of milk for years, and have kept themselves informed on nutritional developments to this end. However, just as Dr. Carlson said, you cannot change ingrained notions overnight with respect to the value of skim milk. The dairy industry has found that you cannot change this ingrained notion over a considerable period of years. Some progress has undoubtedly been made, but that is already reflected in present price structures, and any compulsion now to attach more of the value of milk to the skim milk just wouldn't find the consumer acceptance there to support it.

Much of the sentiment among consumers in favor of repealing Federal taxes on oleomargarine is engendered by the State taxes. The fact that many States have tax laws on oleomargarine has been used to engender this feeling when, as a matter of fact, all but seven States exempt the product on some basis or other. With normal distribution of population these seven States affect only 7.5 percent of our Nation's population. It is the Federal

tax that is important in controlling the product; the State taxes, however, reflect the sentiment of individual States. Some consumers have expressed the belief that repeal of the Federal tax would set the pattern, and repeal of State taxes would follow. It is our considered opinion that the reverse would be true, and more stringent State laws would undoubtedly follow in a number of cases.

There are those who are skeptical about these consequences of repealing the tax on yellow oleomargarine. In this respect, as well as other respects, the timing of these repeal efforts is opportunely chosen. Our production and flow of goods is temporarily not under the normal effect of economic laws but is directed by price controls, set-aside orders, and quotas.

It is largely due to the resulting conditions that much of the consumer pressure for repeal originates. The butter industry has literally gone to war. It served as a reserve milk supply which has been extensively diverted to other products. A large part of the nonfat dry-milk solids, a byproduct of the butter industry, is being used by the armed forces and for lend-lease shipments, and our chief customer in normal times, the baking industry, cannot be adequately supplied. It is true that some of the consequences here pointed out will not occur under the war conditions, but repeal is not limited to the duration. It is also true that repeal of taxes would not add 1 pound of fat to our total national supply. Further, it is also true that it would be a shameful act to undermine the butter industry while it has been diverted to war, analogous to taking away a soldier's permanent job and violating his home.

But there is another respect in which repeal efforts may be opportune. Developments in the chemistry of fats foreshadow striking improvements in oleomargarine with respect to body and texture, as well as flavor, through still more exact duplication of butter. After this has been achieved, the potential effects on the dairy industry would be so obvious that repeal of taxes would be difficult.

To be more specific: One of the problems in the manufacture of oleomargarine is to duplicate the body and texture; in short, the spreading quality of butter. It so happens that butterfat contains fatty acids of different molecular weights ranging all the way from 4 carbon to 24 carbon fatty acids. This gives butter the property of undergoing a very gradual change in firmness over quite a wide temperature range. It has no definite melting point, and it is only by arbitrarily choosing the test conditions that we can assign a melting point to it. The fats from which oleomargarine is made do not contain the lower molecular weight, fatty acids. While it is possible to adjust their melting point by mixing, blending, and hydrogenation, it has not been possible to duplicate the gradation in firmness over an appreciable temperature range. This can unquestionably be obtained by adding fats of low molecular weight fatty acids, but no such fats are naturally available except in butter. Coconut oil is a step in that direction but still falls considerably short. The low molecular weight fats can eventually be made by synthesis. In this connection, let me point out that according to an article by A. Imahusen, published in *Kolloid Zeitschrift*, volume 103, No. 2, page 105, May 1943, a method has been developed for the manufacture of fatty acids, soaps, and finally edible fats from petroleum paraffin and from a byproduct of their synthetic-gasoline plants. In this method they have control of the length of the carbon chain in the fatty acid molecule. He reports a plant in operation producing synthetic edible fats as early as 1937 and also mentions the active production of "synthetic butter." He also

mentions affiliation of these activities with I. G. Farben-Industrie. This is partly confirmed in a report from the International Institute of Agriculture issued from Rome in 1939 in Studies of Principal Agricultural Products on the World Market, No. 5, Oils and Fats: Production and International Trade; part II, page 342, where it says:

"Finally, very recently, there have been experiments in the production of synthetic fats. Of these, experiments in the production of synthetic fatty acids from coal led to practical results. Already in Germany in 1937 the first factory for the manufacture of artificial fatty acids was established with a production capacity of 20,000 metric tons, and preparations were in progress for the erection of a further two factories with similar capacity."

If we adopt nutritive equivalency as our basis of policy, developments such as these may prove embarrassing. Imhausen says of these synthetic fats as follows—this is a translation:

"The Public Health Bureau of the Reich has by thousands of experiments under the leadership of Professor Flossner demonstrated the high value of the synthetic edible fats, and has released it as the first synthetic food material of the world for human nourishment."

In connection with the synthesis of fatty acids and its significance in assuring the German fat supply, Professor Imhausen in May of 1943 presented a rather full statement.

That has a very definite bearing upon the problem that we are discussing here, Senator, and about which you have inquired. Perhaps a little fuller reference to it at this time would serve to bring out more definitely my point.

The questions you have just asked me, I think, are in large measure answered by this.

For instance, Professor Imhausen says:

"It is difficult to present the magnitude of fat utilization, production, and imports correctly and accurately in a few words. It is necessary to differentiate between food fats, technical fats, and such fats which serve both purposes. It is necessary to consider the pure-fat content of the individual fats. It is necessary to take into consideration which part of the domestic production has its origin in imported feeds. And it is necessary to consider whether and to what degree the fat of whole milk as beverage milk contributes to nourishment besides the spreading and cooking fats. If one views all that, then it develops that before the war the truly domestic production, that is, the production based on our own feed basis, supplies about 50 percent of the requirements. This holds for Germany as well as for Europe to about the same degree.

"The other half of the requirements before the war, aside from the feeds for cattle and hogs, was furnished by the tropical and Antarctic regions, which supplied the whale oil, and the former the oils and fats of oil-bearing plants. To this there must be added east Asia, as supplying soybeans, and South America, as supplying linseed.

"The National Socialistic Economic Management recognized in its full scope the dangers that arose out of this dependence on foreign sources for the German fat supply. It introduced a planned supply economy and carried through workable saving measures. It soon became apparent that these measures alone did not suffice to assure the fat supply against the possibility that Germany might be isolated from foreign sources of raw material. One required, therefore, especially the development of new kinds of raw material on a German raw-material basis.

"The procedure which has been worked out by me for the preparation of synthetic fatty acids, therefore, enjoyed from the start the energetic encouragement of related Gov-

ernment offices. Their help later contributed materially to the fact that in an astonishingly short time the laboratory experiments could find them practical in a technical large-scale installation.

"At the start of the war we, therefore, had at our command a fat factory which already had been in operation for several years, and which had operated practically without any 'children's diseases.' For the technical fats and the washing materials field, a suitable raw material basis had thereby been provided. At the same time this materially improved the edible fat field, since large quantities of natural fats, which formerly were required for technical uses, were now released for food.

"Also the processing of technical fatty acids had already been tried in peacetime on a large technical scale, so that based on these experiences the measures required by the war could be met without risk.

"The idea of preparing fatty acids from hydrocarbons is not new. The first works in this field were carried out nearly 100 years ago. A large number of investigators up to the present time have busied themselves with this problem, and in these efforts the most varied hydrocarbons and the most diverse types of oxidation media have found utilization. Hofstadter must be credited with being the first one to point out that the 'limit hydrocarbons,' Grenzkohlenwasserstoffe, the paraffins, are not so chemically inert as their name indicates.

"On treatment of paraffin by fuming nitric acid he was able to prove lower fatty acids in the reaction products. In the time that followed many chemists have busied themselves with the problem of oxidizing paraffin, and in this the names that deserve special mention are Gill and Mensel who used chromic acid as the oxidation medium; Willigk, who worked with a mixture of nitric acid and sulfuric acid, as also Champion and Bellet. A significant step forward was attained by Bolley and Tuchachmidt, who carried out experiments to convert paraffin to fatty acids by atmospheric oxygen. In 1885 E. Schaal announced his basic patent 'Procedure for the oxidation of petroleum and similar hydrocarbons to acids and for the preparation of soaps and esters of these acids.' During the World War the need for the synthetic preparation of fatty acids became especially acute, but even Schaal himself had to admit before the end of the war that his work was not ripe for technical application.

"The World War gave the investigation in the field of fatty acids a new impulse. At that time, for example, the firm Fantho & Co. in Pardubitz erected a small technical installation, in which they oxidized some quantities of paraffin, but this installation was soon shut down since both the quality and also the yield of the prepared products were poor. Also Harries, Kotschau & Fobert toward the close of the war applied their works to the oxidation of lignite coal tar oil. The trials had to be discontinued as wholly unsuited to economical operation. Later, Ubbelohde, Kelber, Franz, Fischer, Gun, Löffl, Franck, and many others published their works in this field. Now also begins the large series of patents by I. G. Farben-Industrie, which had taken up the investigation in the field of fatty acids on a large scale. Also the works of Zerner, Pflugh, and Avenarius must be considered. There would be dozens of names to be mentioned if credit were to be given to everyone who worked in this field not without result. A large number of patents have been announced however without attaining large scale technical evaluation of these works.

"All these experiments were carried through with natural raw materials. I also used, for my early experiments, lignite paraffin, petroleum paraffin, and various other hydrocarbons.

"It was a fortunate circumstance that at this time the economic director of the Fuhrer, Secretary Kepplar, placed a new product at the disposal of professional people. To close

the gap in the field of motor fuels, Secretary Kepplar, in addition to the erection of gasoline plants according to I. G. Farben processes, had started carbon monoxide hydrogenation plants according to the Fischer-Tropsch process.

"In these plants, in addition to motor gas, gasoline, Diesel oil, and high-molecular paraffins, also a fraction was obtained which was designated as 'Gatsch.' This Gatsch at that time represented a troublesome byproduct for which no use had been found. I soon found that in this Gatsch, fractionated suitably, I had the most suitable starting material for the fatty acid oxidation. Secretary Kepplar at once saw the large significance of this discovery. He directed Prof. Wo. Ostwald to investigate the new procedure exhaustively. By means of a clear and simple method Prof. Wo. Ostwald was able to prove the value and advantages of the new procedure convincingly. By the opinion of Prof. Wo. Ostwald the views of Secretary Kepplar were verified on all points, so that the building of a production plant proceeded with all vigor.

"It developed that the length of the carbon chain in the raw material is of decided significance. The oxidation does not take the course, as it might on first glance appear to, when the structural formula of a hydrocarbon and a fatty acid are compared. It can now be stated definitely that the oxidation does not, or to an insignificant extent, occur at the methyl group at the terminal carbon of the hydrocarbon. Even if the oxidation processes in the production of synthetic fatty acids from hydrocarbons are too complicated to permit a conclusive opinion as to the course of the oxidation it is definite that the oxidation proceeds through the peroxides. The presence of peroxides in the reaction products as well as the composition of the reaction products make this theory very plausible.

"According to this view a molecule of oxygen joins at a C-C bond with the formation of a dialkyl peroxide, whereby the molecule is ruptured. Besides the possibility that the oxygen will not rupture the molecule as a primary action, but instead forms a labile addition product on the paraffin molecule in the form of an alkyl hydro peroxide, one can also defend the view that, with the aid of the conception of active reaction centers, the first phase of the oxidation is a dehydrogenation with the formation of olefines, on which the oxidation medium then acts further in the well-known manner. That means, however, that in the oxidation there is a decrease in the length of the carbon chain. According to the length of the chain, one arrives at fatty acids with short carbon chains. Since technically the fatty acids with C<sub>10</sub>O to C<sub>20</sub>O are the most interesting and valuable, and the aim of the paraffin oxidation must be to obtain the largest yield of these fatty acids, it is necessary to start with a material of such C chain length that the fatty acids mentioned will result as oxidation products.

"This fundamental fact makes it necessary from the start to fix the carbon chain length of the source material by a suitable fractionation.

"Neither the naturally occurring hydrocarbons nor the products of carbon monoxide hydrogenation meet this requirement. For this reason extensive fractionation of the source material was undertaken in order to determine the optimum boiling limits of the source material. Also in the technical, large scale plant we now start with a carbon monoxide hydrogenation product that distills within an accurately fixed temperature range. Besides the fatty acids a large number of other oxidation products are obtained such as dicarboxylic acids, oxy acids, alcohols, ketones, aldehydes, lactones as also reaction products formed by the interaction of the individual reaction products.

"In the oxidation experiments it soon had to be determined that it would hardly be

possible in one oxidation procedure to oxidize all of the Gatsch, even though this thought was persistent; the atmospheric oxygen during the reaction attacks not only the hydrocarbons started with but also the formed fatty acids; yes, these even to a higher degree, since they are more susceptible to oxidation than the hydrocarbons themselves. In order to limit the production of undesired oxyacids, the reaction must after a time be discontinued.

"The choice of the catalyst was also significant in this connection. A catalyst was found which not only favored the reaction but also directed it; i. e., in our case, hindered the formation of oxyacids unfavorable to fatty acids, to the greatest possible extent. Thus we succeeded in oxidizing the source material about one-third, without forming oxyacids in noticeable amounts.

"The dispersion of the air plays a further significant role in the oxidation. The laboratory experiments which showed that both the utilization of the air and the reaction time develop most favorably when the air is applied in a finely divided condition, were also later fully verified in the large-scale technical process.

"The synthetic fatty acids are manufactured in Witten in the plants of Deutsche Fettsaure Werke, G. M. B. H.

"This corporation was formed in the year 1936 jointly by the firms, Henkel & Cie., Dusseldorf, and Markische Seifen-Industrie, Witten. First, a small model factory was built in a building of the Markische Seifen-Industrie, and then soon thereafter the erection of a large-scale plant was started, which after an extraordinarily short building time was able to assume production as early as the spring of 1937 and since then increase from year to year. Later the Deutsche Fettsaure Werke joined the I. G. Farben Industrie, which had produced pioneer work in the field of synthetic fatty acids to form a working association (Arbeitsgemeinschaft). After the start of the war, I. G. Farben also erected large-scale plants for the production of synthetic fatty acids. The plants operate according to the following procedure:

"The 'Gatsch' with the definite boiling range is collected from the several carbon monoxide hydrogenation plants in kettle wagons or tank autos and mixed in a tank. It is then freed from small impurities by centrifuging, since these can affect the oxidation procedure unfavorably. The 'Gatsch' is then pumped to the oxidation units in which, after the addition of the catalyst, the actual oxidation proceeds through the introduction of compressed air at temperatures above the boiling point of water. Since the reaction is exothermic, the oxidation units are equipped with cooling coils as well as the heating coils which are to start the reaction. By means of the cooling coils an accurate control of temperature is provided during the reaction.

"With the air that escapes lower molecular weight oxidation products are carried off, which even today constitute a valuable raw material for the most varied purposes. They are condensed by special coolers and consist in part of lower molecular weight fatty acids, and the other part out of alcohols, aldehydes, ketones, and low molecular weight hydrocarbons. The main product in the oxidation unit, the oxidation. This method has a further fundamental advantage:

"As already stated, the oxidation products contain not only fatty acids, but also, e. g., esters, lactones, 'estolide,' and so on. The fatty acids which are obtained by the extraction procedure still show a relatively high ester number, a constant which indicates the presence of esters. This ester number cannot be eliminated by means of a normal saponification. Only by the treatment of the saponification products at higher temperatures as it is applied in the distillation procedure does one arrive at a fatty acid which is most completely free from an ester number. The

soap which comes out of the vaporizing chamber and contains only small parts of unsaponifiable matter is decomposed with acid. One obtains a raw fatty acid which is light brown and it represents a mixture of fatty acids of various chain lengths.

"Even though at the start it was stated that through suitable prefractionating of the raw material the chain length can be extensively influenced, it is not to be avoided that a certain percentage of lower and higher acids result. This is apparent from the reaction mechanism.

"For the further technical utilization of the raw fatty acids they are subjected to steam-vacuum distillation which makes it possible to separate them into different fractions practically without any cracking. The main part of the distillate consists of fatty acids with a carbon number of  $C_{17}$  to  $C_{20}$ . Thus they represent the fatty acids which are obtained in the saponification of natural fats. However, they differentiate themselves fundamentally in that they also contain the fatty acids of uneven numbers of C atoms. These synthetic fatty acids can by treatment with alkali be converted to soaps of desirable cleansing power. Naturally the synthetic fatty acids can also be reduced to the corresponding fatty alcohols.

"But not only for technical purposes are the synthetic fatty acids the suitable raw material. It has developed that by esterification of definite fractions with glycerin an unusually valuable edible fat can be prepared.

"The Public Health Bureau of the Reich has, by thousands of experiments under the leadership of Professor Flossner, demonstrated the high value of the synthetic edible fat and has released it as the first synthetic food material of the world for human nourishment. Under the instigation of Secretary Keppler the first large-scale plant for the manufacture of edible fat after my procedure was erected. This has been in operation for years—'Diese ist seit Jahren in Betrieb.'

"For some time the edible fat has also been prepared in emulsified form as 'synthetic butter.' It has developed that the synthetic edible fat, because of its keeping quality, is superior to the natural fats. Also for therapeutic purposes it is even today of specially large significance.

"Besides this main fraction with carbon chains of  $C_{17}$  to  $C_{20}$ , there are also acids with shorter and others with longer carbon chains. Both types are equally interesting and can be introduced for the most varied purposes. The lower fatty acids have not been available to the chemical industry in practically utilizable quantities. Only the fatty acid synthesis gives us these interesting fatty acids which are winning increasing significance in ample amounts. The situation is similar for the residue, the so-called high molecular fatty acids.

"I believe without exaggeration I can say that the synthesis of fatty acids has not only fulfilled our expectations, but has far exceeded them. Through it there has come first an abundance of interesting raw materials which still await their absolute disclosure. The synthesis of fatty acids has opened the door to a new field in chemistry into which till now only a small step has been taken. Just as in its time coal tar gave an unexpected upswing to the chemistry of cyclic compounds, the carbon oxide hydrogenation in conjunction with the fatty acid synthesis has given the development of aliphatic chemistry the determining jolt that in its full significance cannot yet be judged."

This question of nutritive equivalency contains other troublesome angles. If by our present action we apparently establish the principle that approximate nutritive equivalency of an imitation food product is the criterion of legal legitimacy, then we are open-

ing up numerous possibilities. In the dairy field, filled milk, filled cheese, and filled ice cream then become definite possibilities by similar reasoning and similar standards of approximate equivalency. But it has been argued that oleomargarine is not an imitation product. Yet the fact remains it was conceived in France as an imitation product and Napoleon's prize was awarded on the basis of the manner in which it succeeded in duplicating butter. In fact, because of the duplication and the obvious possibility of fraud, the committee recommended that oleomargarine be not colored, a policy which has been followed consistently in France.

Practice in this country and the standards adopted by the Food and Drug Administration involve imitation, detail for detail. The legal minimum fat content is the same for both butter and oleomargarine—80 percent. The water and salt content are the same. Milk or skim milk are used in oleomargarine to imitate the curd content of about the same—about 1 percent in butter and to imitate its flavor. Lecithin normally present in butter may be added up to 0.5 percent in order to imitate the quiet foaming type of frying as with butter. The flavor ingredients, typical of butter starters may be added. When oleomargarine is fortified, it must contain 9,000 U. S. P. units of vitamin A per pound, a value arrived at on the basis of testimony that purported to show that this is the approximate average content of butter. The final step in the imitation is color. A noteworthy deviation in this imitation is that the use of a preservative is permitted in oleomargarine, but not in butter.

We may have a court opinion that oleomargarine has an identity of its own, but this does not alter the actual facts. Nor is this our answer to the possibilities of filled milk, filled cheese, and filled ice cream. By similar reasoning that flies in the face of facts, it could also be held that such products have an identity of their own. They have all been made at one time or another, and if mere existence means having an exclusive identity, then no inconsistency would be involved.

But it is argued that oleomargarine is to be released from tax in the interest of adequate nutrition of low-income families. Exactly the same argument can be made for the other imitation products I have mentioned. Some interesting variants can even be introduced in the arguments.

For example, in the case of filled ice cream, the argument might be as follows:

A low-fat product containing 2.5 to 4 percent fat is made in semblance of ice cream in some States and is sold as "ice milk" or "milk ice." The plea is that low-income consumers can thereby buy an inexpensive frozen dessert. However, let us continue: In a frozen dessert a substantial part of the cost is in processing and selling in the frozen condition. This cost would be no greater if the product contained more fat—a cheap fat, so that it could still sell at a low price. There you have all of the elements as in imitation butter.

Again, we might apply the same reasoning to cheese. Here we might start with the observation that a certain amount of skim milk is used for animal feed. It is too valuable a human food to be so wasted, so let us make it into cheese. But in cheeses such as Cheddar cheese the product would be tough and unpalatable, so in the interest of keeping it cheap for low-income families, let us add a cheap fat to the milk and then make cheese. It can be done. It has in time past been done in this country, but was made illegal. Under the policy of approximate nutritive equivalency, it might well be revived.

Filled milk is with us even now, despite the Filled Milk Act of March 4, 1923. We have it in the intrastate commerce of at least one State, and it remains to be seen whether the law will be sustained, even as to interstate

shipment. Filled ice cream has not become an extensive problem, but there have been violations of existing laws. Filled cheese was at one time widely prevalent, but was brought under effective control by the Filled Cheese Act of June 6, 1896.

Now, obviously, I am not arguing in favor of such imitation products. I am merely pointing out that the principle is the same in all of them. With respect to filled cheese, filled milk, and filled ice cream, the attempt to legislate them out of existence has been more or less successful. Oleomargarine arrived on the scene earlier, in about 1874 in this country, and at that time Congress elected to control it through taxation. Had it arrived later when the consciousness of authorities was developing as to the need for control of adulteration, the fate of oleomargarine might well have been the same as filled milk, filled cheese, and the other products. The act of 1886 was later construed by courts to mean that oleomargarine had been recognized as a legitimate article of commerce.

So now we have taxation of oleomargarine established as the means of controlling this product. Yet, it can be made to sound abhorrent—to tax a wholesome food. Actually, even if the consumption of an individual consumer were 20 pounds per annum, the tax on uncolored oleomargarine amounts to only a nickel a year. It is our contention that it must be done to keep this dangerous trend under control, otherwise, once the policy has been established, it will have far-reaching consequences. If imitation were allowed to go unchecked, the dairy industry, as we know it today, would cease to exist. In forming our policy, our outlook must obviously be larger than mere nutritive equivalency coupled with pleas in behalf of the low-income groups.

Imitation in the field of foods must be regarded apart from imitation in any other field. Imitation in foods is invariably practiced to cheapen the product. Imitation in other lines in many cases has resulted in products that are growing superior and sell at a higher price. Imitation in foods cannot be easily detected by the consumer. In many cases it requires laboratory tests to prove it, and in any case the evidence is gone when the food has been consumed. The consumer cannot judge the results of use in the case of foods; continued use and time are required for any effects to become evident and then usually only to the trained diagnostician or nutritionist with physiological training. As against this, imitation in other lines can be checked by results and the article is still there as proof if wear or other results are not in keeping with the price exacted.

We believe that in controversial matters a sound and well-established legislative principle is that the greatest common good shall prevail; it is our contention that the present taxes on oleomargarine are in the interest of the greatest common good. Certainly the one-quarter cent per pound tax on uncolored oleomargarine is not burdensome but it assures a type of enforcement that cannot be attained in any other way. It is true that the 10-cent tax on yellow margarine may eliminate the eye appeal of butter yellow, but certainly the consumer gets almost complete protection against fraud in return. It is also highly likely that the restriction on yellow color means lower prices to the consumer. Certainly, if the yellow color is so important to eye appeal it will become a definite price factor and the price of yellow oleomargarine can then easily advance since uncolored oleomargarine will disappear in all but a few States. It is definitely in the interest of consumers to maintain the present taxes.

As between the dairy industry and oil crop producers, the greatest common good definitely lies with the maintenance of the existing Federal taxes. Even if oleomargarine were to take over the greater part of the but-

ter market, the gain in market value to the oils could not possibly approach, even to a fractional degree, the loss to the dairy industry. This must inevitably be true because the entire huge pool of fats and oils would have to be lifted in price. Resisting this effect would be the shifts in uses—shifts of fats from technical uses to edible uses, shifts from soaps to sulfonated hydrocarbons in the cleansing field, and possibly also the actual synthesis of fats from petroleum byproducts. It is also likely that whatever benefits would accrue would not be reflected back to the ultimate producer as directly and completely as in the case of dairy products.

As against this, the loss of a substantial part of the butter market would cause decided losses to all dairy products since the entire price structure is based on the butter market. This loss would go directly to the dairy farmers. There are some 3,000,000 such farmers, and the industry concerned represents about one-sixth of our national agricultural income in normal times.

It is our well-considered judgment that sound national policy and the greatest common good require that the present Federal taxes on oleomargarine be maintained.

That is all I have to present, unless you have some questions.

Senator AIKEN. Senator WILSON, do you have any questions?

Senator WILSON. No.

Senator AIKEN. I do not have any. Do you desire to enter anything further, Dr. Sommer?

Dr. SOMMER. There was one point I might clear up.

As the record stands now, there was testimony introduced which would have us believe that in comparing adjoining States, one in which the State has no restrictions on oleomargarine and a neighboring State which has restrictions on oleomargarine, that such restrictive taxes have had the effect of causing a lower return for milk in the State concerned.

Those figures introduced—and they were based on combined sales of butter, cream, and milk in the State, and compared New York and Vermont. It was thus shown that the return in terms of price per pound of butterfat was considerably higher in New York than in Vermont. The difference was 9 cents per pound in favor of New York.

A more fair comparison would have been to compare the returns for cream sold to plants, dealers, and so forth, which would then exclude the high-class, high-priced milk that goes to the city market.

When that comparison is made it shows just the reverse in all but one of those five pairs of States, where the difference was only 1 cent.

Instead of placing a construction on the figures, the figures that have been introduced earlier, and the figures to which I now refer—instead of placing the construction on them that was done, obviously, the correct construction is that in each case the State that had restricted taxes on oleomargarine had those taxes because in their State a large portion of the milk sales had to go to manufactured dairy products which are obviously most directly affected by competition from oleomargarine. And the existence of a tax reflects that condition rather than proves anything else.

Senator AIKEN. Thank you.

Mr. WILEY. At the same meeting there was testimony from Dr. E. B. Hart, of the University of Wisconsin, in whose laboratories far-reaching and important experiments have been conducted during the past 38 years. These experiments include some of the first experiments in vitamins, substances which intrigue so many of us, and cause us to spend much money, and about which we hear so much over the radio, large sums being

paid to commentators to put on fine programs advertising them. The distinguished Dr. E. B. Hart, of the University of Wisconsin, was among those who led the way in the field of vitamins. He appeared at this meeting and gave his testimony. It reads like a fairy book, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his testimony follow my remarks and be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The testimony is as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. E. B. HART, PROFESSOR OF BIOCHEMISTRY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Dr. HART. My name is E. B. Hart. I am professor of biochemistry at the University of Wisconsin. I am here authorized by the dean of the college of agriculture. I am sure you do not care for me to go into details of my qualifications, except to say that I have been at the university for 38 years, and my principal work has been in biochemistry and in nutrition.

Senator ELLENDER. As a teacher?

Dr. HART. As a teacher and in research, so that the problems that are here before us have been under investigation at that institution for some time.

Senator ELLENDER. Doctor, before you proceed, I wish to state that Senator AIKEN made a request yesterday that we put before you certain samples of oleo butter and butter made from soybeans, and so forth, so that you could look at them and discuss them if you desire to, or you may even go so far, if you desire, as to ask questions of Mr. Hopkins, who presented them here. That is a little unusual, but as I have stated to many of those in attendance at these hearings, what we want here are the facts, and if we do not follow the strict rules and regulations of the committee, that is our business. Mr. Hopkins is very anxious to go to New York, he would like to get away before 12 o'clock. We stopped him yesterday from going, and he is very anxious to leave, so, if it will not interfere with your present program, I would appreciate it if you would be kind enough to go into that matter at present, so that we can give him a leave of absence.

Dr. HART. Well, Senator, may I present what I have to say first?

Senator ELLENDER. That is perfectly all right, if you insist.

Dr. HART. And then come to this.

Senator ELLENDER. That is agreeable.

Dr. HART. I will not be very long. It has been stated here by certain witnesses that the nutritive value of good margarine is identical with good butter, except for flavor. That particular point I want to discuss somewhat, especially in reference to the vegetable oils.

The history of research in reference to the nutritive value of vegetable oils goes back a good many years, and goes back to our own laboratory, when it was first shown that the vegetable oils contain very little vitamin A. That was done in my own laboratory by Dr. McCollum. About 25 years ago an attempt was made to put upon the market a product known as Hebe, a filled milk which was made by taking the fat out of milk and then homogenizing it in a vegetable oil.

At that time, in Wisconsin, we opposed by legislation the manufacture of that product, on the basis of the vegetable oils not containing vitamin A. Statutes in reference to filled milk have been extended to other States. The objection 25 years ago was that the nutritive value of Hebe was not equivalent to that of a whole evaporated milk.

As time went on and research accumulated, it became possible for men to find vitamin A and put it in vegetable oils. The Caroline Co., of Fitchfield, Ill., a few years ago began

the manufacture of a filled milk in which they put vitamin A in the vegetable oil.

Senator ELLENDER. What kind of milk was that?

Dr. HART. Filled milk.

Senator ELLENDER. What is that?

Dr. HART. That is milk from which you have taken the butterfat and in which you have substituted—

Senator ELLENDER. You would not call that skim milk?

Dr. HART. Not skim milk, but it is substituted in vegetable oil, and then they put the vitamin A in vegetable oil and claimed the product as equivalent to evaporated milk. In the meantime they would get out an injunction against the enforcement of the filled milk law in the various States and put this material on the market. So there has been legislation pending concerning the legality of such procedure.

I have been a teacher of biochemistry for a great many years. I have always been interested in milk and its constitution, and I have always suspected that the mammary gland made something very special when it constituted milk. You have in milk a special sugar known as lactose; you have special fine products. As the studies have gone on it has been determined that practically all the nutrients that are necessary for continued life and reproduction by a laboratory animal are contained in milk. All you have to do to make milk a complete food is to add iron, copper, and manganese, and vitamin D for the child, and you have a complete food. It carries them through one cycle after the other, these laboratory animals. And as a matter of fact, boys in our short course oftentimes in the winter have been sustained on this milk for months, reinforced in this way.

Well, the point I wanted to make is this: That I suspected that there was something more in butterfat than mere calories, as compared, for instance, with coconut oil or soybean oil, and so on, and so we began a series of experiments to determine whether, after we had reinforced a skim milk from which the fat had been taken out reinforced with vitamin A or vitamin D, as to whether that milk so reinforced was equivalent in nutritive value to butterfat or a butterfat milk. Those results were rather interesting, and demonstrated to us that there was some growth-promoting influence superior in butterfat to the vegetable oils when we used a skim-milk diet.

Senator ELLENDER. What do you use for a subject in your experiments?

Dr. HART. This is the rat.

Senator ELLENDER. Somebody objected to the use of the rat yesterday as a subject to experiment with. So in your process you are using the rat?

Dr. HART. We use the rat in our experimental work entirely, as the laboratory animal, because, after all, as I want to point out, it is impossible to have experiments with humans.

Senator ELLENDER. I understand that, Doctor.

Dr. HART. No one has done that yet. No one has taken a thousand children and subjected them to the influences of these particular kinds of things.

Senator ELLENDER. You are of the opinion that the use of the rat as a subject to demonstrate the qualities of foods is reliable?

Dr. HART. Very useful, but not necessarily translatable to the human. Let me give you an illustration. These laboratories have been using rats as an experimental animal for a great many years. You have in the South the disease called pellagra, dermatitis of the skin, insanity following, and so on.

Had the rat been used to experiment with to disclose whether that was a nutritional disease or not, they would have completely failed, and not until the dog was used that is sensitive to this particular disease, was there a possibility of putting the cause of pellagra upon a nutritional basis.

Senator ELLENDER. Suppose it be a rat, a dog, a coon, or a mink, is it possible to find out the effect of certain drugs or foods that may be transmittable to the human? The reason I am asking you is because it was questioned in the testimony by some witness—I do not recall who it was now—but since you have opened the subject, I should like to have in the record your views on that, and I presume that you will tell us about the experiments you carried on with the rats, and how that was translatable to the human.

Dr. HART. Well, Senator, they have not been translated, because they have not been tried with the human. And, as I say, one cannot absolutely conclude. There are a good many phases of nutrition that appear in the rat, like rickets—we can produce rickets in the rat, and we know we can produce rickets in the human, and we know the same thing that takes care of one will take care of the other. But, as I mentioned, in the case of pellagra, you cannot produce pellagra in the rat. Why?

Senator ELLENDER. I understand.

Dr. HART. Because he makes the substance himself.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, you know Dr. Carlson. I am sure, from the University of Chicago?

Dr. HART. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. And I think he made the statement here that from a nutritional standpoint there is absolutely no difference between butter and oleomargarine, if you add vitamin A to it which can now be done. The subject that he used in order to determine that was the rat. Later, some witness questioned that method. Since the question has been raised, I would like to get your views, if you do not mind, in the record for our information.

Dr. HART. I will come to that, because that is important, as to how far you can translate from one to the other. Now, as we went along in these experiments on the vegetable oils versus butterfat and milk, using skim milk as the base of the diet, we moved over to powdered milk, that is, skim-milk powders. There again we found these same differences in the growth-promoting properties of butterfat as compared with the vegetable oils. These skim-milk powders as they are manufactured always contain some butterfat. It is never completely taken from it. And so at times in these experiments with the skim-milk powders, the differences were not great.

Then we moved to a strictly synthetic diet. By that I mean, instead of using all fat material, like skim-milk powder, we made the ration of sugar of milk, lactose, casein of milk, then we put in salts and an arrangement of vitamins that are necessary. With lactose as the main sugar in the diet, these differences again between butterfat and the vegetable oils became very, very definite.

Well, it then occurred to us that possibly this sugar of milk fits best with butterfat and that that combination which nature has provided in milk makes for a superior food. Then we moved over to the next step, and that was to take the lactose out of these synthetic diets and put in the ordinary carbohydrates, like starches and like dextrin, maltose, and so forth. It was very interesting then to see that the gap in the difference between the lactose diet and the mixed carbohydrate diet in respect to these vegetable oils and butterfat was somewhat closed; in other words, when you had a diet with starch or dextrin, maltose in it, and the lactose was in a very small amount, then these vegetable oils appeared to do with the rat, in the time of the experiment a very good job, that is, they did the job quite as good as with the butterfat.

So that the point that I bring out is that with the kind of ration that you use, the kind of ration that you construct where lactose is

predominant, as it is in milk, and as it comes for the child, as contrasted with the diet of the adult where the starches, and so on, prevail, that we cannot demonstrate any distinct difference in the time we exposed these animals, we cannot demonstrate any distinct difference between the vegetable oils and the butterfat in their nutritive value so far as the rat was concerned.

Now, just this point: We have moved on to some further experiments where with these carbohydrates other than lactose we have exposed our animals to low water-soluble vitamin intake. In the other experiments we had a high water-soluble vitamin intake. And it appears now that even with the starches and the carbohydrates other than lactose, and where the water-soluble vitamin intake is low, then these differences or this gap appears again, not so great, but it appears again, between the influence of butterfat and the vegetable oils.

In other words, the whole matter, this nutritive comparison, seems to rest upon the influences of these various nutrients upon the flora that grow in the intestinal tract. That is a new field in nutrition that has not been developed, but it is one that is going to become of very great importance, because apparently these various nutrients have an influence upon the character of the flora of the tract, and that flora of the tract makes certain things that are necessary for the animal.

For example, I can construct a ration of synthetic products that is wholly satisfactory for the rat. I take that same ration and give it to the little chick at 1 day of age, and he fails completely. And now go to a natural substance like liver, and add that to that chick ration, then he comes along fine, but those things that are in the liver could be made by this animal, but they could not be made by the chick.

Now, suppose I take this successful ration with the chick that contains liver and carry that over to the guinea pig. It fails again. He needs more things than the chick did, that we do not know about.

What I am trying to say here is the state of knowledge of nutrition in reference to all of these things is so incomplete that one questions very much the scientific value of a statement that the nutritive value of one thing is equal to the other.

Senator ELLENDER. Doctor, there is one question I would like to ask you. Your testimony is technical, and I follow you fairly well. You have been talking, as I understand, of a kind of liquid diet, in which you put this lactose and take it out. You use this liquid for feeding, as I would judge, as milk with and without lactose and you have described the effects on rats with and without lactose. Now, I was under the impression that butter was made out of the fat itself, the butterfat out of the milk; is that true?

Dr. HART. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. Now, how much of this lactose is in butterfat?

Dr. HART. There is none in butterfat.

Senator ELLENDER. That being true, why should there be any difference in the utilization of the butterfat from cow's milk, in contrast to soybean fat, or cottonseed fat, or the fats from any other oil if in the manufacture of butter this precious lactose that you have been describing to us is absent in the butterfat from cow's milk?

Dr. HART. I would like to have the answer to your question myself. I do not know.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, that is why I referred to the testimony we have had so far from Dr. Carlson. Of course, he did not raise any question about this lactose, but he said that experimenting with rats—and I do not know, maybe some other animals—he demonstrated that, nutritionally speaking, there was as much nutritive value in oleomargarine as there is in butter.

Just one moment. Mr. Reporter, let the record show that Senator GILLETTE, from

Iowa, and Senator WILLIS, of Indiana, are present at this hearing, although not on the committee.

Dr. HART. Please let me refer now to the experiments that Dr. Carlson quoted from. He quoted from Duell's experiments at the University of Southern California. He did not quote from our experiments. I am acquainted with the publications of Dr. Duell, and his conclusions. He worked, as we did, with a skim-milk powder unextracted with a solvent, which should remove, had he used it, the residual butterfat that was in the skim-milk powder. The skim-milk powder that he used, from his own testimony, contained 1 1/2 percent of lipoids, of which butterfat was the main constituent. In consequence of that, Duell's experiments, in my judgment, in which he found little or no difference between these vegetable oils and butterfat are entirely clouded by the presence of a certain residual butterfat in his experimental diet.

Now, let me add one other thing, and I am proceeding now with my statement:

These studies are summarized in the Journal of Nutrition for December 1943:

1. With lactose as the sole carbohydrate in the diet, rats showed superior growth when fed butterfat or lard as compared with corn oil, coconut oil, cottonseed oil, soybean oil, peanut oil, olive oil, and hydrogenated cottonseed oil.

2. With a mixture of carbohydrates composed of sucrose, starch, dextrose, dextrin, and lactose in the diet, the average growth response of the animals fed vegetable oils was equal to that of animals fed butterfat and lard. The growth rate on this ration was more rapid than when the only carbohydrate present was lactose.

3. Properly fortified oleomargarine fats gave growth equal to butterfat over a period of 6 weeks when the above mixture of carbohydrates was incorporated in the rations.

4. Properly fortified oleomargarine fats did not give growth equal to butterfat when lactose was the sole carbohydrate in the diet. On such a regime rats fed butterfat grew slightly better than rats fed oleomargarines of animal origin, but decidedly better than rats fed oleomargarines of vegetable origin.

It should be noted—and I am referring now to our own experiments—that these are experiments with rats and only over a 6-week period and do not involve reproduction or lactation. If 6 weeks of growth of the rat at a rapid stage of its development can be used as the criterion of adequate nutrition, then certainly these oleomargarines compare favorably with butterfat. Whether this deduction is entirely sound can be answered only when growth to maturity and reproduction are studied experimentally. It should be recorded that there are no published controlled experiments with infants, children, or mature men on the comparative nutritive value of vegetable oils, butterfats, and oleomargarine.

More recent experiments, unpublished, indicate that only when the water-soluble vitamins are abundantly supplied in the ration will the character of the carbohydrate fed close the gap in the differences between butterfat and the vegetable oils as influenced by the carbohydrates.

Senator AIKEN. May I interrupt? If I remember Mr. Hopkins' testimony correctly, he made some reference to the range of the vitamin A content of butter as being from five to twenty thousand units.

Dr. HART. I am covering that.

Senator AIKEN. All right.

Dr. HART. We have results that show that on low intake of water-soluble vitamins a mixture of carbohydrates such as starch, dextrose, and dextrin did not give as good results with the vegetable oils as did the butterfat.

In other words, this matter of comparative nutritive value is a complex one and will be influenced by the kind of carbohydrates, the

kind of fat, and the level of soluble vitamins in the diet. This means that all of these nutrients have a profound influence upon the kind of flora inhabiting the intestinal tract, which in turn can or cannot make an abundance of certain unknown nutrients needed by the rat.

In none of our experiments have we ever found butterfat inferior to any of the animal fats or vegetable oils experimented with. In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition.

I might add something which is not contained in this printed matter, as to the experiments of Mr. Gullickson at the University of Minnesota with calves. He fed calves skim milk with butterfat in some cases, and with the vegetable oils in other cases, and he published the records in the Journal of Dairy Science in 1942, and the records show that those animals receiving the vegetable oils grew poorly, in fact, he snatched them from the grave by merely substituting, as they got down, certain animal fats, butterfat, or even lard, and he even used tallow, and it successfully brought those calves away from death. He has not pursued the subject further. And you might ask me why, or how this works, and I would simply have to tell you that I do not know in the present state of our knowledge of nutrition.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, Doctor, assuming what you have stated, that the value of oleomargarine has not been found to be equal to that of butter, and it may be, as you have indicated, that you will never be able to determine it. Have you ever made any experiments, or heard of any, where oleomargarine is harmful to the human being, and that it does not promote growth?

Dr. HART. None at all. I have never heard of that sort of thing.

Senator ELLENDER. I suppose you have given thought to this idea that most of this butterfat you talk about is made from vegetation. They use cottonseed meal for feed, and they also use various other ingredients of the same kind that are used to make oleomargarine. As a matter of fact, do you not get the same product in some way through the cow?

Dr. HART. That is where this wonderful synthetic mechanism of the mammary gland comes in, to make things over, to reconstruct.

Senator ELLENDER. In other words, the cow is used as the machine to make the butterfat from this vegetation or vegetable oils in a different form than the factory uses them to make margarine?

Dr. HART. There is no fat that has been studied that is more complex in composition, and from year to year new unsaturated acids found, as in butterfat.

Senator ELLENDER. But, as I said, with all of the experiments you have found that the utilization of margarine is conducive to growth?

Dr. HART. It certainly is.

Senator ELLENDER. With human beings?

Dr. HART. Well, I do not know. There is no experimental evidence; but it is with rats, certainly.

Senator ELLENDER. Have you any knowledge of any experiments that have ever been carried out with human beings, using butter as a diet and using oleomargarine?

Dr. HART. No; I have not.

Senator ELLENDER. It is a pity some of that has not been done.

Dr. HART. It has been urged, but has not been done.

Senator ELLENDER. Do you know of any reason why it has not been done?

Dr. HART. No; I do not know of any reason why it has not been done. Of course, the supposition has been that there was no dif-

ference in the vegetable oils and the butterfat.

Senator ELLENDER. That is what I have concluded.

Dr. HART. Among pediatricians. They have not wanted to subject the infant to that exposure.

Senator ELLENDER. It could have been carried out with grown human beings. Infants do not eat butter.

Dr. HART. They have the fat.

Senator ELLENDER. But they get it from the mother's breast.

Dr. HART. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. It could have easily been carried on with children from 5 to 10 years of age. Dr. Carlson stated that from all of his experiments, all of his observations, that nutritionally speaking there was absolutely no difference between butter and oleomargarine as now being made and fortified by the vitamin A content.

Dr. HART. The only answer I have to that is that I would like the evidence.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, the way to do it, I guess, is for us to get a few thousand dollars together, and use humans as guinea pigs.

Senator AIKEN. Human guinea pigs.

Dr. HART. If you do that, then, of course, you are hamstrung by the question of translation to the human.

Senator AIKEN. I said human guinea pigs.

Senator ELLENDER. I am sorry, Senator AIKEN, I interrupted you.

Senator AIKEN. It was suggested by another witness that the bleaching required in the process of the manufacture of oleomargarine might remove some nutritional value from the product. Do you know anything about that? Do you agree with that?

Dr. HART. No; I do not know. I do not know anything about it. Testimony has been introduced to the effect that the vitamin A content of butter may be as low as 500 I. U. per pound. The conclusion has been drawn that fortified oleomargarine is therefore a more dependable source of vitamin A than is the case with butter. The facts are that analysis of some 200 samples of commercial Wisconsin butter showed a vitamin A content of 10,000 units per pound of winter butter and 18,000 units in summer butter. These facts are presented for the purpose of keeping the records accurate.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, is that amount of vitamins more prevalent in a Wisconsin cow than it is in a Missouri cow, or let us say a Louisiana cow, or an Iowa cow?

Dr. HART. Of course, the amount depends upon how they are fed, and I have not the records available of the butters of the United States.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, Wisconsin has the reputation, I believe, of being the leading dairy State in the Union. I presume you folks pay strict attention to the diet of the cow, and it ought to be done in many other places. I am in agreement with all of that. But do you have any knowledge as to what the vitamin content of the milk of the average cow is, just like we have, say, in other States where they are not as careful of the cow's diet as is the case in Wisconsin?

Dr. HART. Well, Senator, as to those records, there has been in the Food Board of the National Research Council a national survey of the vitamin A content of butters, and those analyses—they are not available to me—but so far as I know I think they are available, and perhaps someone here knows more about it than I and can give you a summary.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, maybe Mr. Holman can. He is the head of it. I am going to ask him, if he is present, to get that information since the question has been raised.

Dr. HART. I say that these facts are presented for the purpose of keeping the records accurate. My opposition to the bill is based on the statement that follows, and while we do not concede that there is established evidence of the equivalence in nutritive value

of oleomargarine and butterfat, yet our opposition to the bill is not based upon that evidence.

It becomes axiomatic, it seems to me, that if the tax is taken off of yellow oleomargarine and its price to the consumer is reduced, it will become distinctly competitive with butterfat. It is known that butterfat prices largely control the price of dairy products. Should the price of butterfat fall to certain low levels, the production of milk would be curtailed, and, if this occurs, then the very direction in which improvement in nutrition should go would be defeated. We want more milk, and not less.

Recently a draft memorandum of the United Nations' program has been prepared, and prepared by a group of economists and medical scientists. In this memorandum they classify the status of nutrition of different countries into seven groups. The first group includes New Zealand, Denmark, and the Northern States of the United States of America. The seventh group includes China and India. Everyone knows that dairying and the production of milk is the feature industry of New Zealand and Denmark, and also everyone knows that the cereal grains are the predominating constituents in the nutrition of the people of China and India.

Senator ELLENDER. At that point, Doctor, will you permit an observation? As I recall, we had testimony here yesterday or the day before that more oleomargarine was used in Denmark than butter. That is my recollection.

Dr. HART. More oleomargarine?

Senator ELLENDER. Yes, sir; more oleomargarine used in Denmark than butter. I mean among the inhabitants. Now, Doctor, you made a very significant point a while ago there, and I am inclined to agree with you somewhat, and that is that if oleomargarine is permitted to compete with butter, and the people of our Nation can be made to see that the nutritional value of oleomargarine is as good as butter, that it might put the butter manufacturer "on ice," as it were. I can see that, but on the other hand, there was some evidence produced here that the milk producers could find new outlets for milk, that is, the milk itself, so that the people can get more of this lactose that you say is so necessary for the flora of the intestines and that is conducive to growth. Now, do you not think it is possible that some way can be devised whereby more and more milk in the raw state can be sold and used, and more can be used in powdered form and other forms, and thereby let a product like oleomargarine have a better play?

Dr. HART. That is a fine program, and I agree with your program, and my successors here will discuss that, what has been tried, and how much failure there has been to do the very thing that you suggest.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, I thought maybe you might have some intelligent and practical views on the subject. That suggestion has been made here by two or three witnesses, and of course the committee will be glad to receive as much evidence along that line as possible, because I can well see that the butter market can be destroyed if we can educate the people to believe that oleomargarine is as nutritive and as palatable as butter, and 50 percent cheaper.

Dr. HART. If you let oleomargarine come in—

Senator ELLENDER. I concede it.

Dr. HART. What I fear is the reduction in milk production and things other than butter that are so important in the nutrition of the Nation.

Senator ELLENDER. I am glad you say that witnesses will be produced to discuss that, because that is very important.

Senator AIKEN. Doctor, I think Dr. Carlson called attention to the fact that the stature of

the Sioux and the Crow Indians indicates that the human being does not require milk at all to attain the proper physique and strength. What have you to say as to that?

Dr. HART. They were meat eaters. I do not know anything about their stature. But let me point out one thing. India is a good illustration of three states of nutrition. In the northwestern corner of India you have wheat-growing and dairying and some rice. On the other side, you have fish and some wheat and rice, little dairying. In the southern part you have mostly rice, and the poorest state of nutrition. The people in the northwestern part are in the best state of nutrition.

Going on as to the draft memorandum of the United Nations' program, this memorandum points out that the length of life is about 67 years in New Zealand, Denmark, and the northern United States, and only about 36 years in China and India. The memorandum promulgates this idea—to improve the nutrition and general health of countries that fall below the first group must involve the provision of protective foods, of which milk is one of the most important.

If the removal of the tax on yellow oleomargarine is going to curtail the production of milk in this country, then certainly the improvement in nutrition will be curtailed and the plea for better health will have a distinct obstacle put in its path.

It is a notorious fact that low income, low living standards, poor health, and short span of life are found where the average diet is high in cereals and potatoes. Let me quote:

"Korea is typical of the countries with monotonous and deficient diets. More than one-half of the Korean's daily food is rice. The remainder is a combination of millet, soybeans, sorghum, buckwheat, sweetpotatoes, and corn. The other foods necessary for a balanced diet—vegetables, fruit, milk, and dairy products—are not even listed in Korea's consumption tables."

This memorandum from which I quote generally and consistently recommends milk and dairy products as the means of improving the nutritional status of peoples whose nutrition today is recognized as inadequate.

Senator ELLENDER. Have you anything further, Doctor?

Dr. HART. No.

Senator ELLENDER. Any questions?

Senator AIKEN. It occurs to me, I think, in Mr. Hopkins' testimony that he called attention to the fact that States that had taxes against oleomargarine paid to milk producers a lower price than adjoining States that had no tax against oleomargarine, and I believe he used Wisconsin and Illinois as examples. Is it true that the milk producers of Wisconsin get less money than the milk producers of Illinois for their product?

Dr. HART. I cannot answer that question.

Senator ELLENDER. Senator AIKEN, at your request I suggested to Mr. Hopkins that he bring back his samples. They are here. Do you want to question him in the presence of Dr. Hart?

Senator AIKEN. I would like to have Dr. Hart see the samples.

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Hopkins, will you kindly step forward, please? You have already been identified for the record.

Senator AIKEN. I am not questioning the samples myself, Mr. Chairman, but the suggestion was made here yesterday that these samples might be here for the occasion.

Senator ELLENDER. Let the record show that in response to a request by Senator AIKEN, the samples were this day produced.

Mr. A. G. HOPKINS (representing National Association of Margarine Manufacturers). Mr. Chairman, would you care for me to go through these samples?

Senator ELLENDER. What you might do is this, present these various samples and state what they are, and if Dr. Hart or anybody

present desires to ask any questions, I know you will be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. HOPKINS. Gentlemen, this is sample No. 1 of crude soybean oil, a vegetable oil. You can see the sample is not particularly clear, because the gums and residual matter have not been removed.

This is sample No. 2 of refined soybean oil, and since the record will not show without some further description, I would like to point out that this has a distinct brownish yellow color.

This is the same sample, sample No. 3, as No. 2, except that it has been bleached—the oil has been bleached by the conventional bleaching process—and you will observe by comparing the two that practically all of the color has been removed from the refined oil.

Senator AIKEN. Is that bleaching required by law?

Mr. HOPKINS. You have to bleach this oil down to this color in order to get the color within the restrictions demanded by the Internal Revenue Department. Now, when we continue with the process of manufacturing in making margarine we hydrogenate, and this is a sample of this oil that has been hydrogenated, and you will observe it is practically white, because it has been hydrogenated.

This is a sample of the same oil manufactured into margarine. This, of course, is sample No. 6—the first one I referred to. Here the hydrogenated oil is pure fat. This is margarine bleached artificially white, and I would like to emphasize that it is bleached to be an artificial white, not a natural white. This is margarine that has 80 percent fat.

Now, let us go back to sample No. 2. This is refined oil. Suppose we did not go through this operation here, suppose we did not bleach this oil. We come to an unbleached partially hydrogenated oil here, and we get a very distinct yellow sample. I want to emphasize that for the record that this is a pronounced yellow color, and if there be any disagreement about the color, I would like to have that stated for the record.

Senator ELLENDER. What kind of oil was used in order to make this yellow?

Mr. HOPKINS. All of these samples I am showing are soybean oil.

Senator AIKEN. And you state there is nothing but soybean oil in that?

Mr. HOPKINS. No. I might emphasize this, that it is not artificially colored, no chemicals have been used to give an artificial color, nothing else has been used in this sample.

Senator AIKEN. That is as I understood you.

Mr. HOPKINS. Now this yellow sample of partially hydrogenated soybean oil unbleached for manufacture of margarine would produce a margarine with a very distinct yellow color, as is shown in sample 5. I believe there was some question you wanted to ask about the possibility of carrying through some color in the finished product. This is 80 percent fat, and is margarine made out of oil that has not been bleached.

Dr. HART. May I ask a question?

Senator ELLENDER. Yes; surely.

Dr. HART. Is this an acceptable edible product?

Mr. HOPKINS. It would be accepted.

Dr. HART. Have you records to show that it is?

Mr. HOPKINS. Please bear in mind, Doctor, that this work was done entirely for demonstration here. The law does not permit us to manufacture colored margarine, and we have not done it on the commercial scale, so far as manufacture in the plant is concerned. But anything we can do in our laboratory we can do in our plant on a commercial basis.

Dr. HART. Can you make an acceptable edible product?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir. It would be an acceptable product; yes, indeed.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, how would that product differ from the margarine that is now sold?

Mr. HOPKINS. This is sample No. 7, and sample No. 7, as you will recall, is the artificially bleached margarine, the product that was bleached to make it white. This is a sample made from the natural colored oil, without the addition of artificial coloring, without the addition of any chemicals.

Senator ELLENDER. Would you say that there would be the same nutritive value in the bleached margarine as there would be in the one in which the color is not removed?

Mr. HOPKINS. I think Dr. Hart would probably be better able to advise you on that, because I am not an authority on nutrition, but it is my understanding—I believe I got that information for the record—that in the vegetable oil you take out carotene and certain other things that are helpful, that have a food value and that go out with the fuller's earth in the bleaching operation.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, Dr. Hart, would you be able to describe the color of this margarine that was made with the unbleached oil, in contrast, say to butter color? What is the difference in the color, for the record?

Dr. HART. I think it looks more like butter. Senator AIKEN. Has anyone here a sample of soya butter? I was wondering how that would compare with it.

Mr. HOPKINS. I know nothing about soya butter.

Senator AIKEN. You heard the testimony yesterday afternoon?

Mr. HOPKINS. No, I was not here. I would like to enlarge a little more on that one point. Yesterday there was some discussion, and I bring this out because there seemed to have been some indication that certain things could not be done. This, gentlemen, is a sample of pure butterfat, sample No. 8, and it is butterfat that was made in the spring of the year. It has a rich golden color. This is not butter—it is butterfat that has been extracted. And I want to point out that in my testimony I did not say you could make white butter, except that by bleaching butterfat in the same way that you bleach vegetable oils, you would produce a white butterfat, and this is butterfat that has been bleached in the same conventional way that we bleach vegetable oils, and you can see very distinctly it has practically no color—it is practically a perfect white.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, will you present a sample of that bleached butterfat, and also a sample of bleached margarine, to Dr. Hart, and ask him if there is any distinction or difference between the two in color, just for the record?

Dr. HART. Well, nothing significant, I should say.

Senator ELLENDER. They are about the same color?

Dr. HART. It would seem so to me.

Senator ELLENDER. Senator AIKEN, is there anything else you want to bring out?

Senator AIKEN. No. All I wanted was to have Dr. Hart see the samples and see if he had any comments to make.

Senator ELLENDER. I want to be sure that we have produced what you wanted. Do you want the samples for any other purpose?

Senator AIKEN. Not that I know of.

Mr. HOPKINS. I will be glad to leave the samples for the hearings at Washington.

Senator ELLENDER. Suppose you leave them in the possession of Mr. Donoho.

Mr. HOPKINS. They will have to be kept under refrigeration.

Senator AIKEN. This is simply to cover the testimony given yesterday.

Senator ELLENDER. So that if somebody asks for them, we will have them available. Thank you, Mr. Hopkins. Now you are discharged and I desire to again thank you for your indulgence.

Dr. Hart, I was given to understand that there was an experiment, I think carried on in some foreign country—it may have been Great Britain—where they tried in an orphanage the use of margarine and butter for a

certain period. Are you familiar with the experiment, sir?

Dr. HART. No, I am not.

Senator ELLENDER. Thank you, Doctor. I thought maybe you were. If there are no questions, you may be excused, Dr. Hart, and thank you very much.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sure that everyone is interested in the factual presentation of the question of oleo or butter, and of vegetable oils and animal fats. The dairy industry of the country, and I am sure, everyone who will read these remarks will be interested in reading a very short statement by Mr. Walter E. Camp. He is a partner in Vita Health Foods Co., of the city of Washington, and I am sure the people reading his testimony will be much intrigued therewith. So I ask that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF WALTER E. CAMP, VITA HEALTH FOODS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. CAMP. My name is Walter E. Camp, and I am a partner in the Vita Health Food Co. here in the city, selling various vegetable foods.

Senator ELLENDER. Some witness testified here last week that some soybean butter manufactured by Butler Food Products in Cedar Lake, Mich., was handled by your store.

Mr. CAMP. We sold it until recently; yes, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. Why don't you sell it now?

Mr. CAMP. It gets moldy in hot weather, so we discontinued it during the summer.

Senator ELLENDER. In what size container is this soya butter sold?

Mr. CAMP. That is the only size I know of [indicating] and this morning I got a new size, but this new size we have never handled yet.

I think it is quoted at about 79 cents.

Senator ELLENDER. I notice the contents is one pint, or 13½ ounces, net weight.

Mr. CAMP. Yes, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. Is that new size the same weight as the other?

Mr. CAMP. It says on there, I believe, 13½ ounces.

Senator ELLENDER. What do you retail that for, what price?

Mr. CAMP. Fifty-five cents.

Senator ELLENDER. How much do you pay for it?

Mr. CAMP. Thirty-eight and one-half cents.

Senator ELLENDER. Is that a normal profit?

Mr. CAMP. It is a little less than our profit that we have to have, but we believe that with common food products we can make a little less. We usually make more on this. If you want an explanation of our profit, I will be glad to give it to you.

Senator ELLENDER. No; I don't care to go into your business. I want to be fair with you.

Do you know that this same product is being sold in Cedar Lake, Mich., and other parts of Michigan and Wisconsin for 36 cents a pint?

Mr. CAMP. That is the wholesale price in that section, I understand. I don't believe it is the retail price, although I am not informed as to what they sell it for. We pay 38½ for it.

Senator AIKEN. My recollection is that one witness said it was selling at the stores for 36 cents in Michigan and 59 cents in Washington.

Senator ELLENDER. That was the testimony here.

Mr. CAMP. I thought it was 55 cents. I am not quite sure about that.

Senator ELLENDER. And you say it cost you 38 cents delivered in Washington?

Mr. CAMP. Thirty-eight and one-half cents delivered here.

Senator AIKEN. One of the witnesses testified that he went into your store to buy some of this and was asked for six ration points, but another one that went in and made a purchase was asked for no ration points at all. Why was one asked to give up ration points and others were not?

Mr. CAMP. Well, all meats went out without ration points very recently, so the one that made the first inquiry, was apparently while it was still on rationing, and when the actual purchase was made, the O. P. A. had taken the points off of soybean oil and meat products, so that when the purchase was made, there were no points on it any more.

Senator AIKEN. Perhaps Mr. Camp can tell us, if soybean oil is being generally substituted in restaurants for other products, both oleomargarine and butter?

I asked the distributor that question this morning, or last night, rather, and he told me he sells it in 30-pound containers to the Statler Hotel, and he sells it to the People's Drug Stores, and he probably has other patrons. At one time very recently there was absolutely no butter available, and the restaurants and hotels substituted anything they could get. For instance, in the seafood restaurants they apparently substitute soy oil for butter when they serve lobster.

Mr. CAMP. We have a restaurant and we use soy oil a great deal.

Senator ELLENDER. I was out to dinner the other night, and I do not like lobster very well, but I had to have lobster, and apparently it was soy oil that was served with the lobster. It had no resemblance, so far as I could see, to butter and not much to oleo.

Senator AIKEN. How about the taste?

Senator ELLENDER. It tasted like soy oil. I suppose the restaurant uses it because of their inability to get butter.

Mr. CAMP. do you handle oleomargarine? Mr. CAMP. No; we do not.

Senator ELLENDER. Then you say the reason you are not handling this product any longer is because it mildews in the summer?

Mr. CAMP. It does. I understand there is no benzoate of soda in it. We do not handle products that have benzoate of soda or anything of that sort in them, so we just have to discontinue the product in the summer.

Senator ELLENDER. I believe that is all, Mr. Camp. Thank you very much.

Mr. CAMP. I have some literature here in case you should be interested in it.

Senator AIKEN. When did you discontinue the sale of this product, Mr. Camp?

Mr. CAMP. It was as soon as the weather got hot, 2 or 3 weeks ago. It may be that one of the downtown stores still have a pound on hand. I don't know how recently you bought it, but it might have been bought just after that. But all of the rest of it was moldy and I just sent it back.

Senator AIKEN. Could that be renovated and sold again?

Mr. CAMP. I don't know about that.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)



## RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate stand in recess until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, September 8, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 5 (legislative day of September 1), 1944.

## UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

ASSISTANT SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1944

Willys M. Monroe

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

|                    |                   |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| James A. Finger    | Luther L. Terry   |
| Millton W. Gwinner | Albert L. Chapman |
| George F. Ellinger |                   |

SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEONS EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

Cassius J. Van Slyke  
David C. Elliott  
Roy E. Butler

SENIOR SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY MEDICAL DIRECTOR EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

Michael J. Pescor

PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY DENTAL SURGEON EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 1944

Francis J. Walters

ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY PASSED ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEER EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

Harvey F. Ludwig

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 1944

Ellis S. Tisdale

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEER EFFECTIVE DATE OF OATH

Malcolm C. Hope

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 1944

|                   |                      |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| John G. Crawford  | William G. Budington |
| Vernon W. Foster  | Jesse D. Harris      |
| Ray H. Vanderhook |                      |

SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 1944

Leland J. Hanchett

SENIOR SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY MEDICAL DIRECTORS EFFECTIVE AUGUST 15, 1944

Otis L. Anderson  
Edwin H. Carnes

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Alfred L. Holloman, July 1, 1943.  
John G. Crawford, October 16, 1943.  
John C. Grier, July 1, 1944.  
Buell S. Bindschedler, September 19, 1944.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Victor H. Haas, September 1, 1944.  
Clifton K. Himmelsbach, September 1, 1944.  
Kenneth E. Gamm, September 1, 1944.  
John W. Oliphant, September 1, 1944.  
Seymour D. Vestermark, September 1, 1944.  
Hollis U. Maness, September 1, 1944.  
Leroy E. Burney, September 12, 1944.  
Charles R. Mallary, October 1, 1944.

SURGEONS TO BE SENIOR SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Adolph S. Rumreich, September 2, 1944.  
Ernest E. Huber, September 2, 1944.  
Alfred J. Aselmeyer, November 29, 1944.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate September 5 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

## POSTMASTER

## MICHIGAN

John J. Hauserman to be postmaster at Negaunee, Mich.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1944

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

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

We praise Thee, O Christ, that with Thee trifles are revelations and that Thou dost tarry before the commonplace and abide in the presence of every passing hour. With Thee every countryside may become a Bethlehem, every feast a Bethany, and every shore line a Bethesda. Let us hail this day, with its conditions and circumstances, as the call of the Lord and accept our labors as Thy errands. Thou who fillest eternity with Thy glory, find Thy spirit in our praise, see Thy will in our motives, and Thy life in our love.

When Thou didst weep over Jerusalem, Thou didst grieve over the failure of a national center. O God, unite our country and take it unto Thyself, directing it in brotherly ways that we may move on to a great and wonderful future. Mold our citizens into the sons of the morning, beholding the light as Thou art in the light, making them a torch of spiritual knowledge that shall banish ignorance and divisive influences and enkindle the spirit of the divine presence in the breast of our whole land. O hasten the hour when the guns shall be put in the racks and our boys come home, and peace shall fill the earth as the waters cover the sea. In the name of Him who is the hope of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 1, 1944, was read and approved.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include excerpts from the Senate hearing before the Committee on Agriculture, and also to extend my remarks and include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to extend and revise my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

## THE RED MENACE THREATENS THE PEACE OF THE WORLD

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the conference at Dumbarton Oaks of the three powers, United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia, which has for its purpose the creation of an international security league, furnishes another example of how far the United States and Great Britain are going in bending over backward to meet the wishes of Russia. The Government of China is not included in this conference at the present time at the request of Russia because, as she puts it, Russia is not at war with Japan. That, however, is not the real reason, as Russia does not wish to have China represented at the conference because Russia has been doing everything possible to communize China. In fact, there is a communistic army in northern China which is controlled by Russia and takes its orders from Stalin, and does not take orders from the great Chinese leader, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

The Chinese were the first to feel the might of the imperialistic Japanese war lords, and all freedom-loving nations owe China a great debt for the valiant and gallant fight that she has been making against the Japanese for these many years—in fact, the Sino-Japanese war has been going on 7 years, 8 weeks, and 3 days. I can see no reason why China, a great nation of peace-loving people, should not have delegates at Dumbarton Oaks. Certainly she should not be denied representation there on the flimsy basis that Russia is not at war with Japan. If that were the real basis, then neither the United States nor Great Britain could have delegates there, because both the United States and Great Britain are certainly at war with Japan. We hear now that at the second session at Dumbarton Oaks the Chinese and French will be represented and that the Reds will withdraw but will be kept fully advised as to the subject matters of the conferences. I sincerely trust, however, that something constructive will come out from the conference at Dumbarton Oaks, and I also express the hope that the Congress and the people of the United States be fully advised as to the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks. It certainly is not sufficient to give to the public only the statements on the opening day of the representatives of the three great powers, followed by occasional press releases.

The statement of Andrei A. Gromyko, the Russian Ambassador, is indeed very pertinent as to the attitude of his Government and is as follows:

The present meeting is the first meeting of exploratory discussions between representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union on the establishment of an international security organization. I fully share the thoughts expressed by Secretary

Hull in regard to the importance of the present discussions.

The people of our countries are waging a life and death struggle against the worst enemy of humanity—Hitlerite Germany. This struggle has already cost our countries, as well as many other freedom-loving countries of the world, heavy human and material sacrifices. Waging a struggle for their freedom and independence, the peoples of our three great nations are also saving the freedom and independence of other freedom-loving peoples of the world.

As a result of the combined efforts of the Allies, our common foe—Nazi Germany—is nearing its inevitable catastrophe. Our brave warriors are squeezing the enemy from the east, west, and south. As a result of the latest offensive of the Red Army, military operations are already being carried to enemy soil. The time is not far off when the combined efforts of the freedom-loving countries of the world, and, first of all, the efforts of our nations, will bring a complete and decisive victory and will force Nazi Germany to her knees.

In view of the heavy destruction and countless sacrifices which the present war has brought to humanity, the freedom-loving peoples of the world are naturally looking for means to prevent repetition of a similar tragedy in the future. They have shed too much blood and made too many sacrifices to be indifferent to their future. That is why they are striving to establish an international organization which would be capable of preventing a repetition of a similar tragedy, and of guaranteeing for the peoples peace, security, and prosperity in the future.

Members of such an organization can be, as it is said in the four nations' declaration signed at the Moscow Conference on October 3, 1943, all big and small freedom-loving countries of the world. All of us are glad that one of the distinguished participants of the Moscow Conference, Secretary Hull, is among us at the present meeting.

It goes without saying that in order to maintain peace and security it is not enough to have the mere desire to harness the aggressor and the desire to apply force against him if it should be demanded by circumstances. In order to guarantee peace and security it is absolutely necessary to have resources with the aid of which aggression could be prevented or suppressed and international order maintained.

In the light of the above, it becomes clear what responsibility falls to the nations, members of the future security organization, and especially to the nations which bear the main brunt of the present war, and which possess the necessary resources and power to maintain peace and security.

That is why all those to whom freedom and independence are dear cannot but draw the conclusion that this freedom and independence can be preserved only if the future international security organization will in the interests of the freedom-loving peoples of the world use effectively all resources in possession of members of the organization and, first of all, the resources of such great nations as the Soviet Union, and United States and Great Britain.

The unity displayed by these countries in the present struggle against Hitlerite Germany and its vassals gives ground for certainty that after final victory is achieved these nations will cooperate in maintaining peace and security in the future as they are cooperating at the present time in saving humanity from enslavement by the Fascist barbarians.

In this noble striving our countries naturally cannot but find support on the part of the other United Nations, big and small, which will be participants of the international security organization, which will be based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all freedom-loving countries and

which will bear joint responsibility for the maintenance of peace.

The unity of the Allies displayed in the struggle against the common foe and their striving to maintain peace in the future is a guaranty that the present exploratory discussions will bring positive results. They are the first step leading to the erection of a building in the foundation of which all freedom-loving peoples of the world are interested—for an effective international organization and maintenance of peace and security.

In closing, I consider it necessary to note the initiative taken by the Government of the United States in calling the present conference. The Soviet delegation is glad to begin discussions with the American delegation, headed by Edward R. Stettinius, with whom I have had the pleasure since 1941 of meeting and discussing at different times various matters of mutual interest, and also with the British delegation headed by Sir Alexander Cadogan.

I have no doubt that in the course of the present discussions the representatives of the three nations will conduct their work in a spirit of mutual understanding and in a friendly atmosphere which cannot but add to the successful outcome of the discussions.

This is, indeed, a statement of high-sounding phrases, and if it could be accepted at its face value thinking people around the world would rejoice because it would result in the dawn of a new day that surely would engulf the world in the bright light of perpetual peace. However, the nations of the world, both large and small, who have had dealings with the present communistic regime at Moscow have learned to their sorrow that any statement, any treaty, or any agreement with Stalin cannot be relied upon for its face value.

William C. Bullitt, former United States Ambassador to France and Russia, in a brilliant article in the current issue of Life magazine of September 4, 1944, entitled "The World From Rome," sets forth that—

The Eternal City fears a struggle between Christianity and communism and that the Italians fear that the present war will result in the subjugation of Europe by Moscow instead of Berlin, and also said that the Italians believe the failure of the United States and Great Britain to stand strongly for independence for all the states of Europe has made certain a new world war.

Mr. Bullitt further stated:

The Romans expect the Soviet Union to dominate Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, as well as eastern Germany.

The article further states that the Italians are terrified in their fear that the neighboring nations of Austria and Yugoslavia will be dominated and be brought under the influence of Russia. It is brought out that the Italians are surprisingly well informed about events in all of Europe and that they hope, but are not convinced, that the United States and Great Britain can hold off the "hordes of invaders from the east." It appears that the Italians are of the opinion that Great Britain will emerge from this war a tired victor and they feel that Great Britain will be unable to stop the threat from the east alone, and are by no means sure of what the United States might do.

Mr. Bullitt's article is unusually well written and in a very informative man-

ner which to the most casual reader discloses that the author is not only unusually well informed but also a master of the subject matter of the article.

The political aims of Stalin and Soviet Russia are further set forth in an article by Samuel Crowther, written in July, entitled, "What Happened at Bretton Woods," and published by the National Economic Council, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Mr. Crowther sets forth in his article in regard to the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference held at Bretton Woods, N. H., from July 1 to 22 that—

Considered for itself, and also as a dress rehearsal of international conferences to come, holds a lesson and a warning for every American. The large Russian delegation was mostly made up of men who spoke only Russian and who did no mixing around with the other delegates. They were very intent and interested only in having a large quota in both the stabilization fund and the bank, in order that they might have a large voting power and a large borrowing power. They were all set to make a raid and get what they wanted. They also insisted that they put up a minimum amount of gold and a maximum amount of promises. They refused to disclose any facts on their gold or other holdings. They made their demands as of right, practically as orders from Stalin to the conference. They answered no questions and made no decisions except on their cabled instructions. They did not bother with argument or logic.

It is brought out by Mr. Crowther in his article that—

The delegates did not reach an agreement. They merely signed a paper which looked like an agreement. But on the minutes they entered reservations that destroyed the agreement. The final statement by Secretary Morgenthau was utterly disingenuous. All this had a considerable effect on the delegates from some of the smaller nations who had been taught to believe that the American Government was always frank with its own people.

In regard to the attitude of the Russian delegates Mr. Crowther had this to say:

The dominance of the Russians disillusioned and discouraged Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Greece. Their territories are now occupied by the Germans. They have all been living on promises from Washington and now they find Russia predominant. Every shift upward in the Russian quota was accompanied by a shift downward in their quotas. They see nothing ahead for them and they feel they have been abandoned.

Take Poland. The Poles had worked out a careful reconstruction program based on half-official assurances from Washington. If they should get their freedom and their territory, the funds now available to them under the plans would not be sufficient for reconstruction. But they plainly see, from what has gone on here, that the territory they get and the freedom they get will be at the will of Russia and, instead of an independent government, they will get a Quisling government which will join the Soviet Union. They do not expect to be collectivized, but they know that the Soviet is planning for buffer states in Europe and that it intends to keep those states for a defense in depth against invading armies while it moves its industries far into the interior. They see a Poland of the future that will only be good ground for armies to fight over.

The same prospect holds out for Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Greece. They

have to conceal their feelings, but they are very bitter. They had all relied on direct aid from America.

Mr. Crowther sums up the conference in the last paragraph of his article, which is as follows:

In a word, the conference showed that "one world" to date means "one sucker"—the United States. That is our diplomatic progress to date reduced to crude language.

The warning given by Mr. Crowther in his article on the Bretton Woods Conference was "a dress rehearsal of international conferences to come" certainly has borne fruit as the Dumbarton Oaks Conference discloses by the attitude of the "Reds" to dominate everything, and their refusal to permit the Chinese to participate with them in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, although they were a signatory to the Four Nations' Declaration of Moscow.

It would be well for the United States and Great Britain to take cognizance of the statement of former Ambassador Bullitt in his very able article in *Life* magazine:

Will the result of this war be the subjugation of Europe by Moscow instead of by Berlin?

If the Allied policies are to be based on the naive and childish faith in the Soviet assurances and promises, it will surely lead the world into a still greater catastrophe than was caused by the faith in the past guaranties of Adolf Hitler made just a little over 5 years ago. The whole world knows these guaranties and promises were never kept and resulted in the outbreak of this present European war by the invasion of the German hordes into Poland on September 1, 1939.

The liberty-loving Poles, fighting with their backs to the wall, received the mortal blow when they were invaded from the rear and stabbed in the back by Russia on September 17, 1939—that was the death blow. Even though mortally wounded, Polish patriots continued to fight until death. The heroic defense of Warsaw by Mayor Stefan Starzynski was viewed with admiration by the entire civilized world. The Poles in 1939 at Warsaw were left to fight it out by themselves. It is sad but true—history has again repeated itself. The Polish patriots of Warsaw were called upon to rise and evict the Nazis from the capital of the Republic of Poland. The underground of Poland has never ceased to fight since the fall of Poland, and the remarkable advances of the Red Army westward which has been acclaimed by all the world could never have been accomplished had it not been for the heroic work of the Polish underground, who paved the way for Stalin's army to the gates of Warsaw.

The Reds of Moscow realized that within the city of Warsaw was the flower of the Polish underground. Even though they had called upon the Polish underground for assistance, which was so willingly given to the Reds, in order that the hated Nazis could be driven from Poland, the Reds let the Polish patriots down by halting at the gates of Warsaw. For 34 days the Polish underground fought valiantly and took

over large portions of the city of Warsaw, expecting every hour of every day that the Reds would push on into the city. When all hope of assistance from the Reds was a foregone conclusion, the women of Warsaw addressed a pathetic appeal to His Holiness, the Pope at Rome. However, all appeals were in vain. The Polish patriots were without food, water, medicine, ammunition, and other supplies—exhausted, they were compelled to retreat. When the women made this appeal to Pope Pius XII the Russian Army had been standing at the gates of Warsaw more than 3 weeks and had not moved one step forward. Thus, again, the Republic of Poland—the first to resist the Nazi hordes—had twice within 5 short years been denied the assistance which she could rightfully expect from her allies.

Oh, it is true that Poland did receive some assistance, but since April of this year the Polish underground has received no appreciable assistance, and during this last seize of Warsaw the only assistance General Bor did receive was the supplies that the British, American, and Polish flyers dropped from the skies. In fact, the Russians refused to permit the American, British, and Polish flyers to make shuttle flights—that is, leave their home bases and land on Russian airfields. If such shuttle flights had been permitted by the Russians, these flyers could have carried much heavier loads of supplies; but, be that as it may, the irony of it rests in the fact that there were Russian airfields within 20 minutes' flight distance from Warsaw, and the Reds absolutely refused, and did not even attempt to fly supplies to the valiant patriots of Warsaw. I need not tell the Members of this House that the majority of the Russian supplies and equipment came from the United States—you only have to read the lend-lease reports and draw your own conclusions.

Despite the remarkable advances of the American, British, and Canadian Armies on the western front, particularly the Army under the leadership of General Patton, the war against the barbaric Nazis is not yet over. It is now certain, however, that victory will be on the side of the Allies. It therefore follows that it is superfluous to talk about Nazi danger to the world. Instead, it becomes necessary to analyze carefully and cautiously the Soviet policy and its administration relative to the organization of Central Europe and China as vassal states.

Soviet Russia has already annexed three free Baltic countries, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and has incorporated them into her territory as Soviet republics. Thus the Soviet Government endeavors to establish in Europe a bloc of states friendly disposed toward Russia. Such states would at first even enjoy a so-called independence, but would later fall under Russian influence and an absolute Soviet leadership through the action of communistic agents. For instance, the seizure of Poland by a formation of a treacherous new government is not a novelty of Russian tactics. As we all know, Stalin made a pact in 1940 with the legal Lithuanian Government and as

a token of friendship offered Wilno, having no right whatsoever to do so, for it was not Russian property. A few months later, after having prepared the ground for such an act through Soviet propaganda, the Russian Government issued orders to arrest and deport the members of the Lithuanian Cabinet, accusing them of being involved in the killing of two Red Army soldiers. A new government, nominated by Stalin himself, under the leadership of a Lithuanian Communist, Paleckis, started to function in Wilno. That is a classic example of Stalin's strategy, and hundreds of such moves could be possible if Russia establishes a sphere of influence in Central Europe and Germany.

In brief, if Soviet Russia accomplishes their plan there will be in Central Europe and Germany a huge bloc of states composed of one hundred and twenty to two hundred million people supervised and controlled by Moscow. If that Red menace comes into being it will be the greatest menace of all time, and will be particularly directed at Great Britain and the United States. The security of both the United States and Great Britain rests on individual, independent states in Europe or a federation of such states which, as free and independent states, will be the bulwark that will separate the plans of Russia's westward movement for world domination, and will act as a buffer for the security of Great Britain and the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

If Soviet Russia is permitted to create such a bloc without a word of protest from the Allies—in fact as it now appears often with their actual consent and help—a powerful bloc of nations will have been brought under the influence of Moscow. For instance, if Soviet Russia dismembers Poland against the agreement already made with her, she will be throwing the whole Polish Nation at the mercy of a government formed in Moscow and composed of communistic traitors and criminals. By that act the liquidation of the legal Polish government-in-exile in London and the abolition of the independence of Poland will have been brought about—which is in accordance with present policy and procedure—without protest by either Great Britain or the United States. Certainly such is not the policies as enumerated by the Atlantic Charter. For instance, if Russia succeeds in her plan in China, there too, they would have at their disposal an enormous reserve of people of more than two hundred million, together with great and unestimated natural resources.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is, therefore, creating—without a word of protest from the Allies, and often with their actual consent and help—a powerful bloc of nations which would be under her influence and absolute domination. It is, therefore, possible to determine the extent of such a bloc and to visualize its size and influence, which are enormous. It would comprise approximately one-half billion people when you include the population of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics before this present war.

When one gives serious thought and considers the manner in which the Soviet Government is mobilizing the civilian populations in the countries which apparently have been liberated with the help of their own Quislings and Red agents, we then have a clear picture of Communistic Russia's real intentions—notwithstanding promises, pledges, treaties, and agreements made with the members of the United Nations, including the principles of the Atlantic Charter, of which Soviet Russia was a signatory.

The appalling fact that stares us in the face is that with a bloc of nations mobilized or as a potential threat for mobilization, what awaits the world, there is one answer—a perpetual Red menace. If the plans of Moscow are brought into being it is practically impossible to anticipate the next move of Stalin and his communistic government. Will Stalin and his government postpone their intentions of communizing the world until after the reconstruction of his country? Will he or his government, still under the camouflage of friendship for Great Britain and the United States, take advantage of the post-war chaotic conditions? Will Stalin and his government, as many think, take advantage of the post-war period and provoke a world-wide revolution in all European and Asiatic countries, starting with China and India? It has often been said that it is not given to man to foretell the future, but the mothers and fathers of today whose sons and daughters are in the armed forces view with apprehension the world of tomorrow.

Take, for instance, Yugoslavia. Soviet Russia has destroyed the unity of that country through the action of her agent Tito and has incited a civil war in Yugoslavia. Yet it is one of the Allies. It has been proven by subsequent events that the arrangement by which General Mihailovich was supplanted by Tito as military leader in Yugoslavia, and Purich was supplanted by Subasich as Prime Minister, had the blessing of Great Britain's Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill. This switch of leaders in Yugoslavia, of course, was instigated by Soviet Russia and is another classic example of Great Britain bending over backward to meet the wishes of Stalin.

It is indeed interesting to note how the government of Subasich was brought about. On May 18, 1944, Mr. Churchill, in a speech regarding Yugoslavia, stated:

That he had received a message from King Peter that he had accepted the resignation of Prime Minister Purich and his Cabinet.

However, Prime Minister Purich had not resigned. In fact, he wired the Yugoslav Ambassador in Washington, Dr. Fotitch, that he was still functioning as Prime Minister and that the rumors were without any foundation whatsoever so far as he had knowledge.

The resignation, or rather dismissal, of the Purich Cabinet took place on June 2, 1944, almost 2 weeks after Mr. Churchill had stated in the House of Commons that he had resigned. This proved beyond any doubt that the British Government was exerting the utmost pressure upon the poor young King of Yugoslavia to

dismiss not only his Prime Minister Purich but also General Mihailovich, the War Minister of Yugoslavia, who was and still is leading the major forces of Yugoslav resistance, even as Tito parades about in Italy and has his photograph taken in company with Mr. Churchill.

In Mr. Churchill's speech before the House of Commons in regard to the Yugoslav situation he stated:

This involves the severance from the Royal Yugoslav Government of General Mihailovich in his capacity of Minister of War.

And he continued by saying:

We do not know what will happen in the Serbian part of Yugoslavia. Mihailovich certainly holds a powerful position locally as commander in chief and it does not mean that his ceasing to be Minister of War will rob him of his local influence. There are perhaps 200,000 Serbian peasant proprietors who are anti-German but strongly pro-Serb, less enthusiastic in regard to communism than some of those in Croatia and Slovenia.

Mr. Churchill thus assumes the role of an arbitrator who has already made up his mind. While telling the world that Mihailovich has the support of the Serbs, and admitting the Chetnik leader's influence over the largest part of Yugoslavia, he takes the view of a militant minority that has support in Slovenia and Croatia, although even in these parts of Yugoslavia, Tito has a very limited following. This seems to be a very poor excuse for stoppage of support to General Mihailovich and for arming a well-organized minority which, prior to Russia's entry into the war, was defeatist.

This prearranged plan was put into operation soon after formation of the new Yugoslav Government under Subasich. In July, Stoyan Pribichevich, a known Tito sympathizer, reported that—

The two members who had entered the Subasich Cabinet as Tito representatives are not the members of his organization and while Tito has nothing personally against them, it should be understood that they do not represent his anti-Fascist Council which is that supreme governing body of Yugoslavia.

A few days later the world was told that Tito had gone into Yugoslavia to lead the fight against the occupiers. The fact is, however, that since Tito had fled Yugoslavia, he had never set foot anywhere in the proper mainland of that country. He was installed on the small island of Vis, an island in the Adriatic held by the British, where Tito himself lives in a cave. The British officers on the same island live in houses but ever since the fatal parachute attack by the Germans on his former headquarters in Yugoslavia Tito prefers to live in a cave against further German attack.

The tragic part of this whole affair is that the British, especially Mr. Churchill, had continued to support and also has been successful in having our Government support the Tito movement instead of realizing the error, we continue supplying and arming this small resolute and united minority. General Mihailovich has reported that the Partisans, armed by the Allies, attacked his forces while he was organizing his units for the coming Allied invasion through the Balkans. Tito's headquarters also reported the attacks, mind you, not against

the Germans but against the Serbs as if the Serbs were our enemies and not the most loyal of allies of this and the last World War. The Partisan report was made on August 13, via Associated Press from London:

In another battle with General Mihailovich's Chetniks, 522 Serbs were killed, 500 wounded, and 637 captured.

It will be remembered that it was the Serbs who led Yugoslavia over to the side of the Allies by the coup d'état on the 27th of March 1941, and not Tito and his Communists. And it was the Serbs who lost more than 1,000,000 dead, or approximately one-eighth of their population in their fight against the Germans. There are more than 140,000 Serbs prisoners of war in Germany. These prisoners of war have steadily refused offers by the Germans to return them home if they will promise not to continue the fight against the Germans. It is regretted that such attacks against the loyal Serbs by the Communist Partisans are made possible only by the arms and supplies sent to Tito by the Allies, many of which instruments of war are made right here in America for use supposedly against the Germans and the Japs.

It has been recently learned by reliable sources that the War Department rejected a demand by Tito that the British and Americans guarantee him military support in a military campaign against General Mihailovich. Tito's demand was supported by the British, but the War Department of the United States took the position that its original agreement to give arms to Tito was on the basis that America was willing to help anyone who wished to fight the Germans, and the agreement was not for the purpose of supplying ordnance to assist Tito in his efforts to seize control of Yugoslavia.

Tito's demand was a supplement to the agreement between him and Ivan Subasich, new pro-Communist Croat Premier whom Churchill forced on the Yugoslavs. The Tito-Subasich agreement was signed on June 16 at Bari, Italy, where Tito had arrived after fleeing from Yugoslavia. It contained the following provisions:

First. The Subasich government in exile recognizes the legality of the Communist administration and institutions created by Tito.

Second. The Subasich government recognizes and legalizes post facto all actions taken by Tito.

Third. The Subasich government agrees that King Peter will not be permitted to return to Yugoslavia until after a plebiscite.

Fourth. The Allies will support only Tito and not Mihailovich.

Fifth. The Subasich government will comprise two Serbs, two Croats, two Slovenes, and two representatives of Tito.

Sixth. All diplomatic and military personnel who have opposed Tito and the Communists are to be eliminated from the government and army.

Seventh. Tito is recognized as commander in chief of all Yugoslav combatants.

The men who now comprise the Tito-Subasich government include one man who personally signed the pre-war pact with Germany and three Communists. The signer of the pact that turned Yugoslavia over to Hitler is Dr. Juraj Sutej, who is now Subasich's minister of finance and commerce. Sutej and Subasich represent Croatia, which under Nazi nudging, declared war on the United States and which still remains at war with this country. Sutej, as minister of war in Prince Paul's cabinet, not only signed the pact with Hitler, but to avoid freezing of Yugoslav funds in America ordered approximately \$10,000,000 transferred from American banks to Brazil.

The new premier himself, Dr. Ivan Subasich, also supported the Yugoslav pact with Hitler. Last March his name appeared as honorary member of the pro-Tito Communist propaganda committee in this country headed by Louis Adamic. The Communists in the government include two representatives of Tito and Dr. Sava Kosanovich, who worked here in America for 3 years with Adamic on the propaganda promotion of Tito.

The pay-off of this creation of Churchiavellian power politics is that the new Yugoslav Government does not include a single representative of the intrepid patriots who rebelled against Regent Prince Paul's pact with Hitler and whose courageous coup d'état overthrew Prince Paul and replaced him with the youthful King Peter and under the military leadership of General Mihailovich rallied the Yugoslav people to continue the war against the Nazis.

On August 16 the Polish underground informed the Polish Government in London that the wife of General Mihailovich had died in a Nazi concentration camp at Oswiecim, Poland. Will the Communists find in this tragic news further proof that General Mihailovich is collaborating with the Germans?

Soviet Russia has not only taken steps to destroy the national unity of Yugoslavia, but she also has interfered with the domestic affairs of Greece, and attempts now to draw Bulgaria into the sphere of her strong influence. Russia is preparing the occupation of the territories in Germany not only assigned her by the Allies, but also of the remaining part of the country, through a skillfully prepared revolution with the help of the Moscow-born Committee for Liberation of Germany and through the close collaboration of this state after its annexation. Russia has encouraged the increase of the Communist movement in France and Italy and has acquired almost one-fourth of China and has created there a communistic army.

All these facts point to evidence that a clandestine pact made by Russia with Japan arrived at the division of China into two spheres of influence—Japanese and Russian. Soviet Russia is inciting pro-Soviet movements in Iran and India. It is clearly Russia's plan to set up a world-wide Soviet regime. Both Lenin and Stalin, together with other Soviet masters, have frequently said that the Soviet regime is in constant danger as long as it exists only in Russia. Russia

should not be an isolated island on the sea of capitalistic states, but should—still being a citadel of socialism—inoculate Soviet ideas in other populous communities, especially in Germany, China, and India. Despite all maneuvers and Stalin's statements, together with his camouflaged actions, a careful analysis of the present Soviet tactics shows that Stalin, lulling the opinions of western states, prepares to realize the above plan.

If, step by step, he attains his aim without opposition and with the help of the western states, the pattern of the future is clear. After the creation of such a bloc of states, the Soviets will next attempt to abolish democracy and Christian civilization in America and England, for these are enemies No. 1 of the country of the proletariat, as Stalin and Lenin often stated.

In this manner, the "great mission" which Stalin undertook with fanaticism and with political ingenuity will finally be achieved. As he put it:

The rotten world of capitalism and religious superstitions will cease to exist. A wonderful era of flourishing proletarian culture will follow, based on modern science and proletarian idealism.

May I, in the conclusion of my exposé remind you of the results of this so-called idealism? I want to emphasize that the following facts are not taken from Polish, but from exclusively Russian, Ukrainian, and partly Lithuanian sources.

During 20 years of Soviet regime in Russia, there were shot or perished from exhaustion in forced labor and concentration camps the following number of Soviet and non-Soviet citizens:

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| 1. The number of the liquidated Soviet opposition, Socialists, social-revolutionists, democrats | 3,000,000  |
| 2. The number of members of clergy and persons affiliated with the church                       | 1,000,000  |
| 3. The number of members of the liquidated peasant opposition (Kulaki)                          | 8,000,000  |
| 4. The number of members of the national Ukrainian opposition                                   | 10,000,000 |

Moreover, during this war, not including the murders committed on people like Alter and Erlich, who followed Marshal Tuchachewski, Radek, and Bucharin, millions of Polish citizens deported to Russia were killed in a cruel manner, together with many thousands of priests, leaders of intellectual and religious life of Polish as well as Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Ukrainian, and Jewish societies.

An investigation is not necessary to find who committed the Katyn crime. "A state without justice is only a band of outlaws and gangsters," said St. Augustine in the seventh century. Crime does not recognize pacts or keep promises. A criminal respects only strength. In my opinion the hopes for the success at Dumbarton Oaks are at least 15 centuries too late.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative

program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the special order granted to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### SOME FACTS ABOUT OLEO

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on page 7 of a publication called Legislation Which Renders It More Difficult to Secure Adequate Nutrition, by Dr. A. J. Carlson, star witness of the Oleo Institute and darling of the oleo promoters, is found the following statement:

The United States census of manufactures of 1939 reports a considerable decline in the output of margarine. This decline applied to all types of margarine whether made solely of vegetable oils or of mixtures of animal and vegetable oils and fats.

This shows that the people did not care for much oleo even at that time. Here is another statement:

As of January 1, 1943, however, by order of the War Production Board, margarine manufacturers where previously allowed to use only 110 percent of their average consumption of fats and oils in 1940 and 1941 were permitted to raise that figure to 180 percent.

This should clear up the question as to whether or not the unspeakable dairy lobby was holding down the production of oleo. Many loud-mouthed and loose-thinking oleo promoters were making that statement. The production and sale of oleo was being controlled by the amount of oil allocated by the W. P. B. and the amount of oleo the people wanted to buy.

There is another interesting paragraph on page 11:

Milk provides us with many different food items. In terms of food value fluid milk ranks highest and butter lowest as we shall show. \* \* \* Butter has a very close nutritional substitute that can be produced at considerably less cost.

Is it not a great statement to be made? Many scientists have shown that butterfat is a fat without a peer. However, what are these men going to do if they want to make use of only the skim milk? Would they in their attempt to promote oleo pour the cream down the sewer? Surely powdered skim has 35 percent of a splendid animal protein, but everyone knows except some blinded New Dealer who has instructions to follow the line, that skim milk has to be supplemented by other feeds in order to get the proper health and growth. One cannot follow that line of reasoning until someone develops a cow that gives only skim milk. How are you going to get the skim

milk? What are you going to do with the fat?

There is another statement on this same page:

The importance of milk depends upon the use to which it is put. Milk going into butter when the skim milk is not utilized for human consumption, is far less important in the human diet than is whole milk or milk products using all the milk solids.

An analysis of this statement is appropriate. First, that much butterfat is produced in the United States on farms remote from market, and where the whole milk could not be marketed. In many sections the road would not be passable for daily deliveries of milk; and in many sections there is not enough dairying being done to provide a local market for milk, while the cream can be shipped to market. If Dr. Carlson had ever raised any farm animals, pigs, calves, or chickens he would know that this skim milk is not wasted when it is fed to growing animals. If Dr. Carlson lived in some parts of northern Wisconsin he might find it rather difficult to deliver his whole milk each day, although he might be able to get his cream out to the road a couple of times a week in the middle of winter.

Here is another angle. When the whole milk is delivered to the factory, butter is manufactured from the butterfat. In the up-to-date plants the skim milk is made into powder. Where does this skim-milk powder go? Part of it for human consumption, and part of it goes into feed for livestock, such as dog feed, calf feed, chicken feed, and so on. If whole milk is delivered to a factory, the butterfat made into butter, and the skim milk is made into skim-milk powder as animal food for someone's animals to consume, why is this powdered skim milk thus made any more contribution to feeding the world than would the natural skim milk contribute to feeding the world if it was kept and fed on the farm where produced in the first place?

The total production of animal skim-milk powder in the United States is of large volume. The O. P. A. and W. F. A. combination has had rationing on the products such as cottage cheese made from skim milk, although at the same time the man with the price could buy all the cream he desired. Figure that one out if you can. The average New Dealer thinks that no one ever valued the skim milk as a food until they came into power, though this skim milk has been made into cottage cheese and other soft cheeses for centuries.

Dr. Carlson spent several minutes of his time before our Agriculture Committee with a long dissertation on his greatness. He testified he was being paid by the Oleo Institute for his testimony.

If the Oleo Institute is going to rest its case on Dr. Carlson's testimony, it appears they have lost their cause, first because he makes statements as facts that neither he nor anyone else knows to be facts; and second he makes statements that show that he has not much practical experience in dairying or in the problems involved in milk production.

The testimony given before the Senate Agriculture Committee in June 1944 by Dr. E. B. Hart, the leading nutritionist

in the world today, should be conclusive evidence that no one wants to be misled by any hired mouthpiece of the Oleo Institute. It is on page 169 in the hearings and is as follows:

In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition.

According to my standard dictionary, preposterous means "contrary to nature, reason, or common sense, strikingly or utterly absurd, foolish and ridiculous."

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include certain extracts from the inaugural address of President William Henry Harrison, delivered March 4, 1841.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial, and in the other a statement by John D. Jones, Jr., representing Hoard's Dairyman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an article setting forth the benefits available to discharged veterans of World War No. 2.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include two extracts from hearings before a committee in the other body relative to the shortcomings of oleo.

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

There was no objection.

#### EUROPEAN BATTLEFIELDS

Mr. SCRIVNER. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, nearly 200 Members of this body served during World War No. 1, and each and every one of us is thrilled as we read the rapidly changing headlines, in which we see such familiar names as Soissons, Chateau-Thierry, Belleau Wood, St. Mihiel, Verdun, the Meuse, and the Argonne—names which come back to us over a quarter of a century, recalling more youthful and active days.

These youngsters of ours are performing exploits which not only equal but surpass the feats of World War No. 1.

Many of these men are sons of members of the A. E. F., and they are now taking and passing through towns of which many years ago they heard their fathers tell. In an hour these young Americans, in their trucks and tanks, travel distances which took their fathers days and weeks to go on foot and with horse-drawn artillery.

Mr. Speaker, the victory which these young Americans are bringing us is the result not only of American production but especially of American brawn, brains, and bravery. This time the peace must not be soft and too sentimentally idealistic. We must have a realistic peace under which the Huns, led by another Hitler, cannot again try to bring upon the world the tragedy of world conquest.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans of the A. E. F. vintage of 1917-18 take off their hats to the hard-hitting youngsters of the new A. E. F.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Michigan.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### PROPOSAL TO ERECT A PERMANENT PEACE PALACE AT BELLE ISLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask has been called the hub of the arsenal of democracy. Mr. J. Lee Barrett, executive vice president of the Detroit Convention and Tourist Bureau, has sent to the common council and the Honorable Edward J. Jeffries, Jr., mayor of the city of Detroit, a proposal to erect on Belle Isle a \$1,000,000 shrine for a peace palace established as permanent headquarters for a new international league. Belle Isle is located in the Detroit River at the international boundary. It is fitting that the peace shrine should be established there where there is a record of 132 years of uninterrupted peace along 2,500 miles of the unfortified United States-Canadian boundary, setting an example to the world that peace can exist between adjacent nations.

Detroit offers an ideal location for peace headquarters because of its cosmopolitan citizenry and its position at the crossroads of the new hemispherical world created by the airplane.

The industrial genius of that city and the State of Michigan has been proclaimed to the world in the war effort. No finer tribute could be paid to Michigan, which ranks first in its contribution of industrial production to the war effort. The Allied armies are riding to victory in vehicles many parts of which came from Michigan. May the machinery for peace be produced here, too.

It is only proper that the invitation to the Allied Powers to recognize Detroit as a fitting place for the peace palace should receive the utmost favorable consideration.

#### BITUMINOUS COAL ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Congress should adjourn before taking action to reenact the bituminous coal legislation. We have been giving a great deal of thought and attention to legislation preparing the way for conversion of industry from wartime production to peacetime production, but none of this legislation will, in any way, bring relief to the coal industry. Why, I ask, should the coal industry be left out of the reconversion picture? All familiar with the coal industry know exactly what will happen if the war ends without the renewal of the coal legislation. The industry will be thrown into a chaotic condition, the operators will suffer irreparable loss, and misery and distress visited upon hundreds of thousands of honest, hard-working miners and their families. We cannot afford to let this happen.

A Democratic House cannot offer one single excuse as to why this legislation which, as you know, we wrongfully let expire, should not be reenacted. The legislation is the child of this administration as it was initiated by this administration in cooperation with the miners and a great majority of the operators. And in spite of the dire prophecies made at the time of its enactment, in spite of an adverse Supreme Court decision which caused the legislation to be redrafted and reenacted, it worked, and brought order and stability to the industry, untold benefits and blessing to the miners, and a dependable supply of coal to the public at fair and reasonable prices. It is, if we mean what we say, still the child of this administration. We again placed the stamp of approval upon the legislation in our 1944 platform. Since the adoption of the 1944 platform the President has again written a strong letter not only approving the legislation but urging its reenactment. Surely the leadership of the House will follow the Democratic platform and the President's recommendation made in keeping therewith.

Now just a word as to the legislation that has been introduced: The bill I introduced (and similar bills were introduced by other Members) was agreed upon by the miners and a great majority

of the operators, and follows closely the old act. Only two objections, so far as I know, have been advanced against present action. Instead of using the word objections I should say excuses, because that is exactly what they are, and they are being advanced for the purpose, I am afraid, of delaying and defeating the legislation. Let me take up these excuses:

First, we are told that long and lengthy hearings will have to be held. Now the fact is we have held, on more than one occasion, long and lengthy hearings, and the membership of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as the membership of the House, is perfectly familiar with the pros and cons of the legislation. If we held hearings from now until doomsday nothing new would be developed. All hearings have been printed, and if any Member desires to refresh his memory all he will have to do is to review the printed hearings.

In the second place, the excuse is made that there is a controversy as to whether the legislation should be administered by an administrator or by a commission. The bill I introduced which, as I have stated, has been agreed upon by the miners and a great majority of the operators, provides that the administration of the act shall be in the hands of a commission of five, one representative of the industry, one representative of the miners, and three representatives of the public. Surely this is just and fair. Surely the wishes of the industry and the miners, those who will be so vitally affected by the legislation, should in this respect be respected, especially when the public representatives will constitute the majority of the Commission. The miners and industry, more than any other groups, are vitally interested in seeing the act work, in seeing that the act is administered in the right way, and they should be represented in the administrative set-up. Until the old act was by Executive order transferred to the Interior Department and placed under an administrator, it was administered by a Commission, and be it said to the credit of the Commission, in spite of all the criticism, that it did a splendid job. At the time of the transfer the Commission had done all the spade work which required months and months of tedious, painstaking, and exacting work, and all the administrator had to do was to put into effect the labors of the Commission.

If we save the miners and the industry the time to act is now. Delay, I am afraid, will be fatal.

#### MEXICO

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most concrete examples of the working of the good-neighbor policy between the United States and the Latin-American nations to the south is the way in which our neighbor, Mexico, has been

helping us to meet the acute manpower shortage among our agricultural workers. When the necessity arose for expanding our Army and Navy to hitherto unheard-of numbers, our farms and ranches, especially in the West, were extremely hard hit. Crops were in imminent danger of spoiling because there was no one to harvest them.

Into this situation stepped the Farm Security Administration, and worked out a program with the Mexican Government by which many thousands of Mexican nationals could be temporarily imported into this country to work in the fruit and vegetable crops. The Department of Agriculture today has informed me that as of August 16 there were more than 65,000 such Mexican nationals working in the United States. In my own State of California alone, 30,537 laborers were recruited this year. Even more are needed, and the Department hopes to obtain a minimum of 8,500 more workers this month.

When one considers the mutual suspicion that frequently has existed between the two countries, we must all admit that this has been not only a remarkable achievement, one that has contributed materially to the war effort, but also a most clearcut demonstration of friendly cooperation on the part of our nearest southern neighbor. I pay tribute today, not only to the Mexican nationals who have helped us so much here on the home front, but to the Mexican Government itself for its help, its friendship, and its unselfishness in this matter. I feel certain that it is only one of many indications of increasing cooperation between our two countries.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a telegram in regard to the operation of the W. P. B. order on the lumber industry, the other extension being in regard to the Table Mountain Dam in California.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. DEWEY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today an amendment to the law which set up the so-called Export-Import Bank of Washington. I think it is thoroughly agreed by all economists and all thoughtful people in the House and throughout the country that in order to give full employment we must have our industry and our agriculture producing at high levels. This will naturally develop surpluses. We have at the present time no national financial machinery by which those surpluses may be financed outside of the territorial United States.

This amendment increases the powers of the Export-Import Bank so that it

may aid in the disposal of surpluses, to the end that they may not hang over our domestic market and thereby eliminate jobs and decrease employment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of benefits to service men and women, veterans, and their dependents.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement made before a committee in the other body by Fred Brenkman of the National Grange.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests, one to extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial, and the other to extend my own remarks and to include therein a statement given by Dr. Harrison A. Ruehe before a committee in the other body.

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

There was no objection.

#### WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARRIER. Mr. Speaker, this House has considered at some length and has passed legislation known as the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. The Senate has passed the so-called George bill carrying somewhat different provisions. The two bills are now in conference, and the final legislation will probably be something in the nature of a compromise.

There has been much criticism by various groups because of the conservativeness of the unemployment compensation benefits provided in this legislation. Personally, while I am in favor of legislation to tide the workingman over the transition period, I do not believe unemployment-compensation benefits should be made so attractive as to put a premium on idleness, or as would cause workers to abandon all thrift.

The purpose of reconversion legislation is to enable this country to transfer from a war economy to a peace economy with the least possible shock and hardship to our business and individual life.

Now that we have provided for reasonable unemployment-compensation benefits, I believe this Congress should im-

mediately pass legislation which will shorten that transition period from war to peacetime economy by creating constructive employment which will give due return to the debt-ridden taxpayers of America.

I am in favor of immediate passage of H. R. 4915, the Post-War Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, in order that construction may get under way at the earliest possible date. This bill recently reported by the House Committee on Roads authorizes an appropriation of \$1,500,000,000, to become available at the rate of \$500,000,000 a year for 3 successive post-war fiscal years. The respective State highway departments must be advised of the funds to be made available and other details before they can proceed with preliminary plans. There is no time to lose in passing this legislation.

In my State of Kentucky the legislature has inaugurated a plan for the construction of five new tuberculosis hospitals in the State. Public Law 410 of this Congress provides authorization for appropriations up to \$10,000,000 annually, beginning July 1, 1945, for aid to the States for the control of tuberculosis. Much time will be lost, many lives will be snuffed out by this dreaded disease which might be saved, and many man-hours of employment will be lost between now and July 1, 1945. This money should be made available at the earliest possible date.

Another piece of legislation, H. R. 2849, known as the Educational Finance Act of 1943, would assist not only during the reconversion period but benefit the future America. This bill authorizes an appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools. This bill has been peacefully resting in the House Committee on Education since June 2, 1943, with no action taken on it. Discharge petition No. 12 is now on the Speaker's desk to bring it before the House. It is my contention this legislation, if enacted, would give added employment to many teachers who are now engaged in war production. It is also my contention that no child should be penalized or denied elementary or secondary school advantages because of the locality in which he is born. Under the present system, there is no equality in the educational advantages available to children. This should not be permitted in a country boasting of equal privileges for all.

Statistics recently published indicate that attendance in American high schools dropped 1,000,000 during the last 3 years. This is accounted for by an increase of approximately the same number of boys and girls of 14 to 17 who are employed in industry either full or part time. I maintain better schools, including vocational training, which Federal aid would make possible, would encourage these youngsters to go back to school and thus indirectly aid employment.

The educational provisions in the G. I. bill of rights is a step in this direction and will aid the employment situation.

Another means of unemployment relief, much more constructive, to my mind, than paying large sums to young people to remain in idleness, is to make possible more adequate annuities for the aged.

I am also in favor of expansion of rural electrification. Such a program has great possibilities as a creator of employment.

Summing up the problem of reconversion, the surrender of Germany will not put an end to all war production; neither will it mean immediate demobilization of all the armed forces. The whole country has been forced, and has graciously conceded, to get along without many of the conveniences to which it has been accustomed. Farmers have had to get along without proper machinery and equipment, peacetime industry is anxious to expand, and there is scarcely a home in America that is not waiting for repairs, furniture, and so forth, which only labor can supply.

The people have been urged to buy bonds, and have bought bonds, which will afford them a source of ready money to be converted into durable civilian goods the moment materials and labor can be released and goods manufactured. Many people are now working for patriotic reasons and will retire upon cessation of hostilities. Many wives and mothers are looking forward to the day when the call of their homes may be heeded, rather than the call of their country to work in war plants.

In my opinion, good Americans who believe the people should support the Government, rather than the Government support the people, will favor a program of reconversion such as here outlined. They believe the taxpayers' money should be spent for constructive enterprises, such as better roads, better schools, better health, better homes, and for better care of the aged, thereby making a better America.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress will take immediate steps to enact such legislation without delay.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the West Side Messenger of Indianapolis.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a number of editorials from Tennessee papers, lamenting the passing of former Senator George W. Norris.

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

There was no objection.

#### THE LATE SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS

Mr. KEFAUVER. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.



Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation laments the passing of former Senator George W. Norris. The people of the Tennessee Valley, for whom he did so much, are especially grieved. Senator Norris will be remembered as one of the great men of the United States Congress. He will always be remembered by the people of the Tennessee Valley for the contribution he made to our welfare and for his unselfish friendship. His long and untiring fight for the success of T. V. A. stands out as an example of his national vision and of his stature as a truly great statesman. It is appropriate that the great Norris Dam and the city of Norris should serve to keep alive for future generations the name of the man who was so largely instrumental in setting up this project which is one of the Nation's great assets.

Last January, after Senator Norris' retirement from the Senate, a scroll expressing the appreciation of the people of the Tennessee Valley was presented to him. The scroll was signed by the officers of every municipal power board, electric cooperative, and R. E. A. group in the valley. On his passing the sentiment contained in this scroll is re-expressed in perpetuity.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

#### ARMY-NAVY GAME

Mr. WEISS. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

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

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances, and in one to include a communication from a serviceman and in the other a part of a column by Bill Cunningham, of Boston.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Rowe] on September 3 at Akron, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may have permission to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today for 15 minutes after the conclusion of the regular business of the day and any other special orders previously made.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an article on millionaire radicals.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a letter from Mr. W. Seger, of Indianapolis, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

#### SURVEY OF CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith an editorial from the South Bend Tribune.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate recently passed a resolution of far greater importance than the attention given it would indicate. It provides for a joint Senate-House survey of congressional legislative procedures and could result in vast savings to the taxpayers.

It is impossible for the Members of Congress themselves to go into each department and section of each bureau to determine for themselves the exact needs of that particular agency, and it is obvious that ambitious bureaucrats are not

going to advise congressional committees to lop large sums off their department's budgets. Department heads testify at committee hearings as to their money needs, the President has his Budget Bureau to pass on requests for funds, so why should not Congress have its experts to do the necessary investigation of departments' needs? Such committee experts, responsible only to Congress, could save the taxpayers many, many times the amount of their salaries.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the South Bend Tribune of September 1, 1944]

#### FOR MODERNIZATION

Without pleasing the radicals who advocate changes that would impair the constitutional checks-and-balances system Congress can consider modernization of its organization and procedures with greater efficiency as the goal. A certain amount of modernization could disarm the radicals. Some phases of the internal organization of Congress and some of its procedures are tending to justify much of the criticism of that legislative body.

Senate approval, therefore, of a resolution proposing establishment of an inter-House committee of 12 to make "a complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States" obviously is a step in the right direction. Such a study should be conducted by representatives of both Houses. Whether or not a joint committee is necessary at the outset is an authentic question but not necessarily a vital one. If the House of Representatives should consider independent preliminary action to that end an insuperable obstacle apparently would not be raised.

Although the need of some modernization is reasonably plain, hasty action should not and probably will not be demanded by the public. Whatever is done eventually should reflect the best judgment not only of Members of both Houses of Congress but of private authorities on legislative procedure who are sensitive to the vital importance of the legislative branch and respectful of the Constitution and the checks-and-balances system in general. Steady, orderly progress toward modernization would be vastly preferable to fast action that might lead to development of legislative conditions worse, at least from the public-welfare viewpoint, than those abated or eliminated.

As one House passes the resolution for an official study and it goes to the other House the indicated trend does not appear dangerous. One of the most discussed modernization projects is consolidation of some congressional committees. Much duplication serving no constructive purpose is involved in the present method of each House having its own committees to prepare bills for presentation to the full Houses. Loss of time, increased expense to the taxpayers and sometimes confusion are products of this system.

Feeling is also spreading that staffs of experts be formally created for the purpose of helping congressional committees and perhaps even individual Members of the two Houses. Too often it seems that all committee members are not thoroughly familiar with legislative projects they help submit to the full Houses. Too often also some Senators and Representatives lack complete understanding of bills for which they vote in the final tests in the Houses. As matters stand, experts must be "borrowed" from bureaucratic agencies in Washington. A permanent staff of experts mandated to do nothing but help the Members of Congress to shape and to understand legislation might be beneficial not only to the legislators but to the Nation.

## SHUT-IN'S DAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, we who are privileged to pursue our daily tasks in the hustle and bustle of this great country are not always conscious of our greatest blessing, that of good health. And yet there is scarcely one among us who does not know some person who is spending his life in some hospital or who may be confined to his home for an indeterminate period. Those of us who have sought out these people have found them invariably cheerful and courageous to a degree beyond our own understanding. Many of them are fighting battles of their own which try men's souls and there is reason to believe that this number will be increased daily as the result of the present struggle in which America is engaged.

From time to time, there have been proclamations by various States in the Union to set aside a given day for special attention to these shut-ins. It would seem to me altogether fitting to make this a day of national observance—designating the first Sunday of June of each year for the purpose of encouraging the public to remember those sick and disabled persons, war veterans and civilians alike, who are confined to their homes, in hospitals, sanatoria, or other institutions. I am introducing a resolution to that end.

As an outstanding example of what these shut-ins are doing, I would like to mention Mr. Charles Reid-Burke, an arthritic patient in one of our Washington hospitals. Although completely paralyzed this man conducts a mail-order business from his hospital bed as a means of rehabilitating himself. His spirit remains undaunted; his faith is an inspiration to many who call upon him. These shut-ins, and the term implies those who have been that way since birth as well as others who have had illnesses that have laid them low, need to know that they are remembered and that their lives are dear to us all.

The United States of America Chapter of the Shut-In's Day Association "International," an organization composed of shut-ins throughout the country, is sponsoring the designation of the first Sunday of June as Shut-In's Day. Mr. Burke is the District of Columbia representative.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial paying tribute to Senator Norris.

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

There was no objection.

## SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sadness that I learned of the passing of my distinguished friend and co-worker in the cause of public power, former Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska.

As you all know, I was the coauthor with him of the bill that finally became a law creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has wrought the greatest development of its kind the world has ever known. It has set an example for the entire Nation to follow, if our people are to enjoy the full benefits of this electric age.

He was a leader in the fight for rural electrification which has done so much for the farmers of the Nation. He regarded the power business as a public business, and electricity as the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. He felt that it was a necessity of our modern life which must be handled by a monopoly, since it would be too expensive for several different concerns to furnish electricity to one community. Besides he pointed out that water power of the Nation already belongs to the Federal Government, which gives it an additional public interest.

Today the American people are enjoying the benefits of the struggle which Senator Norris led, for reduced light and power rates, while millions of farmers throughout the Nation have their homes lighted as a result of those efforts.

Then, too, the T. V. A. and other public power projects are producing the war materials that are bringing us victory in this titanic struggle.

This year the people of this country will use more than 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. In 1921 they used only 49,000,000,000, or about one-fifth of the amount they are using today.

There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy going to waste every year in our navigable streams and their tributaries which should be developed, and must be developed, for the use of the people as a whole.

Just think what that would mean to our children, the future inhabitants of an electrified America.

We have learned recently that more than 10 percent of the earth's crust is aluminum, and we are going to use this power to develop it.

We are told that there is enough aluminum within 10 feet of the earth's surface to cover the ground a foot deep, or more in volume than all the iron, all the copper, and all the wood in the world. With the aid of electric power, we are bringing in the aluminum age. In the years to come you will see furniture, automobile bodies, streetcars, railroad cars, boats, barges, and building materials made of aluminum.

These are some of the things that are coming to pass in the new age that lies before us, largely as a result of our public power program, which was led by that great humanitarian, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

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

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a news item from this morning's New York Times with reference to the economic situation in Italy.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may address the House for 45 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

## A POST-WAR TAX PROGRAM

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to predicate what I have to say upon the challenging statement, "Our future economic, social, and political life will be determined quite largely by the tax policies and program we adopt for the post-war era." Conceding the truth of this statement then the following facts and opinions should be of interest to the Members of Congress and to the country as a whole. I offer them for the careful consideration of my colleagues, in the hope that they may shed some light upon a most difficult problem that Congress must face and solve. Upon the proper solution of the problem of post-war taxes rests the future of this Nation.

## THE PRESENT TAX SITUATION

Mr. Speaker, during the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, Uncle Sam will spend \$105,000,000,000 and receive in taxes \$45,000,000,000, going \$60,000,000,000 deeper in debt. This means that at the end of this fiscal year we will owe \$250,000,000,000, and if the war lasts until June 30, 1946—and everything seems to point that way—we will have a national debt of \$300,000,000,000, twice as much as even the most optimistic economist 3 years ago—yes, even Roosevelt himself—thought we could ever safely

assume. That means we will face a serious financial condition, not a theory, and something must be done about it.

Studying the Treasury Reports issued following the last war by two great men, CARTER GLASS and Andrew Mellon, we learn that they cut the Nation's war-time tax load in half within a short period after the close of that war, and at the same time they reduced the Nation's war debt at the rate of \$1,000,000,000 per year, a remarkable achievement, really a financial miracle.

#### THEN AND NOW

Our total war debt then was \$26,000,000,000. Our total war debt this time will be anywhere from two hundred and sixty to three hundred billion dollars. Our peak war tax load then was five and one-half billion dollars. Our peak war tax load this year will be \$45,000,000,000. But while the figures are much higher today than they were then, the problem is much the same, and it can be solved in much the same way.

Mr. Speaker, many economists claim that when taxes total 25 percent of the national income they have reached the point of diminishing returns. Today we are taking \$45,000,000,000 in Federal taxes out of a national income estimated at \$150,000,000,000. This means our Federal taxes alone amount to 30 percent of our national income. When added to State and local taxes, the total tax burden amounts to nearly 40 percent of the national income. Perhaps this tax load is a wartime necessity, but it certainly is not a peacetime possibility. Figuring on a national income of \$130,000,000,000 in the post-war period—and that is an optimistic figure—Federal taxes cannot and should not exceed \$24,000,000,000—a little more than one-sixth of the national income. That is a safe estimate of what the maximum Federal tax load should be. It allows a margin for State and local taxes during the post-war era before the total tax load will exceed 25 percent of the national income. Now the question arises, Can the Federal Government get along on \$24,000,000,000 a year in the post-war period? Budgeting a \$24,000,000,000 income for Uncle Sam will mean, roughly:

(a) A \$6,000,000,000 yearly service charge on the public debt—three hundred billion at 2 percent.

(b) Six billion dollars applied yearly on the national debt, which means a 50-year period for liquidation.

(c) Twelve billion dollars for the total operating expenditures of the Government, and that must include a greatly expanded Army and Navy upkeep.

Briefly, that is the picture of the post-war tax situation, and a conservative national budget to fit into that picture.

#### THE NEW DEAL THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TAXATION

Mr. Speaker, Bernard Baruch, in his report on war and post-war adjustment policies, brings a strong indictment against the New Deal tax policies of the past decade. Analyzed and summarized the Baruch reports says in substance:

First. The New Deal tax policies are designed to prevent business concerns from growing and expanding, and new businesses from being created.

Second. Taxes have been levied for three distinct purposes:

(a) To collect necessary revenue for the Government.

(b) To redistribute wealth—a socialistic program.

(c) To penalize success—another socialistic idea, the slow-down principle applied to management.

Third. Baruch also says that at current tax rates neither individuals nor corporations can hope to start new enterprises, because they cannot repay borrowings out of earnings after taxes have been deducted. He says if we want to preserve private enterprise we must make it possible for a man to repay what he borrows within a reasonable time.

Mr. Speaker, the Baruch report is both refreshing and encouraging to one who has had to listen to Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury; to Randolph Paul, General Counsel for the Treasury Department; and to Marriner Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board—all three of whom have been clamoring for higher, higher, and ever higher Federal taxes on business, and also business earnings when paid to stockholders in the shape of dividends. The New Deal tax policies initiated by these three men have dried up the sources of risk capital and prevented industrial expansion. Their tax policy has been part and parcel of the scarcity program that has been the basis of the New Deal economy. In contrast Baruch claims:

Lower tax rates, which stimulate a high volume of business and a high national income, will yield greater total tax receipts and more jobs than will high rates, which depress business volume, employment, and income.

Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, says:

Present taxes are too high for American enterprise to function. We won't have to vote socialism; we will get it by default if the Government becomes the only source of new capital for business.

The same thought was expressed many years ago when Chief Justice John Marshall said:

The power to tax is the power to destroy.

The effect of the New Deal tax program has been to destroy private enterprise by taxation. The Baruch report certifies to this fact. Now, what should our post-war tax program be?

#### GENERAL SUGGESTIONS

First. Cut the tax burden in half.

Second. Adopt a national economy budget.

Third. See that the tax burden is spread equitably and in such a way that it will stimulate business expansion and thereby create jobs.

#### SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

First. Repeal the excess-profits tax.

Second. Revise both corporate and individual tax rates downward, and eliminate all surtaxes.

Third. Levy a single transfer tax to cover both estate and gift taxes, at reasonable rates.

Fourth. Keep excise taxes on luxuries, such as tobacco and liquor, high; and adopt a moderate Federal sales tax.

That is the post-war tax picture as I see it. It should be drafted into the

form of a tax bill and be dropped into the legislative hopper the first day of the next session of Congress.

#### A CEILING UPON FEDERAL TAXATION

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the subject of a post-war tax program we should give some thought to placing a ceiling upon Federal taxation. A resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to place a limit of 25 percent upon Federal taxes has been before the Congress for 5 years, but no action has been taken upon it. Today, 17 States—Wyoming, Rhode Island, Mississippi, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Indiana, Arkansas, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Texas, Illinois, Wisconsin, Alabama, Kentucky, New Jersey—are proceeding to force action by petitioning Congress through their legislatures, as provided in the Constitution itself. The amendment proposed would repeal the present sixteenth amendment—income tax—and substitute for it an amendment containing the 25 percent limitation. At present the sky is the limit on rates the Federal Government may levy, and the sky in Federal taxation has about been reached.

The first Federal income tax—1913—had rates that ran from 1 to 6 percent; today the rates run from 19 to 95 percent. Taxpayers this year in the highest brackets actually are required to pay more than 100 percent of their incomes. A limitation upon the power of the Federal Government to tax during peacetime should be adopted, and a 25-percent ceiling is high enough.

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

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman mentioned a moderate sales tax as a part of a post-war tax program. What does the gentleman mean by "a moderate sales tax"?

Mr. MASON. I would say a 5-percent general sales tax collected at the source. Call it a manufacturer's tax, if you want to. But that would be what I would term not only a moderate sales tax but also a practical and feasible one.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman stated "collected at the source," because 15 years ago I agitated the same thing, what is known as a general manufacturer's excise tax, collected at the source, rather than when the buyer goes into the retail store, with all the annoyance that is connected with such a tax.

Mr. MASON. The difficulty of going into a store and collecting a retail tax is that about 27 of our States have State retail taxes, and it would be on top of that. If this tax were collected at the source, it would be much more effectively and much more cheaply handled, and it could be better administered.

Mr. McCORMACK. The individual State would have difficulty in collecting a State tax at the source where the Federal Government would not, because a State collecting the tax at the source would penalize its own industry more in connection with adjoining States and competition, whereas when the Federal Government applies the tax at the source

it applies to all manufacturers throughout the country. As the gentleman knows, my inquiry is most friendly, and is for the purpose of trying to have the record show more pointedly just what the gentleman meant by a moderate sales tax. There are two types of taxes of this character—one collected at the source, commonly and properly referred to as a general manufacturer's excise tax, and then there is the sales tax on the consumer. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman as to the advisability of a manufacturer's excise tax. I advocated it years ago; in fact, we got such a tax placed in one tax bill, but on the floor of the House it was stricken out. I agree that the tax should be imposed at the source rather than on the consumer's end, and I think 5 percent would bring in a very substantial amount. Would the gentleman consider any exemptions to such a tax?

Mr. MASON. I would not.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is meeting the question directly and squarely, and I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. As a student of taxation, may I say that the Federal taxing powers have overlapped and duplicated some of the State taxing powers. There are certain taxes that are much better collected by the Federal Government and others which the State government should preempt.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice the gentleman referred to a redistribution of wealth. Not for the purpose of controversy, may I say that I am sure the gentleman's charge of socialism in that connection would not apply to a redistribution of income.

Mr. MASON. It would not.

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

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement, and I want to thank him for it. I would like to know just what the gentleman would include in the words "general sales tax," and whether or not he would include, in addition to manufacturers, the jobber and wholesaler and everyone above the retailer?

Mr. MASON. If a general sales tax or a manufacturers' tax were collected at the source where the article is produced that would be the end of it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would be then a manufacturers' tax?

Mr. MASON. It would be then a part of the cost of production.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would not include a tax on any other business, as in the financial fields?

Mr. MASON. It would not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And would not include a tax on any other business, as in the financial fields, on stocks and bonds, or anything?

Mr. MASON. It would not.

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

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman will recall James M. Beck, who was a great student of government. I want to record him here today. He used to offer many

splendid speeches here on various amendments to the Constitution of the United States. I asked him one day if he would not agree with me that the sixteenth amendment had caused more bedevilment to our country and to our Government than any other amendment. He said he would think it over. He came to me a few days afterward and said, "I fully agree with you, the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution is an amendment wherein a few States support the Government. They have learned how to make those few States support the Government."

Mr. MASON. I agree with the gentleman. That is the reason that I advocate changing the sixteenth amendment to place a limit upon the power given in that amendment.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want that grand old man, whom I quoted, to go on record; he would vote with the gentleman to repeal this sixteenth amendment.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after other special orders heretofore entered, I may have permission to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### NEGLECTED MEN IN SOUTHWEST PACIFIC—WAR DEPARTMENT FAILS TO KEEP PROMISE—NO FURLONGHS AFTER 2 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is my duty again to address this House on the subject of furloughs for the men who have been in the southwest Pacific theater of operations for more than 2 years. Last October the War Department announced that a method of giving furloughs to these men had been established. This was great news for the people at home, but still greater news for those boys over there who have been living, fighting, yea, dying, in a "green hell." Almost 1 year later, Mr. Speaker, it is also my duty to report that the War Department has failed to keep its promise to these men, many of whom have served more than 2 years. After all these months but very, very few of them have been furloughed, and I am advised by men and officers over there that unless the program is accelerated considerably a great majority will not get home until after the war, no matter how long it may take. Mr. Speaker, there is a limit to physical endurance. These men expect and demand that Congress by law fix and establish a policy of furlough rotation for troops which

serve in areas far from home and in jungle country. The War Department has failed them; they cannot speak for themselves; we are their spokesmen.

Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I introduced House Resolution 632, which makes a request for a full and complete investigation into this matter. This is a vital subject and goes to the very heart of a highly important intangible we call morale.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. As a member on the Subcommittee on Civil Aviation of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, my committee and I have just returned from Alaska. While we were in Alaska we had occasion, of course, to talk with troops in various parts of that great Territory and to ask them what they thought about the troop rotation plan versus the furlough idea. Almost every one of them said that the troop rotation plan was not working out at all, because, if they put in for rotation, it might be 2 or 3 years before their number would come up, and consequently they were forced to choose the furlough, which meant returning to the United States and then back to Alaska. Many of those men in Alaska have been there more than 30 months, away from their homes and families. Some of them have been there since before we were actually attacked at Pearl Harbor. There are units of certain National Guard organizations that were there at that time. I desire to compliment the gentleman upon introducing his resolution, although it seems to me the War Department could take care of this by a sound rotation plan by units and not by individuals. I hope that attention is paid to the gentleman's resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not hear the gentleman's resolution, but I heard the remarks just made by the gentleman from California. I think his suggestion of a rotation by units is a good one and hope it may be used. I want to say that I have had numerous letters from Arizona concerning men in the South Pacific who have been there more than 30 months. They complain that the rotation system by individuals now in use is too slow to get them back within the United States in the next several years at the rate it is being applied. They also point out that a stay of 3 weeks or 21 days in the States for those on furlough is inadequate. I think the gentleman is doing well to call attention to this deplorable situation in that area because certainly there is a limit to human endurance. Let us urge a better plan if we can possibly give them relief. I have taken this matter up with Judge Patterson.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I believe with the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] that this is a matter that could be handled by the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman care to yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. At one point we found a military outpost in which there are 19 human beings living within a radius of 100 miles of that spot. Some of those boys have been there for a great many months longer than they should have been. About that time we find that the number of knotholes on the side of a wall becomes a very important question, and one over which personal animosities can arise concerning the count. That sort of thing persists in these isolated outposts. It seems to me that attention should be paid to those conditions here, otherwise we are going to have a lot of psycho cases that we need not have.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. As a matter of fact, those psycho cases are already coming back in great numbers, I understand.

Mr. HINSHAW. They are coming from the Aleutians, from the interior of Alaska, and also from the Yukon territory.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The War Department says that we have no ships and no replacements which are necessary before those men can be relieved. This, I doubt, but if this resolution is adopted we can get the whole story. I am told that 75 percent of our ships return empty, and there always seems to be ample space for thousands of returning war brides.

Our men out on the fighting fronts and their families find it difficult to reconcile these facts and they now demand action. A soldier out there wrote me recently: "You can bet that we shall have long memories, and when we return we intend to have these injustices righted. We will not forget." There is bitterness, disappointment, and disillusionment in that young man's heart. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will have to answer the wrath of those serving out there unless we ascertain all of the facts in this situation. I urge that the Military Affairs Committee will give House Resolution 632 immediate consideration and I shall appreciate the support of other Members in this request. These men are entitled to fair treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point in the Record, and as part of my remarks a series of letters from the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; Gen. Douglas MacArthur; and letters from soldiers and constituents all of which relate to this furlough matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Priest). Without objection, the letters will be included.

There was no objection.

The letters referred to are as follows:

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS  
SOUTHWEST PACIFIC AREA,  
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF,  
May 23, 1944.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Your letter of May 13, 1944, has been received. I am as solicitous as possible of the welfare of the officers and enlisted men in this command and have done everything in my power to effect a reasonable rotation to the United States and to give recuperational leave, but I am limited by War Department policies which are dictated by the lack of shipping in

the Pacific Ocean. The selection of individuals to be relieved from the theater or to be granted leave, within the limitation of available facilities, is in the hands of local commanding officers who have an intimate knowledge of the merits of individual cases. I shall continue to do everything possible but because of the shortage of shipping in the Pacific there is no adequate solution to the problem. The return to the United States without replacement of all men who have served a specified length of time would, of course, halt our offensive against Japan and might indefinitely prolong the war.

I have sent a copy of your letter and of my reply to the Commanding Officer of the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Medical Regiment for his consideration. Our reports indicate that the general service of this unit has been excellent and that its morale and spirits are high.

Very truly yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D. C., May 27, 1944.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I have your letter of May 23 and enclosure in further regard to the rotation of troops from the South and Southwest Pacific areas.

Permit me to reinstate your attention to the following statement in my letter of November 2 to you: " \* \* \* you have my firm assurance that the War Department will do everything physically and militarily practicable to alleviate the rigorosity of our soldiers' service overseas." I made this statement in all sincerity and assure you that the War Department will return as many of these men as possible under the circumstances.

In this connection I was pleased to note the observation in your speech of May 17 that, "We are all cognizant of the difficulties involved in this situation; no one has a desire to interfere with those charged with the responsibility for a successful prosecution of this war. If the retention of men in that area is the difference between success or failure of that campaign, then by all means the men must be retained there." This statement is the crux of the matter. Military limitations alone, not our disinterest, have prevented a more liberalized rotation policy.

We are keeping in intimate touch with the morale of the men in the Southwest Pacific areas. Of course, you realize that General MacArthur also is most vitally concerned. This is one of the most important aspects of his command responsibility. Neither he nor the War Department will permit the morale of the troops in this area to deteriorate to such an extent that either the war's prosecution or the ultimate welfare of the men themselves will be adversely affected.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Now, Mr. Speaker, in support of the statements I have made, I wish to submit excerpts of letters that I have received from men in the Southwest Pacific:

NEW GUINEA, April 30, 1944.

DEAR MR. SMITH: To you, the following topic may be of little interest, although I hope not, for to us it is of vital importance. I look to you as an unknown friend who might be of some aid in getting us a little consideration on this "getting home" subject.

As you know our outfit is going into its twenty-seventh month overseas. Not a man as yet has left. For the months of June, July, and August our company has been allotted two places as its quota to go home. At this rate, for example, I who am on the last list to go, stand a good chance of spending another 2 years here. Here may I add that along with 50 others I was sent overseas

with this regiment after only 5 weeks of training in the States, so that practically all of my time in the service has been overseas.

Now it seems that if the American boy does his duty as he is called upon to do it, the least the Government should also do, is its duty to that one; in regard to sending him home after his allotted time determined by the "rotation policy." It appears that they are holding to this policy legally by a mere shred.

The touring Senators and newsmen will give ample evidence that the most important question on the men's minds was, "When are we getting home?" And, how jubilant they were when promised a trip home after a specified time—in this area that time being 2 years, compared with 18 months in all other areas. Yet the world-wide fighting Aussie will tell you that this climate, terrain, and living conditions are the hardest a soldier will endure anywhere. Who arrived at this decision (2 years time) certainly used unexplained logic.

Is it being unpatriotic to expect to get home (only for a short period) after years (as promised) or 2½ years in this tropical climate? Most certainly, entertainers, movie stars, and recreational activities will not supplant the yearning for home and loved ones.

Also, one must take into consideration that this area is like none other; in that we might be termed virtually isolated, since there are no towns or cities of any kind about, no diversion, not even a civilian or life as we know it back in the States anywhere—so that the utter monotony is a hardship, too.

It is not to be supposed that the soldier, upon returning home, expects to then remain there for the duration. At any time after his short leave is up, the soldier is subject to go wherever they may deem it necessary to send him. Who can say that he wouldn't? Can one be called unpatriotic considering the foregoing?

Recently, upon touring one of the camps here, an inspector general, upon being questioned about leaves home, by some of our men, replied that: "The rotation policy did not guarantee all of us getting home—even for a leave—that some of us would remain for the duration." Is this what was intended to be believed by the parents and loved ones, and soldiers when the news was released concerning this rotation policy? Certainly not. Who can be responsible for such an interpretation? We, who have been living in a world of hope since that policy was announced, find that little faith can be put in the Government's word.

About a year ago a notice from General MacArthur's headquarters stated that upon the relief of the then shortage of shipping, we would be gradually relieved. Now that the Mediterranean Sea is ours, Kaiser continues to break ship-building records, and the combined fleets of the Allies is admittedly all out of proportion to their enemies—plus issued statements of our surplus of shipping, it would seem that his (General MacArthur's) point has been cleared up.

Another reason why we aren't being relieved, we are told, is because the replacements are not as yet qualified to substitute for us. An obvious contradiction of fact—for in my own case if after 5 weeks of Army training, over 2 years ago, I was considered overseas material, certainly these men who have been in the Army a year and more, are more fit than I was at that time.

I only hope and pray that some definite policy will be adopted, whereby we may have some hope of getting home soon—if only for a short time.

Many thanks to you, Representative SMITH, for giving ear to a downhearted and homesick soldier.

May God bless you and yours, I remain,  
Sincerely,

NEW GUINEA, May 6, 1944.

HI FOLKS: Things over here are in the same sad plight that they have been. It makes me sick to think about it so will just drop the subject. One of these days I will blow off again and reexplain the whole situation to you. I hate to get into these moods though, because I can feel the effects of them for 2 days later. I suppose my letters for the past few weeks have been disheartening but there is no use trying to hide the truth as we shall never get anything done that way. Even the Aussies know this place is no good for any man for when their men have been here for 15 months they are required to send them back for a 6-month break.

Mr. Speaker, more soldier letters could be produced but the letters above are sufficient evidence of the state of mind that these men are in. And this attitude is reflected on the home front, too, and I submit herewith a few letters from the folks back home.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, May 24, 1944.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to extend my heartfelt appreciation of the remarks which you made in Congress and which appear in the RECORD of May 17, 1944, with reference to the conditions which exist in the Southwest Pacific area.

Within the past few days the death of my son in New Guinea has been reported to me by the War Department. While details are lacking, I am satisfied that his death was directly due to the diet or lack of diet, the climate, and the failure of our Government to permit the rotation of troops in this area after service of not less than 12 months.

It is bad enough to have to lose men in battle. That is unavoidable in time of war. But to permit the loss of lives, health, and sanity to thousands of our young men because of inefficiency, bungling, and neglect in the administration of our armed forces is inexcusable and deserving of the most severe condemnation. So long as the War Department has shown its utter inability to cope with this situation, it certainly is incumbent upon Congress to exert its power to remedy the situation forthwith so that other boys might not suffer the same fate that my son did.

Very truly yours,

EUGLID, OHIO, May 25, 1944.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed letter (to President Roosevelt) explains itself. You may use it in any shape, manner, or form if it will help my dear son's beloved remaining buddies of the Thirty-second Division, mostly from the State of Wisconsin.

I am sending it to you as a salute and tribute for the many times you have carried the torch for the lads trapped like rats in the Southwest Pacific. As a daily reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I well know what you tried to do and what others failed to do.

I did the same thing in a humbler capacity, but it fell on deaf ears, as people are living on the let-George-do-it theory for years now, so why bother. God bless you.

Sincerely,

MILWAUKEE, WIS., May 25, 1944.

Hon. Representative SMITH:

In respect to your plan of obtaining furloughs for servicemen, I hereby present a case as follows:

My son-in-law has been in service 3 years up to May 30, 1944. Over 2 years in foreign service and never had a furlough. He is a married man and his wife was operated on about a month ago and his mother died a week ago. The American Red Cross tried to get a furlough, but no success. I think I am justified in writing you as a man who served overseas over 2 years as this boy has done certainly is entitled to a furlough for the

good of the service he has rendered. I am writing you for my daughter. This boy being my son-in-law, I know you can take his case up at Washington, D. C., as a servant of our community and country. Everything you do in this case will be wholeheartedly appreciated with thanks.

Respectfully,

EDGERTON, WIS., May 26, 1944.

DEAR SIR: From all reports, our boys of the Thirty-second must be given a furlough now.

My son has been in service over 3 years, more than 2 years overseas, and in that time he has had one furlough home. Certainly it is not the shipping problem as we seem to have plenty of transportation facilities available to bring the girls from Australia and New Zealand across. Why couldn't our boys be given that space?

Are our own people, and especially those poor boys who have lived and existed any old way not to be considered? If not, I can't see what my three sons and one son-in-law are fighting for. Mr. SMITH, please give this your immediate attention and earn the gratitude of both boys and mothers.

Sincerely,

Mr. DILWEG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DILWEG. Would the gentleman be so kind as to insert in the RECORD a letter that I have received on the same subject from Adjutant General Ulio?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I will be glad to.

Mr. DILWEG. I think it would assist in our general effort to get some respite for these boys who are in the South Pacific and many other parts of the world.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the additional letter may be included.

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

AUGUST 5, 1944.

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG,  
Representative in Congress,  
Green Bay, Wis.

DEAR MR. DILWEG: I have your letter of August 1, 1944, enclosing a newspaper clipping, and making further reference to the return of military personnel from overseas. You also make reference to a previous letter dated July 31, 1944, on this same subject. I addressed a letter to you on August 4 in reply thereto which you have, no doubt, received.

The return of soldiers from foreign theaters for any purpose has been delegated entirely to the discretion of the commanding general of the theater involved, with the result that the determination whether an individual may be spared from his assignment is the responsibility of his theater commander and will not be initiated in the War Department. I might observe, however, that there is no set period of duty on foreign service before a soldier may be returned to the United States, the governing criterion being military requirements, the nature of the soldier's duty, and similar factors which are entirely local in character.

It may be helpful to explain the procedures involved in the return of soldiers from overseas. As you know, the War Department has never questioned the desirability of returning men to the United States who have served overseas for long periods. The fact is, the matter has been under constant study since the war began. Until recently, however, the lack of shipping space has been an insurmountable obstacle, but the shortage is

now partially remedied and has permitted some liberalization of our rotation policies.

Units and individuals within each overseas theater are constantly rotated from combat duty to rest areas, and, subject to shipping limitations, theater commanders have authority to select individuals in their commands for return to the United States. Among the soldiers now being returned are battle-trained officers and enlisted men to act as instructors and aid in the formulation of new training doctrines and techniques; those who require medical attention unavailable overseas, or whose physical condition warrant their return; and those returned for emergency reasons. We also are implementing personnel rotation policies for most overseas areas and plan to extend and increase these rotations as rapidly as circumstances permit. However, it is impracticable, as well as incongruous from the military standpoint, to remove entire units from an active theater of war.

As the situation now stands, soldiers in Alaska and the Caribbean Defense Command with more than 2 years' service in those areas and certain numbers of those with over 18 months' service in the north African theater may normally be returned to the United States. A procedure has only recently been placed in operation which will effect the return of some of the soldiers on a rotational basis who have been in the South Pacific and Southwest Pacific theaters for 2 years or longer.

Unfortunately so many factors must be considered in connection with returning able-bodied personnel from overseas and, at the same time, providing suitable replacements to continue the prosecution of the war, that it is virtually impossible to prescribe any fixed procedure applicable to all areas under all conditions. However, we are attempting to effect as complete an exchange of personnel as possible within various military limitations unavoidably imposed upon us. You will appreciate that the continuation and/or liberalization of the present policy will depend upon the course of the war, the availability of shipping facilities and replacements, the local situation in each theater, and similar military considerations.

Our primary mission must continue to be the successful conclusion of the war as promptly as possible, with the least expenditure of life and property. Any fixed requirement which would effect the return of individuals or organizations to the United States after certain specified periods of service overseas would result only in the absorption of our facilities and manpower in the movement of large numbers of troops without compensating increases in effective strength throughout the various theaters; moreover, the adverse effect of such a policy upon military strategy and projected tactical operations would result in an inexcusable and expensive delay in the date of final victory.

I appreciate and share the feeling that these men should be returned as soon as possible to the United States. This will be done, but our plans must remain subject to our military needs.

With kindest regards,  
Sincerely yours,

J. A. ULIO,  
Major General,  
The Adjutant General.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the report of 5 United States Senators whose observations on a 45,000-mile trip to the war areas were reported to the Congress in the form of 10 conclusions. One of these conclusions, dealing with the subject under consideration, was as follows:

8. A policy of relieving men overseas after they have served a certain length of time would be in the interest of efficiency as well

as conducive to physical and mental welfare. The committee is aware of the shipping problems which have created this situation. It believes that the shipping situation is now improving. A definite promise to a man that after a certain length of time he will be replaced, is a big morale factor.

Here we have the studied conclusion of men who realize the importance of a definite and unequivocal policy of rotation of those men who are today serving in the southwest Pacific. As I have previously pointed out, the need for immediate action is imperative. It should not be delayed any longer. Thousands of these men who ask for just a brief respite from jungle warfare have been in uniform for almost 4 years. They are the National Guard units of that famous Thirty-second Division from Michigan and Wisconsin; they are the citizen-soldiers who were ready to defend their country before Pearl Harbor. We owe them consideration and fair treatment now. The purpose of my resolution is to get at the facts; let us find out if there is actually a shortage of ships and replacements at this time. The responsibility is now upon the proper House committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand the Inspector General, or a representative of his office, made a tour of Alaska and its posts, and that his report was terse and to the point. It was to the effect that there is nothing wrong with the morale of our troops in Alaska that a sound troop-rotation plan would not cure.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from California.

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

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### AMERICA'S FUTURE IS IN THE AIR

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts from letters and reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have had a growing concern which I am certain is also being felt by every other Member of Congress, as well as by the American people at large, about what we may expect, and should plan for, in the aftermath of the present war.

All Americans now believe in the certainty of a relatively early United Nations military victory, this belief being based largely on reports and public statements of heads of Government agencies and assurances we have received from our military leaders. It seems to be a fact, however, that as our conviction grows that we shall win an early military victory, our doubts or fears increase as to how the United States of America may fare in the peace terms and in the economic war that will certainly follow the military conflict. In this respect, it has

been pointed out that it is only natural to assume that some of our present Allies will be competitors in the forthcoming economic battle.

There is a growing belief throughout our land that there has never been a time in the history of our great country when real patriotic effort and statesmanship was more sorely required than will be needed during the ensuing months, in order that our people may be fairly and adequately safeguarded during the years following World War No. 2.

During the period between World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, foreign powers have been actively engaged in planting, in this country, many foreign-born ideas and "isms", for the purpose of influencing and shaping public opinion in America along lines that would be of material benefit to such foreign countries, and harmful to us; ideas that would enable other sections of the world to take away from our country the leadership we now have in things and activities that mean so much to the prosperity, progress, and happiness of the American people.

There is a growing alarm among my constituents, and yours, that the dissemination of these various foreign "isms" in this country are now increasing to such an extent that unless our leaders and moulders of public opinion exercise the greatest energy, intelligence, and patriotic effort, we may find after the war is ended that we have lost the peace, and at least acquiesced in American standards of living, freedom of thought, action, opportunity, and general welfare being endangered or actually taken away.

National policies relating to both domestic and international activities and rights of Americans are of growing importance, and every good American has the right and the duty to express his or her thoughts about such things, to their executive officials and to their Congress.

I am convinced that there has never been a time when Congress had a more serious or demanding obligation to its country, its future prosperity and safety, than it has on its shoulders today in matters relating to the war's aftermath.

The American people are becoming more and more seriously concerned about secret agreements reportedly being entered into during this period between major and minor officials of our country and officials of the Allied Nations. Our people recognize the propriety and necessity of certain types of secret understandings between certain officials of our Government and those of Allied Nations on matters of a military nature. It is recognized that divulging our military plans in detail might endanger the war effort, but we feel equally certain that agreements as to post-war policies, not connected with the war effort, are dangerous to the future welfare of our people and even to our future friendly relationships with foreign powers, unless such agreements have been given advance study by Congress, and even until the American public has had an opportunity to analyze them with reference to possible results and their effects on fu-

ture generations. The only justification for secrecy is to protect military secrets. The American people are entitled to full information on all else, and especially on commitments made in their name.

Disturbing rumors are rife throughout the land and, particularly in Washington, as to secret agreements on post-war matters being discussed or made, without the benefit of congressional deliberations. Perhaps the majority, and I hope all, of these disturbing stories are rumors, without the foundation of fact, but I believe that Congress has the responsibility to our people, to make certain in every possible manner that no unnecessary trading away of rights of future generations of Americans shall be accomplished by any agency or representative of our Government, no matter how sincere and honest, though misguided, their efforts may be.

On matters of such extreme importance affecting national policy, particularly with reference to international activities, we must all, at least temporarily, disregard partisan politics, and work together as a well-organized, cooperative, and patriotic team, putting up a solid front for the rest of the world.

It is divulging no military secret when we admit the fact that there are many differences of opinion between leaders of the Allied Nations as to post-war policies, spheres of influence, and so forth. I am certain that there is no one in our Government who knows, and can express with absolute assurance, what the attitude on post-war policies will be of Chiang Kai-shek, Stalin, or Churchill, much less the attitude of our military enemies. The ability and statesmanship of our leaders is challenged by this situation, and we shall certainly be faced with new problems in the peace era which we have not yet had the opportunity to study, and which are so entirely new and complicated and far-reaching that they are potentially as dangerous to our country as a 6-ton blockbuster would be dropped upon an unprotected auditorium packed with helpless humanity.

Theories and idealistic suggestions are interesting as subjects of study or entertainment, but we cannot afford to be other than most realistic, intelligent and patriotic in dealing with the new post-war problems with which we are faced as a result of the present most brutal and merciless conflict in the history of human beings.

A case in point, and one which is of such vital importance to the country's welfare that it deserves the most careful study and thoughtful consideration that can be given it by every Member of this House, is national policy for world-wide air transportation after the war is over.

There has been considerable discussion of the subject, and that in itself, is good. We have to have full and free discussion to bring out the facts upon which to make decisions. Unfortunately, however, the loudest and most persistent talking has been singularly unrealistic, and worse than that, it has ignored the fundamental consideration, which is the position of the United States in the international air transport picture.

I refer specifically to arguments advanced and eloquently advocated for free and open competition among American companies operating in the international air transport field.

To cry out for freedom of competition is to voice a popular theme. But in this particular case it is a tragically unrealistic approach to the problem. Within the borders of our own country we can profit by competition between our able American companies, but in the foreign field, unbridled competition among ourselves is not necessary, and more than that, it would be a definite hazard to our national economy. You ask why? Competition among ourselves is unnecessary because there is already enough competition in the field—more than enough—to spur our own people on to higher and broader achievement. All the major foreign powers have their own highly developed international air transport systems. We have to meet that foreign competition and do better than our rivals if we want to lead the way in global air transportation after the war, as we did prior to Pearl Harbor. That is why unlimited competition would be a hazard to our own economy.

We are not going to get anywhere by scattering our national effort into as many different operating companies as may have the desire to fly the oceans. We have to unify our effort, combining and coordinating our resources in such a way as to make the strongest possible showing in comparison with our foreign rivals.

We simply cannot afford to dissipate our energies in fighting among ourselves for foreign markets and foreign trade routes in the air. If we do, our competitors among the other nations, with their heavily government subsidized and controlled overseas air lines will play one American air line against another to the disaster of our whole American effort in world air commerce. This coming trade war in the air will be ruthless. Expect no international concessions to us as an expression of appreciation by other nations for our aid to them in this war. It will be every nation for itself. Therefore, the United States must be as well organized and united in its effort for the battles of peace as for the battles of war. Our overseas air routes should be operated by one American company, preferably owned cooperatively by all domestic air lines, at least in the first few years. Our competition will be with government owned, controlled, or financed foreign air-line monopolies. We had better not divide our energies and our strength in this field, competing among ourselves, but rather unite all of our resources and energies into a national effort for our proper place in world air commerce. The leading position that we now hold in the world can be lost overnight when this war is over, if we fumble the ball in this matter.

Policy for international air transport is a complete subject, and I will not pretend that I can give you the right answers to all the questions today. But I do ask that you keep an open mind and not permit yourselves to be swayed by

the persuasiveness of those who want to get in on the ground floor of a good thing to serve their own interests in their own way. Apply the test of the national interest.

How can we operate international air transport so as to maintain the leading position of our country on the international air lanes—the position won prior to the war by this country's international operation?

In the foreign field we cannot afford to serve the interests of any one individual or any one company. We must serve the interests of 130,000,000 Americans.

In due course, Members of this House will be called upon to cast their votes for or against certain proposals, and I want to call your attention to a very thorough and statesmanlike job of fact finding that already has been accomplished by a Senate subcommittee, and which will be of assistance to Members in reaching decisions.

The very competent Senate Commerce Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JOSIAH BAILEY, through a subcommittee under the leadership of Senator BENNETT CLARK, have conducted executive hearings for some months in an endeavor to separate the wheat from the chaff on the important subject of international air transportation and have made a report by letter to the President very recently.

This subcommittee has devoted a great deal of time and study to the subject. I am informed it has had many competent and well-informed witnesses, including executives of all American air lines concerned.

Many controversial issues are involved, which has been at least partially responsible for conducting the hearings in executive sessions; it being important that all witnesses be able to speak freely and frankly and not be compelled to run the risk of public misinterpretation of ideas during an intermediate period of presentation. The subject is that complex. I know their task is a heavy one and of such importance that no single detail should be dealt with in haste.

In view of the fact that we will now have the benefit of the studies of the above committee, it appears to me that none should be influenced at this time by the self-serving statements or propaganda that are being put out by any prejudiced person or groups, political and industrial.

Permit me to quote from the letter of the Senate Commerce subcommittee to the President of the United States, dated August 19, 1944. I am quoting random paragraphs from this letter:

The committee is deeply impressed with the importance of the decisions which must now be reached; whether there should be any change in United States policy in the matter of regulating international air transport with foreign countries and whether the United States should have a number of American flag air lines operating abroad or concentrate American operations under a single system in which all transportation interests able to contribute would be permitted to participate. In these decisions, the advantage of any one air line or group of air lines must be subordinated to the paramount national interest.

Policies which will best assure the United States retaining the position of leadership in international air transport, to which its resources and geographical situation entitle it, should be adopted. \* \* \*

The question of whether or not the United States should now modify its historic position as to sovereignty of the air above its borders and to what extent the United States may wisely go in subscribing to the various doctrines being proposed that contemplate general agreements with another nation or group of nations concerning freedom of the air or freedom of innocent transit seem to the committee to invite the most careful consideration by both the executive and legislative branches of the Government and particularly of those concerned with the determination of policy. \* \* \*

All the evidence before the committee has indicated that approximately 75 percent of international air travel may be expected to be of United States origin. Under these circumstances, the United States would seem to be entitled to expect a position of preeminence in international air operation.

In the special report of the Civil Aeronautics Board on International Air Transport Policy under date of April 12, 1944, it is recommended that the Governmental agreements suggested "should place no limitation on the total volume of operation on particular routes agreed upon." The consequences of such a policy, if adopted, seem to the committee to offer great dangers to the development of United States international air transport. Under such a policy under the lower operating costs of foreign carriers with lower wage levels traffic of United States origin might well come to be monopolized by foreign flag lines to the very great prejudice of the national interests of the United States. \* \* \*

Whether or not American international air transport should follow the pattern that has been adopted by all principal foreign trading nations, or should develop several independent systems, each to serve a separate trade area abroad, presents a question of policy for legislative as well as executive consideration.

A number of important American companies concerned with air as well as surface transportation have presented the advantages of creating a community company to represent the United States effort abroad in which all transportation interests able to contribute by air, sea, and land may pool their resources and facilities to present a united and coordinated air transport system to meet the undoubted severe competition of other nations that the United States must face in the post-war period and American labor organizations have shown great interest in the advantages of such a plan.

Foreign commerce, in all of its phases, has, during the past 50 years, become of utmost importance to our country, therefore, every American activity even remotely affecting our future foreign commerce should be dealt with in the soundest possible manner. In this connection it appears to me that we should make sound plans that would result in at least 50 percent of our future foreign commerce being carried on American bottoms. I understand that as late as 1939, in spite of the millions our Government has appropriated as subsidies to our shipping companies, less than 25 percent of American commerce was carried on American bottoms.

To avoid a growing army of unemployed, a lowering of wage schedules and standards of living, in the war's aftermath we must prepare now to secure for our people a fair share of the expected increase in foreign commerce. We must



make it possible for a substantial number of American families to gain their livelihood from such activities, we must train a fair percentage of our youth to engage in this field.

When individuals or groups approach the subject dispassionately and seek to get at the fundamentals, the results in many cases are much happier. Among such are the conclusions reached by the great railroad labor organizations of our country with reference to national aviation policy. Quite naturally, railroad labor executives have looked for the implications of the situation which involved wage levels and standards of living. It was certainly both sensible and patriotic for labor to give thoughts to these phases, since post-war standards of living are of paramount importance to all of us. The labor organizations apparently looked far beyond their own immediate interests and thought in terms of the welfare of the Nation as a whole—that being their own ultimate interest as well. For example, Alvanley Johnson, grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, in a joint statement regarding national policy on aviation, used these words, and I quote only a small portion of their statement:

That post-war development of international air commerce will have a far-reaching effect upon our world society and the future of America is regarded as a major post-war certainty by nearly everyone. We believe that the time has come when our Government should assume a leading part in the shaping of America's future international and domestic air-transport policy. We believe that there should be a thorough public discussion of this important problem, and that its solution should not be left entirely to diplomatic negotiations. The people of the United States should move now to formulate and establish a comprehensive policy. \* \* \*

The present war has seen the development of air power as a third major branch of the military. Nations heretofore have competed principally in the building up of armies and navies. We have now three dimensional warfare. If the United Nations fail to establish the machinery to a secure world peace, then a key issue in the preparation for the inevitable World War No. 3 will be that of air policy. Therefore, considerations of international air policy are not alone simple considerations of labor policy as such and of maximum service at minimum cost. International (and also domestic) air transport policy is inextricably enmeshed with the issue of national safety and of war and peace.

Sovereignty of the skies describes the system under which all international air transport has been developed. It established that each nation shall have full authority or sovereignty over the air space above its own territorial domain. Under this system air lines carrying the American flag are now leading in the field of international air commerce. This principle means that foreign air lines cannot land, refuel, and do business in this country or fly their planes over it except as authorized in a specific franchise.

The term "freedom of the air" would seem to imply the right of the international air carriers of all nations to fly anywhere and land anywhere and do business anywhere on the face of the earth without restriction of national boundaries. The British interests, who are now the leading exponents of the principle, have broken down the definition into three parts: First, the freedom of peaceful transit over all territories for the

aircraft of all nations; secondly, the free access to airports and other air facilities; thirdly, the freedom to transport international traffic, including goods and passengers, under any flag from any point of origin to any destination.

In general we believe that the unsettled international situation and the unpredictable ultimate results of post-war peace plans call for a continued maintenance, in fact a freezing, of our policy. We are therefore opposed to any relaxation of our present control of our air space. For the present we must consider complete sovereignty of the air as a necessary principle of national safety. Until the machinery of post-war peace has been designed and made operative it would be unrealistic, in fact national folly, to barter away any military and commercial protection or advantage which sovereignty now gives the United States.

High wage standards are essential in a highly skilled industry like air transportation. Government policy should be devoted to the support of such standards and the protection of the American carrier, maintaining them against cheap labor of foreign powers. Such a policy will react to maintain wage standards in all other forms of transportation and the American standard of living. We have, therefore, suggested in point 1 above that the Congress study this problem.

It is by no means certain that the United Nations will be able to agree on a decent and durable peace after the Axis Powers are defeated. In any event, until such a peace is assured the American people should not sink their Navy; junk, abandon, or sell their merchant marine; barter away our large reserves of aircraft; or in any way relinquish their present advantages in commercial aeronautics and military air power.

Our No. 1 post-war objective is a just and stable peace. The above-outlined policies should be subordinate to this grand objective. Any projected plans for a secure peace will involve the knotty question of national sovereignty. Let's see the blueprints of the peace before we throw away any of the valuable tools which we can use to build it or any of the useful weapons which we must defensively keep if we cannot attain it.

I would also like to call your attention to a recently published statement by George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, writing in the American Federationist, in which he has gone thoroughly into the implications of international air transportation to the future of our country and in which final paragraphs he concludes as follows:

In the final analysis, let us remember that the whole problem of civilian air transport in the future is inevitably tied to our future as a nation. Who flies airplanes over our country is our business. Who makes the airplanes that fly over our country and at what wages these planes are made is also our business. Let us in this case decide coolly and calmly for ourselves what we should do in the air-transport field of the future to protect ourselves. Let us not make such decision on an emotional basis superinduced by a slogan that sounds good to us.

Let those who are interested in avoiding unnecessary unemployment among American workers and in protecting American wage standards from the unfair competition of low-wage countries operating through government-subsidized monopolies, avoid being carried away by "freedom of the air."

Let us keep in mind the thought that, before buying an article so attractively painted and so urgently offered, it is well to remember a much older and better pedigreed slogan: Caveat emptor—let the buyer beware.

Another interesting report on this same subject is contained in the December issue of International Conciliation gotten out by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, in which Dr. Arthur E. Trexler analyzes the various theories and recommendations advanced by certain groups and then summarizes the situation in part as follows:

Commercial air power, whether we like it or not, is going to be a spearhead instrument of national policy so long as any vestige of nationalism remains in the world political structure. To ignore this fact would be dangerous, and to neglect it would be suicidal. The policy of the United States on international air transport should be one of enlightened self-interest for the immediate future, coupled with a dynamic long-term policy of international cooperation and good neighborliness.

The idea of freedom of the air is admirable as a long-term goal, but it is utterly impractical under present conditions. Without an international civil aeronautics administration, which would necessarily work in cooperation with other international bodies, the ideology of freedom of the air is simply a cloak for anarchy in international air transportation. Neither the idealists nor the air-line leaders who take a realistic point of view should stand in the way of an undertaking to secure regulation of world air traffic. The fact that the voices which have been raised in favor of this so-called freedom are articulate and strong will not count in the balance when the problem is really faced and all the facts are represented in international negotiations.

The present practice of the major powers with respect to the securing of operating rights in other countries should be continued. This practice consists of the conclusion of liberal reciprocal agreements between the leading nations and the obtaining of unilateral franchises covering rights to operate air lines in other countries. A general policy of reciprocal agreements would lead to dilution of the American position on the trade routes of the world, particularly in areas where our air lines would cross a large number of small countries.

Both the labor and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace publications and the Meany article on the important subject of national aviation policy should be studied by all concerned.

Thousands of American men and women are dying on foreign fields in an endeavor to protect the country and the homes of their descendants against the efforts of any other nation or nations to take away or endanger the rights and opportunities of Americans. Make no mistake about it, our fighting men on the war fronts of the world are fighting and dying primarily for the purpose of protecting America and Americans. Self-preservation is and always will be the first law of nature. If while American soldiers are protecting the future of their own country and own people our Government incidentally finds it possible to succor peoples of other countries, our fighting men will not object, provided that in doing so our Government has not given away rights, material things, and opportunities of American citizens of this and following generations.

We all know that our country has no desire to seize territory or rights from any nation as a result of this war. We

do not want to take anything away from any other nation, victor or vanquished, that is rightfully theirs, but neither do we want to find ourselves in the position when the smoke of battle is cleared away, of having acquiesced, much less of having mistakenly arranged, to give away to other nations anything that rightfully belongs to American posterity.

In this connection our attention is called to a public statement of some months ago credited to that great leader of the British Empire, Prime Minister Churchill, to the effect that he did not become Prime Minister of England to liquidate the British Empire. We may be equally certain that Stalin is as patriotic and nationalistic with reference to his own country and does not propose to give away to us or to any other nation anything he may want for Russia. These two able leaders are indeed great and patriotic in the interests of their countries, and in no uncertain terms indicate to the rest of the world that they consider the interests of their respective countries first. The leaders and citizens of all other nations are becoming more and more nationalistic in their ideas and efforts, and we certainly cannot afford to be less so.

This does not in any way imply any unwillingness to join other nations in co-operative efforts to maintain the world peace. We cannot contribute effectively to such cooperative efforts, however, unless we are ourselves strong at home. A weakened United States will not be much help to strengthen the world.

It is perhaps unfortunate for us that we are about to be faced with a heated partisan political fight during the most critical period of our existence, but we must, regardless of political faith, indulge in partisan politics, only to the extent that such activities do not jeopardize the future of our people.

It is not my intention nor desire to criticize the sincerity of purpose nor to impugn the motives of any of the officials or representatives of our Government who may or may not be carrying on secret negotiations relating to post-war policy. However, it is not only the right but the duty of all good Americans to question the judgment of any official of our country when we honestly feel that the judgment is subject to question or that the actions of such official may conceivably result in needlessly giving away American rights or sovereignty of any kind.

Our great and generous people are taking care of, on our own shores, literally thousands of refugees from war-stricken foreign lands. In addition, we are feeding, clothing, and financing millions of war-ravaged people in their own countries. We are, through lend-lease and other methods furnishing the sinews of war, in large quantities, to all of our allies. We are doing our full share, and more, to finance the war and to aid the people of the rest of the world, to an extent never before done by any country.

Many of the war-ravaged and destitute foreigners for whom our people are making great sacrifices will certainly not appreciate and will forget the generosity of Uncle Sam after this war is over and

the economic battle of the future begins. We are doing more to help in every manner possible the rest of the world than any people had any right to expect, and we are doing it at the expense of my children and yours. These things I do not criticize, but I point them out merely to illustrate that while we have been and are being so generous to others we must at the same time try to be fair to our own people and protect their interests in every fair and practical manner.

It has been my privilege to talk in confidence with many of our military men who have served at home and abroad about the subject matters of my talk today, and my remarks have been based on what I have heard from them and on my own observations in Washington. It is with deep regret that conditions have made it impossible for me to stay in uniform with other Americans in the front ranks, but since circumstances have forced me to return to Congress, away from the carnage of battle, I am most anxious to do my full share at home and to join with all good Americans and my friends in Congress, regardless of their political faith, in combatting inside our country and in the Halls of Congress insidious influences wherever they may crop up and whose effects might result in making the forthcoming victory a hollow and worthless one, and in making a mockery of deaths of our fighting men, valueless because we at home may not have fought our part of the battle as unselfishly and valiantly as our soldiers are fighting wherever they meet the enemy.

The question is: How well prepared are we with plans for the period following our military victory? I am addressing myself particularly again to the question of our future in the air. We are coming into an air age and I firmly believe that America's future is in the air. Today we dominate the air in every phase, commercially, militarily, design, construction, and production capacity. In the post-war period 80 percent of the air traffic will originate in the United States. How well prepared we are to meet that will determine to a large extent whether we retain our leadership which we have now won or whether we lose it. We have that leadership today—remember, it can be lost. We have built up the greatest system of air bases. One of the main questions that arises is as to the disposition of these bases. Specifically in the Pacific area there are many bases that we took with the blood and lives of Americans, and at great cost in our resources, islands that were mandated to other countries by the League of Nations. Those islands were either surrendered without fighting or were conquered by the Japs.

I can see no other position than when such mandated territories were surrendered the mandate ceased to exist, and that when we occupied those islands by virtue of having driven the Japs out the ultimate disposition of those islands is our responsibility, and no nation has any rightful claim to them and no American official has any right to make any agreement disposing of those vital military bases, which also will have great

commercial importance, without the full knowledge and approval of the American people. I do not think any executives have the right to hand around territory.

The island bases I am talking about were not the sovereign territory of any nation since the last war. They were generally German islands that had been mandated by the League of Nations to Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and England. They are not parts of the sovereign territory of those nations. I know that our naval and air needs will require a comprehensive system of air bases in the Pacific. The question as to innocent passage or freedom of the air sounds very attractive, but to a large extent that is a way to divide with other nations the advantages which we already have—advantages that were built up legitimately and honestly by American initiative and toil.

There has been some sort of an agreement that we would limit our trips in competitive areas to those of other nations. Many times the capacity of another nation will be so limited that they might be able to make but 2 trans-Atlantic trips a day, whereas our capacity, our production of airplanes, our reserve of pilots, and our know-how might make it possible to run 10 trips a day. However, we are apparently agreeing to limit ours to the minimum of any other nation with whom we are competing.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Before the gentleman launches into that subject, I would like to advert to his statement concerning the islands of the Pacific which our troops and Navy have taken and will take in the future. I have not looked up the international law on the subject, but I would assume that possession is nine points of that law and particularly in the present case where possession was taken by force and occupation is in force. It would seem to me that under those circumstances that they can be considered the property of the United States and would come under article IV, section 3, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, which provides that no property of the United States can be disposed of without act of Congress.

Mr. MAAS. I feel the same way the gentleman does on that subject, but we have those in the executive department who do not seem to agree with us merely because no act of Congress was passed in the acquisition of such bases. I do not think that position is well founded. We have obtained a great deal of territory without specific acts of Congress every time they became a part of our sovereign territory. I do not contend that these islands are necessarily a part of our sovereign territory, but I do contend that their ultimate disposition is the responsibility and solely the responsibility of the United States.

Mr. HINSHAW. Certain members of the Marine Corps not in high official position have told me about the access of our troops to these islands and the reconquering of those islands from the

Japanese, islands that had belonged to another Allied Power. Upon the conquering of these islands by the American troops the flag of this other country was raised upon the island without ado by a consular representative of that nation.

Mr. MAAS. Yes. For instance, at Tarawa both the American and British flags were raised side by side, although there was not a representative of the British Empire even present.

The British started operating the mineral deposits on Tarawa Island before the fighting was over. Certainly no base that we now occupy should be disposed of until our military people have made a complete and comprehensive post-war survey and have reported to us the need for a complete system of bases to defend this country. Certainly, I think that would be the attitude of the American public if they understood the full problem.

May I briefly go into this question of the competition in the air that is coming when the war is over? It will be an air age, both as to commercial traffic and passenger traffic, and therefore the defense of the Nation will be in the air. Whether this Nation can ever pay off the ghastly debt that it has had to assume by reason of this war depends upon whether we can take our proper place in world trade. Since that trade will be largely in the air, at least spearheaded in the air, what we do in the air will be of vital importance.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman made the remarks that he has in regard to world trade. May I ask the gentleman this question: He is a Navy man, I believe?

Mr. MAAS. Marine; pardon me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I stand corrected. We will have approximately 20,000,000 tons of cargo shipping available after this war is over, and possibly more. Our country was driven from the high seas in the hauling of world products and world trade because of the differential in the cost of operations.

I assume that will take place again, because most other countries which have cargo ships to haul world products pay their men less than we do, and there are even government subsidies for the operation of those ships. I assume the gentleman, as I do, wants to have a big world trade, but does not the gentleman feel that we must have some means of providing adequate subsidies so we can keep our ships on the seas and also keep our fleet of airplanes in the air?

Mr. MAAS. I am not sure that is necessary. If American ingenuity and initiative and energy are permitted free play, I would rather take the results of the American way of doing things than I would the subsidized way of our competition. But if American industry and our commerce in the air are to be strangled and put at a disadvantage by unfavorable agreements with other nations, and then we are forced to have

destructive competition among ourselves for our overseas traffic, then even a subsidy would not meet the problem.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Assuming that of this 20,000,000 tons of cargo shipping we have, half is given away to the other countries so that they can go into competition, and that the wages they pay are 70 percent below the wages that under existing law are paid to our sailors, what will we be up against then?

Mr. MAAS. I recognize the problem and I hope we are not going to give away our merchant fleet or any substantial part of it. There is no reason to. We are all in favor of helping our allies to the last drop to win this war, but that does not impose any responsibility or obligation or confer the right upon us to assist them during the war to prepare them to compete with us when the war is over, at our expense.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a news item from the Washington Post under date of September 2, appearing on page 1, entitled "Pope Pius XII Urges Enforced World Peace."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### THERE SHOULD BE BUTTER TO SPREAD ON YOUR BREAD, REGARDLESS OF THE READER'S DIGEST ARTICLE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, butter could be plentiful today if the War Food Administration was operated on the basis of producing more food. The principal reason that the people do not have butter to spread on their bread is because the New Deal political agriculturists have not carried on a real food-production program. In the December issue of the Reader's Digest I read an article entitled, "Here's Why There Is Nothing to Spread on Your Bread," by Harland Manchester.

My first thought when I read the article was the question as to whether or not a magazine would really pay money for such an article. My second thought was if the Reader's Digest would actually pay money for this kind of article. I wondered what they would pay for an article based on facts and one that would give the factual bread spread picture.

In reply to my letter of inquiry to the Reader's Digest I received the following communication:

THE READER'S DIGEST,

Pleasantville, N. Y., December 16, 1943.

Mr. REID F. MURRAY,

Member of Congress,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: We've referred your query about Harland Manchester's sources of information for the oleomargarine article to Mr. Manchester himself. You will doubtless hear from him in the near future.

Sincerely,

THE EDITORS.

I then received the following letter from Mr. Manchester:

THE READER'S DIGEST,

Pleasantville, N. Y., December 18, 1943.

The Honorable REID F. MURRAY,

Congress of the United States,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: Your letter to the Reader's Digest, asking for information about my professional background, has been forwarded to me, and I am glad to supply you with whatever facts may be of interest.

My experience as a newspaperman and magazine writer has covered more than 20 years, and in recent years I have specialized in technical and scientific subjects which require extensive research, both in technical literature and in the field. My articles have appeared in such publications as the Reader's Digest, the Atlantic Monthly, Harper's Magazine, the American Mercury, Scientific American, Science News Letter and the Technology Review. If you wish to take the trouble, you can find much of my work listed in Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature for the last 5 years or so, and a number of my articles have been reprinted in scientific anthologies.

I have always been interested in problems of agriculture, both economic and technical, and have discussed many of these problems with farmers and agricultural scientists, as well as studying much of the literature of the field. My interest is partly due to the fact that I spent my youth on a dairy farm, and also because of an appreciation of the vast importance in our national economy of the production and distribution of foods and the development of new foods which will help raise the national standard of nutrition.

I first became interested in the suppression of margarine several years ago while making a study of interstate tariff barriers, a system which I consider destructive to national prosperity and a de facto violation of article I, section X, subsection 2 of the Constitution of the United States. You are doubtless aware of the part antimargarine legislation plays in this network of tariff barriers. As you know, there is a vast literature on margarine legislation from 1886 to date, and numerous recent analyses of the content and nutritive value of margarine by disinterested medical and scientific bodies. Because of the limitation of space, I was forced to omit much of this interesting material from my recent article.

In recent months, as you know, butter has been virtually unobtainable at many times by millions of families, my own included. This raises a particular problem in making meals appetizing to young children. The importation of low-grade Argentine butter, which has been widely publicized, is only a temporary stopgap and a none too reassuring one.

If this deprivation were necessary in the conduct of the war, I would not complain and I do not know anyone who would. But everyone knows now that there is a satisfactory substitute which is cheaper and uses fewer man-hours in the national production effort. They know it is being barred from their tables and they know why. My family and many of my friends have been able to obtain margarine by seeking out shops which carry it and coloring it in the kitchen. But all this is time consuming, and these discriminatory difficulties placed in the way of buying a cheap and satisfactory food have caused mounting irritation among a great number of people with whom I have come in contact.

This situation was the immediate background of my decision to write the article of which you speak. So far as I can discover, the same feeling prevails throughout the country. People want something to

spread on their bread, and they don't care whether it comes from a Wisconsin soybean or a Wisconsin cow.

I hope I have given you the information you sought.

Sincerely yours,

HARLAND MANCHESTER.

There is nothing personal about this situation, as I never heard of Mr. Manchester before. I would not bother to even take this time today, if it were not for the fact that I have been reliably informed that Fortune Magazine is coming out with an oleo article in November 1944.

#### ANALYZING THE ARTICLE

First there is this statement in the Reader's Digest article:

Here are the facts: Margarine, made by churning a pure vegetable oil—usually cottonseed or soybean—with skimmed milk, salt, and other minor ingredients, has been approved unanimously by recognized health authorities as the nutritive equal of butter. It is now fortified with vitamin A to bring it up to butter standard in that respect. It is flavored to taste so like butter that it is not always possible to tell the difference. Its content is regulated by law, and its manufacture and sale supervised by the Pure Food and Drug Administration.

You will note that Mr. Manchester makes no mention of the fact that the oleo manufacturers used 215,000 pounds of benzoate of soda as a preservative in 1942 according to their own reports. In fact oleo has nearly everything in it but the kitchen sink. Rape oil, linseed oil, cottonseed oil, peanut oil, and many other ingredients too numerous to mention.

I now quote Dr. E. B. Hart, of the University of Wisconsin, in whose laboratory at Madison, Wis., Dr. McCollum, of Johns Hopkins University, first discovered vitamin A, and in whose laboratory Dr. McCollum first showed that vegetable oils contain very little vitamin A:

In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition.

Dr. Hart has been at the University of Wisconsin for 38 years and is recognized as the greatest biochemist and nutritionist in the world today.

With the background and experience of these two men to be considered which one do you wish to call your leader?

The following is another quote from his article in the Reader's Digest:

Iowa State College has been publishing a series of pamphlets about wartime food production. Oswald H. Brownlee, of the faculty, wrote one of them. In simple, businesslike fashion Mr. Brownlee stated that there is a serious butter shortage, that feed and farm labor are so scarce there is little chance of overcoming it, and that margarine is just as nutritive and palatable and much cheaper to produce. He concluded that, if housewives can't get butter, they ought to have more margarine.

There are several answers to this statement. The first is that oleo is not as nutritive and palatable, and all oleo is not fortified, either. Second, all the oleo is being made for which the War

Production Board has allocated oil to the oleo industry to make. The third answer could easily be that the War Food Administration has not provided for a maximum milk-production program. They have not even lived up to their commitments to producers in obtaining the milk that has been produced, either.

In January 1942, W. F. A. agents told Wisconsin dairymen they would receive \$2.10 per hundredweight for their milk, and in 90 days they received as low as \$1.65 per hundredweight. In other areas they promised \$2.35 per hundredweight, and in 90 days the farmers were receiving \$1.85. The War Food Administration, by controlling the cheese market by their purchases, took 3 cents per pound off the price of cheese in 1942, after their agents had pleaded for increased dairy production. The Plymouth-plus gives Wisconsin farmers as much as 2 cents per pound less for Wisconsin cheese than some other States received. The milk-subsidy program gives Wisconsin farmers 30 cents per hundredweight less subsidy than that given many other States. The Plymouth-plus showed a 20-cents-per-hundredweight differential. Such manipulations have not nor will not obtain maximum national milk production. This provides Wisconsin with 50 cents per hundredweight below the price in some other areas.

Then here is another excerpt from the article:

Wisconsin leads the shameful parade, but it would take a volume to list the measures by which 45 other States prevent people from buying a cheap food that is good for them.

The answer is that no one is trying to prevent the manufacture of oleo. All that is hoped for is that oleo will not be sold as butter. There is nothing stopping anyone from buying and eating oleo. An effort is being made to keep oleo from being sold as butter.

There are Federal laws against interstate traffic in filled milk; there are Federal statutes governing and defining cheese and filled cheese.

If Mr. Manchester, or the gentleman, whoever he is, that is preparing his article for Fortune magazine, believes that a fortified vegetable oil such as cottonseed oil, rape oil, mustard oil, used in oleo, is equal to butterfat in butter, then they must come out frankly and advocate filled milk and filled cheese. The principle is exactly the same. No oleo and vegetable oil promoters are bold enough to suggest this yet. If the oleo promoters were really as interested in the low-income groups as they profess, and if they knew much about dairy products, they would know that powdered whole milk could be used and reconstituted and provide a saving of three times as much on the milk bill as oleo would save on the butter bill.

This article by Mr. Manchester should give the dairy farmers of America an idea of the vicious propaganda that is being spread by the oleo interests. After getting legislation passed so that vegetable oils can be sold for animal fats, the next step, no doubt, will be to fortify vegetable proteins and claim they are equal to the animal proteins of meat.

The present New Deal administration may give them a hand. At least at this time when eggs—one of the very best animal proteins—are being converted into pig feed and bringing 5 cents per case, the present War Food Administration is spending \$14,000,000 this very year as a subsidy to get people to eat a vegetable protein in the form of peanut butter.

No one wants to try to stand in the way of science. Maybe Mr. Manchester is right when he says in his article that—

There are many evidences that taxpayers, even in the great dairy States, are becoming scornful of the petty parochialism of their lawmakers.

There happens to be 1 percent of the dairy cows of the United States in the Seventh Wisconsin District, which I have the honor to represent. I have studied under Dr. E. B. Hart, one of the greatest teachers as well as scientists of the day. I do not intend to let any name calling whether called provincialism or parochialism keep me from giving the people of my district the facts. I am not going to be misled by the rantings of any bogey scientists that the Oleo Institute hires to give testimony. I am not here as a Member of Congress to sit idly by and see the dairy industry of our Nation ruined by any individuals that get paid for writing articles or be misled by the babblings of any high-sounding Oleo Institute. When and if ever the scientific facts prove that vegetable oils are equal to animal fats, the dairy industry should recognize it and govern itself accordingly.

If the New Deal political agriculturalists follow an agricultural program that raises millions of acres of cotton each year they do not know what to do with after it is grown, if the New Deal political agriculturalists raise the tobacco acreage 16 percent and then give away 25 percent of the crop, if they provide fertilizer for nonfood crops, if they pay a subsidy to export cow feed as they have, at the same time they paid an import subsidy and if they do not have a constructive dairy program that includes feed production, there is no one to blame but themselves if they do not provide butter for the spread for bread. Since cream for the man with price has been obtainable without even being rationed, and has been provided, an adequate spread for bread, butter, could be provided for the average family if and when we have an agricultural department that wants and wishes to work toward that end.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Some of those oils, I understand, are not digestible.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMEY. In the introductory part of the gentleman's address he spoke of

"political agriculturalists." Then he referred to a gentleman who evidently received money from writing on agriculture. Now, by "political agriculturalists," I believe the gentleman was referring—we hear the word "refer" in Washington about 100 times a day, so I use the word "refer"—the gentleman was referring to the man who had never done real, dirt farming or hard work, to a man who has never worked but has been able to get money by what is called "research"; or an "inspector", as we have found here in Washington, where most of the people who are getting money from agriculture are folks "referring" to inspectors who refer you to rereferers, and so forth, but who have never done constructive work.

Now, had this researcher or referrer who is writing and telling other folks what to do, gone to the great farms of our country, you would have had no trouble about producing substitutes, would you?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would say that we do not have a man in a real key position in the present New Deal administration that has any knowledge of the dairy industry; or one who has had any agricultural training. It may not be exactly appropriate to say it, but I have not seen any farmers appointed on the Supreme Court bench. It seems to me that after Congress has appropriated the money as it has for 50 years to these experiment stations and agricultural colleges, the farmers at least should be sufficiently recognized so that at least one of them might secure a key position. It should not be necessary to have an Assistant Secretary and an Under Secretary and the man in charge—all people without any agricultural training whatsoever. Especially is this disturbing when the one agriculturally trained man is rather put in cold storage evidently for the duration or until after election anyway.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is overlooking that great statesman Paul McNutt, who took natural oleomargarine in raw state and ordered the injection of 9,000 units of vitamin A, so that it would have what he called the same nutritive value as butter. He, apparently, is tied in with the same group who are out to jeopardize the interests of the dairy farmers of this country. The gentleman would not belittle Oleo McNutt at all in the effort he is making to help the dairy farmer?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would answer the gentleman by saying that I firmly believe, without any political implications connected with it at the present time, that the dairy industry of this country is in the most hazardous condition it has ever been.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Supplementing what the gentleman has just stated regarding Hon. Paul McNutt and his apparent affinity for oleomargarine, I might state to the gentleman that when he was Gov-

ernor of the State of Indiana, he purchased oleomargarine for use in all of the institutions in the State of Indiana, against which the people protested vigorously.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to get that information about our friend McNutt.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thought the gentleman would be.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We happen to come from a dairy section. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has done a magnificent job in finding out facts and figures and giving the details in order to protect the dairy industry of the country and protect the consumers from deception. However, I want to say that we from the dairy sections do not have any objection to people eating as much oleomargarine as they want to, but what we object to is the deception that takes place where some of these people want to color it and prepare it to have it appear and taste like butter, and thereby deceive the consumers of the country. Is that not correct?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. In the particular district that I represent we do not happen to be one of the large butter-producing districts. But anyone who has ever taken the time to follow this controversy through knows that this oleomargarine controversy is just the camel getting its head under the tent, because nutritively the principle is absolutely the same in all cases. If vegetable oil is equal to the animal fat in butter, then the vegetable oil is equal to the animal fat in filled milk—and equal to the butterfat in cheese. In other words, it is not only the butter industry but it is the whole dairy industry that is being threatened. This combination of interests that willingly or unwillingly are threatening the dairy industry must not be allowed a free hand in putting their plans into operation. Post-war agriculture in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and many other States must be approached on the basis of how much progress the vegetable oil interests make at the expense of the animal fats of the country.

I certainly would not stand up here, nor would I want anybody else to stand up here, and oppose science any time science will prove a fact. I do not care to be misled by any bogey scientist coming down here at the bid of the oleo institute and talking half an hour about how much he knows, and let him do the leading as far as the legislative action of this Congress is concerned. I represent a dairy district, and regardless of any criticism of being called provincial I surely am not going to stand idly by and see the greatest industry of our State completely wrecked by these people that are doing it intentionally or unintentionally at the present time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Furthermore, the gentleman does not want to be a party to any proposition which proposes to turn over a synthetic product to people where the question of health is concerned.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is right; it should not be allowed.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CLEVINGER. At about what date did they begin stepping up and fortifying oleomargarine?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The oleo people have always forced their product on to the American people through deceit and deception. They tried to deceive them into believing it was just as good as butter before they even fortified it. I believe they first began fortifying oleomargarine in 1937 and expanded the injections of vitamin A in 1938. The oleo interests said oleo was equal to butter before they ever fortified it. They do not inject vitamin A into 100 percent of it even at the present time.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I believe Mr. McNutt was Governor of Indiana from 1934 to 1937. At the time he was forcing this thing on the State institutions of Indiana it had none of the fortification they claim for it now.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; that is right. It was brought out very clearly in the hearings. The tables submitted by the Oleo Institute show that they began the fortification in 1937, and expanded it from 1938 to the present time, as I said before. I also said before, it is not 100 percent fortified even now. By fortification I mean, it does not all contain 9,000 international units of vitamin A. The reports of the United States Department of Agriculture show that the average winter butter contains 11,000 international units of vitamin A per pound; that summer butter averages over 20,000, and much butter goes to 27,000. To prove that the oleo boys do not tell the facts just exactly as they are, there is evidence that lots of butter contains three times as much vitamin A, to say nothing of other qualities, as there is in oleo that has 9,000 international units of vitamin A injected into it. Butter has 50 to 500 international units of vitamin D and oleo has none.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Will the gentleman tell the House something about the nutritional value of a pound of lard compared with some of these substitutes?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As far as calories are concerned, a pound of lard has more calories than either a pound of butter or a pound of oleo. Lard has around 4,000 calories; oleo and butter have 3,600 due to moisture held in the butter, and the moisture put in the oleo. The pure fats should have no moisture. Oleo has 17 percent of skim milk put into it to make it smell like butter. In the manufacture of butter they cannot get out all the moisture if they so desired. If a pound of lard was fortified with an equal number of international units of vitamin A as a pound of oleo was, lard would have more food value. It might not be as palatable as the oleo

would, since the oleo has been perfumed up in a manner to make it taste and smell like butter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. PLOESER and Mr. VURSELL asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### THE FACTS ABOUT GUAM

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much confusion has been created about the island of Guam, and that confusion has been augmented to such an extent that it is now time that the American people know the facts about that small island and the legislation that was presented to Congress respecting the same. Quite recently it was discovered in many congressional districts that some of the people were greatly confused respecting the facts concerning Guam, and without ascertaining the facts on that subject made statements to the effect that Members of Congress should be defeated in the coming election because they have voted against fortifying Guam. It is lamentable, indeed, that any person would deliberately make any such statement without knowing the facts on that subject.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is there was never any bill presented to Congress, either in the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, or seventy-eighth sessions thereof, and that covers the entire period of time that I have been a Member of the Congress, to fortify Guam. The question of fortifying Guam was never presented, during that period, and no Member of Congress had any opportunity to vote upon that question. There was never any bill reported out of any committee, during that period of time, by which it was sought to fortify the island of Guam. Therefore the many statements made, by those without knowledge upon the subject, by which the inference is left with the people that there was some measure presented for the fortification of Guam, is without any foundation whatsoever.

It has been a great surprise to me to find that many of those representing the New Deal have been, and they are now, trying to confuse the American people upon that subject and are making an effort to create the impression that Members of Congress, and especially the Republican Members of that great law-making body, voted against the fortification of Guam. Of course, both Democrats and Republicans—and I speak of all of them—did not vote on the subject of fortifying Guam, because there was never any bill presented to the Congress on that subject, and the opportunity to vote upon that subject was never presented. The President, who is the Com-

mander in Chief of the Army and Navy, never sent any message nor did he make any request for an appropriation for the purpose of fortifying Guam, and the majority in Congress, which has been under the full control of the President since he took office, did not at any time suggest or present any bill or measure for the fortification of Guam. Therefore, all of the adroit statements made and the misleading assertions uttered which tend to leave the inference that Congress, or any Member thereof, declined to vote for the fortification of Guam, is confusing, entirely misleading, and purely disgusting. If the President wanted to fortify Guam, or if he gave that matter any consideration, why did not he ask for it? During the pre-war period he had a great majority in the House of Representatives and he could have obtained an appropriation for that purpose, without doubt, if he had requested it. But the fact remains, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so discloses, that there never was any request made for an appropriation for the fortification of Guam.

Mr. Speaker, quite recently the President, while on one of his many trips, told the American people:

We were not permitted to fortify the island of Guam.

He did not in any way amplify that statement. He did not tell them that he had failed to ask for any appropriation for the fortification of Guam, and he did not tell the American people that there had never been any suggestion or request made to Congress that Guam be fortified, but he was content to try to leave the inference that Congress had failed to do that which was necessary relative to the fortification of Guam. That was merely a cunning method of attempting to play politics with the American people, and such a method places a new and a low level in politics during this, our greatest war, to which the American people will take exception. Regardless of the cunning statement made by the President, in his effort to mislead the people, I state, again, there was never any bill presented to the House of Representatives to fortify Guam. The Members of the lower House of Congress never had any opportunity, therefore, to vote upon that question and any statement to the contrary is entirely misleading.

Mr. Speaker, what was the proposal that came before the House of Representatives respecting the island of Guam? And what was the item submitted to the Members of the House of Representatives for debate, consideration and vote? The sole question was presented by an item in the pending measure for an appropriation for \$5,000,000 for cleaning out and dredging the harbor at the Island of Guam. There was no request to fortify that island. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of date February 22 and 23, 1939, the entire debate and action on that appropriation of \$5,000,000 for the cleaning and dredging of the harbor at Guam is set forth. Democrats and Republicans alike voted against that useless expenditure of \$5,000,000 for the cleaning and dredging of the Guam harbor, because it would only serve to irri-

tate Japan, which then occupied many of the mandated islands in that immediate vicinity. Admiral Hepburn, who testified on this subject, openly stated to the Naval Affairs Committee, that the dredging and cleaning of the harbor, and improving the harbor facilities, at Guam, did not follow the recommendations made by the Hepburn Board. That statement comes from high authority. Again we have some very high authority on the subject of the matter presented to Congress, and upon which the confusion to which I have referred has resulted, because Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs in the House, made the following statement:

Opposition to this item has been based on the assumption that Guam is to be fortified and made into a strongly defended naval base for airplanes and submarines. In view of this opposition the committee has gone into this matter at great length, and I can assure you that there is no intention on the part of the Navy Department to fortify Guam, or to do anything further than what is included in this bill.

As heretofore stated, the pending measure provided, only, for the cleaning and dredging the harbor, and improving the harbor facilities, at Guam.

Admiral Leahy was interrogated on the question of fortifying Guam before the Naval Affairs Committee, and he testified, in 1939, as follows:

Admiral LEAHY. The failure to carry out this plan to fortify Guam resulted from an agreement of the United States not to fortify the islands in the Pacific.

During the debate on this question, the then majority leader in the House, now the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, took a part in the debate on this very question, and he made the following illuminating statement:

Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] that there is no reason whatsoever for unseemingly excitement for such an item in this bill. If I wanted to justify this statement I would merely read the minority report. Every argument I would have to meet for this bill is met by the language in the minority report. The minority report states: "We recognize the right of the United States to establish military facilities in Guam." We are attempting, and the committee is attempting, no such thing as that in this bill.

The gentleman from Georgia, Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, who had charge of the bill on the floor of the House, made the following statement during the debate on the measure:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The bill, in the first place, does not call for any fortification whatsoever.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia, Hon. PATRICK H. DREWRY, a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, and on the 29th day of August 1944, had this to say upon this subject, and I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 29, 1944, page 7382:

Mr. DREWRY. I think this is a good time to clear this matter up, and it might as well be

cleared up. Nobody has ever heard me say that I thought the appropriation carried in that bill was for fortifying Guam. I made a speech on the subject, and the gentleman might have quoted me and said that I said it was not for the purpose of fortifying Guam. I say it now. It was not a matter of fortifying Guam. It was an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to clean up the harbor in order that the coral rocks which were below the surface and were a menace to the submarines and airplanes that might land on the water be dredged out. The \$5,000,000 was asked for in order to do that dredging and it was not asked for fortification purposes. There was no fortification in that appropriation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is a great surprise to me to learn that there are some people in our country who, for political purposes, or for want of knowledge and understanding on the subject, continue to try to leave the impression that Members of Congress voted against fortifying Guam. Such was not the case. There was no measure presented for the fortification of Guam, and the Congress has never had the opportunity to vote upon that question. The Navy never requested any measure for the fortification of Guam, the President never made any such request, and the majority in the House, under the complete domination of the President, has never suggested nor requested any appropriation for the fortification of Guam. Therefore, if any mistake was made in failing to ask for the fortification of Guam, the President made that mistake because he failed to ask for the appropriation for the fortification of Guam. The fault does not lie in the lap of Congress because this is the legislative body. The fault lies with the Commander in Chief, and he should assume his full responsibility in this and in all matters; he should not, by cunning phrases and subterfuge, attempt to place the blame elsewhere.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### CHRISTMAS MAIL FOR OUR ARMED FORCES OVERSEAS SHOULD BE MAILED NOW

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in order that Christmas parcels may reach the addressees on time and in good condition, arrangements have been made by the Post Office Department in cooperation with the War and Navy Departments—the latter including the Marines and Coast Guard—for the acceptance of such parcels for members of our armed forces serving outside the continental United States.

The term armed forces overseas includes the personnel of our armed forces who receive their mail through an A. P. O. or fleet post office in care of the postmaster at New York, N. Y., San Francisco, Calif., New Orleans, La., or Seattle, Wash., or an A. P. O. in care of the postmaster at Miami, Fla., Presque Isle, Maine, or Minneapolis, Minn., or through a naval installation or station in care of the postmaster at Seattle.

#### TIME OF MAILING

Christmas cards and Christmas parcels for personnel of the armed forces

overseas must be mailed during the period beginning September 15, 1944, and ending October 15, 1944, the earlier the better. The War Department advises that Christmas greeting cards for soldiers overseas must be sent in sealed envelopes and prepaid at the first-class rate.

#### NO REQUEST REQUIRED

No requests from the addressees are required in connection with Christmas parcels mailed to Army personnel during this period only. Patrons should endorse each gift parcel "Christmas Parcel." Special effort will be made to effect delivery of all Christmas parcels mailed during that period in time for Christmas.

#### SIZE AND WEIGHT

In view of the urgent need for shipping space to transport materials directly essential to the war effort, Christmas parcels shall not exceed the present limits of 5 pounds in weight or 15 inches in length or 36 inches in length and girth combined. These Departments have pointed out also that members of the armed forces are amply provided with food and clothing and the public is urged not to include such matter in gift parcels. Not more than one Christmas parcel or package shall be accepted for mailing in any one week when sent by or on behalf of the same person or concern to or for the same addressee.

Christmas parcels for members of the Army personnel leaving home stations en route overseas shortly before or subsequent to October 16, 1944, will be accepted after October 15, up to and including December 10, 1944, upon presentation by the sender of a change of address notification—W. D. A. G. O. Form 204 or equivalent notice—from the addressee received subsequent to September 30, 1944, provided the parcels come within the prescribed limits of weight and size and are endorsed "Christmas Parcel." Only one such parcel will be accepted from any one person to any one individual having an overseas A. P. O. address.

#### PREPARATION OF PACKAGES

Owing to the great distance this mail must be transported and the handling and any storage it must undergo, it is absolutely necessary that all articles be packed in boxes of metal, wood, solid fiberboard, or strong double-faced corrugated fiberboard reinforced with strong gummed-paper tape or tied with strong twine, or both. It is highly desirable that all fiberboard boxes be securely wrapped in heavy paper, if available, as experience has shown that boxes without an outer wrapper often become crushed or split, thus allowing the contents to escape. Furthermore, as each parcel is subject to censorship, delay in handling may be minimized by securing the covering of the parcel so as to permit ready inspection of the contents.

When combination packages are made up, including miscellaneous toilet articles, hard candies, soaps, and so forth, the contents should be tightly packed, in order that the several articles may not be loosened in transit, damaging the contents or the covering of the parcels. Christmas boxes should be enclosed in

substantial containers. Hard candies, nuts, caramels—including those covered with chocolate—cookies, fruit cake, and chocolate bars individually wrapped in waxed paper should be enclosed in inner boxes of wood, metal, or cardboard. Soft candies, whether home-made or commercial, do not carry well. Sealed packages of candy, cigars, tobacco, and toilet articles in simplest mercantile form may be placed in parcels without affecting the parcel-post classification of such packages. Sharp-pointed or sharp-edged instruments, such as razors, knives, and so forth, must have their points or edges protected so they cannot cut through their coverings and damage other mail or injure postal employees.

#### PERISHABLE MATTER NOT ACCEPTABLE

Perishable matter will not be accepted, and the sending of fragile articles should be discouraged.

#### PROHIBITED ARTICLES

Intoxicants, inflammable materials—including matches of all kinds and lighter fluids—and poisons, or compositions which may kill or injure another or damage the mails, are unmailable.

#### HOW TO ADDRESS PARCELS

Addresses must be legible, in typewriting or ink. Copies of sales slips of retail stores should not be used as address labels. The complete address should also be shown on a sheet of paper inside the parcel in order to permit identification of the addressee in the event the outer wrapper becomes torn, mutilated, or destroyed in transit. Parcels addressed to overseas Army personnel should show, in addition to the name and address of the sender, the name, rank, Army serial number, branch of service, organization, A. P. O. number of the addressee, and the post office through which the parcels are to be routed.

Parcels for naval personnel, including the Marine Corps and Coast Guard should show, in addition to the name and address of the sender, the name, rank, or rating of the addressee and the naval unit to which he is assigned with the Navy number assigned thereto, or name of the ship and fleet post office through which the parcels are to be routed.

Mail for Coast Guard personnel is addressed the same as for naval personnel except that the words "U. S. Coast Guard" shall be used in place of "U. S. Navy" after the man's name.

#### POSTAGE

Postage must be fully prepaid, the rate on parcels of fourth-class matter—that is, parcels exceeding 8 ounces—being the zone rate applicable from the post office where mailed to the post office in care of which the parcels are addressed. The third-class rate of 1½ cents for each 2 ounces applies to packages not exceeding 8 ounces, except in the case of books, on which the rate is 1 cent for each 2 ounces. The third-class rate of 1½ cents for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof is also applicable to unsealed greeting cards, addressed to other than Army personnel provided they bear no unpermissible written additions. It is suggested, how-

ever, that they be mailed as first-class matter since in that event they will be returned, if undeliverable, provided they bear a return card. Parcels containing only books conforming to the requirements prescribed therefor are acceptable at the special rate of 3 cents a pound, plus 1 cent on each parcel, the limit of weight being 5 pounds.

#### PERMISSIBLE ADDITIONS

In addition to the name and address of the sender, which is required, inscriptions such as "Merry Christmas," "Please do not open until Christmas," "Happy New Year," "With best wishes," and the like, may be placed on the covering of the parcel in such manner as not to interfere with the address, or on a card enclosed therewith. Books may bear simple dedicatory inscriptions not of a nature of personal correspondence. Stickers or labels resembling postage stamps are not permissible on the outside of parcels.

#### INSURANCE, REGISTRY, AND C. O. D. SERVICES

No matter addressed to members of the Army or other persons receiving mail through A. P. O.'s overseas shall be accepted as insured or C. O. D. mail. Letters or packages containing money or other articles of value shall be refused registration, but letters containing valuable or important papers may be registered.

Mail for personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard may be accepted for registration or insurance if it conforms to existing requirements as to weight, size, and other prescribed conditions, and mailers should be advised to register or insure Christmas gifts of more than ordinary value addressed to personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

#### DO NOT SEND CASH—USE MONEY ORDERS

Postal money orders should be used to transmit gifts of money to members of the armed forces outside the continental United States. Do not send cash because at many places where such forces are stationed there is a local prohibition against the importation of United States money, and it could not be used if received. However, domestic postal money orders can be cashed at A. P. O.'s wherever they are located, and they are paid in local foreign currency at the rate of exchange in effect on the date the orders are presented.

#### CHRISTMAS MAIL FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

Christmas mail for members of the merchant marine should also be mailed between September 15, 1944, and October 15, 1944, if delivery by December 25, 1944, is desired. Parcels for such persons cannot be registered or insured, and there is no money-order service available to this branch of the service.

Further information can be had by writing your Congressman, WILLIAM C. COLE, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### THE WAR WILL NOT END IF WE HAVE A FOURTH TERM

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, now that we are approaching the end of the war with Germany, all over the land anxious and devoted mothers and fathers are asking, When will our boys come home? The answer to this question depends upon who is elected President of the United States on November 7.

We are all busy discussing the post-war era with the bright expectation that soon there will be a return to the days of peace and nonmilitary activities. We all know that with the tremendous fighting forces which are in action the fall of Japan will follow comparatively soon after the fall of Germany. Will these welcome events usher in the post-war era?

Because I am convinced of certain things, I am going to speak very plainly and give the American people my conclusion. The war will not end under President Roosevelt. There will be no post-war under Roosevelt. It will be perpetual war. President Wilson said that we fought World War No. 1 to end war. President Roosevelt favors the fighting of this war to perpetuate war and it is no secret here in Washington that he intends to make war in alliance with two great world powers on his own initiative and without coming to the Congress for a declaration of war. And this is in total defiance of section VIII of article I of the Constitution of the United States vesting in the Congress the sole power to declare war. This is why the conference at Dumbarton Oaks is secret.

Let us visualize the future with President Roosevelt exercising these vast and perpetual war powers. By agreement with the British Empire and the Soviet Union, our armed vessels would continually patrol the seven seas and if any small craft came out of a harbor anywhere in the world without previous permission, duly certified and in possession of the master of the craft, a shot could be fired across her bows to make her heave to for inspection by Uncle Sam, the world policeman. A plane could not take to the air without interruption of its course by an air squadron constantly patrolling its beat. There would no longer be any peaceful borders between nations. And the crying outrage of all of this would be visited upon the American people when the world commander in chief called forth our American boys to go forth to battle. The Congress of the United States is expected to sit supinely by while this is taking place and to forget their oaths to support the Constitution of the United States. This majestic dream of too much power would not only involve us in perpetual war but would utterly destroy the spirit of the American people and render us a nation in trembling fear of the next morning's headlines or a coming flash over the radio. We are a great nation because we have lived with honest devotion to the checks and balances of the Constitution of the United States with powers divided between the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of government, well defined and well understood and

sanctioned by over 150 years of steady growth and development. Power begets power and the path of history is strewn with the wrecks of governments where too much power reposed in one man. We fought this war to end dictatorships and we must see it through to the triumph of liberty regulated by law under a leader faithful to the obligations of the Constitution of the United States.

Many good Americans feel more or less secure because they expect that the whole matter will be determined by a treaty approved by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. A reservation to this effect was placed in the Connally resolution upon the insistence of Senator WILLIS, of Indiana. It will be a shock to these well-intentioned people to learn that the Roosevelt plan is to handle the entire matter as a continuation of the war powers which he now holds and which in my opinion he never intends to return to the American people and their Congress.

Is this a violent conclusion? Let us see. President Roosevelt construed his election by a majority of the American voters in 1932 as a mandate. The result was N. R. A., utterly unconstitutional and so held by unanimous opinion of the then existing United States Supreme Court. President Roosevelt in 1936 construed his second election by a majority of the American voters as another mandate. The result was the Court-packing scheme to completely destroy the independence and integrity of the Supreme Court of the United States, a scheme which the Senate Judiciary Committee thus characterized:

It stands now before the country, acknowledged by its proponents as a plan to force judicial interpretation of the Constitution—a proposal that violates every sacred tradition of American democracy.

President Roosevelt construed his election by a majority of American voters in 1940 as a mandate to edge us into the present world war by steps characterized as short of war, but which must inevitably involve us in the war. Can anyone doubt that a fourth election in 1944 by a majority of the American voters will be construed by him as a mandate to keep us in perpetual war? Can anyone honestly argue that an organized continuing militarism is peace?

I have been asked many times whether the vast powers which were granted to President Roosevelt to carry on the war will ever be returned to the American people and their Congress. These vast powers, almost unlimited, are known as the war powers. My answer to this question is in the affirmative if Governor Dewey and the Republican Party are chosen to govern this Nation on November 7, 1944. If President Roosevelt and the New Deal Party is continued in power, my answer is in the negative. Is this a violent conclusion? Let us see.

Bearing in mind that we will be in a close military alliance with two other great powers and that the President will make war at the behest of either one or both of these great powers without coming to the Congress for a declaration of war—a step which he characterizes as



not sufficiently speedy—why would he return these war powers to the American people or to their Congress when he could readily make use of them at any time without a moment's notice?

I participated in the historical debates which preceded our entrance into the war which came after the dastardly Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and I recall what was said by the proponents of the New Deal about an undeclared war. There was evidenced a feeling of dissatisfaction that the President could not make war upon his own initiative but must wait for the slower processes of a declaration of war by the Congress. From all indications which are steadily gaining in strength and taking definite form, the President and the New Deal Party now intend to bypass the Congress entirely and make war at the sole discretion and whim of the President. Can it be possible that a majority of the American voters, with their eyes open, will reelect President Roosevelt for a fourth term when he has declared his intentions?

I have long been a student of the Constitution of the United States and like to approach great issues from that angle. If President Roosevelt, elected for another 4 years, refuses to return these vast war powers the only remedy would be impeachment. The Constitution provides that when a President is impeached he shall be tried by the Senate, the Chief Justice of the United States presiding. It is a well-established fact that in such a trial the Chief Justice passes upon the rules of evidence since the Constitution is silent upon that point. It thus becomes of great importance to ascertain who will be the Chief Justice of the United States to succeed Chief Justice Stone, who is generally expected to resign.

Under our constitutional system, the Chief Justice of the United States occupies a position second only to the President. The American people proudly recall the noble services of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes during the terrible days of the "Court packing" controversy and how he stood out as a great pillar of constitutional freedom, thwarting the efforts of the New Dealers to weaken and destroy the confidence of the people in our highest tribunal. I question whether the Supreme Court could survive as the apex of one of three great coordinate branches of the Government—the judiciary—if we had a New Deal Chief Justice in addition to the overwhelming number of New Dealers already appointed by President Roosevelt to that Court. It is commonly rumored in Washington that Samuel Rosenman will be the next Chief Justice, if President Roosevelt is reelected.

The American people have a right to feel justly proud of the stand which the Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress have taken in support of the Constitution of the United States. A majority of this Congress have been steady and firm in their opposition to New Deal encroachments. Vicious and underhanded attacks are being made by subversive influences against those who have had the courage to protect and defend our great

charter of freedom. We are Americans and share with the immortal Daniel Webster his great devotion to our beloved country which he proclaimed in these words that can never die:

I shall know but one country. The ends I aim at shall be my country's, my God's, and truth's. I was born an American; I live an American; I shall die an American; and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me in that character to the end of my career. What is the individual man, with all the good or evil that may betide him, in comparison with the good or evil which may befall a great country, and in the midst of great transactions which concern that country's fate?

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 6, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARING

The Subcommittee on Merchant Marine in Overseas Aviation, of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Monday, September 11, 1944, at 10:30 o'clock a. m.

At that time the subcommittee will consider the right of the merchant marine to engage in overseas aviation to protect their passenger services over trade routes pioneered and developed by them.

Persons desiring copies of the printed hearings when available will please notify the Clerk by letter.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1787. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report covering the period from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944; under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 779, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1788. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1789. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

1790. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands within the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., to the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1791. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the fourth quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period beginning April 1, 1944, and ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1792. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin

Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1793. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 238 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1794. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for The National Archives for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1795. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal by the Government agencies indicated; 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. BARRETT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5283. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1841). 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. 5289. A bill to provide for the acceptance and protection by the United States of property within the authorized boundaries of the Everglades National Park project, Florida, pending the establishment of the park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1842). 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. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 5301. A bill to provide safety in aviation and to direct an investigation of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 5302. A bill to provide for the construction of a Federal building in Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 5303. A bill to extend the functions of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 5304. A bill to amend the first section of the act of July 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 726); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5305. A bill to change the name of Bladensburg Road in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. R. 5306. A bill to authorize the issuance of United States Government life-insurance policies to replace such policies which have been surrendered for cash; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as

Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 633. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the fifth intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 1366) of the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, submitting an analysis of a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 634. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the sixth intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 1797) of the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, submitting an analysis of a bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; 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. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5307. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie I. Clay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 5308. A bill for the relief of Virginia Packard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 5309. A bill for the relief of the county of Talladega, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5310. A bill for the relief of R. Heine; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5311. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada H. Keith et al.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 5312. A bill for the relief of Joe B. Crawford; 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:

6070. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Florence Leibundguth and sundry other residents of Black Hawk County, Iowa, in favor of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6071. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of Indianapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce and Wayne Township War Mothers Clubs 1 and 2 urging enactment of House bills 3670 and 4284 relating to promotion of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6072. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of County Supervisors Association of California in the matter of encouraging Japanese to return to their native land and amending the laws relating to the operation or ownership of property by persons ineligible to citizenship; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6073. Also, resolution of County Supervisors Association of California in the matter of memorializing Congress to take steps to insure the extension of international air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6074. Also, resolution of County Supervisors Association of California in the matter of making available equipment, material, and supplies produced for United States of America to counties when not needed for war work; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6075. Also, resolution of County Supervisors Association of California in the matter of increased welfare load urging the establishment of fourth category and requesting that the Federal Government participate financially in the program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6076. By the SPEAKER: Petition of F. W. O'Neil, president of the Mining and Metal-

urgical Society of America, petitioning consideration of its resolution with reference to making minerals and metals available for purchase by all nations without discrimination or restrictions, as they have been in the past; that the governments maintain adequate information at all times concerning metals and minerals production, stocks, and consumption in all countries; and that wartime metal and mineral controls should in the post-war period be relaxed and discontinued as promptly as may safely be done; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Thou who art Lord of all the earth, we beseech Thee to speak to us out of the depths of Thy holy nature; and like the exile far from home, may we heed Thy welcome voice. In the name of Him who achieved great miracles when the waters were bitter and the cup was full, we ask Thy blessing of comfort upon the world's stricken multitudes, that in the darkness of their tragic suffering they may feel the breath and hear the approach of Thy coming. O hear our prayers for them and grant that they may rise as holy incense from the altar of the soul of America.

We pray for our Nation and for all who are in authority that they may be united with Thee and guided through these critical and perilous times. Grant that the dawn may speedily come to all nations, that the welfare of one may be the welfare of all. O may intelligence and virtue prevail in our own land and be reflected to those nations which are in the region of darkness and death. O be their savior; preserve them and keep them alive, that they may be blessed on earth. Clothe us all with those high and noble elements which sustain our national life, and Thine shall be the praise and glory, O Master, world without end. Amen.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5181. An act to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive

papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Federal Works Agency.
6. National Archives.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix in two particulars, to include in one an editorial from the New York Times and in the other an article written by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOODRUM), I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include an address before the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs of Richmond, Va., and one before the Kiwanis Clubs of Roanoke, Va. It is estimated by the Government Printing Office that the latter address can be printed at a cost of \$121.40.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a local newspaper.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.