Corporation for the month of October 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARL ANDERSEN:
H. R. 1623. A bill to establish a commission to study the availability and use of public lands.

By Mr. RITTENBERG:

By Mr. REESE of Tennessee:

By Mr. RATHBAH:
H. R. 1631. A bill to amend the schedule of securities of 1929, and section 18 (c) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

By Mr. STROM:
H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:
H. J. Res. 96. Resolution authorizing and directing the Comptroller of the Currency to make an investigation and report on the banking systems and the management practices of the United States.

By Mr. CLINTON of Texas:
H. Res. 96. Resolution to amend rule 111 of the House, with respect to the duties of the Clerk of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorial bills and resolutions were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARL ANDERSEN:
H. R. 1631. A bill for the relief of Dr. William Todor Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY:
H. R. 1632. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Florida:
H. R. 1633. A bill for the relief of Olivia Stebbins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:
H. R. 1634. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Harrell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTENGER:
H. R. 1635. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Harrell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENSEN:
H. R. 1636. A bill for the relief of William S. Thomas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. YANG:
H. R. 1637. A bill for the relief of James Owen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:
H. R. 1638. A bill for the relief of Raymond Crosby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REESE of Tennessee:
H. R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Henry S. Giddens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STROM:
H. R. 1640. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLINTON of Texas:
H. R. 1641. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:
H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Edith Popwell; 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:

24. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition signed by 22 members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Fort Hope (Mich.) Presbyterian Church, praying for legislation for the elimination of the sale of intoxicants in Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, when it was called to order by Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, Vice President of the United States, whose entrance into the Senate Chamber was greeted with applause.

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

Our Father God, to whom a thousand years are as but one day, our brief stay is but as a watch in the night, yet, while last its ebbing hours, make us bold and swift and brave to do Thy will. From this exalted chair of government, bless those who are in the midst of the struggle to maintain justice and peace in the world, and give them wisdom and courage to do Thy will. Grant that the world may soon be freed from the thorny thorns of war, and be filled with the spirit of peace and justice. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

JAMES O. EASTLAND, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 18, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Meskill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H.
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Con. Res. 18) establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM MISSOURI—ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator-designate from Missouri, the Honorable FRANK P. BRIGGS, whose credentials I now offer for filing, is present in the Chamber and ready to take the oath of office as Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read by the Clerk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF MISSOURI,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on this 15th day of January A. D. 1945, I, Phil M. Donnelly, Governor of the State of Missouri, do hereby appoint FRANK P. BRIGGS United States Senator from the State of Missouri, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term beginning January 18, 1945, and ending January 3, 1947, or until his successor shall be duly elected and qualified according to law, to fill the vacancy in the office of United States Senator created by the resignation of HARRY S. TRUMAN. This appointment is made pursuant to the authority vested in me as chief executive of the State of Missouri by the provisions of section 11540, Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1939.

In testimony whereof I hereunto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Missouri. Done at Jefferson City this 15th day of January A. D. 1945.

PHIL M. DONNELLY,
Governor.

By the Governor: WILSON BELL, Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. BRIGGS, escorted by Mr. DONNELL, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

INAUGURATION CEREMONIES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings of the inauguration of the President and Vice President of the United States on Saturday last be printed in the body of the Record.

Without objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The 20th day of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, twentieth amendment, for the beginning of the Presidential and Vice Presidential terms, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of New York, and Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, were this day inaugurated President of the United States and Vice President of the United States, respectively, on the south portico of the White House.

The ceremonies were in charge of the Joint Committee on Arrangements of the two Houses of Congress, consisting of Harry Flood Byrd, chairman; Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee; Sam Ervin, of North Carolina; Robert L. Doughton; Joseph W. Martin, Jr.; and Edwin A. Halsey, Secretary.

Assembled on the south portico were the Committee on Arrangements, and their secretary, members of the families of the President and Vice President, the President's Cabinet, the Chief Justice of the United States, and other members of the Bench, the Justices of the Supreme Court, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Commanding General of the Army Air Forces, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the United States Army and Navy, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Commandant of the Coast Guard, and other high military and naval officers and distinguished guests.

On the lawn surrounding the portico, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Diplomatic Corps, and a large number of citizens were gathered.

At 11:55 o'clock a. m. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President-elect, accompanied by his son, Col. James Roosevelt, Roosevelt, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States?

The President-elect. So help me God.

The Chief Justice. The President-elect. So help me God.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT

Thereupon the President of the United States delivered the following inaugural address:

Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Vice President, my friends, you will understand and believe, agree with the form of this inauguration be simple and its wordsbrief.

We Americans of today, together with our allies, are passing through a period of supreme test. It is a test of our courage—of our resolve—of our wisdom—of our essential democracy.

If we meet this test—successfully and honorably—we shall perform a service of historic importance which men and women and children will honor throughout all time.

I stand here today, having taken the solemn oath of office in the presence of my fellow countrymen—in the presence of our God—I know that it is America's purpose that we shall not fail.

In the days and in the years that are to come we shall work for a just and honorable peace, a durable peace, as today we work and fight for total victory in war.

We can and we will achieve such a peace.

We shall strive for perfection. We shall not achieve it immediately—but we shall strive. We may make mistakes—but they must never be mistakes which result from faintness of heart or abandonment of moral principle.

I remember that my old schoolmaster, Dr. Pendley, said in days that seemed to us then to be secure and untroubled, "Things in life will not always run smoothly. Sometimes we will be rising toward the heights and still we will seem to reverse ourselves and start downward. The great fact to remember is that the trend of civilization itself is forever upward; that a line drawn through the middle of the peaks of the centuries always has an upward trend."
Our Constitution of 1787 was not a perfect instrument; it is not perfect yet. But it provided a firm base upon which all manner of men, of all races and colors and creeds, could build our solid structure of democracy.

And so today, in this year of war, 1945, we have learned lessons—at a fearful cost—and we shall profit by them.

We have learned that we cannot live alone; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations far away. We have learned that we must live as men, not as ostriches, nor as ostriches.

We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community.

We have learned the simple truth, as Emerson said, that “The only way to have a friend is to be one.”

We can gain no lasting peace if we approach it with suspicion and mistrust or with fear. We can gain it only if we proceed with the understanding, the confidence, and the courage which flow from conviction.

The Almighty God has blessed our land in many ways. He has given our land in many ways. He has given our friends with all. He was a good fighter and vigorous member of that committee. Senator Maloney was in the early years of a brilliant and useful career. He was born in 1894 and was just 50 years of age. He served in the Navy in the First World War and made an enviable record. He was Mayor of Meriden, his home city, from 1920 to 1933. He was elected in 1932 to the House of Representatives of the Seventy-third Congress and served in that body until 1935, when he took the seat in the Senate to which he had been elected in 1934. He was re-elected in 1940.

Senator Maloney had a most engaging personality. Always smiling, good-looking, and in every way attractive, he made friends with all. He was a good fighter for every principle he supported and he made an able and forceful Senator.

He was not satisfied with all of the rules of procedure of the Senate and he had submitted a resolution to reorganize the Senate so as to make it more efficient. He was a liberal. He was a strong Democrat and a strong party man, but never offensive to those who disagreed with him. I think he was one of the most capable men who ever served in the Senate.

Personally I was devoted to him, and I think he liked me. We got along splendidly on the Appropriations Committee and I have never heard him say anything unkind about others.

The Senate of the United States will miss him. He was a great ornament to the body. He was a sound student of government. He was wise and his counsel was ever welcome and helpful. He loved our country and he loved our Government, and he just naturally loved people.

I am greatly distressed at his passing away. I saw him only a short time ago and he was the picture of health. I thought I had never seen a stronger, healthier, more able-bodied man.

I think he liked me. We got along splendidly on the Appropriations Committee and I have never heard him say anything unkind about others.

The Senate of the United States will miss him. He was a great ornament to the body. He was a sound student of government. He was wise and his counsel was ever welcome and helpful. He loved our country and he loved our Government, and he just naturally loved people.

I am greatly distressed at his passing away. I saw him only a short time ago and he was the picture of health. I thought I had never seen a stronger, healthier, more able-bodied man.

I think he liked me. We got along splendidly on the Appropriations Committee and I have never heard him say anything unkind about others.

The Senate of the United States will miss him. He was a great ornament to the body. He was a sound student of government. He was wise and his counsel was ever welcome and helpful. He loved our country and he loved our Government, and he just naturally loved people.
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RESIGNATION OF JESSE JONES AS
SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask
unanimous consent to have printed in the
Record at this point two telegrams which
explain themselves.
These, without objection, the telegrams
were ordered to be printed in the
Record, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., January 22, 1945.
Senator K. D. MCKELLAR:
Strongly protest the resignation of Jones and hope
you will work against confirmation of Wallace
as Secretary of Commerce as consider him
a dangerous influence totally unfit for this
highly important post.
H. B. POTTS.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third annual financial statement and report of operations under the provisions of section 13 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774, approved July 19, 1949) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Reclamation.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION-OPERATIONS OF 1944

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the period from its organization, February 3, 1932, to September 30, 1944, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONCENTRATION OF POWER IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire
to call the attention of the Senate to a
resolution recently submitted by the Town
Hall Committee of Wichita, sent to me
by Mr. E. C. Moriarty, of Wichita, presi­dent.
This resolution addresses itself to a
situation that is disturbing to many of
us, that is, the increasing powers which
are being seized by Federal agencies un­der
extremely broad interpretations be­ing
given the intergovernmental clauses of the Constitution. Without undertaking
to say that this resolution points toward the right solution, I desire to
express my approval of its purpose.
I ask unanimous consent to have the reso­lution printed at this point as part of
my remarks, and appropriately referred.
There being no objection, the reso­lution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the Rec­ord, as follows:

WHEREAS the tendency of the Federal ad­ministration in recent years toward con­centration of what constitutes interstate commerce has gone far beyond the wishes and
beliefs of the public; and

NOW, therefore, we, the Town Hall Committee of Wichita believing that the abuse has reached the point where some action should be
taken to correct the tendency; and

Whereas the effect of the recent construc­tion of interstate commerce has been to eliminate and curtail free enterprise and bring practically every business within the
control of Federal bureaus.

Now, therefore, we, the Town Hall Com­mittee of Wichita, recommend to Congress that it give full and immediate considera­tion to an amendment to the Constitution that it limit any such concentration among the several States as set forth in the Con­stitution so as to better meet the needs of the people in promoting business, industry, and
property and in this connection we cite, as outstanding examples, the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in
WHEREAS the United States of America has always safeguarded and protected the sovereignty of all small nations in maintaining the boundaries established prior to September 1939; and

WHEREAS the United States was the first nation to recognize and acknowledge solemnly the present Polish Government-in-exile established in London; and

WHEREAS your honor, as our senior Senator, you were one of the first to evaluate the principles of the new historic meeting proclaiming the famous precepts of the Atlantic Charter, which have established boundaries of small nations as inviolate and sacred, without any changes whatsoever when all hostilities cease.

Resolved, That there be noted on your official records the sentiment and sympathetic feeling of Polish-American citizens in this area, that due recognition be given to the independence of the Republic of Poland as it existed before September 1939, and that you perpetuate your valiant leadership in continuing to recognize the present Polish Government-in-exile.

WILLIAM JOHN ORSALZ
Pastor, St. Mary’s Parish of Clinton,
Rev. A. B. KASATKA,
Curate, St. Mary’s Parish of Clinton,
STANLEY E. MACORA,
Attorney and Town Solicitor of Clinton,
Mr. WALKER. Mr. President, I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD this letter and resolutions which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD.

Yours for a Christian
United States of America,
ETHEY R. COHENBAVER.

INDEPENDENCE OF POLAND

Mr. WALKER. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred letters and resolutions sent me by the United Polish Organization and Polish Mothers’ Association of World War No. 2 of Salem, Mass.; by the pastor and parishioners of St. Stanislaus Bishop and Martyr Church, of Chicopee, Mass.; by the Federation of Polish-American Societies of Greater Boston; by the American Women of Polish Descent of Bondsville, Mass., urging a just treatment for Poland.

The being no objection, the letters and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. STANISLAUS
BISHOP AND MARTYR CHURCH,
The Honorable WALTER J. WALKER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Enclosed please find a copy of a resolution which has been drawn up by parishioners of this church, of which I have received from the Polish-American citizens of Clinton, Mass., asking that due recognition be given to the independence of the Republic of Poland, as it existed before September 1939, and that the present Polish Government-in-exile be recognized.

I suggest that this letter and resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW DEPARTMENT,
TOWN SOLICITOR’S OFFICE,
Hon. WALTER J. WALKER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MR. DEAR SENATOR WALKER: The representatives of the Roman Catholic Church, of which I have the honor to be a member, and professions have instructed me to send you the enclosed resolution for your kind consideration.

We have followed your leadership from the beginning and shall appreciate any response you can give in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
STANLEY E. MACORA, Attorney.
Resolved, That you as President, by all means, will not permit the contemplated partition of Poland and enslavement of other nations.

Resolved, furthermore, That justice and peace may prevail forever.

EUGENE PIASKI,

FEDERATION OF POLISH-AMERICAN SUCIETIES OF GREAT BOSTON

To the Massachusetts Members of Congress: At a mass meeting, A tribute to Poland, held at Faneuil Hall on January 14, 1945, at Boston, Mass., the enclosed resolutions were adopted.

Very truly yours,

ROMAN F. PIASKI,
Chairman of the Resolution Committee,

Whereas Poland, the first nation in Europe to reject appeasement, was the first to fight Nazi tyranny in the cause of freedom and civilization; and

Whereas Poland continues to fight valiantly on land, sea, and in the air for her cause and that of the United Nations; and

Whereas Poland is a country whose people have contributed to civilization the achievements of western civilization, and the democratic traditions of individual liberty and the freedom of conscience; and

Whereas Poland, in this tragic hour, despite her efforts in the cause of the United Nations, is being threatened with partition and the possible loss of her independence through the disregard of justice, international law, and the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Resolved, that we, citizens of the United States, gathered at Faneuil Hall, the cradle of liberty, on the day of January 14, 1945, at Boston, Mass., firmly condemn a policy of appeasement that has rallied to the cause of freedom the sons of the people of Poland.

Resolved, that while it is in the best interests of the Allies to maintain unity and to fight together in loyalty for their cause and for the hopes that have rallied 36 nations to the democratic principles of justice, law, and the rights of all nations.

Resolved, that a copy of these resolutions shall be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State, and to every member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Respectfully submitted by the committee on resolutions:

ROMAN F. PIASKI,
Chairman,
LILLIAN J. NEMENSKY,
FRANK NOWAK,
CLAYE PIESARAKI,
ELAINE H. PROBADOSKI,
JOHN SOIKOULSKI.

BONDSVILLE, MASS., January 20, 1945.
Hon. David I. Walsh,
United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The undersigned American soldiers' mothers, sisters, and sweethearts respectfully ask if the United Nations fight for democracy and all nations' freedom has now definitely become a fight for Russia's and England's world supremacy, if their beloved Poland in particular shall be reduced to the question of dying Caesar: "Et tu Brutos contra me?" America also is now against their beloved Poland.

Sincerely yours,

American Women of Polish Descent:

UNITED POLISH ORGANIZATION OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Resolutions of the Executive Committee

RESOLVED, That the United Polish Organizations of Massachusetts, as President, there has recently been issued by the Synagogue Council of America, representing orthodox, reform, and conservative religious groups an endorsement of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a constructive step forward in international relations, but criticizing their lack of any spiritual motive of inspiration to inspire the will to peace.

Endorsement of Dumbarton Oaks Proposal by Synagogue Council of America

Mr. TOBEY, Mr. President, there has recently been issued by the Synagogue Council of America, representing orthodox, reform, and conservative religious groups an endorsement of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a constructive step forward in international relations, but criticizing their lack of any spiritual motive to inspire the will to peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by these Jewish groups, and the letter endorsing it, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection to the statement and letter, are ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Tobe: You were good enough to make reference to the Synagogue Council statement on Dumbarton Oaks in your remarks last night in the Town Hall meeting of the air.

May I therefore take the liberty of sending you a copy of the full text of the statement of the Synagogue Council.

In the hope that you may want to make reference to it in the Senate?

With cordial greetings,
Yours in the service of God and country,
RABBI AHRON OPHIR.

The Synagogue Council of America greets with profound gratitude the labors of the leaders and the representatives of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, China, and our own country as set forth in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for an international organization to achieve the maintenance of international peace and security. Although these proposals are admittedly tentative, and constitute only a preliminary and incomplete statement of a hope yet to be fulfilled, the Synagogue Council acclaimed the temper in
which they are drawn. The statesmen of the four Allied Nations testified to the faith that rests in the human spirit and bespeak our own conviction that men and nations can and will cooperate to free the world of the curse of war.

The Synagogue Council of America is in full accord with the recommendation in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal to create a machinery for the possible prevention of international violence after these occur, not for their prevention; a mechanism calculated to remove or adjudicate international disputes without conflict and recourse to war.

To achieve the purposes envisaged by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the conduct of men and nations must accept the sanctions of the ethical law, proclaimed by Judaism as the sine qua non for the redemption and salvation of humanity. The bow and the sword and the battle will be banished from the earth, when the Prophets (Deut. 18:20-22), only when mankind will become devoted to God in righteousness and justice, in loving kindness and compassion on faithfulness and charity, which man shares, transmute the problem of war and peace into the realm of the ethical principles taught by our prophets, without which an enduring peace is impossible. Nor is a just and enduring peace probable unless it shall be universal. Therefore, the Synagogue Council of America endorses the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference as marking a most significant step forward. It has been the aim of the Synagogue Council of America to establish an international court of justice to which oppressor and to vanquish the oppressor is the attribute of Mercy—"The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in kindness and truth; the Lord is good to all; his tender mercies are over all his works" (ondrous consent, the second time, and re- introduced as follows:

"An act providing for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; without amendment (Rept. No. 14);

S. 315. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, of Arkansas, off the Baptist Church, without amendment (Rept. No. 15);

S. 317. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Depart­ ment, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 16); and

S. 330. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKeight; without amendment (Rept. No. 17).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported January 13, 1945,

S. 219. A bill to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy, without amendment (Rept. No. 18); and

H. R. 621. A bill to further amend section 23 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for the better protection of the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserves' Training Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 19).

AUTHORIZATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at 2 o'clock this afternoon there is to be a meeting of the Committee on the Judici­ ary on a very important matter. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may file its report dur­ ing the recess of the Senate, assuming that the Senate takes a recess at the conclusion of the day's work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without ob­ jection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRO­ DUCED

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

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 350. A bill granting a pension to Lottie Fink, daughter of the Commissary, Pensions.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 351. A bill to promote on the retired list all line officers of the Army who have served in the field during their time of service or for performance of duty in actual combat; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
By Mr. BALL: S. 352. A bill authorizing the State of Minnesota Department of Highways to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Hastings, Minn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOEY: S. 353. A bill for the relief of Carl Lewis; to the Claims Committee.

S. 354. A bill for the relief of Fred S. Hordroo; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. REED: S. 355. A bill to restore standard time; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 356. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide a limitation on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by, or against, common carriers by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELOCK: S. 357. A bill for the relief of the Forward Columbus Fund, of Columbus, Nebr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ALISH: S. 358. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Lisitano; and S. 359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen McCormack; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing for an annual audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of certain governmental agencies and corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HAYDEN: S. 360. A bill providing for an annual audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of certain governmental agencies and corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O’DANIEL: S. 361. A bill to amend the Fact Finders’ Act of 1924 relative to costs of investigations of certain reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GURNEY: S. 362. A bill for the relief of C. Owen Welch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O’MAHONEY: S. 363. A bill to amend the Fact Finders’ Act of 1924 relative to costs of investigations of certain reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 364. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; and S. 365. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; and S. 366. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 367. A bill to provide for the compilation and publication of a list showing the names and addresses of taxpayers relieved from liability for the payment of taxes under the provisions of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 and the amounts of taxes from which such taxpayers are relieved from liability for payment; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 368. A bill to amend the act entitled “An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipeline lines related to national defense, and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL): S. 369. A bill to provide for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. CAPPERS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. BUSHEFORD, and Mr. THOMAS): S. J.Res. 38. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relative to freedom to work; and S. J.Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of office of President and Vice President of the United States and Members of Congress to 6 years and imposing limitations upon the appointment of certain persons to office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and wish to make a statement regarding it.

The bill does not create any new agency, but simply recognizes the existence of an existing agency, to wit, the Federal Loan Agency, created by Reorganization Plan No. 1 under the Reorganization Act of 1939. It reestablishes that agency, which now is a skeleton agency, since the transfer by the President under the Second War Powers Act of March 24, 1942, of most of the agencies and the functions of those agencies theretofore operating under the Federal Loan Agency. The purpose of this bill is to return and restore to the Federal Loan Agency all those agencies and activities which were transferred by Executive order of the President under a date of February 24, 1942, to the Department of Commerce.

The bill does not affect the status of the National Housing Agency or of housing agencies which were transferred to the National Housing Agency at the time of the Executive order, nor does the bill deal with the Export-Import Bank, which seems to have been transferred by subsequent Executive act to the F. E. A., and is not now under the Department of Commerce.

Since this bill creates no new agency and does not enlarge the power or responsibility of any of the existing agencies, but merely takes out of the Department of Commerce or from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce all the loaning agencies theretofore transferred to that Department, I think the bill should go to the Committee on Commerce, and I request that it be so referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.
THE DRAFTING OF FARM WORKERS

Mr. LANGER, Mr. President, commencing more than two years ago, I have repeatedly since called the attention of the Senate to the desperate situation caused by the drafting of farm workers into the service. The Tydings amendment was finally adopted and the situation, to some extent, bettered. So far as I know, nothing was done about the 375,000 boys who were deferred to take jobs in the Government. The best I could do was to get a list of such individuals sent to the Speaker of the House and the Vice President. In my opinion, thousands of these men occupy places which could be filled by those who are unfit, or who are too old for combat service, and the able-bodied released.

Since the Selective Service has directed local draft boards to send more farm workers, I have been deluged with letters from every section of my State and the Northwest making clear that the taking away of normal farm hands, under any circumstances, means that the farmers must quit farming. I ask unanimous consent to have the letters printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks, and that the Selective Service be directed to give farmers help because that might prove embarrassing.

There being no objection, the letters, without the signatures attached, were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BATHGATE, N. DAK., January 10, 1945.

Dear Senator Langer,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator:

I am writing with reference to drafting the few men we have left to do the farm work. I am a farmer and do not have any of those younger farm boys to do my farm work. Therefore I am writing from a production basis.

I farm about 800 acres and hire two men in the summer. If these men are all taken to the Army who is going to do the work? I have experienced men from the cities and different parts of the State who are not capable of running this modern machinery.

As a farmer I want to be patriotic and do my bit, but if these farm boys are taken from my farm, like many of my neighbors, will have to stand idle and just grow up to weeds.

BLESSELL, N. DAK., January 12, 1945.

Dear Senator Langer:

From what we hear over the radio it seems likely that all able-bodied young workers will be in the Army soon if the military get everything the way they want it.

In my case it means that I shall have to quit farming because I am too old to do much work myself.

I mention this because I know there are thousands of farmers similarly situated.

Older men are going to take charge they say. Where are all those older men we hear so much about? All the older men I know of are overloaded with work now and cannot take on any new jobs.

BUXTON, N. DAK., January 14, 1945.

Dear Senator Langer:

This is the first time in my life I have written to any of our Senators in Washington, but things are pressing us farmers in North Dakota, and I am sure it is not new to you.

As I understand, they are to draft our farm boys who are farms' hands, and as we have only a little over 200 boys left in II-C class I for one do not feel it quite right.

We have a hard time taking care of our 1944 crop on account of help.

Had we had enough help from the start of harvest we could have saved a lot more of the grain, but as it happened the heavy rains came and a lot of the grain is still out in the field. Many of the boys got disgusted and left for their homes down South. If we had had help we could have harvested this grain could have been saved before the rains.

I hope you will pardon me for writing a rather long letter, but it is a hell of a farm man, but as you are a man from our own State I urge you to do your best for us farmers up here to help keep our boys, who are left, on the farm.

PENNEWIN, N. DAK., January 15, 1945.

HON. SENATOR WILLIAM LANGE:

Enclosed find two copies of our newspapers.

Why so much confusion in regard to II-C men deferred in agriculture, which are the men we farmers so badly need here in North Dakota. Something should be done to freeze this II-C deferment of future farmers, and for the duration. Instead of being batted around within the draft, and racing to do planning ahead for a successful job on the farm.

Some objections that put pressure to induce II-C farm workers believe we farmers can use anybody to run our tractors and machinery, but that cannot be done.

Some believe we have too many farm boys deferred, when we know it was the farm boys that were the first to be drafted in North Dakota. Even after and besides the farm boys should have same rights as those Federal men and factory workers in defense that are 18 to 26 in determinants, and if it came to the worst, we could get along with a lot less Federal men that are now on the payroll.

The farm boys that reach the age of 18 of late have not had much chance for deferment, which should be considered, and give them an own chance with those drafted in 1942.

TO EXAMINE ALL II-C MEN

MINOT, N. DAK.—Brig. Gen. Heber L. Edwards, North Dakota director of Selective Service, said here that within the next 90 days every boy deferred in class II-C (farm work) and under 26 years of age, will be sent to Fort Snelling, Minn., for preinduction physical examinations under the new regulations.

This does not mean, however, that every II-C man passing the examinations will be drafted.

He came here with other officials from State headquarters in Bismarck for a conference on the new regulations with draft boards from nine counties in the Minot area.

EXPLAINS NORTH DAKOTA POLICY ON FARM BOYS

Despite what the headlines may say, the bulk of young men from 18 through 26 deferred for agricultural purposes are not going to be drafted. This was the reasinging statement made before the county officers by Lt. Comdr. Frank L. Benson, of the North Dakota selective-service headquarters staff. These young men will be given preinduction physical examinations, but that does not mean they will be called.

The fact that North Dakota has the highest agricultural production per man in the United States, is an indication that this State has no wasted manpower in agriculture, Benson said, pointing out that the Defense Department was interested in seeing that agricultural production was maintained.

He said that the nonagricultural group of eligibles in the State had been exhausted, and that a small percentage of agriculturally deferred men would be taken from some counties, but that the service would try to take the men who would hurt farm production the least.

Lieutenant Commander Benson urged all to vote intelligently and be a friend of the farms. We were interested in seeing that agricultural production was maintained.

He said that farm workers, in the eyes of Selective Service, and that the man on the farm had as good a chance at deferment as one who went west to work in a bomber plant.

ROGERS, N. DAK., January 13, 1945.

Senator William Langer,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I am writing in regard to the drafting of farm labor. I think the Government is making a grave mistake in taking the boys from the lower-age brackets from the farms.

To cite my own case. We have 430 acres, last year we raised 170 hogs, sold $1,500 worth of cattle, and around 2,000 bushels of wheat. This year we are keeping 15 brood cows and 80 head of cattle, 20 horses and hogs which will increase our herd this year. Included in this are 6 milk cows.

Despite for a month's harvest and threshing when we had the help of one man, our only boy, 23 years of age, has done practically all the work of the 70-year-old, and physically unable because of a bad heart condition, to do anything except the lightest work. My wife has been crippled with arthritis for 3 years and is unable to do her household work.

I had my farm loan renewed in 1943 to the amount of $4,800, and owing to the condition of crops and prices, Interest and taxes, increased it to $12,000. During the last 3 years we have paid off $6,000 of this loan (a Federal loan) besides paying some feed and seed loans. We have also subscribed to our quota of bonds and all other war drives in our community.

If this boy is taken, our farm will lie idle, as there would be no one I could get to take his place. I am personally acquainted with five other farmers (all older men like myself) in our township, who are faced with the same situation as I, and who have one boy in the 18-25 age group, with no other help.

Please give this matter your consideration, for if these younger farm boys are taken, the output of food would be drastically reduced. Thank you.

ASHLEY, N. DAK., January 13, 1945.

Dear Mr. Langer: I am sending you this newspaper clipping so you can see what is going on at home.

When I read it I wondered if this is our pay-off from our Government for the work that we farmers did. For our boys on the fronts and for our Government that they want all our young boys from the farms and put them in the Army. So other young boys can play football, basketball, and boxing matches. I heard a boxing match this evening on the radio and got to be conducted.

Someone told me that a high officer made this statement in Ashley lately. We have to take the front and get them. We can't draft them in March. Are we farmers still recognize in Washing­ton? We had better hit back on this one before it don't look like it here at home. It looks very bad for us right now.

I hope you can do something for us farmers real soon.

[From the Ashley (N. Dak.) Tribune of January 11, 1945]

WILL CALL FARMERS FOR PREPHYSICAL

Reorganization of the McIntosh County Local Selective Service Board took place Monday, due to the resignation of Ed. Herr, of
 Wishek. Otto Brandt, of Wishek, was named in his place. The board now includes Jacob Remper, chairman; Fred Breitmeyer, vice chairman, and Leonard Setzer, secretary.

The regulations provide that all farm boys under the age of 26 will be called for a preinduction physical examination. This will take place in the next period of a week, which he stated, however, that farmers should not become alarmed and assured us that this does not mean that all farmers will be taken out of their agricultural occupation.

Regardless of what happens, it is nevertheless true that the armed services are in need of more men due to our expanding war fronts in the Pacific and in Europe. This need will continue.

Grain farming differs from dairy farming in that it can be laid down for a year, and the next spring the farmer can go in and plant a crop. In 3 or 4 months he will have raised a crop. But a dairy farmer who has dairy herds has built up his herds in any less time than 3 years, and for that reason we believe that the dairy farmer should be spared in preference to the grain farmer. The farmer who has built up a dairy herd can give you only so much milk, and if you can get the best men you can here to help do this matter will be very much appreciated, and thanking you for an early reply, I am,

Sawyer, N. D., January 13, 1945.

Senator Langner, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Being a farmer for 40 years, I am very much interested in the new draft regulation.

It's been almost impossible to farm the last 2 years we did not have a crop and if they take any more there will be many farms standing vacant.

There is a farm within a mile of me that has been vacated by the owner for lack of competent farm help. It's a well improved farm with $4,000 improvements and a section of land. The owner tried to farm it after his last boy on the farm was drafted last May. He has one of the best dairy herds around here. It has 35 years of age and in poor health, he couldn't do the work and had a sale last November and went to California and probably through the duration this farm will lay idle.

On this farm was 20 acres of crested wheat grass that was never cut which would have made 1000 to 1200 bushels of seed per acre if it has been harvested.

It's my opinion if they take more farm boys and try to replace them with IV-F or other hired help, who are not interested in the place, they are not willing to work 12 to 16 hours every day like the farm boys do themselves, there will be many more farms standing vacant.

We had a good crop in this part of the country last year and most of it was harvested. In my estimation, 10 to 20 percent had gone back into the ground for lack of help and combines.

There were hundreds of tons of wild hay that was cut in this part of the country, although many of the farmers put hay up hay as late as the last of November.

To me the farm situation looks very serious and the present administration will find it out when it's too late.

The atmosphere father and Wayne failed to pass the physical examination and is in class IV-F. For the last 2 years he has been working in the Kaiser shipyards in Vancouver, Wash. I also have a married son who farms for himself. Then I have one 26-year-old boy running this farm with my advice and help. Last year we milked 16 cows and had 350 acres of crop in. I have a 20-year-old son at home who is running the farm. I'll have to quit farming, as my health is very poor and I am not able to do the work anymore.

My reason for writing this letter was to let you know the exact condition in this part of the State, and I know you will be interested in knowing these facts,

Zap, N. D., January 6, 1945.

HON. WILLIAM L. LANGNER, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGNER: I am herewith writing this letter concerning my son, the only boy 20 years old who is running the farm and is married. I have to quit farming, as my health is very poor and I am not able to do the work anymore.

The oldest boy that I have at home is only 14 years old and is still going to school. If they take my boy into the Army then I don't know what I am going to do with the farm. I have one boy in the Army already for more than 2 years.

DEVLIN, N. D., January 6, 1945.

HON. WILLIAM L. LANGNER, W. Langner, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Once again the administration wants to take our young farmers into the Army, because of a so-called manpower shortage. I am farming 250 acres and milk 24 cows. The total number of cattle that we have to feed during the winter is 46 head.

The vice president of the Farmers Union and I have rented everything to him, because I have a 78-year-old mother who can't do the work. I have rented everything to him, because I have a 78-year-old mother who can't do the work.

DEAR MR. LANGNER: I am writing to you about trying to get my boy deferred.

I have been married 25 years and have two children. The 2 first years he was married he worked on the farm, and in the fall he got a job in a creamery, and then he was in the Army already for more than 2 years, but he was deferred for farm work last summer. He moved back to the farm and has been helping me ever since.

I have rented everything to him, because I have not been able to do my own work by myself for the last 3 years; have been under the doctor's care all the time.

I have a doctor's statement at the draft board in Minot, but they don't pay no attention to it, and he is due to be called most any time, as he has been put back in I-A. Help is so hard to get, and we only have the one boy, and it is hard to do without him when farm work is so important to help win this war we all are trying to fight.

Mr. Langner, you have helped us before, when times were hard, and we could not work it out by ourselves, and I am asking you for your help again, as I need it as bad now as I did before.

Write at once and let me know what to do.

Jamestown, N. D., January 19, 1945.

Senator William Langner, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGNER: I am writing you about the draft taking all of our farm boys. You know conditions here in the Northwest as well as anybody else, and when it breaks up in the spring we have got only a
short time to get our crops in if we expect them to get a good crop. And in order to do that we have got to have help we can depend on to go ahead and do their stuff, and there is no one who can go and do this. The boys have been born and raised on the farm. He knows his machinery and he knows the lay of the land. He knows where he can go with a tractor and where he cannot.

My experience with inexperienced help is, they spend most of their time in a mud hole somewhere, burning up a lot of our much-needed gas and getting nowhere. Now, we have a boy 28 years old that, after keeping company for 4 years last summer and is living on our farm, which consists of about 1,600 acres, rented land and all. My wife and I moved to town last fall and she is operating a rooming house, and I spend a good share of my time helping the boys on the farm.

We aim to keep around 100 head of cattle, of which 30 are milk cows, and along with the hogs, sheep, and poultry gives us plenty to do. The average 600 acres of small grain. The boy got his notice to go to Fort Snelling for his examination, so he left this last Tuesday and passed; so the local board says now if he gets a card stating he is in I-A he had better get ready to go, as he is to report at the local board.

That means he will have to sell off his stock and farming equipment and I will have to hire hands and will have to juggle with a stiff leg for the last 20 years and am crowding the 60 mark. Am still able to do a lot of work, but there are no other hands that I can do. I don't like to quit farming now, as I know we have all got to do all we can to win the war, and if our boys have got to power there and fight, give them all the eats and help we can; but we can only do so much. We only have two boys, and the youngest enlisted in the Navy 2 years ago.

A bad year with a large acreage there is still a little surplus left, but a bad year with a small acreage it takes it all for seed and feed.

In closing, I hope the officials can see before it is too late and leave us some good help on the farm.

FARDO, N. DAK., January 9, 1945.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.: Farm boys as ready and willing to serve in armed forces as any group. Many deferred because of absolute need of maximum production. Now if armed forces need men, the maximum production Congress must decide. The farm-labor situation is acute and production will be cut if large numbers of farm youths are called. Their need cannot be replaced by transient labor, older men, or young boys.

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1945.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.: Dear Senator Langer: American dairy farmers have been among the most progressive in the reclassification and induction of farm youths in the 16-25 age group. They are fearful that in many instances local draft boards will be stampeded into overlooking the provisions in the present law which exempts essential agricultural workers from military service. If because of this oversight, or because of an abandonment of present standards of deferment, the dairy industry is to be further drained of essential workers, it will irrevocably cripple our efforts which last year produced 20,000,000,000 pounds of milk products for the armed forces and our allies and cared for our civilian needs as well. A full-scale drafting of workers in the 16-25 age class from dairy farms would cut 1945 milk production by as much as 5,000,000,000 pounds, or well over 8,000,000,000 pounds. No argument. Even in a time of emergency, dairy agriculture is more hard pressed by manpower shortages than the dairy industry. Milk producers came forward where they could go on their own land. We present these facts for your information. Army spokesmen have told us that at no time have their working inventories of farm men more than maximum production, and are now calling for maximum production. The heavy draft work is borne by younger men— which alone makes possible the fullest utilization of the energies of women, children, and older men in lighter tasks.

We present these facts for your information. Army spokesmen have told us that at no time have their working inventories of farm men more than maximum production, and are now calling for maximum production. The heavy draft work is borne by younger men—which alone makes possible the fullest utilization of the energies of women, children, and older men in lighter tasks.

James FARGO, N. DAK., January 9, 1945.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.: We are very much concerned at recent reclassification and induction into military service of farm boys in 18 to 26 age group. There may be surplus of farm labor still exists; however, North Dakota has long ago scraped the bottom of its agricultural manpower reservoir. If maximum food production is as vital in producing maximum food which is the major prerequisite to winning the war and the people of the world a decent peace under which the will of people may be expressed and their needs may be served through governments and economic systems of their own choice, for these reasons the winning of the war and the peace must be an inseparable process. With few exceptions the induction of North Dakota farm boys between the ages of 18 and 26 means an inevitable reduction our food production from the maximum which effective prosecution of this war and establishment of a lasting peace will require.

WALLHALLA, N. DAK., January 5, 1945.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.: If present production to be maintained everything possible must be done to have farm laborers deferred.

BURTON, N. DAK., January 15, 1945.
Hon. William LANGER,
Washington, D. C.: Sir: Have been reading the papers and hearing across the radio that all the farm boys and others are going to be drafted in the near future. What is going to happen to us older fellows going to do with so much crop to put in and other work to be done on the farm? It just can't be done. If they want farmers in civil service I can't see that they can take farmers especially when there is only one in the family and one that has never been off the farm and is either for school or anything else, as that has been his only ambition. If there is anything you could do in this matter to have us do it as soon as possible as the II-Cs are coming up now, it would be surely appreciated, and we look to you as our Senator to be of some help to us here in this matter. Thanking you for what you can do.

ECKELSON, N. DAK., January 12, 1945.
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.: Dear Sir: I am writing in regard to the farm-labor situation. We would like to tell you that if they take our boys away we would have to leave our farm, as Mr. H. Rieken has bad heart and cannot do any heavy work. Now we farm a lot of land and have a large herd of cattle and quite a few hogs, and milk quite a few cows. I wish you would try and do something about it. Last year help was so scarce. There is no other farm work involved to produce a crop, like our own boys would. Please consider this and oblige. I have only three boys in fo 3 years now.

HATTON, N. DAK., January 16, 1945.
Mr. William LANGER,
Washington, D. C.: Dear Sir: I have confidence in you Mr. Langen—and have always admired your work, therefore, I am bringing my problem to you, hoping you can do something about it.

I am farming 2 quarters of land (320 acres) which I bought in 1941. My son and I have been farming it since; I could not get along without him, because I am not in such a good condition as I used to be. I'm 54 and my son is 23. Last fall my son went to the draft board to find out if it was all right to rent some land on his own so he rented 320 acres more and bought a tractor and machinery, and we plan to do all this together, but if they're going to draft him I will never have any land, saying nothing about his, which has already been contracted.

These are several cases just like this one around here. Last fall when we threshed we couldn't get any help, and we had to use bull belts and push it to the machine, I pitched alone because we were so short-handed. If he went and if they take the other deferred boys, there is no one who can replace them, because there is no one to hire, and wages are outrageous. Please do what you can. There won't be enough food at all—if this happens.

Thank you. P. S.—Please do not publish this, or let my name be known to anyone but yourself.

BISBEE, N. DAK., January 10, 1945.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:
I am alarmed at the draft of farm boys that we hear so much about on the radio and read about in the newspapers. I was just listening to the radio and heard General Hersey say that they were going to take all farm boys regardless of deferments. I want to say right now, that it just means the end to family-type farming. I further want to state that we are just going to fold up and quite farming. We will be unable to earn a living. I know several farmers who are going to do the same thing. So if General Hersey wants to see the farmer out of business, all he has to do is to get these deferred boys and he will see a farm panic.

ALFRED, N. DAK., January 4, 1945.
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.: Dear Mr. Lange: I am going to write to you, and would like to know what you can do to help the farmers bring in their crops.
January 8, 1945.  

Senator Langer: I see in the paper that farmers are going to draft farmers. If they do that, they will not need much food for 1945. My boy is in draft age, and if they draft him there will not be much food produced on that farm. My boy is all alone on the farm. He owns eight cows, eight young stock, besides two hogs, one of which he is the only boy I got. He is married and got one child. I know you have been a good friend to the farmers. I am enclosing a clipping that steps are being taken to process youth of the county, deferred or twisted beyond all understanding. North Dakota is left, one boy, or one boy left, as most of us farmers are getting on the old side of life and simply cannot run our farms and produce to full capacity without efficient help. It seems reasonable where a farmer is over 65 years old and has a full line of equipment necessary to the care of land, raising cattle, etc., he should be able to keep his own son on the farm, especially when that son will be the only boy left. Many hundreds of farmers have quit farming on account of inefficient help, and if more farm boys are not been farms, we will not be able to do that. I am enclosing a clipping that steps are being taken to process youth of the county, deferred or twisted beyond all understanding. North Dakota is left, one boy, or one boy left, as most of us farmers are getting on the old side of life and simply cannot run our farms and produce to full capacity without efficient help. It seems reasonable where a farmer is over 65 years old and has a full line of equipment necessary to the care of land, raising cattle, etc., he should be able to keep his own son on the farm, especially when that son will be the only boy left. Many hundreds of farmers have quit farming on account of inefficient help, and if more farm boys are not been farms, we will not be able to do that.

Trailing gets large call for I-C exams—many 18-26 farm deferred men go to Smelling January 26

Conservation farmers are taking steps to be used in processing youth of the county, deferred in the past for farm work, and prepare an increasing number for possible induction, was offered this week when the Traill County selective-service board received instructions to send an additional number of registrants to Fort Snelling, Minn., for preinduction physical examinations. The call is scheduled for January 27 and was for a very large number, the board disclosed. Those to be in addition to the regular January call for preinduction are now classed II-C in the draft and are between the ages of 18 and 26. The regular monthly contingent of preinduction physicals left Wednesday. There were 15 in the call.

The II-C draft class is the only remaining one in this county in which there is an appreciable number of draftable men. Last week the State selective-service office said Traill County has 226 young men in the draft class. The preinduction examinations which of the 226 are to go to Fort Snelling for their examinations is one with which the county board will work. The men can be selected by order number or by other means. Whether they can be deferred after receiving their preinduction examination.

The need for younger fighting men has been evident for sometime, and the present critical situation on the western front has accelerated the demand. Draft calls have been stepped up, and if the II-C group does not yield the necessary number, older men will have to be called up to be able to do the work now—dependable help. A neighbor who farms 320 acres lost his crops because of water and cold, and heed the cry for help he arranged his work at home and got a job in a war plant for the winter. He has been called for his medical. The Tydings amendment for draft deferment of farm boys is in this latest draft. We are wondering what will be up if no hired man or war prisoner would put up 15 or 16 hours a day in the field and work a corn picker all night because the mud had thawed out during the day.

There are hundreds of other farm boys in similar positions. The dairy industry has suffered from lack of help. The grain and wheat will be harvested this year, but if few boys left on the farms must stay there or there will be a decrease in farm production during 1945. This spring will be doubly hard for the farmers because of the condition of the fields from excess moisture.

You are a Senator of North Dakota and know the conditions here, and we are asking you to exert every effort to keep the essential farm boys on the farm. Mr. Langer, Mr. President, I have prepared a joint resolution, which I shall now introduce, which is as follows:

Whereas previous directives of the Selective Service apparently have misled boards into inducting farm workers that are desperately needed upon the farms and have either ignored or twisted beyond all understanding the Tydings amendment for draft deferment of farm workers; and

Whereas the nation's farm population has declined by approximately 5,000,000 even before the ambiguous directives the local boards have received which were sent out by the Selective Service: Be it

Resolved, etc.—1. That the Selective Service is hereby directed to clarify its directives on drafting of farmers; 2. That there be a reclassification for the availability into the armed service of the 5,000,000 farmers; 3. That farming be declared to be a critical war industry.

I am writing you concerning the latest draft order. I am writing you concerning the latest draft order. You are a Senator from North Dakota, raising hens, and will have some sows this year. He has lost his 1944 crop by water, and to which he is married and has 1 child, farming 440 acres in the Red River Valley, milking 10 cows. He has just lost a large flock of laying hens, and will have some sows this spring. He lost his 1944 crop by water, and to which he is married and has 1 child, farming 440 acres in the Red River Valley, milking 10 cows. He has just lost a large flock of laying hens, and will have some sows this spring, and has just spent $1,000 for new blood in his herd. He has done all the field work for the past 3 years as I am not able to do so. I am not able to keep up the work he has been doing, and my chores if he is taken and no help, and I have to be able to do the work now—dependable help.
ferred to by the Senator from North Dakota is withdrawn.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress was referred to the Committee on Rules.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. AIKEN. For the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Hawkes) and myself I submit a resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make an inquiry into the present production and supply and distribution of dairy products. I should like briefly to explain my reason for offering the resolution.

I am offering this simple resolution directing the Committee on Agriculture to make an inquiry into the production, transportation, and distribution of dairy products because of an event which has occurred recently. It may conceivably affect every farmer in the United States who uses mechanical equipment on his farm. I refer to the secondary boycott called by Local 630 of the teamsters' union against the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm of Plainsboro, N. J.

The controversy between the teamster union and the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm began some months ago, when the union undertook to organize the employees of Walker-Gordon.

In response to a telegram from Mr. Fred Brencelmak, of the National Grange, the editor of the Farmers' John, I asked Mr. Flynn, acting president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, replied, August 7, 1943, to the effect that the union had no intention of organizing farmers or farm workers, that they had accepted 65 of the 260 employees of the Walker-Gordon Co., as members of their union, and put forth the claim that these employees were industrial dairy employees as they were operators of mechanical milking machines.

It would appear that inasmuch as the teamsters' union was unsuccessful in organizing the employees of the Walker-Gordon Farm, it resorted to a secondary boycott of the products of the farm. And since January 9, 1943, members of the teamsters' union have been forbidden to handle the milk produced on the Walker-Gordon Farm. According to news reports, this amount to 23,000 quarts a day. I understand it is all certified milk, and a large percentage of it is sold to hospitals and on doctors' prescription in New Jersey and New York City.

I further understand that at present the milk is being skimmed and the cream held at the farm, because no member of the teamsters' union is permitted to deliver it anywhere.

I hold no brief for the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm. I know very little about them. Possibly their employees should be organized, but at present, operations on farms are very attractive to union organizers and will probably become more so. What concerns me is the claim of the teamsters' union that dairy farmers who operate mechanical milking machines are industrial employees. If a precedent to this effect is set as a result of the Walker-Gordon case and the precedent upheld, it would mean that several hundred thousand dairy farms in the United States could be forced to become members of and pay dues to the teamsters' union in order to get their milk delivered to the market.

In my small State of Vermont alone, this would mean that at the rate of $2 per month per member, the farmers might be required to pay $500,000 a year in dues to the teamsters' union in order to market their milk. Throughout the country the total would amount to millions of dollars.

What concerns me further is a report which came to me yesterday that the teamsters' union had demanded of the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm that not only should the motors or the mechanical milking machines be required to join the union, but all employees of the farm, regardless of their duties, should be required to become union members.

On getting the report, I telegraphed Mr. Henry Jeffers, president of the Walker-Gordon Farm, asking if it were true. I received a telegram stating that the report was true; that the only employees to be exempted from union membership would be nonworking supervisors.

It is my opinion that if Mr. Jeffers requires his employees to become union members when only 25 percent of them have signified their willingness to do so, he would very definitely be violating the labor laws of the country.

Furthermore, I am not prepared to believe that if operators of milking machines on farms are adjudged to be industrial employees, then operators of other machines, such as combines, mechanical cotton pickers, and orchard sprayers, would also be classed as industrial employees.

It is conceivable that this might lead to a situation whereby almost any and every farmer could be forced to pay dues to the teamsters union in order to get his products to market.

The situation is so serious that it merits the immediate attention of the Congress, and for that reason I am offering this resolution in the hope that a thorough investigation may be made by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the facts ascertainable on this subject are too late.

It is believed to have 23,000 quarts of high-grade milk withheld from the New York market. It would be infinitely worse to have a general conflict between labor and agriculture, although I cannot conceive of labor in general supporting the reported contents of the teamsters union. It is a matter in which every labor organization, every farmer, and every consumer should be immediately concerned.

There is little time to lose in getting at the facts of this unfortunate situation which exists in New Jersey. We may be faced with only a matter of hours in which to act.

The resolution (S. Res. 38) submitted by Mr. Aiken (for himself and Mr. Hawkes) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture on forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, be, and it is hereby authorized to hold such hearings, if any, and at such times and places, to employ such stenographers and such clerical and other assistants, to require the attendance of any duly authorized witnesses, to require the production of such books, papers, and documents and to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable; and to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. Provided, That the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall
not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

"4. No resolution calling for the establishment of a special or select committee of the Senate shall be allowed by the Senate unless there is no standing committee of the Senate whose jurisdiction extends to the subject of the investigation or study proposed to be made by such special or select committee."

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RESOLUTION 9
RELATING TO EXPENSES OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 41), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 9, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 6, 1945, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the total expenses of each standing committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, in connection with the performance of its duties and functions under paragraph 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, be and are hereby, limited as follows: For the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, $50,000; for the Committee on Appropriations, $150,000; for the Committee on Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, $; for the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, $50,000; for the Committee on Civil Service, $; for the Committee on Claims, $; for the Committee on Commerce, $50,000; for the Committee on the District of Columbia, $; for the Committee on Education and Labor, $; for the Committee on Finance, $50,000; for the Committee on Foreign Relations, $50,000; for the Committee on Immigration, $; for the Committee on Indian Affairs, $; for the Committee on Interstate Commerce, $50,000; for the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, $; for the Committee on Judicature, $50,000; for the Committee on Labor, $; for the Committee on Manufactures, $; for the Committee on Military Affairs, $50,000; for the Committee on Naval Affairs, $50,000; for the Committee on Patents, $; for the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, $; for the Committee on Printing, $; for the Committee on Privileges and Elections, $; for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, $; for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, $; for the Committee on Rules, $; for the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, $; Provided, That the limitation herein set forth may be increased, at the request of any standing committee, by such sum or sums as may be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate."

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING FERTILIZERS FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 42), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the supply, production, distribution, and sale of fertilizers for agricultural purposes. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE CONSERVATION OF WILD-ANIMAL LIFE

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 43), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the authority contained in Senate Resolution 9, as amended, be, and is hereby, authorized to investigate the conservation of wild-animal life, hereby extended from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the continuing fund of the Senate $138,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purpose.

CONSIDERATION OF AGRICULTURE AS A CRITICAL INDUSTRY

Mr. BUSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 44), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be directed and authorized to investigate the purpose.

Whereas General Herehey, Director of Selective Service, in his report on We Service, Tuesday, January 3, 1945, to the Senate, and the local draft boards throughout the Nation; and

Whereas said directive is interpreted by most of the draft boards and State directors as a directive to take the farm workers who are physically qualified or disqualified, subject to the Tydings amendment; and

Whereas under this directive, all farm workers aged 18 through 25 in class II-C, except those previously disqualified, are ordered to report for induction and not subject to the Tydings amendment; and

Whereas evidence has been placed before the Congress that said local draft boards have interpreted this directive as a Presidential directive for both examination and physical examination; and

Whereas farm workers are patriotic and if called for induction will not willingly apply for deferment, even though the need for their services may be greater on the farms than elsewhere; and

Whereas the farm owners and employers of farm labor have no way of knowing whether the workers called for preinduction physical examination will be physically qualified or disqualified; and

Whereas they know that if they are physically disqualified, they will be immediately inducted into the armed forces, and as a result, therefore, auction sales are being held throughout the country for disposal of livestock, poultry, and farm machinery and thousands of farms are either abandoned or farm operations curtailed because there is no available farm help for replacement; and

Whereas this threat to the Nation's food supply has been further accentuated by the danger of a shortage of food not only for our armed forces but for the civilian workers; and

Whereas there is already a severe shortage of butter, milk, cheese, and other dairy products and meat products, in spite of unusually favorable weather conditions, resulting in the greatest crops in our history; and

Whereas there are 3,300,763 in Government employment, and since there are great inconsistencies and contradictions in the governmental statistics in these respects, and since Senator Brum states that there are at least several hundred thousand unnecessary Federal employees; and

Whereas it is acknowledged that there are millions of hoarded workers in the cost-plus and other industrial groups; and

Whereas there are over 450,000 employees of the armed forces still in continental United States; and

Whereas the necessary replacements in our present armed forces are less than 800,- 000 per annum; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Selective Service be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to comply with the intent and spirit, as well as with the letter, of the Tydings amendment, and he is directed to consider agriculture as a critical war industry, and that farm help be deferred in accordance with the provisions of the Tydings amendment wherever it is shown that it is essential for agricultural production; be it further.

Resolved, That the Director of Selective Service be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to immediately issue a clarifying directive to all State directors and local draft boards in accordance with this resolution be it further.

Resolved, That the Director of War Mobilization direct the War Manpower Commission to immediately investigate the availability of manpower among the 3,300,- 763 Federal employees, and especially to make a thorough investigation in regard to labor hoarding in industry, and particularly so in the cost-plus war industries, in order that all essential labor in every critical industry may be treated alike; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be directed and authorized immediately to determine the effect of the State director advice No. 268, released January 3, 1945, upon agricultural production and upon the war effort, and to return its findings to the Senate within 5 days.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. McMAHON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the necessary and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Francis Maloney, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

GUARANTY OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AT STANDARD WAGES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on America's war and peace aims delivered by
him before America's Town Meeting of the Air.\textsuperscript{1} He was just read at the desk. I ask that the bill be printed in the Appendix.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, as in executive session, that the nomination be maintained in the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk on behalf of the Senator from New York (Mr. WAGNER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. THOMAS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MURRAY), and myself, a plan to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government.

Mr. MURRAY. As in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The bill offers a fundamental method of attacking America's No. 1 post-war problem: that of assuring post-war jobs for the people.

I ask that the bill be printed in the body of the Record, and that a series of questions and answers which I have prepared, supplemental to the bill as printed following the bill itself.

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

The bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, as prepared by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. O'MAHONEY), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

**Be it enacted, etc.**

**DECLARATION OF POLICY**

**Sec. 2.** The Congress hereby declares that-

(a) It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investments of capital, trade and commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States;

(b) All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right;

(c) In order to carry out the policies set forth in this section, and in order to (1) promote the general welfare of the Nation; (2) foster and protect the use of the natural resources of the United States; (3) raise the standard of living of the American people; (4) provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans; (5) contribute to the full utilization of our national resources; (6) develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; (7) preserve and strengthen competitive private enterprise, particularly small business enterprise; (8) strengthen the national defense and security; and (9) contribute to the establishment and maintenance of our national security, it is essential that continuing full employment be maintained in the United States.

(d) In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stabilize and encourage feasible levels of employment opportunities through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure.

(e) To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment; and (f) Such investment and expenditure by the Federal Government shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprise.

**The National Production and Employment Budget**

Sec. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session the National Production and Employment Budget (hereinafter referred to as the "National Budget"), which shall be submitted in summary and detail for the ensuing fiscal year, or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate-

(1) the estimated size of the labor force, including the self-employed in industry and agriculture;

(2) the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, required to produce such volume of the gross national product, at the expected level of prices, as will enable the Federal Government to provide employment opportunities for such labor force (such dollar volume being hereinafter referred to as the "full employment volume of production"); and

(3) the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government (not taking into account any increased or decreasing investment, which might be expected to result from the programs set forth in such Budget).

The estimates and information herein contained shall take into account both foreign investments and expenditure for exports and imports as affect the volume of the gross national product.

(b) The extent, if any, by which the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or other period, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, is less than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (2) of this section, and in order to (1) promote the general welfare of the Nation; (2) foster and protect the use of the natural resources of the United States; (3) raise the standard of living of the American people; (4) provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans; (5) contribute to the full utilization of our national resources; (6) develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; (7) preserve and strengthen competitive private enterprise, particularly small business enterprise; (8) strengthen the national defense and security; and (9) contribute to the establishment and maintenance of our national security, it is essential that continuing full employment be maintained in the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session.
working conditions, foreign trade and investment, education and training, social services and the development of natural resources, and other matters as may directly or indirectly affect the full employment volume of production, as may be expected to result from actions taken under the program set forth in accordance with subsection (b) of this section and are necessary to provide a full employment volume of production, the President shall transmit to Congress such supplemental or other productive facilities by the Federal Government, up to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production. Such program shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate additional non-Federal investment and expenditure. Any of such programs calling for the construction of public works by the Federal Government shall provide for the performance of the necessary construction work by private concerns awarded in accordance with applicable laws, except in the case of some other work by some other method is necessary by reason of special circumstances or is authorized by prior resolution of law.

If the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any calendar year or part thereof, set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (5) of this section, is more than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for preventing inflationary economic dislocations, or diminishing the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production, or both.

The programs referred to in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall include such measures as may be necessary to prevent or curb monopolistic practices with respect to prices, production, or distribution, or other monopolies if not induced by, the achievement of the purposes of this act.

The National Budget shall include a report on the programs of economic aid and assistance, including the extent to which the development of national resources, and other measures as may be required to achieve the purposes of this act. 

The President may from time to time transmit to Congress such supplemental or revised estimates, information, programs, or legislative recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable in connection with the National Budget.

PREPARATION OF NATIONAL BUDGET

Sec. 4. The President shall prepare the proposed National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for preventing inflationary economic dislocations, or diminishing the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production, or both.

The programs referred to in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall include such measures as may be necessary to prevent or curb monopolistic practices with respect to prices, production, or distribution, or other monopolies if not induced by, the achievement of the purposes of this act. 

The National Budget shall include a report on the programs of economic aid and assistance, including the extent to which the development of national resources, and other measures as may be required to achieve the purposes of this act. 

The President may from time to time transmit to Congress such supplemental or revised estimates, information, programs, or legislative recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable in connection with the National Budget.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL BUDGET

Sec. 5. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the National Budget, to be composed of the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, and Finance, and seven additional Members, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House of Representatives, and Banking and Currency, and Means, and seven additional Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation of the joint committee shall reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the Joint Committee-

(1) to make a study of the National Budget transmitted to Congress by the President in accordance with subsection (a) (3) of this act; and

(2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1 of each year, recommendations with respect to the National Budget, together with a joint resolution setting forth for the purposes of this act, with respect to such National Budget to serve as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to such National Budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by provisions of law other than this act.

The statement presented by Mr. Murray is as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

1. Does the bill aim at an economic situation where there will be 60,000,000 jobs? The bill purposely does not pre-conceived figure for the total number of jobs needed to provide full employment. The number of jobs needed for full employment depends on such changing factors as total population, the number of young people in the labor force, the size of our war armed forces, the extent to which old people retire from the labor market, the name of women who resume their full-time housekeeping duties, the number of hours worked, technological progress, other considerations. In view of probable changes in these factors, the exact number of jobs which would constitute full employment in any one year can best be estimated currently.

2. Does the bill guarantee everyone the kind of job he wants? This is not a bill to guarantee jobs to any individual. It aims at securing the time-honored right of every American able to work and seeking work to find a job, by giving him the assurance that there are jobs to be had.

3. Does the bill provide for a planned economy? The bill aims at creating a dynamic approach to the problem of providing expanded production and consumption, thus creating a sufficiently dynamic for the economy. The approach attempted is not dissimilar to the one taken in the Homestead Act which helped create our system of free enterprise during the last century.

The kind of Government responsibility envisioned in this bill is excellently described in a quotation from the January 6, 1945, issue of the magazine Time: "If Government responsibility means that we control the over-all volume of spending and other general measures which we do not dictate how men shall earn their livings, it would be a capitalistic blessing."
the enactment of the bill would mean still greater hardships for the small businessman and the small farmer.

5. What is the purpose of this bill for agriculture?

6. Does the bill call for increased expenditures by the Federal Government?

7. Does the bill have an appropriative measure, or a revenue measure? It provides for a framework within which the administrative and legislative branches of Government working with private enterprise may effectively promote such governmental policies and distribute the burden of post-war activity on the part of private enterprise.

8. What about the national debt?

9. How would this bill guard against the danger of inflation or of a speculative boom?

10. A tremendous amount of new information has become available both to private enterprise and to Government as a result of the war effort. The President has asked the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of the Budget and cooperating Government agencies to bring together war and non-war statistics that will be needed for reconstruction and post-war production.

The question of drawing up a National Budget for a fiscal year or longer is left to the President. Under the bill, the President submits to Congress an outline of the programs of economic development that Congress may want to provide for and a report on the basis of the outline of economic programs that will be presented by a Joint Committee on the Budget and reported to both Houses, where it would then be debated. The Joint Committee on the Budget will provide a general policy framework to guide the operations of the several committees of each
House dealing with fiscal matters. This resolution is to be reported to both Houses by March 1 of each year, so that there would be sufficient time to debate the resolution and enact fiscal policy measures by the beginning of fiscal year.

21. What does the bill call for in the activities of the various individual congressional committees?

There would be no change in the activities of the individual congressional committees, except that the joint resolution on the Budget became a general policy framework within which they would operate.

22. Does the bill provide for lump-sum appropriations?

No. The bill provides for no appropriations at all.

23. How does the philosophy of the bill differ from the "Compensatory economy" philosophy developed during the 1930s?

First of all, it places major emphasis upon non-Federal expenditures and that Federal expenditures are only to be used as a last resort.

Second, it provides for preventing unemployment, rather than for "taking up the slack" after men are walking the street looking for work.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to make an explanation of the bill. I understand the Senate is still in the morning hour, but it seems that speeches are to make an explanation of the bill. I made at this time I want the right to resort.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield long enough to enable me to make an observation?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for years I have sought to secure the enforcement of the rule which provides that during the morning hour no Senator shall speak longer than 5 minutes. That rule is constantly being violated, and I hope the President of the Senate, without direction being called to it, will enforce that rule. The rule was made for a good purpose, in order that Senators who desire to transact business in the morning hour will not have to wait 6 or 7 times. If any Senator desires to make a speech, he should obtain unanimous consent, but he should not transgress the rule.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I express my complete concurrence in what the majority leader has just stated. I think the rule should be respected. I believe that if the rule is respected, by and large, in the length of time its enforcement will amply justify its existence.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am in full sympathy with that rule, and have always followed it. But if I am to be prevented from making a statement in explanation of a very important piece of legislation, I shall ask to have the privilege.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senate has already obtained unanimous consent to make his explanation. I made the statement which I did simply for the benefit of other Senators, and for future reference.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the history of the world, the struggle for existence has manifested itself in economic systems that have been constantly changing. At one time western civilization was based upon the feudal manor. Then came the development of handicraft industry. Then came the industrial revolution, and with it the economic system of free enterprise and the political system which we call democracy.

In America private enterprise and political democracy have developed and flourished side by side. They have contributed to our welfare and human happiness than any previous system. The American people, therefore, want to preserve this system. They want it further strengthened and perfected so as to usher in a still greater future for our country. They know that no economic system can survive by remaining static. Times and conditions change, and our lives must change with them.

Our free-enterprise system has been subject to many improvements. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, we have enacted minimum-wage laws, we have created unemployment compensation benefits, we have provided old-age benefits, we have guaranteed the right of collective bargaining for labor, we have corrected abuses in the security market and provided protection to investors. We have made it possible for millions of farmers to cooperate among themselves and with the Government in matters of land consolidation, production, and prices. When these laws were first proposed they were attacked and it was charged that they would undermine our system. But after these laws were put in operation they were recognized as necessary to the strengthening of business enterprise, and today no one would dare to propose their repeal.

While we have been improving and strengthening our economic system of free enterprise throughout the years, we have as yet been unable to control the violent fluctuations which have resulted in periodic mass unemployment.

During the nineteenth century we had the western frontier, which acted as a safety valve in times of depression. Furthermore, it permitted constant expansion. We aided this expansion through the enactment of the Homestead Act, the Railroad Land Grant Act, and the mineral and mining laws, which threw open the public domain to exploitation and development. As early as 1816 we began to enact tariff laws deliberately designed to protect and foster business rather than for revenue purposes. As the result of this policy, we made it possible for the economic system to flourish side by side. They have characterized our economic system in past years, capitalism will be threatened in America and throughout the world. Already, before the war, three of the largest nations in the world had abandoned it, and many other nations were preparing to emulate their action.

There are some today who dread lest America be converted to socialism, communism, fascism, or some other form such as those that have taken root in other countries. I say to them—let us make our system of private competitive enterprise work so well here in America that other countries will seek to imitate us. Other nations follow our lead in technology—in mass production methods of manufacturing steel to automobiles and airplanes. Why should we not progress to the point where they will imitate us in the field of economics also? Why can we not take the lead in remedying the chronic unemployment? Why can we not consider the economic system that has developed in our capitalist system? Why can we not set an example here for all the peoples of the world by affording the fullest possible opportunity and encouragement for private initiative and ending chronic unemployment? Why can we not demonstrate to the world that it is possible to have the highest standard of living without abandoning our cherished political freedoms?

My colleagues, who have joined me in sponsoring this bill, the distinguished senators from New York, Utah, and Wyoming, have to their credit some of the most valuable and constructive social and economic legislation on the statute books of the Nation. They have served their country well as chairmen of important committees of the United States Senate, and their broad understanding of economic and social problems is well recognized.

As chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, the senior Senator from Wyoming has made a historic study of the operations of the American economy. In his report of the Temporary National Economic
The right to a job does not mean guaranteeing John Jones a given job carrying a set salary and a definite social standing. It is not the aim of the bill to provide specific jobs for specific individuals. The responsibility of the Federal Government is limited to encouraging the highest degree of economic flexibility, which means that at all times a minimum amount of unemployment is unavoidable. Technical advances, the desire to shift to other work, seasonal changes in production, or other circumstances cause what is known among economists as short-run frictional unemployment. As conditions change, the volume of this relatively small amount of frictional unemployment will also change.

The responsibility of the Government with regard to full employment is clearly stated in the bill. I quote from the declaration of policy, as set forth in the bill:

"In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure. To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide for Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment."

This policy is in accord with the philosophy recently expressed by an outstanding political leader. I quote:

"Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in industry."

If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours.

This statement was made in San Francisco on September 31, 1944, by the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.
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"In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure. To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide for Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment."

This policy is in accord with the philosophy recently expressed by an outstanding political leader. I quote:

"Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in industry."

If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours.

This statement was made in San Francisco on September 31, 1944, by the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

In the same speech, Governor Dewey emphasized the responsibility of government, in the following words:

"Yet, if there is one thing we are all agreed upon, it is that in the coming peace-time years we in this country must have jobs and opportunity for all. That is everybody's business. Therefore it is the business of government."

In this connection I should also like to quote from an editorial from a leading American business magazine, pointing out the Government's responsibility on employment so clearly that it has been impressed upon me and upon others for some time:

The editorial reads:

"Every business man who is not kidding himself knows that he does not know how to solve these problems unless the public realizes that the markets with which alone his free competitive capitalism can function. Every businessman who knows what business means knows that, if left to its own devices, business would sooner or later run headlong into another depression."

This editorial appeared in the June 1938 issue of Fortune magazine, and I obtained unanimous consent to have it printed in the Congressional Record during 1938. THE NATIONAL POLICY ON FULL EMPLOYMENT

The bill sets up a national production and employment budget to help appraise the nation's present productive capacity for goods and services is sufficient to assure the productive employment of those who are willing and able to work. The national production and employment budget differs from the ordinary budget of the Federal Government in that it includes not only investment and expenditures by the Federal Government, but also investment and expenditures by all groups in the country: Consumers, business, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. The total of all investment and expenditures adds up to what the economists call the gross national product or the gross national income. This total expenditure for goods and services is the generally accepted measurement of our Nation's total economic activity.

When the aggregate volume of expenditures by consumers, business, State and local governments, and Federal Government is equated with the amount needed to guarantee full employment, this national production and employment budget is regarded as balanced. Theoretically, if all the various expenditures, the result will be unemployment. The purpose of this new budgetary system is to provide a businesslike way of appraising:

(a) The number of jobs needed over a given period to provide full employment;
(b) The total of consumer-business-Government expenditures required to provide that number of jobs;
(c) The prospective volume of investment and other expenditures by consumers, business, and Government, including expenditures in our foreign trade;
(d) The fiscal or other programs required to encourage additional private employment, if necessary; and
(e) Whatever program of Federal investment and expenditures is required as a last resort to make up the difference between the total required expenditures and the total that is likely to prevail without additional Federal investment and expenditures.

This procedure is not only businesslike and logical, but it is also conducive to drawing upon all segments of our economy for their maximum effort.
A FRAMEWORK OF RESPONSIBILITY

The responsibility of the President under the bill is to report to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, on the extent to which the economy is providing full employment and the danger of unemployment, he must consider the need for maintaining full employment through stimulating private enterprise and through necessary Government programs, together with recommendations for such additional legislation as he deems desirable.

Congressional responsibilities are also defined. At the present moment, unfortunately, there is no single body within either House of the Congress which has the responsibility of considering in a comprehensive manner either:

First. The general contents—without respect to taxes, appropriations, or borrowing—of the regular Federal Budget; or

Second. The relationship between the regular Federal Budget and the national economy.

For example, both Houses of Congress have just received the President's proposed Budget for the coming fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee will study the Budget's proposals for individual Finance Committee will study the revenue aspects of the Budget message. No committee will study the Budget message as a whole, or its relation to our national economy.

The full-employment bill sets up a joint committee to make a detailed study of the national production and employment budget transmitted to Congress by the President. This joint committee on the Budget is to be composed of 15 Members of each House, chosen in such a manner as to give fair representation of the major political parties.

By March 1, at the very latest, this committee would be expected to report to both Houses of Congress on measures that forth a general policy with respect to the National Budget for the next fiscal year. Congress, as a joint resolution, would mean an annual debate, in both Houses, on national economic policy. The resolution could then be amended in any manner that the majority of Congress might determine to be appropriate. As finally agreed to, it would serve as a general policy framework within which the individual committees of Congress could work on individual appropriation acts, revenue acts, and related measures. These provisions go a long way toward restoring Congress to its rightful place as the policy-determining branch of the Government, and this is done in a way which provides for active interplay between the Congress and the Executive, a way which makes the two branches of the Government coordinate. The bill avoids both the danger of delegating excessive power to the Executive, and the danger of involving Congress in micromanagement.

I should like to point out that the bill aims at eliminating business uncertainty over the Government's fiscal policies. Business cannot plan effectively for full employment without knowing the Government's plans and the additional knowledge and open discussion of the Government's plans, and reasonable consistency and stability in the administration of the Government's program.

For example, revenue measures are often enacted only a few weeks before they are to become effective. This makes it impossible for business to make any adequate plans. Future revenues cannot be estimated with any degree of certainty, and they are not sufficient time to consider the Government's tax policy in relation to his own plans for future investment. Under this bill it would be for the President to develop its fiscal policies in a unified manner, and to enact both revenue and appropriation measures before the beginning of each fiscal year.

TYPE OF NATIONAL BUDGET

The full employment bill recognizes that we live in a world of changing conditions and changing requirements in national economic policy. For that reason, it provides for fixed proportions of the National Budget to be supplied by consumers, business, or Government. In certain circumstances, Congress may find it desirable or necessary to provide:

First. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in consumers' expenditures; or

Second. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in the capital outlays of business; or

Third. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in Government expenditures.

Naturally there could be all degrees of difference between these three general types, as well as combinations of any type.

In other words, the Government's program could aim at balancing the national economy through measures to increase consumers' expenditures, through measures to increase capital outlays of business, through increased Government expenditures, or through a combination of those methods.

There are some who think that the major emphasis in our post-war economy must be upon Government expenditures. There are others who say that this means deficit financing, and that deficit financing would lead to a planned economy or to nationalization of our industries. I propose that the Government do everything in its power to give a green light to business and heighten the confidence of private investors so that the major emphasis in the post-war period would be upon increased capital outlays of private enterprise.

It is my own personal opinion—and I have stated this before on the floor of the Senate—that the royal road to prosperity is high wages, low prices, and a tax system that is unequivocally based on the ability of the employer to encourage production. It is my belief that in this way, with only moderate Government expenditures for desirable Government services, we could achieve a more equitable distribution of the national income. It is my conviction that this improved distribution of the national income would give us an unprecedented expansion in expenditures and a vigorous, though not excessive, expansion in the capital outlays of business.

But my personal opinion on how the national economy might be balanced is not relevant to the question of how it would be balanced under this bill. The specific National Budget that would result in any given period would be determined, not by the operations of any one individual or any one group, but on the basis of that active interplay between all groups, which is the process by which the people of our country live individually and collectively. It is the very essence of the democratic process in our democratic America.

NEED FOR ACTION

A few weeks ago, Dr. Gallup's interviewers went around the country asking whether they thought there would be enough jobs after the war. Sixty-eight percent thought that there would not be enough jobs. The younger people of the country were even more optimistic than their elders; 73 percent of those between 20 and 30 years of age thought that the outlook was black.

What Senator would stand up and say that the people of this country are mistaken in their beliefs? Who is there who, on the basis of what has thus far been done in the field of post-war planning, would be willing to predict that there will be jobs for all after the war?

We all know that during the war we have transformed our economy into an economic skyscraper of breath-taking magnitude.

We all know that when war-production contracts are withdrawn, the danger we are not the end. On the contrary, those who are born in the 1930's. It would be extremely dangerous to do so. Mass unemployment would mean discontent, disunity, and an intolerable loss to our Nation in terms of both physical wealth and moral well-being.

All the men who are here—there is no one in this Chamber who is not in favor of full employment—and we know that the world cannot afford again to 18 months of an inflationary boom, the long-term threat is a deflationary collapse.

Unless an economic substitute is found for war contracts, we face mass unemployment in this country of a magnitude which could easily surpass anything that was dreamed of during the last depression. Thus far, we have not found that substitute.

The country cannot afford to go into a depression such as we experienced in the 1930's. It would be extremely dangerous to do so. Mass unemployment would mean discontent, disunity, and an intolerable loss to our Nation in terms of both physical wealth and moral well-being.

Still more appalling, an unemployment crisis in America would spread like wildfire throughout the world. It would give us dumping, higher tariffs, export subsidies, blocked currencies, and every other new and old type of economic warfare. And this, I submit, would be an inevitable wreck plans for an effective international security organization, turn back the clock of progress, and plunge us into another holocaust of blood, suffering, and chaos.

We have it in our power to make full employment the cardinal principle in our domestic economic policy.

We have it in our power to make full employment in America the keynote of our economic relations with the other countries of the world.

In principle, both of our major political parties are agreed that this must be provided.
In Chicago, on October 28, 1944, President Roosevelt stated that "every American, able to work and willing to work, has the right to a useful and remunerative job." This, he promised America, would create 60,000,000 post-war jobs.

In Seattle, on September 18, 1944, Governor Dewey, the Republican nominee for President, made the following statement:

"We must have full employment. • • • Those who come home from the war and those who have produced for war—all people—have earned a future with jobs for all.

The full-employment bill, I submit, provides the instrument whereby the political parties can make good on their common aspirations for post-war full employment.

NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE DEBATE

Of course, some Members of Congress may disagree with the sponsors of this bill. That is how it should be in a democracy. Sound legislation can be developed only by clarifying the differences between conflicting schools of thought. The sponsors of this bill, therefore, welcome criticism. We welcome debate on alternative methods of assuring post-war full employment.

But let it be constructive debate. Let it not be like the writings of some editorialists and columnists who, in their pontifical infallibility, have thrown up their hands in horror at the full-employment bill—and have then offered no constructive proposals of their own.

The United States Senate has been called the greatest deliberative body in the world. On this issue of full employment, at a time when democratic institutions are under attack in one country after another, the opportunity exists for the Members of the Senate during the Seventy-ninth Congress to demonstrate that we really are the greatest deliberative body in the world, and that we have the capacity to bring forth constructive legislation fully commensurate with the needs of our country.

I have faith in the Members of this body. I know that they will take advantage of this opportunity. I know that if any Senators arise to take issue with the principles set forth in the full-employment bill, they will realize that, as Members of this great deliberative body, and as influential leaders of public opinion, they are under obligation to offer alternative proposals of their own. If such proposals indicate the need for changes which are practical and realistic, they will undoubtedly win the support of this body.

Every two decades, for the past 100 years, we have been plagued by a boom and a major depression; and every decade has brought forth new explanations as to the causes of the business cycle and new remedies. But there is one fact upon which all are agreed, namely, that fear of a depression tends to make our efforts. Let us not be swayed by our inability to determine our own destiny.

Let us not wait until millions of men are walking the streets looking for work before we do something about post-war employment.

Let us act now, through the regular legislative process, and set forth in the Constitution, to provide our businessmen, our farmers, and workers, and, above all, our 11,000,000 soldiers and sailors, with confidence in the future of American enterprise and American democracy.

Mr. TAP. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAP. Is the bill which the Senator introduces substantially the same as that which was introduced in the New York Times 2 or 3 weeks ago?

Mr. MURRAY. No: it has been greatly improved as the result of constant study and contact with the experts of the Treasury Department and experts of the Federal Reserve Board and of various other federal agencies.

Mr. TAP. Does the Senator intend that the bill shall be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. MURRAY. No; I shall ask that it go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TAP. Mr. President, I might say that if the bill is as I have understood it to be described of its philosophy is so completely at variance with my whole idea of the American system that I made a brief address analyzing the bill on Thursday night, which was inserted by me in the Record today, and I hope that those who read the speech made by the Senator from Montana today will do me the favor of reading the speech which I made on the bill. I therefore have a fundamental difference. I agree fully with the Senator from Montana on the importance of the subject, but I believe very strongly that the remedy which he has suggested is absolutely dangerous and incorrect.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator from Montana if he has suggested that the bill which he has just introduced be referred also to the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning?

Mr. MURRAY. It is my intention, and I am now in the process of preparing a copy of the bill, with an explanation of it, and will ask consent to have it sent to the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that that committee has no power to report the bill. It could be referred to that committee for the information of the committee, of course, but not for the purpose of having a report submitted.

Mr. MURRAY. That is exactly what I had in mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to say that I am very happy that the Senator has done that. As I understood him, he asked that the bill be referred to the legislative Committee on Banking and Currency. In view of the fact, however, that this measure deals with a fundamental and of greatest importance, and in view of the further fact that the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. Georson) is the head has been set up by the Senate to study post-war economic policy and planning, it is of the utmost importance, I think, that that committee should participate in the study. The cooperative action of the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee with the legislative committee on matters of such far-reaching importance could not fail to be beneficial to all concerned. The Senator from Montana has, on numerous occasions, consulted me—and I feel grateful to him for so doing—with respect to the underlying plan of this bill. I feel that the study which can be given to it by these two committees cannot fail to be helpful.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER IN GOVERNMENT PLANTS—REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, from time to time the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and later the war program has made reports to the Senate, and particularly on occasions when it was apparent that some major problem was holding up the war effort. It will be recalled that the committee reported to this body on the necessity for a complete war program. We reported on the matter of the recruitment and training of personnel for the war effort. We reported to the Senate on the question of eliminating bottlenecks and material shortages. Our committee is making an investigation, as quickly and as widely as our personnel will permit, and today I wish to discuss particularly what the committee saw at a nearby navy yard.

It is my duty, Mr. President, to reveal to the Senate what I believe to be an alarming condition. A subcommittee of the war investigating committee last week visited the Norfolk Navy Yard. I might say we visited several other navy yards as well, and reports on them will be forthcoming shortly. What we learned in Norfolk is, I believe, disturbing and, I think, most significant.

The armed forces have long painted a gloomy picture of their civilian labor needs. Program after program on the "must" list is described as short of labor,
Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I think it would be wise to permit the Members of the Senate to see the checkerboard and the table to which it refers, if it have been referred, which I believe are available. The checkerboard was just one of many we traced down which were made by this one man, who apparently devoted all his time for a while to making cigarette boxes from lucite, as well as hand-carved legs of tables for the masters' conference room. I wonder if the Senator would care to have that checkerboard brought into the Senate, to show the volume of work done on it, being inlaid. Incidentally, it is made from Government material.

Mr. MEAD. I understand the checker-board is available, and it will be called to the attention of the Senate a little later in the progress of this statement, but, Mr. KILOORE. If the Senator will yield again, one other matter which impressed me was the fact that before going to Norfolk I had read in the newspapers of the coal shortage. My State being a coal-producing State, I paid particular attention to the employment offices in the State, in each of which I found a recruiter from the Norfolk Navy Yard taking persons away from the mines and giving them priorities to go to the Norfolk Navy Yard. Of course, there were many other recruiters there. There were recruiters from Bethlehem Steel, Sparrows Point. They seemed to divide up, Bethlehem Steel, one from Bethlehem-Fairfield, Hercules Powder, and Goodyear Rubber, recruiting workers from the mines, at a time when the mines in my State are only 75 percent manned, and the newspapers claim that American industry must be 'in full wartime production.' That was a matter which impressed me in connection with the question, why 4,000 additional men are needed for that yard. I think that every Senator should know why that yard needs 4,000 additional men, taken largely from the coal mines of Virginia and West Virginia.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am pleased with the interjection, and I wish to say to Senators that the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, as they already know, is a diligent and hard-working member of our committee. He himself made a survey of the situation at the Norfolk Navy Yard, and I am sure we can agree with him that the recruitment of labor in the district of which he speaks is a problem and that operation is not in keeping with the over-all and appropriate plan of manpower mobilization.

Mr. KILGORE. I may interject that these recruiters, when they secure a man's consent to go to Norfolk Navy Yard, have automatically forced his release from the mine in which he is working by an enforced release.

Mr. MEAD. That is because they have a higher priority rating.

Mr. KILGORE. It is because they have a higher priority on manpower.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the oyster table spoke of was intended for use for one oyster feast that was to be attended by the shop masters.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask the Senator how many shop masters there are.

Mr. MEAD. It is my understanding that there is one master mechanic to every shop, and there is a small number of shops.

Mr. KILGORE. Not over 25?

Mr. MEAD. Not over 25.

Mr. KILGORE. So it was not a general moral problem, but simply for 25 or 26 men?

Mr. MEAD. Only for the masters.

Erection of an elaborate Christmas tree and a model village with elaborate lighting took many days' work. All this work was directed to be done by supervisors.

Men are told to stretch out jobs and to appear to be working.

When investigators go through the men are warned in advance to look busy. They must put work into machines even if they mean to do nothing. A few minutes before the investigators actually appear, another warning is given by a "Paul Revere" who tears through the shop just ahead of the investigators.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Were the supervisors civilians or naval officers?

Mr. MEAD. The Senator from Massachusetts asked that question. The supervisors are for the most part civil-service workers. There are, however, officers of the Navy in charge of these shops, but the immediate supervision, I would say, is by civil-service employees.

Mr. WALSH. So that in order to dismiss or discharge any supervisor who was found not to be performing his duty efficiently, charges would have to be preferred against him and evidence presented?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York allow me so that I may make answer to that question?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. The apparent situation, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts is that naval officers come and naval officers go, but the master mechanics and the supervisors remain forever, and I think the Senator from New York will remember that we could not find a single job order actually signed by a naval officer. All of them were signed by the master mechanics. I do not know whether we have such an order for building a battleship, but they can certainly sign orders for anything smaller than that, and apparently, they stay on the job while the officers are being constantly transferred back and forth.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that the navy yards operate somewhat differently from the Army arsenals; that in the navy yards the master mechanics or the foremen are, as in private industry, responsible for the job and for the work; that the Navy officers are simply inspectors and have nothing to do with respect to the men, but see that the work is done, that the material complies with specifications, and that the job is satisfactorily completed. I have had complaints made to me by the master mechanics or by the foremen at the arsenal in Springfield, Mass., that the Army officers interfere with the master mechanics, by saying, "You are not doing this right" or "You ought to do it differently." Such things have been lodged with Members of the Senate and with me against that system prevailing in Army arsenals. The statement is made that a foreman and a superintendent ought to be allowed to do the job, and that a transient Army officer or Navy officer who comes and goes every 2 or 3 years, should not tell the foremen and the superintendent how to perform their work.

As I understand the situation at Norfolk, the whole operation is under foremen or master mechanics who are under civil service, and the naval officers are supervisors only to the extent of seeing that the job is done; they do not interfere with the men, or say that a certain man is doing his job satisfactorily or is not doing it satisfactorily; it is the task of the naval officer to attend to his employment, and should be dismissed. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. MEAD. I think as a whole that statement is correct; and, further than that, the selection of men for promotion is originated in the civil service setup.
Mr. WALSH. Which is also under civil service.

Mr. MEAD. Which is also under civil service. There is an over-all supervision by the Navy Department, as pointed out by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Kilgore), it is not so direct and so constant as is the supervision of this civil-service employees.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. On that point I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that this is the weakness: The commissioned officers are actually responsible and accountable financially and otherwise for everything that goes on, but the actual control is vested in individuals who have no financial responsibility to the Government. In other words, the responsibility and accountability do not go with the actual bosses, but go with the commissioned personnel, who are rather isolated, and if anything goes wrong the naval officers will be blamed. The master goes scot free because of regulations which prescribe that only a commissioned officer can be responsible to the Government for money and material expended on the job.

Mr. MEAD. There is an apparent need for a revision or refinement of this supervisory system so that the Navy Department, which is responsible under its regular selected and appointed officers, may have a larger share in the actual operation of the plant.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. May I inquire if the committee fixed the blame for this system, which I understood the Senator to say was--

Mr. MEAD. This dual supervisory system?

Mr. WALSH. No; of word being passed around that an inspector is coming, and for the men to get on the job? I think the matter has rather been exaggerated as something like a "Paul Revere" who went around through the factory.

Mr. MEAD. That is the sworn testimony of a number of employees who appeared before our committee, and we heard about it in other instances. The instance referred to is simply one.

Mr. WALSH. On whom did the committee fix the blame for it?

Mr. MEAD. On the supervisors.

Mr. WALSH. Did the committee find the names of the men or officers so that the Navy Department or some authority could present charges against them? Or did the committee find involved naval officers who ought to be removed for being negligent in the performance of their duty?

Mr. MEAD. We have not presented a finished report. This is simply a statement made to the Senate concerning what we found on this particular visit. Our committee is continuing the investigation process to the point where we may find disciplinary action should be taken. We have not arrived at that point as yet.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the committee will make recommendations, and I hope the committee will name naval officers or civilians who are responsible, and that such naval officers will be court-martialed, and that civilians who are found negligent will be dismissed from the service. The committee can render a splendid service by helping the Navy Department to detect this underground system of wasting time and wasting property and not properly performing work. Of course, the system should be traced up and be traced through in order to find out where the blame is higher up.

Mr. MEAD. I have already said that we have had the cooperation of labor, and we expect the cooperation of management and of the Navy Department, and we have reason to believe we will have such cooperation, because in its own report, regarding this particular navy yard, its recommendations, in some measure at least, square with ours. The Department indicates in its report that there is wasted labor and hoarded labor there, and that the system should be better utilization of labor.

Mr. WALSH. That is a report made a year ago when the Navy Department called in some civilian outsiders to make an investigation.

Mr. MEAD. No; there is a later report, made by an industrial set-up which has been created in the Navy for this very purpose. I think Admiral Fisher is in charge.

Mr. MEAD. They are not naval officers, but are supposed to be efficient leaders of industry?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. They are industrial engineers.

Mr. WALSH. While I am on my feet, I should like to make another suggestion. The subject of employees at our navy yards is very important, and the situation is very serious, as the Senator probably ascertained. Is it not a fact that at the navy yard at Norfolk, there were 40,000 employees, 20,000 of them were assigned by the Labor Board or the Civil Service Commission as new employees during the past year?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. And 26,000 employees were dropped from the service, leaving a net loss of 6,000.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Is not the turn-over very extensive, not only at that navy yard, but at all others? Or the Senator's.

Mr. MEAD. That is my understanding.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator's committee expect to link up that fact with the need for some manpower legislation?

Mr. MEAD. Yes. I believe that a good deal of the trouble resulted from relaxation due to predictions that the war would soon be over, and also because of War Production Board orders which launched a large number of new civilian programs. The turn-over which occurred, not in any navy yards but at other plants throughout the country, resulted from those orders. There was an attempt on the part of the individual worker to find peacetime occupation which would be more permanent. However, that trend has been stopped. Only this morning I was informed that since the work-arrangements order was issued, more than 2,000 persons have applied for work at the gate of the Norfolk Navy Yard.

Mr. WALSH. Were any of the supervisory or superintendents informed of these things?

Mr. MEAD. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH. What defense did they make?

Mr. MEAD. A very inadequate defense. We went as high as the master.

Mr. WALSH. He is a civilian, is he not?

Mr. MEAD. He is a civilian.

Mr. WALSH. Did it appear to the Senator that there was an implied league for loafing or inefficiency, which extended from the masters down, or from house up to the masters?

Mr. MEAD. No. For the most part, the higher we went among the supervisory personnel, the more they tried to cover up the situation, and to indicate that there was not true, but they did not see it. But the further down we went along the line, the more willing the workers were to agree that it was there.

Mr. WALSH. Would this investigating all done by members of the Senator's committee, or was some of it done by members of the committee staff or other personnel?

Mr. MEAD. We had an expert from the War Manpower Commission make a survey, and then our committee went down there with several agents. While we were there, we divided into subcommittees and went in all directions, so that we would not be going in a single direction, with opportunity for everyone to know of our coming before we got there.

Mr. WALSH. Before I take my seat, let me say, that as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I welcome the activities of the Senator's committee and the lines which he has described. I wish to cooperate in every way and to do everything possible to see that inefficiency or violation of the regulations of that committee is stopped. We feel that regulations should be put into force, I wish to assure the Senator of my hearty cooperation. I believe that it is a wise thing on the part of the Congress to have such an investigation, conducted by an independent committee, and not by the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, or the Committee on Commerce, so that there can be no suspicion or suggestion that members of the committee might be influenced or prejudiced with respect to one particular department.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the Senator's offer of cooperation. I know that it will be forthcoming willingly, and that it will be very constructive. I assure my distinguished colleague that every suggestion that will be brought to his attention, so that it may be helpful to his committee.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In connection with the question of management, did we not...
also learn from the testimony that the Bureau of Ships had control of one line of work, and the Bureau of Yards and Docks had control over another line of work, and that the line of demarcation between them was not clear.

Mr. MEAD. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. When we follow the chain of authority through to the management, you find that there seems to be a lack of that spirit which we expect in time of war from the personnel of the Government.

Mr. MEAD. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. That investigation is very vital in connection with the manpower question.

Mr. WALSH. Complaints of a somewhat similar nature have reached me from other navy yards, and also from arsenals. I am disturbed over the fact that there seems to be a lack of that spirit which we expect in time of war from the personnel of the Government.

Mr. MEAD. We have visited two, and we have an investigation in progress on another one. We are not neglecting any of them.

Mr. WALSH. Their record in the Norfolk Navy Yard was concerned, when they were assured that they were afforded protection, they very willingly reported and their work helped us with us for a more orderly system whereby they could do a real day's work. We have the cooperation of labor, and I am sure we shall have the cooperation of the high naval officials.

Mr. President, as I have previously stated, men were told to stretch out jobs, and appear to be working. Our committee did not receive the customary treatment provided by the "Paul Revere" on this trip, because we appeared on short notice.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The statement which the Senator has just made is very important. If men were told to stretch out their jobs, who was responsible for such instructions? Let us get our hands on him. If such a situation exists, those responsible for it are indirectly committing sabotage. If anyone is saying "Let us make this job last," we ought to ascertain his name. I hope the committee will do so.

Mr. MEAD. We have the names. They are in the record, in the sworn testimony of witnesses who were told to stretch out the job. This condition exists at a navy yard which has been asking for 4,400 additional men. This report was filed with the Department last December.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it contemplated that the Senator from New York and his committee will investigate other navy yards?

Mr. MEAD. We have visited two, and we have an investigation in progress on another one. We are not neglecting any of them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The reason I ask that question is that as Governor of South Carolina various complaints came to me along the same line as those which the Senator has reported. It was stated that thousands of employees were told not to work, and did nothing all day long. The employees themselves came to see me, and wanted to know what could be done. They wanted information as to what the Government in time of war, instead of being on the job without rendering service to their Nation.

Mr. MEAD. That is the very story we received at Norfolk. The men want to work.

Mr. President, we have no reason to believe that the persons in charge of the Norfolk Navy Yard are any less able than those in charge of other navy yards or war plants. In fact, we are informed that the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, in comparison with that of some other navy yards, is considered excellent. That yard has built and repaired many great ships.

Mr. WALSH. Their record in the production line is excellent.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. They have built and repaired many great ships, but they are wasting labor.

As I previously stated, to a large degree the supervision is that of the civil service or organization on top of that. In that connection, the contribution made by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Ferguson] was a good one, because as it was explained to us, there are several bureaus in Washington, each of which has a part in the operations of the navy yards in the field.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator mentioned the question of civil service. Is it not a fact that we found that one of the things which ought to be cleared up is that the rating and the amount of pay are determined by the number of employees under a given manager? Even if the employees are told by the Navy Department itself, that condition causes "feather bedding" and the keeping of men on the pay roll, because if they are dismissed or transferred, the supervision of a given manager or supervisor will be smaller, and therefore he will receive less pay.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did we not find that to be a fact there?

Mr. MEAD. That was testified to, and it was apparent; because where there are a certain number of men there will be a certain number of supervisors. The supervisors begin with the supervisor. He is the lowest in rank in the supervisor group. Above him is the leader. Above him is the quartermaster, and above him is the superintendant. When the number of employees decrease, both the number and the rate of pay of the personnel diminish.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. That is true of all the navy yards; is it not?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, the situation arises more as a result of the general system than because of any particular mismanagement at the Norfolk Navy Yard is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. I wish to make that plain. The condition arises because of the system which is supervisory followed.

Mr. President, the committee has received information which leads it to believe that manpower is being inefficiently utilized in a great many war plants. That is natural, but it must be stopped. It is natural because prior to the war these plants were efficiently operated. The plants were sufficiently large, and they had the correct number of employees, and the employees were trained.

Then the emergency caused a rapid increase of personnel and machinery, and the recruitment of personnel became more and more difficult as we began to absorb the labor load in its entirety. As a result, many plants are overmanned. It is claimed that they are overmanned simply because they are not able to obtain the trained workers they need, and because they have training programs and because they have to meet selective-service demands. Therefore, this is the time, all over the country, when a labor utilization program must be instituted.

In that connection, let me say that the War Manpower Commission is not allowed in certain plants. It is feared that it will provoke strikes or that it will create a chaotic condition. But in my opinion, the War Manpower Commission should have the power to go into any plant which has a war contract or into any Government plant and conduct a war-utilization survey.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in connection with the statement of the Senator concerning the industrial tunnel, let me say that the Norfolk Navy Yard had 5,000 employees some years ago, but today it has 40,000 employees.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator that the system calls for great numbers of workers.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, let me repeat that, probably before the Senator enters the industrial tunnel, that the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, by comparison, is considered excellent.

Mr. BYRD. But there is no doubt that the system does utilize a great deal of manpower.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.
The American people have shown their willingness to respond voluntarily whenever the facts have been made clear to them, and we continue to make them clear. Our committee has frequently pointed out the need to give the people the facts. Too often the people have been scolded for acting on optimistic new facts. The November 1945 Congress of Congresswoman Toby's speech is not very much better. When we asked about the production of skilled workers, we were informed that only a quarter of a page, appealing for employment. I am surprised to hear the statement which the Senator has just made. I do not doubt that the Senator has been informed employment offices are being flooded. The recent newspaper reports that 24,000 nurses were enlisted in New York City alone within a few days after the call for more nurses went out, and that over 4,000 of the 20,000 who are required volunteered in the first few weeks. Employment officials state that today they are being flooded with applicants. In part, this is due to the pressure which is being brought to bear on TV-2's, and in part, it is due to the realization on the part of the people that we are in a real fight, perhaps just getting into the real battle.
Mr. MEAD. We are beginning to understand that the situation is now fairly general in the various war plants.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine? I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I may state that in Boston and other New England areas during the evening hours from 6 o'clock to midnight there are programs which are interrupted four or five times by a radio announcer calling for help in behalf of various industries.

Mr. MEAD. I have in my possession a number of letters which I think will be illuminating on that subject.

It may be that we need some form of legislation to keep war workers on their jobs. It seems most unlikely that we would take the form of an all-over regimentation of 100,000,000 Americans. This task may prove so complicated and so cumbersome that it could only add to our troubles.

The inefficiencies which mark the administration of the few existing regulations would multiply and thrive in a completely regimented system. No existing agency from New Hampshire, for instance, can claim to have any notion of the number of workers in war industries.

Mr. TOBEY. How many?

Senator from Maine.

Mr. MEAD. I would say -

Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator mean by a bill?

Mr. MEAD. A re-engineering job would mean that in the light of new demands and new practices the work could be arranged so as to be done more efficiently.

Mr. President, a plant manager will not rack his brains to put in an efficient system if he can merely call for and obtain additional workers whenever he wants them.

The workers, some of whom have a tendency to loaf on the job as it is, will be much more likely to do so if they are working under compulsion.

In other words, the existing condition will not be eliminated. It will become worse. We want to diminish the demand for labor by proper utilization. That, in my judgment, will be done only with the approval and support of labor itself.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine? I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not a fact that because of voluntary retirement and dismissals, a very considerable turn-over takes place, which results in a deficiency?

Mr. MEAD. What the Senator has said is true to some extent with respect to dismissals, and is also true to some extent with respect to retirement, but I should not say that the turn-over due to those causes is large.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator know what the rate of turn-over has been?

Mr. MEAD. It has been large as applied to the IV-F's.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. It is said that the situation has been stabilized to a considerable extent. When the Nation was given to understand that we were well on our way to victory and we felt that it would not be long before workers could return to civilian occupations, there was a great turn-over of employment. The turn-over took place because men felt that they could provide better for their future by securing a position in a permanent industry.

Mr. BREWSTER. So the Senator feels that the more critical phase of the war which has recently taken place has helped to improve the situation?

Mr. MEAD. It has.

Mr. BREWSTER. When the situation with respect to the war improves—as we certainly hope it will not be a tendency for the difficulty to recur unless we provide for some form of stabilization employment?

Mr. MEAD. I trust that it will not recur.

Mr. BREWSTER. If a man is not required to remain in a war job, why should he remain in it and sacrifice his future after the return of peace?

Mr. MEAD. Some control can be exercised by the W. P. B. in authorizing civilian activities to increase, as was done a year ago.

Mr. BREWSTER. Those controls proved utterly inadequate through 4 pessimistic months last summer, as the Senator well recalls.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is there not a very great likelihood that that situation will recur when the war situation improves, as we hope it will within the next few months?

Mr. MEAD. There is such a possibility; and we should guard against it as a result of the experiences of the past. I think the idea is a very excellent one to be put into the Record.

Mr. President, we have learned through sad experience that placing more men in a plant will not necessarily mean more production.

Surveys conducted by the War Manpower Commission show that idle labor can be eliminated in war plants. This is accomplished by rigorous action. When successful it usually results in a corresponding increase in production. This has been done in many cases.

In one shipyard alone which this committee has investigated, total employment was reduced about 10,000. In the last year, while the yard's productivity remained equal to what it had been with the swollen labor force. This was a result of a desire on the part of the management and the Maritime Commission to improve performance. Without incentives to do the job efficiently, management must be expected to try to accomplish its ends by using excess labor.

The cost-plus contract has not helped this situation. The contract not only provided no incentive to keep pay rolls down but actually paid dividends for hoarding labor, because if the work was not completed before completion, the amount of fee paid depended on the proportion of the job which was finished. Any work completed as a result of hiring excess labor benefited the contractor. The cost was all the Government's.

When we adopted the system of fixed-price contracts, we accomplished little to correct this situation. In the first place, the prices were based on cost experience acquired under the cost-plus-fixed-fee
system. As a result, the price allows the accumulation of excess labor. Secondly, there is a tendency to outbid costs by reducing the amount of labor, because profits realized in that way would be absorbed by renegotiation or taxes.

The evidence of a substantially increased efficiency in war plants. The Manpower Commission surveyed one shipbuilding company, which in August of 1944 said it needed 17,000 additional workers to get the job done. In October, the needs had been reduced to 1,000. At the same time production jumped from five and seven-tenths to seven ships a month.

But the Manpower Commission has not really been permitted to do a job. It lacks the power to go into many plants. In the shipbuilding industry it is permitted to make its surveys only if the plant management agrees. Too often management says that a survey would disrupt production.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, is that true about the navy yards and arsenals?

Mr. MEAD. No; I cannot say it is. I think as a rule the navy yards cooperate very well.

Mr. WALSH. Why has not the War Manpower Commission made some recommendation with regard to these matters?

Mr. MEAD. I believe, in justice to them, I should say that they have mentioned this to our committee. Until November they were all pretty sure that they were up to schedule, but in December the scheduling was so impoverished and the personnel of workers so reduced by demands which were not foreseen that immediately a conference was held; all the agencies got together and agreed among themselves that, with certain controls and certain cooperation, they could meet the emergency without legislation. So, in December, the War Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, the War Production Board, the Navy Department, and several other agencies, came before our committee and told us that they were able then to take care of the situation. But additional demands were made since the beginning of the year, and they now need, I believe, some added controls unless the workers are forthcoming.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator stated a few moments ago—and his statement was true—that the optimistic reports or statements made by high officials about the termination of the war in Europe led to a movement of employees from one industry to another so as to obtain permanent positions in life. It seems to me the time has come for somebody in high position to say that the ending of the war does not mean the disbandment of the Navy and the Army. The information most of us are able to get is that the war against Japan may last from 2 to 4 years, and that most of the European war will simply mean the transfer of the Army and Navy and the entire war effort into the Pacific Ocean area. If that is known it could be said that the disadvantage of which I am speaking does not mean that as soon as the European fight is over the war itself is practically over.

Mr. MEAD. That is a valuable contribution, and I appreciate it.

This committee has heard the story before. We risked disrupting production about the termination of the war in Europe, and we have our own survey of one of the largest airplane plants. That plant's labor shortage of over 10,000 workers proved wholly fictitious once the job was really got to work. And in most instances the workers prefer to do a good job.

The War Manpower Commission must be empowered to do plant surveys wherever such surveys are needed to accomplish this job. It must be permitted full access to records and to books. It must be able to question witnesses under oath. It must have power to force action on its findings. It must have this power now. Management and labor must cooperate to get this done. There are too many inefficient plants where workers anxious to work are not given enough to keep them busy.

Malutilization of labor is not all that is wrong. In our last report to the Senate, our committee pointed out some of the slack practices in our procurement system which result in waste of manpower. We called attention to poor over-all planning, to overbuying, to duplication of purchased material, to poor inventory control, and to other wasteful practices. It is up to the armed forces and the other procurement agencies to eliminate these conditions.

I will say for the armed forces that they are doing a remarkable job, taking it by percentages, but now when we are scraping the barrel it is up to them to refine their work so that none of these inefficiencies will remain if it is possible to eliminate them.

An excellent example of what can be done is the solution of the serious bottleneck problem in foundries. This problem was solved in the case of the heavy tire industry some 6 or 8 months ago, although there is now an apparent need for it. The foundries have raised some of the most troublesome of our production problems. Thousands of men were said to be required to cure them. Meanwhile vital war programs were held up for lack of castings. The dilemma was solved by rescheduling the work in the foundries in order to put first things first. That was done by the Army. As a result, the foundry situation is now largely corrected.

Throwing labor into the yards is now idle in Detroit. We are advised that thousands of Negro workers and skilled workers, are unable to obtain war work in many parts of the country.

There is still unemployment in many communities despite the urgent need for workers elsewhere.

The procurement agencies are now hastening to award new contracts in the areas which have most workers available, and that will be very helpful; but the present situation is not helped by the fact that in the last few months contracts have been allowed to expire in places where workers were available while more work was plied into the critical labor areas. Both shipbuilding and munitions contracts were placed in critical west coast areas, while in other sections plants with labor available were passed by.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WALSH. How are we going to remedy that situation? The argument the Senator is making is one which leads to what he and I are, I believe, both opposed, namely, the drafting of labor. Yet the facts which present almost raise in the mind the necessity of it. Is there any other method of handling the problem where there is a shortage of labor in one place and a surplus in another?

Mr. MEAD. We have been assured that withdrawing contracts where labor is available, and increasing contracts in areas where labor is not available, will be eliminated so far as possible. That has not been eliminated, but excellent control is already in the hands of the proper procurement agencies. They can, in a survey of the field, place contracts where there is available labor, and they can discontinue withdrawing contracts where there is labor available. They have an excellent control, they can cooperate, one agency with another, and do a good, over-all job with the power they have.

Mr. WALSH. Who could give us information today, or in the next day or two, as to the areas in which there is a surplus of labor, and in what areas there is a shortage? Is there some authority that could give us the information?

Mr. MEAD. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH. Who is it?

Mr. MEAD. I imagine the information could be secured from the War Manpower Commission, and from certain branches of the War Production Board, Mr. WALSH. Was it being done to level out that uneven face?

Mr. MEAD. We are told contracts are now being placed where there is labor available, and are being withdrawn where there is a shortage of labor.

Mr. WALSH. That would help.

Mr. MEAD. For instance, some time ago there were cut-backs in the airplane industry. Some time ago there was a severe cut-back in aluminum production, and a number of plants were closed. In some cases aluminum plants, which were the main sources of employment in the
Mr. WALSH. It is necessary to win the war. Mr. KILGORE. Yes, so it is not a labor-union situation.

Mr. WALSH. Delegations come to me from labor unions in Norfolk.

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, yes; they are recognized, but it is not what we would call a closed shop, by any means. About 40 percent of the employees are nonunion employees.

Mr. WALSH. In the situation I think is the fact that the yards have not gotten over their normal peacetime methods of operation; in the lower levels they are still operating as they operated in the past.

Mr. KILGORE. The Navy, I think with the proper idea, the making of the Corsair, and of course did the Treasury I think is the fact that the yards are in a critical area, and how important all those factors are to the war effort.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to conclude in a moment or two. The Senator from Massachusetts has made a very helpful contribution to the discussion.

The armed forces also must clean their houses—not only their arsenals and navy yards, but also their actual uniformed ranks. There has been too much evidence of excess manpower in uniform. There are too many men now assigned to nonproductive jobs. That is the extent to which there is a manpower utilization, and a committee will continue its study of manpower utilization, and a committee report will be released to the public.

This country will back up its fighting men. It will give them the munitions they need. But our people just cannot act blindly. American people want the facts, and the demand that they have enough to do. They should be utilized in uniform or released to industry. This is a result of the lessening of the workmen themselves. The armed services either will not or cannot shift to useful work. These men complain that they have not enough to do. They should either be utilized in uniform or released to industry.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I wish to say, before I take my seat, that very recently there has been a change in management at the Norfolk Navy Yard. That one heavy instance of the workmen themselves.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator, I will say that there is one Navy establishment in this country—and I hope the committee will visit it—which is manned and controlled and operated entirely by officers and enlisted personnel. That is the one at San Diego. It is apparently very successful. The committee will learn some lessons by visiting that yard. It has a very fine system, and I hope we will increase the problem, rather than solve it. I am concerned about that. It strikes me that in this picture, not only in the navy yards, but in many private plants, management has been under no spur whatever to clean up its own house and provide supervision which will get results. I understand that when the captain of a company or commander of a regiment falls down on the job in the field he is yanked off right then and there and replaced. That certainly has not been done with the executives who fail to deliver production at Norfolk, or in any other plant. I have seen that.

Mr. WALSH. The Navy, I think with the proper idea, that the average tour of duty of a naval officer is about 2 years, whereas none of the masters at Norfolk, so far as the Navy has any record, has ever been dismissed. They have retired on account of age. In fact, there may be dismissed, the officials have to come to Washington and hold hearings. So it can be imagined that officers on duty at the yard for 2 years are not likely to tackle that kind of proposition.

Mr. WALSH. They are in charge of productive work. These men complain that they have not enough to do. They should either be utilized in uniform or released to industry.

Mr. WALSH. And they resent official regulation, official direction. That is my observation. Just as the Senator has said, the presence of the conflict is apparent to anyone who studies the matter.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to say, before I take my seat, that very recently there has been a change in management at the Norfolk Navy Yard. That one heavy instance of the workmen themselves.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator, I will say that there is one Navy establishment in this country—and I hope the committee will visit it—which is manned and controlled and operated entirely by officers and enlisted personnel. That is the one at San Diego. It is apparently very successful. The committee will learn some lessons by visiting that yard. It has a very fine system, and I hope we will increase the problem, rather than solve it. I am concerned about that. It strikes me that in this picture, not only in the navy yards, but in many private plants, management has been under no spur whatever to clean up its own house and provide supervision which will get results. I understand that when the captain of a company or commander of a regiment falls down on the job in the field he is yanked off right then and there and replaced. That certainly has not been done with the executives who fail to deliver production at Norfolk, or in any other plant. I have seen that.

Mr. WALSH. The Navy, I think with the proper idea, that the average tour of duty of a naval officer is about 2 years, whereas none of the masters at Norfolk, so far as the Navy has any record, has ever been dismissed. They have retired on account of age. In fact, there may be dismissed, the officials have to come to Washington and hold hearings. So it can be imagined that officers on duty at the yard for 2 years are not likely to tackle that kind of proposition.

Mr. WALSH. And they resent official regulation, official direction. That is my observation. Just as the Senator has said, the presence of the conflict is apparent to anyone who studies the matter.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to say, before I take my seat, that very recently there has been a change in management at the Norfolk Navy Yard. That one heavy instance of the workmen themselves.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator, I will say that there is one Navy establishment in this country—and I hope the committee will visit it—which is manned and controlled and operated entirely by officers and enlisted personnel. That is the one at San Diego. It is apparently very successful. The committee will learn some lessons by visiting that yard. It has a very fine system, and I hope we will increase the problem, rather than solve it. I am concerned about that. It strikes me that in this picture, not only in the navy yards, but in many private plants, management has been under no spur whatever to clean up its own house and provide supervision which will get results. I understand that when the captain of a company or commander of a regiment falls down on the job in the field he is yanked off right then and there and replaced. That certainly has not been done with the executives who fail to deliver production at Norfolk, or in any other plant. I have seen that.

Mr. WALSH. The Navy, I think with the proper idea, that the average tour of duty of a naval officer is about 2 years, whereas none of the masters at Norfolk, so far as the Navy has any record, has ever been dismissed. They have retired on account of age. In fact, there may be dismissed, the officials have to come to Washington and hold hearings. So it can be imagined that officers on duty at the yard for 2 years are not likely to tackle that kind of proposition.
Mr. KILGORE. No new construction is done there?

Mr. WALSH. No.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to point out that we on this side of the Chamber will hear the pathetic story from Massachusetts. We would be glad to hear everything that is being said.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I regret that we have not spoken louder during the debate.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the present situation is a serious one. It needs to be solved now. We need the ships badly. Therefore, I would recommend to the Navy that it immediately institute an all-out manpower utilization survey by experts, which I understand can be furnished to the Navy by the War Manpower Commission; that the Navy put its house in order; and then, as a long-range program, let us get at the system which my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Affairs Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts, points out is in need of improvement and refinement. If the two programs are accomplished, I am sure that a good deal of the situation will be behind us.

I wish to conclude by saying that the naval officers have cooperated with us in this survey in every yard, and I wish also to add that labor has very generally and enthusiastically embraced the opportunity for a thoroughgoing utilization of the manpower needs in our navy yards.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I address myself to the subject which has been discussed by my colleague on the committee, the Senator from New York (Mr. Mead). I wish to be a little more specific as to what we found at the Norfolk Navy Yard, because from New York is not a report of what we found, and I am sure the Senator from New York was not intending to make a report from the committee.

Mr. President, I feel called upon today to say something in reply to certain remarks made by the Under Secretary of the Navy, and I want to be specific with reference to them. I shall be frank to the Senate and to my fellow citizens of America.

On the 17th day of January this year, when we went through the Norfolk Navy Yard and took the testimony of 27 witnesses, comprising 375 pages, I personally was shocked that such a condition could exist in our country at this time; and, as the Under Secretary of the Navy says, I did remark that I found conditions in the navy yard at Norfolk so bad that I could not hear the words of treason. The definition of treason, my fellow Senators, is merely the giving of aid and comfort to the enemy. The able Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Warden) incidentally Mr. Mead) used the word "sabotage." Mr. President, I shall make a statement as to what we found at the navy yard, so that all may judge what the conditions are.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WARD. Mr. President, I did not comment on any facts, but I did say that if men were whispering to other men, "Go slow; let up do not produce," it was a form of sabotage, which is the same thing that the Senator said.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, among other things, I had anticipated complete cooperation upon the part of the Navy in the solution of this problem. I feel certain that the great majority of officers in the Navy understand the situation, and that even in conditions which prevail have been brought to their attention and they realize the situation, will cooperate to the fullest, as I know that Congress is going to cooperate.

What I shall discuss deals merely with the utilization of labor. It has nothing to do with any recommendation by the President as to what he should do with respect to any bill to provide labor for these plants. I think our first job is immediately— it is long past due—to look into the utilization of every man and every woman in America toward the winning of the war. My only reason for saying what I say today is that I want to cooperate with the various agencies in order that we may get every ounce of effort out of our citizens in the winning of the war.

Mr. President, I wish to read most of a letter written by the Under Secretary of the Navy in order that we may know the attitude of one who is high in position, who in conditions which prevail have been brought to their attention and realized the situation, will cooperate to the fullest, as I know that Congress is going to cooperate.

This is a serious charge against a loyal and able unit of the Naval Establishment which I cannot let pass unanswered.

Mr. President, no one is more loyal to the fighting Navy of the United States and to every man who is rendering service out on the high seas and on shore than I am. It is by reason of my devotion to the Navy that I have made my statement, because I believe it to be substantiated by the evidence, and I think the time has come not only in the shipyards, but also in our great factories, when we should demand that every individual in the United States, no matter what his position may be, whether it be high or low, do his utmost toward the winning of the war. Everyone must exert every ounce of his efforts to the winning of the war, and when he does not do that, but is in a position where he is able to give chosen men the comfort to the enemy, then a proper description of his action is almost that of treason or sabotage, for it interferes with the prosecution of this war, which we must win.

Mr. President, today I had the privilege of seeing a report to the Under Secretary of the Navy showing that the utilization of labor was not good. I am unable to bring that report to the floor of the Senate. Let me read some excerpts from it. The report was made in December 1944.

I shall not overestimate what we found. A fair, mild description of what we found will speak volumes to the Senate and to the American people as to the results which will not be the result in labor in this yard. Reading from the report, under the heading "Utilization," we find the following:

It is estimated that the same amount of work could be accomplished with substantially fewer employees.

Mr. President, how does that line up with the letter which was released by the Under Secretary to the press on Saturday evening? He says that during 1944 the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, including its labor utilization record, was good. Later I shall read further from the report which we have discussed, but at this point I wish to read the following:

Idle time: Idle time, as used here, includes plain loss, which is the employee's own fault.

Mr. President, are we going to blame the employee himself, and not supervision, up to the highest ranking supervisor, for so-called loafing, and are we to say that it is the employee's own fault? I read further from the report:

stand-by time: When men are idle due to no work, or waiting for another trades, for furnishing of instructions.

Mr. President, whose fault is that? The testimony in this record shows that a man receiving $1.25 an hour spent 4 days, with a helper, waiting for four screws; that he complained, and was told by the leaderman to go back and stay there until the screws arrived. When the four screws arrived, he required 1 minute to put them in.

Mr. President, that is a sworn statement. I believe it, and I believe that every other member of the committee believes it.

Another man testified that in January of this year he and two other men waited 4 days in a place where the work which they were supposed to do had already been done. He stated the days he waited there—Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

In this organization in many instances it is not exactly clear as to just who is in authority. Today we heard with great interest a description of the authority, from the top down. The Bureau of Yards and Docks has certain authority. The Bureau of Ships has certain authority. As you go down the line of authority, we find a commandant in the yard. He is an admiral. Under him we find a captain, who is the manager of the yard. As between those two, the division of authority is very clear, but when you go from the Navy official side into the so-called civil-service side, it is not clear.

Coming up the ladder from the bottom, in the line of so-called supervision, we have first the snapper. Next we have
the keyman. Those two men have no particular authority, except that given to them by the leaderman, who comes next. Next in the scale we have the leaderman, then the quarterman. Next we have the chief quarterman, then the foreman, and then the master.

It was testified that there are many good men in the yard who would be the keyman. Most of the men who testified before the committee had more than 4 years of experience. They were good, loyal American citizens, depending themselves out of work because of circumstances and conditions they felt that they were unable to do it.

The evidence clearly shows that men who had been there for only a short time were up-graded, above men who had been there for years.

There is no complaint from the top because of not having work to do. The chief occupation of those at the top seems to be defending themselves. I personally observed conditions on one of the top decks of this carrier. Not more than 1 man in 10 was working. I am sure other members of the committee have observed the same condition. However, at this same time, we are advised that, according to the War Manpower Commission, there is a demand for more hands. The wages paid joiners in other yards are $23.46. The working hours there are 9 hours a day.

I have spoken of the men who were working on the Champlain. That is a carrier, and it is needed at sea as soon as it can be put in the water. One man testified that on a certain Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday he and two other men were sent to do certain work when the leaderman knew that there was no work to do, and that it had already been done. Those three men were sent to a certain place and stayed there during that period.

Another witness testified that on the very day that they had told the leaderman they needed a welder for a short job, the leaderman insisted on sending the welder there and having her remain all day; that the welder actually worked in the hangar deck from 9:05 until 2:30—just 5 minutes. The witness estimated that the Government would have to pay that welder for the actual work done, or an hourly basis. He said that if the welder was paid on an hourly basis, the payment would amount to $23.46.

Another witness who testified about timing the work in connection with work on Sundays, he had timed a person who was going to the rest room. He testified that the first time that person went to the rest room he stayed 45 minutes, that the next time there were four times that particular day, and that he had spent a little more than 3 hours in the shop. That was on the Sunday previous to our going there.

Another witness who testified that he saw loafering in the storeroom 25 or 30 men who claimed they did not have anything to do. The witness testified that the leaderman came along and told them to go down into the shop and that that storeroom was not the proper place for them to be loafering.

There is considerable testimony in the record that only approximately 80 percent of the men are doing essential work. A witness testified about jobs being overmaned. He said that if 10 men can do a job, they will send 20 to do it, and that actually one is in the way of the other. All of the metal trades testified that so many persons were put into a room that they could not work, that they had lack of supervision, that there was featherbedding, and that they had to wait for the crafts to finish before they could start. They said there was 8 to 20 minutes wasted in each 6-hour period. One of the members of the committee, the only department which he said did not have enough work to do, was the pattern department. The other testimony indicated that that department was the only department which had enough work to keep the men busy. The witness from the pattern department stated that he felt that up to 60-percent production was being obtained in that department.
tion, it is a very serious offense, in my opinion, and I am sure the Senator agrees
with me.
Mr. FERGUSON. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator.
Mr. WALSH. I hope the Senator's committee will investigate that matter to
to find out who are the leaders, and will have them prosecuted, and also will find out who are the superiors in that navy yard, or in the Navy, who should know about the situation but have been too slow to correct it.
To me that condition is inconceivable. I can understand loafing; I can understand an inferior type of labor which the navy yards are obliged to hire; I can understand that civil-service regulations may tie the hands of the management so that it is not always to be able to get the best and most efficient labor; but if there is a spirit of "if it is easy and do not reduce too much," that is intolerable, and to me it is unbelievable.
Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have the able senior Senator from Massachusetts in that connection. I feel wholeheartedly, as he does, that we must go to the bottom of these matters, we must bring them to light, and that prosecution should be had in all cases in which it is warranted.
Mr. WALSH. The employees tried to get their superior officers to keep the work in that particular yard, but it was sent to another yard. As a natural consequence, the men slowed down in the performance of their work.
Mr. President, I believe that another thing which causes men to slow down is the so-called private work in the yard. I wish to describe that rather in detail because of the effect it has upon the morale of the men. Of the most difficult things the men have to do is to make a survey of the yard. We appreciate Cook's Tours. We know what is coming, but in the past 2 or 3 years we have kept an eye on, and have observed and not been taken on a Cook's Tour through the plant, as was described by the able Senator from New York. So on one trip we split up into subcommittees and went into various buildings without any previous notice having been given.
The reason I say that private work affects the morale of the men is that, as I was going through the plant, I fell behind and spoke to a workman, and out of the side of his mouth, in a whisper so that the officials could not hear him, he said, "Look for an oyster-shucking table that is being repaired." Another one said, "Look for some picture frames over in the corner." Another one remarked to me, "Look for a checkerboard, or three of them, down in the lower room." And another one went on about these various matters. The situation which I have described is contagious. It affects every one of the employees. Each knows what is going on, and it breaks down the spirit and the desire to produce.
The record shows that much work was done on private orders. A witness stated that when there was technical work to be done, if a private work job came in, they dropped the work which they were doing in order to do the private work, which came first.
Sitting in the shop among the private items which they were engaged, and one small safe belonging to a lieutenant. It was a metal case only a foot by a foot in size. It was equipped with a lock. But it had been brought in, and the men had considered it a private job. They had installed small drawers in the safe. They had even lined it with green felt, I obtained the time card on that particular safe. On the 13th day of January, 1945, the employee received $16.59 worth of labor, and on January 15, $10.83 worth of labor, or a total of $27.03 which represented the cost of the job. It had not yet been finished, and workmen in that yard considered it a private piece of work for the lieutenant. It affected the morale of not only the particular workman who told me to look at it, but of all the other workmen, because they knew concerning it went out over the yard.
Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.
Mr. WALSH. What was the private work to which the Senator refers? Was it work done for an officer, or for a private individual, for which no payment was made?
Mr. FERGUSON. It was done for either an officer, a master, or a civil-service employee, and the men felt that it had no direct relationship to the war.
Mr. WALSH. Was it a naval job?
Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Mr. WALSH. Did the safe come from a naval vessel?
Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Mr. WALSH. Was it going back to the naval vessel?
Mr. FERGUSON. No: it was going into the office of the lieutenant.
Mr. WALSH. Was it going to the office of the lieutenant?
Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.
Mr. WALSH. What was the office of the lieutenant, or to his home?
Mr. FERGUSON. It was going into his office.
Mr. WALSH. So was being moved from a safe for use in the lieutenant's new job in some office capacity. Is that correct?
Mr. FERGUSON. I should not put it in that way. Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.
Mr. KILGORE. I understand a little more about the situation, perhaps, than does the Senator from Michigan. The cabinet was a small steel cabinet about 12 by 12 inches in size.
Mr. WALSH. Was it a private job being done for a naval officer, or for a private individual, and was it for his own individual use?
Mr. KILGORE. The theory was that it was to be used in his office. The officer is said to have stated, "I got this off the shelf of one company, and I have it fixed up for my own office, because everyone else has one like it." It was not a safe. It was a small steel cabinet which would correspond to a dispatch case.
Mr. WALSH. The Senator says that it was being repaired.
Mr. KILGORE. Yes.
Mr. WALSH. Was there any evidence that it was a private job, and that the employees of the yard were repairing the cabinet for private use?
Mr. KILGORE. The empty box, without the felt-lined compartments, could have served as a safe.
when he has to do what was done in this case.

Mr. WALSH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak a few minutes on the work in the lucite room.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Before the proceeding will the Senator say how much the work to which he has referred amounted to altogether? Was it a considerable amount, or was it limited to the particular door which he cited?

Mr. FERGUSON. The work was considerable. I shall try to describe some other things as I proceed, showing that the amount of work was considerable. I wish to describe the work in the lucite room, and state what we found in going through the room. It was only a small office, not more than 15 feet square. It may have been 10 feet square. It was a workshop. Outside we found about 398 sheets of scarce lucite, and the testimony disclosed that a small office, not more than 15 feet square, was good timbers.

The President pro tempore.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to explain to the Senator from Massachusetts the regulations so that he will understand. Up to some months ago this lucite, which is in sheets of about 396 sheets, was declared surplus, it was said that it was placed there and had remained there. They could not tell us whether it was surplus or what it was, but it could not be declared to be surplus so long as it was in the hands of the property man, who could have declared it surplus. It went to the lucite room where it could go into surplus. It got out of the hands of the property man, who could have declared it surplus, and it went to the lucite room and was stored there. There was lack of proper supervision; somebody should have seen to it that proper steps were taken to declare it surplus.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to say this to both Senators: My interest as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee is to get at the facts and investigation we should take action to make them cautious for the time being; but should not action be taken to remedy the laxity on the part of someone.

Mr. KILGORE. One factor is that the naval officer on the job who should know what is going on is not kept there long but is sent to sea.

Mr. WALSH. No matter how long he is there, he ought to know enough to have subordinate officers in whom he has confidence to know what is going on and to submit reports.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator that we took the superintendent of every shop in all the yards with us, so that everything was brought to the fact that amendments are needed, which the Senator's committee could go into.

Mr. WALSH. We could be helpful.

Mr. KILGORE. The committee of which the Senator from Massachusetts is chairman should make a recommendation that the regulations be changed.

Mr. WALSH. I understand the Senator from Michigan is making merely a preliminary report.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. The committee comes here with mere suggestions rather than a report. Who are the men loading on the job? Who are those who are derelict? Is it a naval officer who is incompetent or is it the master mechanic or is it some other master? Is there not some one in this navy yard or other navy yards of whom we can make an example, so as to give some assurance that it will not happen again?

Mr. KILGORE. One factor is that the naval officer on the job who should know what is going on is not kept there long but is sent to sea.

Mr. WALSH. Do they say these things are true and that they are responsible, or do they say that the man in charge and they cannot control the carelessness on
the part of employees. What is their answer?

Mr. FERGUSON. Their answer is that the naval officer who had been there had been sent to sea.

Mr. WALSH. Was he the commanding officer?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; they have a commanding officer and the manager.

Mr. WALSH. So that the answer is that the commanding officer who knew about it had been sent to sea, and did not take any action.

Mr. FERGUSON. They do not admit he knew about it, and they say they did not let him go to sea because of his work or because of this adverse report.

Mr. WALSH. Did not some master mechanic know about these things? Certainly there is some individual higher up than those poor workmen whom we can discipline for this condition and not, as the result of these disclosures, resort to a drastic law to draft labor. Can we not comply by punishing, if it be possible, those in executive positions?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we can; I am sure we can. I shall do everything I can to get to the bottom of the matter.

Mr. WALSH. If there is this Senator, or the Senator, but try to see if we cannot set an example once for all. As I have said, the evidence is helpful in that it will be read in every navy yard and every arsenal, and it will have a beneficial effect, but the most valuable thing of all would be to have some executive held responsible and punished—a naval officer, if it is a naval matter; a civil officer, if it is a civil matter; we would have trouble removing any citizen without evidence, because there are civil-service regulations for their protection. Charges must be preferred and proven.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the orders, and the method of indicating the amount of labor to be used on a particular order. It is one of those general job orders that has helped and hurt labor and caused excessive costs.

There is a pink-slip order. The orders are not numbered consecutively, so that one order may not use it as he pleases, but if one uses one of those pink slips, he puts on it the amount of labor he anticipates being necessary.

One witness describes it in this way, that if it would take $25 worth of labor to do a job, $125 might be indicated upon the slip, and then they make sure that that much labor is charged on that slip against that particular job.

I wish to take one particular order number, that is, order No. X-8140. This comes out of the foundry, and as I was going through this shop, a witness told me that there was an oyster-shucking table over in the corner. I was curious to know how an oyster-shucking table was going to help win the war, so I went over and looked at it, and this is what I discovered. The order number, No. X-8140. Here is the diagram, Exhibit 1, showing what this oyster table was. It is made out of fir. It is cabinet work. They were careful to see that all the screws were countersunk and the edges smoothed. It is 16 feet long. It has a backboard 12 inches high. It has a depth of 45 inches. It has 4 holes in it, through which oyster shells can be dropped. The holes are 5 inches by 5 inches. The table has four highly polished shelves 5 by 2 inches, bored out so that an oyster may be placed in the block and be shucked much easier. One man described working a whole half day on one oyster.

There was an explanation for that. The statement had been made that commandants come and go, but the masters stay on forever. The explanation was that we were going to have an oyster party in their closed room in the cafeteria, and they had that one board made. The officials say in a letter to me that the actual cost of the board was $14.60, $11.97 in labor, and $2.63 in material.

Mr. President, I should like to have every Member of the Senate look at that board, which is here as an exhibit. I think it would be good for the Under Secretary to see the board.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Secretary present the order?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Who issued the order?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Williams, the master in the joiners' department.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Under Secretary permit the order to be placed in the Record?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I shall ask to place it in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the order is printed in the Record.

[Order omited from Record under rules limiting publication of secret documents.]

Mr. WALSH. What was the oyster board to be used for, and where was it to be used?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was to be used in the cafeteria for a party given by the masters on Friday night; we were there on Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. WALSH. That this master issued an order in order to have made, at Government expense, with Government labor, a board or table which was to be used in shucking oysters at masters' parties. Is that the story?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. What action has been taken against that man?

Mr. FERGUSON. So far as I know, no action has been taken by the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Do they know the man's name?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Under Secretary of the Navy defends the making of this board as an order, or a job number.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, his claim is that the masters have clubs, like all officers and enlisted personnel, and that this was an adjunct of their club, which was on the Navy premises and used by the masters, instead of by enlisted men or by officers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Here is the express language:

It is not a workman in the Norfolk Navy Yard built an oyster shucking board. The total cost in labor and material was exactly $14.60, or $11.97 in labor and $2.63 in material. This oyster shucking board was built to protect one of the yard's cafeteria table tops during an oyster roast which was being given for the officers in the yard.

Mr. WALSH. What does the Under Secretary mean by "morale purposes"? Does he mean that the existence of these clubs helped to create a good morale?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not been able to discover just what is meant by "morale" when speaking in connection with either management or labor. I think it is one of those words which is general in its nature, and if one wants an excuse for doing anything one can say that it is for morale purposes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senate go on record?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator that the only club I found in the yard was the masters' club. Other personnel apparently do not have it. Only the masters have access to it. Not even the admirals has a key to it, nor does the custodian.

Mr. WALSH. It would seem from some of the allegations, that "brass hats" ought to be taken off the admirals and placed on the masters in the navy yards.

Mr. KILGORE. I said so at the outset.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to be more difficult to get rid of them than it is to get rid of "brass hats."

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. If the Senator from Michigan will permit me to interrupt him further, I may say that the reason responsibility cannot be fixed for this thing is that it is being done under one of those general job orders which runs for months, and such a thing as this is simply sandwiched in under verbal request. I do not know what job order this particular thing happened to be charged up to, but no responsibility can be fixed because the name of the man who issued the order cannot be found.

Mr. WALSH. Does the order show the name?

Mr. KILGORE. No. Only the general job order shows the name of the one who issued it. The Senator from Michigan will remember that some seven or eight hundred dollars' worth of work was done on that general job order.

Mr. FERGUSON. This particular order has the name on it.

Mr. WALSH. If the individual whose name appears on the order were asked about it, he might say that this work was not performed in the general job order, but that someone down the line did not know that, and ordered the work to be done. The Senator speaks of a general order; that the work would be said to come under a general order, and the individual who performed it therefore would not be subject to blame.

Mr. KILGORE. In tracing the matter down, I will say to the Senator, the work came on the general job order, and one master signed that order.

Mr. FERGUSON. The sketch or print they were going to use was signed.

In an examination of the form with respect to this job number X-8140 one cannot distinguish what labor devoted to the particular work. Therefore they can cover it up by putting it under the number of a general job order.

One thing, as I have said, which greatly concerns these workmen, and I think that it broke their spirit in a way, was the furniture which was made for the master's room. I should like to describe...
Mr. WALSH. Is the committee going to send all this testimony to the Navy Department?

Mr. FERGUSON, Yes.

Mr. WALSH. That is well. Is the committee also going to ask the Navy Department for an investigation and report?

Mr. FERGUSON, Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Has the Department made any report on the furniture to which the Senator referred?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it has not as yet reported.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Navy support and maintain this masters' club? Does it furnish the food and the refreshments and other things served there?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The masters pay 25 cents a meal. It has been increased to 30 cents—in the cafeteria, which is one of the rooms in the masters' club.

Mr. WALSH. So it is a club where the masters meet socially, and have their lunch in the middle of the day?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And they pay for their own lunch?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. And manage it all themselves?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. But they took advantage, apparently, from what the Senator has said, of their positions as masters, to have some furniture made at the Government's expense. It is important to know, it is, that Navy officials higher up approved of that.

Mr. FERGUSON. As to that, we could not get an answer from the witness.

Mr. President, in relation to this club, I wish to describe some things in the dining room. A sideboard was there. It looked as fine as any piece of Grand Rapids furniture. I pulled out a drawer immediately, knowing that Grand Rapids furniture makers usually place their label inside on a little plate. I could not find such a label. Then I was informed that that sideboard had been made at the navy yard. Sideboards were also made there. They were made of fine mahogany, and were of first-class workmanship.

In that room was something which came out of the so-called metal shop. Mr. WALSH. Is the property now owned by the Navy or by this club?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is owned by the club, as I am informed.

Mr. WALSH. Is it on Navy property?

Mr. FERGUSON. In the Navy Building.

Mr. WALSH. And so far as the Senator knows, the furniture in it is owned by the members of the masters' club?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The furniture has carved upon it "M M A", meaning "Master Mechanics' Association" and "N Y N", Norfolk Navy Yard, is graved by hand over every furniture in the yard. This club has two large rooms, cut off from the central cafeteria, and is entered by a different entrance. We were informed that it was for the exclusive use of the masters' association of the Norfolk yards. The yard superintendent who was with us had difficulty in obtaining a key. Finally he had to locate a master in order to get into the club rooms.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Have the naval officers a club there?

Mr. KILGORE. There is a naval officers' club, but it has no connection with this club.

Mr. WALSH. I am trying to compare this station with other stations of which I have some knowledge. At other stations the naval officers have a club where they lunch.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And the masters have a club there. They enlisted personnel have places where they lunch, and the same is true of the civilian employees.

Mr. KILGORE. The civilian employees have only cafeterias.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me that the masters are seeking to imitate the officers by having as luxurious a club as the naval officers have and by having the Navy supply them with furniture.

Mr. FERGUSON. This club is very much smaller than the officers' club.

Mr. President, in the dining room next to the club room, there was a steam table, made of stainless steel. It measured about 13 by 3½ feet, and was equipped with electrical connections so that the food could be kept warm. The men in the yard complained about the use of stainless steel for that purpose, when it was so urgently needed for war purposes. The workmanship on the table was of a high class, and many hours must have been required to build it. The room in which the steam table is used is not more than 25 or 30 feet from the kitchen. As these workmen testified, the furniture in the room was put solely for the use of the masters. We have the testimony of men who are familiar with the construction of furniture. They say that it would cost as much as $50,000 to make this furniture. The Under Secretary describes it in his letter as having a value of about $300.

One other item which I wish to mention is the making of checkerboards. I can conceive that the making of checkerboards for the masters, who have idle time, may affect their so-called morale, and that a master may be enabled to go home at night and say to his family "My patriotism has today been so high that because I have been able to play checkers at work." Some of the workmen described these boards as costing as much as $600. In that letter the Senator said:

Mr. President, I think it is well that we know exactly what is done when these checkerboards are made. We were told that the checkerboards were in the ludic room. We asked to see them. The man to whom we talked denied that he had any checkerboards.
There were three of them there. I suggested to him that he come to the hotel room that evening, and be prepared to take an oath about the checkerboards. By the time he reached the committee room, about 8 o'clock, he had a very vivid memory, so vivid that he could describe the checkerboards, and just how they were made. We had seen one of them in the master's room, and I suggested that it would be well for us to take one of them with us as an exhibit, so that the Under Secretary could see it and judge for himself.

I have before me today in the Senate Chamber a checkerboard made at Government expense. It is not an ordinary painted board. It is not made of cardboard; it is made of solid walnut. The white squares are inlaid with maple. On the border are the chess emblems— the knight, the rook, and so forth. Around the checkerboard there is inlaid a fine line of white maple, less than an eighth of an inch in width.

This board was being made by a man who claims that he is essential to the war effort and who is evading service in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps. He is alleged that he was making three such boards. The Under Secretary says that these boards are for the morale of the masters.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Were these boards to be used in the masters' club?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the testimony.

Mr. WALSH. How many of them were there in all?

Mr. FERGUSON. There are 16 masters. There are now two checkerboards in the masters' club.

Mr. WALSH. How many boards were there in all?

Mr. FERGUSON. Three were being made at that particular time.

Mr. WALSH. Was the Senator able to obtain the orders for the making of these boards?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; we have not been able to obtain the orders for these particular boards.

Mr. WALSH. Apparently, from what the Senator is saying, the furniture for this club was made largely on Government working time, and with Government materials.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was made on Government working time and with Government materials.

Mr. WALSH. I infer from what the Senator says that he discovered, at least in some parts of the yard, a rather unfriendly, if not bitter, feeling on the part of the workmen toward the masters. Was that feeling extensive?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was very extensive.

Mr. WALSH. That is an unfortunate situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is very bad.

Mr. WALSH. There is, I infer, a hidden reason in these breasts of some of the employees against their masters.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is great resentment at what is going on. Just such things as this are causing the resentments, Mr. President, this board has not been painted or varnished. The wood had just been sanded on the particular day when we received it as an exhibit. We have testimony that as much as 3 days are used up on these boards.

There are many other items. I shall only mention them, because they are knickknacks. Nevertheless, they create resentment on the part of the men.

Another exhibit which I have before me is made of lignum vitae, a very important war material. It is a napkin ring. It will be noted that it is bored out in the center. One man told us, on oath, that it was... (omitted)

Mr. WALSH. Of course, a superior officer might have some right, as in the case of the man with the safe, to have repairs done for his quarters; but, if they were made for an officer's personal use, they should not take 1 hour to discharge from the yard the master at whose orders such work was done. Of course, if it was done for naval use, the situation is different; but, as the Senator has said, there are at least suspensory that it was for private use. The Senator has said that there is widespread a rather bitter feeling on the part of the employees against their masters.

Mr. FERGUSON that is correct. Mr. President, I am very glad the able senior Senator from Massachusetts takes such a great interest in this matter because it is a very serious one.

With regard to one item let me say I think even the strongest imagination would have difficulty in understanding how it would help us win the war. That is the case of handles to a lady's handbag. Other evidence was that a handle was made for a smoothing iron.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to say that my interest is to localize and fix the blame where it belongs, and to have some action taken against any wrongdoers. My interest is to make sure that the records of Admiral King, Admiral Nimtz, Admiral Horne, Admiral Jacobs, and the Secretary of the Navy—all of whom are innocent, and all of whom are gallantly fighting this war—is not taken by the existence of such conditions in any part of any navy yard, without any action being taken. I do not want the Navy Department as a whole to be held responsible for a local situation which it is alleged is unsavory.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to read now a portion of a report made last December by the Navy itself. Then I shall read the Under Secretary's letter, and I shall make a few remarks about it.

As I have said, the report states that it is estimated that the same amount of work could be accomplished with substantially fewer employees.

I read from the report:

**IDLE TIME**

Idle time, as used herein, includes plain loafing, which is the man's own fault; "stand-by time," when men are idle due to fault of their own, waiting for other trades, for material, or for the furnishing of instructions.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. PRESIDENT. I wish to mention some of the other things which the men claim have been made in the yard. One of them is a dog house. Others are a serving table, knives, bracelets, rings, ashtrays, candlesticks, handbag handles, cigar boxes made of solid mahogany, cigar boxes, candle holders, picture frames, and a screen for a fireplace.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I understand the Senator has said the men told him those articles were for personal use and were taken outside the yard.

Mr. FERGUSON. They testified they made them on Government time, they made them for a superior officer, and that is all they know about it. They do not pretend to know what he did with it. Mr. WALSH. Of course, a superior officer might have some right, as in the case of the man with the safe, to have repairs done for his quarters; but, if they were made for an officer's personal use, they should not take 1 hour to discharge from the yard the master at whose orders such work was done. Of course, if it was done for naval use, the situation is different; but, as the Senator has said, there are at least suspensory that it was for private use. The Senator has said that there is widespread a rather bitter feeling on the part of the employees against their masters.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Mr. President, I am very glad the able senior Senator from Massachusetts takes such a great interest in this matter because it is a very serious one.

With regard to one item let me say I think even the strongest imagination would have difficulty in understanding how it would help us win the war. That is the case of handles to a lady's handbag. Other evidence was that a handle was made for a smoothing iron.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to say that my interest is to localize and fix the blame where it belongs, and to have some action taken against any wrongdoers. My interest is to make sure that the records of Admiral King, Admiral Nimitz, Admiral Horne, Admiral Jacobs, and the Secretary of the Navy—all of whom are innocent, and all of whom are gallantly fighting this war—is not taken by the existence of such conditions in any part of any navy yard, without any action being taken. I do not want the Navy Department as a whole to be held responsible for a local situation which it is alleged is unsavory.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to read now a portion of a report made last December by the Navy itself. Then I shall read the Under Secretary's letter, and I shall make a few remarks about it.

As I have said, the report states that it is estimated that the same amount of work could be accomplished with substantially fewer employees.

I read from the report:

**IDLE TIME**

Idle time, as used herein, includes plain loafing, which is the man's own fault; "stand-by time," when men are idle due to fault of their own, waiting for other trades, for material, or for the furnishing of instructions.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. PRESIDENT. I wish to mention some of the other things which the men claim have been made in the yard. One of them is a dog house. Others are a serving table, knives, bracelets, rings, ashtrays, candlesticks, handbag handles, cigar boxes made of solid mahogany, cigar boxes, candle holders, picture frames, and a screen for a fireplace.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I understand the Senator has said the men told him those articles were for personal use and were taken outside the yard.

Mr. FERGUSON. They testified they made them on Government time, they made them for a superior officer, and that is all they know about it. They do not pretend to know what he did with it. Mr. WALSH. Of course, a superior officer might have some right, as in the case of the man with the safe, to have repairs done for his quarters; but, if they were made for an officer's personal use, they should not take 1 hour to discharge from the yard the master at whose orders such work was done. Of course, if it was done for naval use, the situation is different; but, as the Senator has said, there are at least suspensory that it was for private use. The Senator has said that there is widespread a rather bitter feeling on the part of the employees against their masters.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Mr. President, I am very glad the able senior Senator from Massachusetts takes such a great interest in this matter because it is a very serious one.

With regard to one item let me say I think even the strongest imagination would have difficulty in understanding how it would help us win the war. That is the case of handles to a lady's handbag. Other evidence was that a handle was made for a smoothing iron.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to say that my interest is to localize and fix the blame where it belongs, and to have some action taken against any wrongdoers. My interest is to make sure that the records of Admiral King, Admiral Nimitz, Admiral Horne, Admiral Jacobs, and the Secretary of the Navy—all of whom are innocent, and all of whom are gallantly fighting this war—is not taken by the existence of such conditions in any part of any navy yard, without any action being taken. I do not want the Navy Department as a whole to be held responsible for a local situation which it is alleged is unsavory.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to read now a portion of a report made last December by the Navy itself. Then I shall read the Under Secretary's letter, and I shall make a few remarks about it.

As I have said, the report states that it is estimated that the same amount of work could be accomplished with substantially fewer employees.

I read from the report:

**IDLE TIME**

Idle time, as used herein, includes plain loafing, which is the man's own fault; "stand-by time," when men are idle due to fault of their own, waiting for other trades, for material, or for the furnishing of instructions.
Mr. President, I now wish to refer to the letter which I have mentioned, because I think the release of this letter will have more to do with having these masters feel that they can do such things and more by the higher up than anything else which has occurred, not only in respect to the utilization of Government yards but in respect to the utilization of labor all over the country. I do not know that those in high office in the United States condone this sort of thing and even stand back of it. Let me say that I have not taken back one word I used wherewith employees under civil service were in the United States Navy. It is true that some of them use their status to avoid service in the Navy.

I continue reading from the communication:

They were not for private use or use outside the Navy. Moreover, they were made by workers in intervals between their more urgent assignments.

But, Mr. President, the testimony is clear that the so-called private work comes first and not afterwards.

The Under Secretary continues, as follows:

It is true that a woodworker in the Norfolk Navy Yard built an oyster-shucking board. The total cost in labor and material was exactly $14.60, or $11.97 in labor and $2.63 in material. This oyster-shucking board was built to protect one of the yard's cafeteria table tops during an oyster roast which was being given for morale purposes in the yard.

Mr. President, that may have been building up morale, but from what I heard from men who worked there, it was doing just the opposite; it was breaking down morale.

It is also true that a few checkerboards were made in the woodworking shop of the yard for one of the recreational facilities at the yard. While an investigation which I have made indicates that it may be more elaborate than necessary, each board required the intermittent time of one man for a total of eight days. The cost of the materials was negligible.

Although you did not mention them in your statement, I understand that you also found that the Norfolk yard's woodworking shop had made napkin rings and had manufactured woodwork for one of the conference rooms at the yard.

Napkin rings made from waste materials and costing much less than 50 cents each were made in the woodworking shop of the yard for the use of officers serving on the new aircraft carrier Shangri La, which was built at the yard. I might add that this is standard practice at this yard. Napkin rings save napkins and laundry aboard ship.

As to the furniture in the master mechanics conference room all the materials but one were removed as surplus from a ship converted at the yard. One chair and the conference table were built at the yard and were paid for by private funds of the Yard's Cooperative Association.

Mr. President, that is not the amount involved which is important, but the time which is spent.

I continue reading from the Under Secretary's letter:

It is impossible for me to discuss all conditions which may have interested you at Norfolk.

Then he states that he does not have a summary or enumeration of the allegations made against the Norfolk Navy Yard. He then continues as follows:

The Navy endeavors continuously to improve operating efficiency. Specifically at Norfolk two manpower utilization surveys have been conducted during the past year.

The first one made by the so-called Andrews Board, which included civil service and industrial experts. The second survey, completed about a month ago, was made by the Industrial Survey Divi-
tion of the Secretary’s office, an agency especially established to scrutinize manpower utilization in navy yards.

The President of the United States Navy who are operating the Norfolk Navy Yard are as patriotic and hardworking as anyone in the Government, and indeed they can work with the largely inexperienced supervisory force and personnel with which they have to work.

Their operations are constantly inspected and supervised and steady improvement is being made as is definitely evidenced by the heavy demand. In man-hours required to build ships as compared to man-hours necessary for the same type of job a year or 2 years ago. There is no just basis for unreasonable condemnation of their performance.

Mr. President, as I have already said, I think the conditions which I have in order to require the attention and consideration of each one of us, as well as of the Government. Why do I say “the Government”? Because I know from experience, and from the record, that those who are long-time operators, and they contracts state that they do not price them very carefully because they rely on the income tax for adjustment. They say that in that manner the Government receives from them, those who are long-time operators, off the profit. With regard to the remaining 10 percent they say, “We obtain that by re-negotiation.” But, Mr. President, in doing so they break down morale in industry. The men in the United States are working there for some time, even when they were not needed.

We need the cooperation of Industry in order to assure that the pricing is done properly, that we do not waste any manpower, and that the men do not sit and wait for work. The report shows that in some instances men have gone onto a ship in process of construction and have remained there for some time, even when they were not needed.

We need the patriotic cooperation of each and every laborer and workman, as well as of those who supervise them. We should expose to the public gaze all these conditions by casting the limelight on them. I hope that our committee can go into the highways and byways in private land and show that they were working. I hope that our committee can go into the highways and byways in private land and show that they were working.

PROPOSED INCREASES OF PAY FOR CAPITOL TELEPHONE OPERATORS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there has come over from the House of Representatives, House bill 1437, a measure relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange. With the bill there comes a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, addressed to the President pro tempore of the present Congress, requesting immediate action on the bill, because it is to go into effect the 1st day of February.

Ordinarily the bill would go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The chairmanship of that committee is vacant at this time. In order that the bill may be expedited and passed so that it may become effective on that date, I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the late Senator Maloney of Connecticut was the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I do not know whether any action has been taken toward filling that position.

Mr. McCARRAN. No action has been taken to fill that chairmanship, and I am making this request in order that the bill may be acted on promptly, and the Committee on Appropriations seems to be the proper committee to consider the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Under the ordinary rules, I suppose the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Truman] would succeed to the chairmanship of the committee, if he desired. He is not present today. I am not a member of the committee, but I think some Senator who is a member of the committee should take some notice of the situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am the ranking member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I do not know whether any action should not be taken. I would guess that the Senator from Florida [Mr. Andrews] would be the new chairman.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Florida is very ill in the hospital at Bethesda.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know why the ranking majority member should not call the committee together.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to that committee considering the bill. My suggestion was made only in a desire to obtain action on the bill. It was acted on in the House by the Committee on Appropriations, and would probably go to the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate, but apparently, under the letter I have referred, it was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It must be dealt with by way of appropriations anyway.

Mr. TAFT. Does the bill provide for?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is a House bill relating to the compensation of telephone operators in the United States Capitol. It increases the salaries of the operators. It passed the House several days ago almost unanimously.

Mr. TAFT. I see no reason why a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds should not be called. I do not suppose I could call a meeting. I should think the ranking majority member could do so.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am advised that the Senator from Maryland will return to the Senate Thursday. I merely counsel against action until that committee at least has an opportunity to be consulted. If the Senator from Nevada would agree to the matter the bill is pending until Thursday. I think perhaps we might be able to make it just as much progress.

Mr. McCARRAN. My reason for presenting the matter is that the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is now in the chair, presiding over the Senate, and I am making the request after consideration given to the matter by the presidential officer. We think the bill should go to the Committee on Appropriations for immediate action.

Mr. CHANDLER. I feel bound to object at this time.

ENLIGHTENED NATIONALISM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I realize the hour is late, and I shall hurry through the remarks I have prepared for this occasion.

From all appearances, Mr. President, the Nation-wide debate over our foreign policy has taken on the earmarks of the debate during the last political campaign. It is full of dead cats, out-dated issues, foggy notions, and unnecessary vituperation which we can ill-afford in so momentous a discussion. This debate, Nation-wide, is mostly in the newspapers. As my humble contribution to clearing the air for a more sound and sensible debate, I should like to present some thoughts now.

These thoughts are arranged so as to first, define the relevant terms; second, state the basic issue; third, reiterate my personal position on this issue; and fourth, propose a brief constructive program in line with my position.

DEFINITIONS OF FOREIGN POLICY TERMS

Now, first, if we are ever to come to a meeting of minds, we must reach an agreement on the meaning of the terms we use.

Therefore, I am going to submit definitions on five terms important to our discussion. Do not imagine that I believe that my definitions, or those of any other single person, will be universally
accepted without qualification. But, at least, they will provide a basis on which we may systematically proceed and be more adequate to our task.

The five terms most relevant to the foregoing belief in the past, present, and future are these: Non-interventionism, interventionism, internationalism, and nationalism.

These words epitomize the opposing viewpoints among our people before and after Pearl Harbor.

Each of these words to a greater or a lesser degree has become a "fight word." Their very mention makes people see red. They have been used ambiguously and irresponsibly in smear campaigns. They have become filled with derogatory connotations.

Let us, however, examine them in the cold light of unemotional analysis.

Non-interventionism was the belief in and America's nonparticipation in the European war either as a declared or nondeclared belligerent. Paraphrastically, I may add that this belief was held by 70 per cent of our people prior to Pearl Harbor, as indicated by every public-opinion poll.

Interventionism was the belief in and desire for America's participation in the Second World War as a declared belligerent.

Isolationism was the belief in and desire for America's abstaining from entangling herself in foreign alliances, abstaining from holding in other nations' affairs, and the belief in and desire for America's playing a free hand in foreign affairs.

Internationalism is the belief in and desire for America's entrance into a supergovernment which, for the purpose of international peace, pools the sovereignty of national states and exerts dominion over those states in a manner supposedly irrespective of particular national interests.

Nationalism—and when I say "nationalism" I mean the new enlightened nationalism of today—is the belief in and desire for America's advancement and protection of its own interests and sovereignty; the desire for our cooperation in world affairs in a manner consistent with such self-interest and sovereignty and for America's participation in establishing a peace which will make for enduring peace, if humanly possible.

It will be noted that the past tense was used for three of these definitions. That is because "noninterventionism" and "interventionism" went out the window when the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor. We have been and are in this war for keeps. There has been no question of withdrawal before final and decisive victory is achieved. "Isolationism," too, has become a thing largely of the past. It will remain so, if certain developments which may produce a new isolationism are nipped in the bud. Whether we like it or not, the war, a shrunked world and modern inventions have forced us into an alliance with our allies.

We had nowhere else in which to belie and we hoped to become a pontiff for these three terms which may be well considered obsolete and inappropriate to our present discussion. But before leaving these terms, let us take one more measure to antidote the poisons which have developed around these three terms and to dispel two other expressions: "internationalism" and "nationalism." Let us set the record straight by stating what all five terms do not and did not mean.

First, "Noninterventionism" did not signify a refusal to interfere with the belligerents. On the contrary, noninterventionists, by and large, favored uninterrupted trade between private American concerns and the belligerents. They favored international arbitration.

Second, "Interventionism" did not signify a willingness to enter war for the sake of war. Interventionists regarded war as a slaughter and our entrance into it a painful necessity rather than an unmixed blessing.

Third, Isolationism did not signify "ostrich-ism." The isolationists did not close their eyes to what was going on around them. Indeed, it was because of the very things they saw that they were isolationists. Nor were they isolationists because they identified one or the other belligerent, notably Britain or Germany. They were isolationists because of what they felt toward America and not because of what they felt toward foreign nations. They loved America so much; they gloried in our independence so highly, that they would not allow our beloved Nation to become the dupe or pawn of an alien power.

Fourth, Internationalism does not signify a lack of love for America. Rather, the internationalist holds America dear, but he believes his Nation can achieve the greatest good for itself and others only by surrendering its sovereignty into a collective pool of the sovereignties of all states.

Fifth, Nationalism, I repeat, the new enlightened nationalism of today, does not signify antiforeignism. The nationalist who exults in his nation and its people and desires to protect and advance their interests and through them the interests of other nations and peoples. Nor does nationalism signify noncooperation. On the contrary the enlightened nationalist desires realistic and practical collaboration with other nations, but not at the price of the loss of national sovereignty. These, then, are the relevant terms in what I believe to be their true light.

THE BASIC ISSUE OF OUR TIME

What, then, is the true basic issue of our time?

It is the issue of the two clashing concepts which we have just found by the process of elimination to be the only relevant terms to our discussion today: Internationalism and nationalism. It is around these two concepts that the opposing lines of today have formed.

For me, one take my stand on the side of nationalism, the new enlightened nationalism, free from the selfish excesses of the past. It does not mean living only our sovereign life, it is to mean using the instrumentalities available for this day.

I take this stand on the side of enlightened nationalism because I believe:

First, The force of enlightened nationalism is the dominant and irresistible force of our time, both at home and abroad, whether we foster it or not.

Second, It provides the only sound and realistic approach in our time through which we may meet the challenges of world progress and peace.

Third, It provides the only sound and realistic approach through which we, at home, may maintain and multiply the force of our American standard of living, and make our contribution to world stability.

In taking this stand, I am continuing along the same pro-American line determined by my conscience in pre-Pearl Harbor days.

At that time, the force of enlightened nationalism pointed unerringly to the absolute necessity for nonintervention in the European conflict.

In most cases, I took no action which I have ever since had cause to regret.

The overwhelming majority of our people agreed then with this formula. I heard their silent prayer that we keep out of this war. I saw the pitiful state of our national defenses, the danger of "playing with fire" by undeclared belligerency, the compulsion for us in war. What is more, I saw that Europe was then unready for and would be unresponsive to any sacrifice in blood we might make in the name of world conquest. If I had prayed the future will be different in this respect.

As I declared then, all my sympathies were with the Allies. The danger of a German victory was obvious to me. Yet, even more obvious were the dangers of plunging an unwilling and unprepared nation into war and the danger of sullying our national honor and this way which guides my own thoughts. By shamelessly breaking international law through devious means, Pearl Harbor did not decide who was right—the interventionist or the noninterventionist, but it did tell the world that the force of enlightened nationalism still points the way for our people. And, again, it is my interpretation of this force and this way which guides my own thinking.

Through this interpretation I have the fervent conviction that everything humanly possible must be done to make this the last world war in which American boys or any other boys engage. I have the earnest desire that we make every effort to lay the foundations for a just and lasting peace.

The President, in connection with the possibilities of peace immediately at hand, I should like to digress for a moment to clarify one point. In the recent debate on this floor on January 15, the distinguished Senator from Montana if the President or anyone else in America had ever defined the terms "unconditional surrender." The Senator replied that he could not answer my own question was to ascertain whether we might further particularize our language and thereby clarify any misunderstandings...
My concept of the use of the words "unconditional surrender" is this: When one nation states this as the basis for its enemies' capitulation, the victorious nation signifies thereby that it alone will have the right to designate the immediate and the ultimate terms of peace.

In our own history, Gen. U. S. Grant was known as Unconditional Surrender Grant. When Gen. Robert E. Lee asked for terms, General Grant stated "unconditional surrender," and Lee accepted. There is no ambiguity in his meaning. His immediate peace terms fitted the situation and were an opening wedge to a reconciliation between the North and the South. Grant permitted the southern soldiers to retain their horses for spring plowing and also their sidearms.

I personally have never interpreted what in peace terms our enemies would be following their unconditional surrender, whether they would or should be drastic or lenient. I believe that the decision as to the immediate basis of the capitulation as to any separate or for the entire war is a matter for the supreme commander of the Allied Armies in the field to determine. When the time approaches and there is the prospect of a cessation of hostilities, our military men will handle that problem.

Therefore, in summary, the leaders of the Allied Armies had determined unconditional surrender as the immediate basis for Germany's and Japan's laying down their arms. I would suggest, therefore, we get on with the business at hand of defining the ultimate meaning of that term, for it is over the ultimate meaning of unconditional surrender that we and our enemies are largely in the dark. The bedrock of enlightened nationalism describes "do's" as well as "don'ts." Thus, I do not want our country to strip herself of her sovereignty and lay it in a collective "kitty" before the present rapacious and bully-plunderers make demands on other nations. I do not want our country to meddle arbitrarily in the internal affairs of other powers. I do not want our country to pay through the nose as a Santa Claus or a Lady Bountiful only to be inevitably abused when we cease our donations. I do not want our country to trade a bird in the bush—a complete dependence on a hoped-for collective security—for our bird in the hand—primary reliance on our own national defenses. I do not want our country to retain her sovereignty while willingly collaborating with like-minded nations. I do want our country to be a good Samaritan, helping to heal others, the way we would like to be healed ourselves. I do want our country to proceed in her own plans for adequate national security. I do want our country to be eternally vigilant for the preservation of her liberty.

American nationalists are ready, willing, and able to consider these issues with those who differ with them. But I do not think that our nationalists want to enunciate arbitrary and definite dictums of the internationalists. We know that such a debate would cripple our Nation. Such a debate would make our Nation a verbal battlefield with slander, abuse, and defamation flying back and forth. No; let us argue the respective merits of our cases calmly and rationally. Let us neither beat our breasts, beat the air, nor beat each others' heads. Let us not impugn each other's honesty or integrity on the floor of the Senate or off the Senate floor. That is all we have ever done before. At the very minimum, America may become so cynical and distrustful that it will only half-heartedly collaborate for peace.

That I, for one, do not want. Against that possibility, I urge that all reasonable measures be taken. I have faith that if we—yes; and our allies too—lift ourselves from the level of bickering and name calling, and get on with the job that destiny, whether we like it or not, has thrust upon our shoulders, we shall discover in ourselves the stature to succeed in the world.

A PROGRAM OF ENLIGHTENED NATIONALISM

Now, what would be the specific attitudes and the specific bases on which enlightened nationalism—and that is the subject of my talk—might have us proceed to success.

Let me suggest four points. They are:

First, Realism and understanding.

Second, Sovereignty and constitutionality.

Third, Leadership and salesmanship.

Fourth, Enlightened self-interest.

First, realism and understanding: This means that we must face the facts of life in the world today, understand those facts sympathetically, and then proceed on the basis of those facts in a practical manner.

What are those facts?

First, We have been beating around the bush with our allies. We have not "talked turkey" with the Russian bear and the British lion. We have not shown our respective "card hands." We are still in the dark as to their intentions. As a result we have been shocked by sharp clashes of Inter-Allied policy which came as surprises to us. Therefore, the time has come to get down to cases, bare our differences, and go ahead in trimming them out in a mutually satisfactory give-and-take.

Second, We have been having pipe dreams of the world. I could elaborate on the many pipe dreams you and I have heard. We have been picturing the millenium as just around the corner. We have been expecting our allies to sprout wings like angels, or we have been imagining them with horns, as devils. These pipe dreams only leave us in blind alleys. Therefore, the time has come to wake up and break our addiction to wishful thinking, and see things straight.

Third, We have been chained to the past. We have fancied a return to a static pre-war world. We have so slavishly thought of some of the world's errors of the past that we have almost come to the foregone conclusion that those errors would be repeated. Yet, we have forgotten the basic error of the past—the failure to recognize that the world has been changing, therefore, the time has come...
to gear our thinking to the dynamic world of today: to learn from the errors of the past, but otherwise "let the dead past bury its dead."

Fourth, We have been obsessed with the problem of post-war internationalization. We have channeled all our energies into arguing over the rival details of the blueprints. In so doing, we have shirked the job at hand. As a result, our efforts have not felt its haunting fear of the specter of more state socialism, communism, and fascism. As a result of our blindness here, we can be of little help to Europe, unless we awaken.

In our leadership we must not lead by example. We have misfired the vast differences today between the Old and New Worlds. I ask unanimous consent at this time that a recent article on this subject by R. H. Markham, be inserted in the Record following my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit A.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. So, to conclude this part, let us recognize our blindness heretofore, let us resolve to open our eyes to these facts, to redouble our own efforts and our sympathy with Europe for these problems.

Sixth, We have not appreciated the tremendous emphasis which Europe fearfully places on its post-war trade. We have not borne in mind Europe's heavy reliance on foreign commerce as its life blood. As a result, we are often given to irresponsible statements and thinking.

To illustrate, it will be remembered that President Roosevelt, in speaking about plans for $6,000,000 post-war jobs in this country, said that to accomplish this the United States would have to triple its pre-war exports. That statement was greeted with the deepest concern across the Atlantic. As an official Labor member put it during a debate in Commons, "If the Americans are going to export three times as much as they did before the war, they must guarantee to export unemployment to Great Britain."

Of course, I am not championing British trade, export or import, at the expense of legitimate American interests. But, I am making the point that such loose and casual statements are taken by the British and other Europeans as one more instance of American misunderstanding and almost nonconcern, in spite of our high talk, with vital European problems. Let me say parenthetically, "American green pastures" are not distant. They are here in America. Here is the greatest market on earth. Let us remember that and better our distribution system.

Seventh, We have unrealistically failed to impress on Europe our willingness to see our mutual problems through. We have not made it clear that it is our intention to stand by our obligations and that we have never failed in the past to stand by them. Because of our failure to reassure Europe in this manner, we have provided it an out for its own forsaking of its obligations. Therefore, the time has come to make as clear as day our stick-to-it-iveness and our desire that Europe evidence this truth whose time has come.

Mr. President, the very dynamic speech made by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Vandenberg] on the floor of the Senate a few days ago probably brought to the attention of all our allies the real intent of America than anything else that has happened. Whether it will result in a nucleus for post-war organization no one can tell, because, as I previously stated, cooperation is a two-way street.

Eighth, We have unrealistically misrepresented our program of aid to Europe. We have given the idea that we are either a meddler spreading homemade solutions or a fairy godfather laying blank but signed checks. As a result, we have set the stage for Europe to throw us out by the ear and call us Uncle Shylock to boot. Therefore, the time has come for us to demonstrate that we intend to help Europe to help itself. We must see that its problems largely solved through itself.

These, then, are my points on the need for realism and understanding.

Second, leadership and salesmanship: Who is to lead America? America must assume its place of leadership in the world? Who is there to gainsay that we must display a caliber of leadership that will inspire the respect and admiration of the world and the world's will to pursue an honorable and straight path for itself?

In our leadership we must not lead by the nose, push, drag, or trick the world into cooperation and peace. Rather, we must do a genuine and honest salesmanship job. We must sell Europe the ship job. We must sell Europe the vast preoccupations of class hatreds and problems largely solved through itself. These, then, are my points on the need for realism and understanding.

Second, leadership and salesmanship: Who is there to deny that America must serve the peace without a declaration of war by Congress. As a result, we have set the stage for a mechanism is provided for policing any of the world's areas by American forces to effectuate such purpose.

As a matter of fact, there might not be a clear line of demarcation between action and treaty, for the President may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

Any durable system of world security can be achieved only if the major powers of the post-war world first achieve their own reasonable security. And, since reasonable security is by definition a security which is not achieved at the expense of a similar security of others, it follows that the security of all nations is interdependent. Our own Nation, of course, of all nations, is least dependent on the security of others as a guaranty of its own security. But even we, in this shrunken world and in these days of abundant and destructive inventive genius, must provide the security of others in addition to securing inviolate a sphere of our own security.

Lastly, we must sell one further article—the American way. Yes; while our Russian ally is undoubtedly even now propagandizing for her form of government, we must do likewise for ours. This does not mean a high-pressure, print-handout type of propaganda for us. Rather, we must create a standard to which the wise and the honest may repair. We have every moral right to hold up our Nation as a model.

A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven.
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This would not be in derogation of congressional power to declare war, but in fulfillment of the inherent power of government to preserve peace.

Fourth and finally, our enlightened self-interest: Let us openly proclaim that we are going into the difficult post-war business for the same reason we hope and believe we did, and that cooperation is entering it—for enlightened self-interest. We are going in not for territories, nor for power, but for a peace, a security and a husbanding of our strength that may confide in and uninterruptedly work out our blessed American way of life. We are going to take out life insurance on ourself by making a paper theory of the practical. What we do not intend to cut our own strength with which we may confidently take out life insurance on ourself by establishing our own frontiers.

This week, America seems to me the place of brotherhood. It is a family in which we all may feel that we belong. Perhaps that is what we humans most want in our serious moments, namely, to "belong." In most parts of the world now, and indeed much of the time, people are as waifs. This week I don't feel as a waif.

I could almost imagine that the Statue of Liberty had settled down in New York. As our marvelous silver ship landed at Washington in the darkness of an early morning, I allowed myself the feeling that the lights were all glowing.

I was only a civilian among fighting colonels and majors and captains and among the heroines of the overseas war, which I knew was a very bad nuisance—but still I was treated kindly by everybody at the airport. The Red Cross girls gave me coffee and even smiles. The information man speedily arranged for my further transportation.

The telephone brought me into immediate touch with the magic cities, bringing to my ears two sleepy voices which had long wished to hear. The efficiency of American telephones is the characteristic of the world. It is a part of the American miracle. I felt like calling up everybody in the country and saying: "Hello; a neighbor has come home."

Then I went to a teeming railroad station with people streaming in all directions and there seemed to be a host of helpers there to serve us "little guys." There were also special booths to make ticket buying easy.

There were streets and everywhere beautiful women. Indeed, all the women of America seemed to me beautiful. I suppose they couldn't be, but they seemed so to me. I felt as if I were living like it any place else in the world. Of course, I know the mothers and grandmothers of America's women live in Canada, or France, or Germany, or Scandinavia, or Great Britain, or some other foreign country. But America changed them all into Cinderellas that is, those who needed changing. I think nowhere on earth have women been so inspiring as they could be in America. Here fairy tales come true.

In time—a very short time—I got onto an almost impossibly long train. I was swept into it by a storm of my fellow Americans. Most of us found comfortable seats. There were soldiers, sailors, WAVES, and all the others. I have my mother's companions, both American and British, and was surrounded by friendly people, but I was terribly lonely. Not only for my family and home and street and comrades, but for hope and, perhaps, for truth; for more equality among classes, for good will among groups and races.

At times I sojourned near the Pyramids and ate food produced by exploited fellahin who are almost as restricted and warped and dulled as the Pyramids are ancient. At other times I looked down upon Mount Zion and saw local turmoil, hatred, and injustice as real as that when Abraham bid his son Isaac come and take the journey to the place of sacrifice.

I was much in Italy, where I dwelt among people more despondent, discouraged, and crushed than those for whom the Caesars prepared gory spectacles. It was a dark and sinister world and most of the people were as they should be, infected through the gloom were false will-of-the-waves.

I think that is why America seemed a miracle to me. America is hope. And much more. It is a demonstration that people can live well together; that they know how to get along; how to make the most of the here and now; and how to enjoy the sources of their simple happiness. It is a kind of civilization which is calamity-proof, and one that we know.
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to be found in paragraph (k) of section 4 of the Selective Service Act;

Every registrant found by a selective service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

I have omitted some language which is not necessary to an understanding of the Tydings amendment and what it meant. It is still the law of the land.

On January 3, General Hershey sent a telegram to all State directors of the Selective Service System. He quoted first what Mr. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, wrote General Hershey:

You have reported that other than the men of 18 years of age, the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 964,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation.

Further on General Hershey quoted further from the letter from Mr. Byrnes, as follows—I now read what Mr. Byrnes wrote:

The War Food Administration, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all food production, the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18- through 25-year age group would not nearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment and should not result in a critical condition.

With that statement I agree. In other words, Marvin Jones, the head of the War Food Administration, upon whose organization devolves the duty of seeing that the necessary food is produced, said:

As long as you comply with the Tydings amendment, that is to all there will be to do it, it is not something we can get along.

But General Hershey did not stop there. Mr. Byrnes wrote him further:

I have reported these facts to the President.

Now I charge my fellow Senators to follow this language carefully. I repeat what Mr. Byrnes wrote:

I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25-year age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.

After receiving an order of that kind from the head of the Selective Service System, through the State director, in a letter which concludes by quoting that language to the President, I think there is scarcely a local draft board in the country which would not assume that it had been ordered by the President of the United States, through the Selective Service System Director, to take all these men.

Mr. President, you particularly are interested in this matter. The present occupant of the office of State director in Missouri, the Vice President of the United States, Someone might think that possibly I have overstated the effect on the draft boards. I have dealt rather actively with this matter.

Last Thursday morning the Kansas City Times carried a story based on an interview with me, describing this situation. I immediately received a letter from the government appeal agent of Bates County, Mo. He gave me some startling information. He said that a letter from the War Food Administration had been ordered by the President, and that therefore all registrants 18 through 25 in II-C should be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces if they pass the physical examination.

Mr. President, that directive comes from your own State. It was issued by the State headquarters of the Selective Service System. Mr. Byrnes wrote him further:

Mr. President, that directive comes from your own State. It was issued by the State headquarters of the Selective Service System, at Jefferson City, Mo., on January 4, 1945, and is signed by Claude C. Earp, colonel, Army of the United States, State director. I shall be very happy to send the Chair a copy of the directive, if he so desires. I send to the Chair a press release which contains the language I just read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thanks the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an explanation of the VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wished to obtain the Senator's own interpretation of whether the President's statement is not again an effort to override the legislative intent of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. REED. Oh, I very clearly think it is, and that is what it does.

Mr. WILEY. Let me say that, after all, we are still a land of law, and it is still the function of the Congress, not the Executive, to enact the laws. If that be true, is it not the opinion of the distinguished Senator that in each case the respective boards are not bound in any way by the action taken, or in any way determined otherwise, by the statement of the President?

Mr. REED. That is certainly my opinion. Yesterday, being unable to obtain the exact information regarding what was going on in my own State of Kansas, I telegraphed Governor Schoeppe1 and told him of the difficulties and of my lack of a clear understanding, and that I thought he should have his personal representative check up, through the office of the State director, and ascertain the situation regarding the operations of every local draft board in the State.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Kansas (Mr. Reed) has already answered the question propounded by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Wiley). I really prefer to offer an amendment to the bill because I joined with the junior Senator from Kansas in the resolution which provides for a clarification. If the directive of the President is clear, it will cause any confusion or will not in any way encourage local draft boards to take different positions with respect to the Se-
The farmers are terribly disturbed. Our Nation is drafting our farm labor, saying it can be replaced with older men. ** There will be hundreds of acres of land lying idle.

Draft boards are drafting farmers right and left; essential young farmers are selling out. Farmers should be frozen on the farm as land will be idle and livestock sacrificed.

There are 3 young men in my community who have farmed all of their lives. Each of them are the only help of aging fathers and each are farming about 600 acres with as many as 125 head of livestock on each farm. ** Each of these boys have been, or will be called for service immediately.

The order is here calling all farm workers regardless of how necessary they are to produce food to report to the armed forces, but for civilians as well. ** Congress certainly is not going to sit idly by and let a few men have to have the brains that they should have ruin the country. Men can't fight on empty stomachs and neither can civilians work on empty stomachs.

At a meeting of farmers and businessmen held in the Farm Bureau offices, we, the undersigned, were appointed as a committee to advise you of the critical situation facing this community, and probably all other farming communities, due to the new draft regulations. The records in the Farm Bureau office here show that we have over 200,000 acres of land in cultivation in this county with a total of only 443 farm workers. This includes farm owners, farm workers, all hired farm help. We are feeling an absolute break-down in agriculture. ** One large farm operator of this county advises that he does not have one man left to farm with and it looks like he will have to fold up on his operations.

I have 3 sons in service—two are in France at last report. These two boys were in the first draft. Our third boy enlisted in the Navy 4 years ago and has seen active duty. He has a son 18 who they have been debating, because my farm operations depend largely upon him. Since this new decree it looks like he would have to go. If he does, I will be compelled to quit for lack of qualified help. ** We milk 20 cows, raise cattle and hogs, also poultry in addition to grain.

I felt I just had to write you. ** I was born and raised on a farm. My brother, sister, and I still own that farm. We have a man on the farm who is past 60. He has two sons, one of them was drafted a year ago and the other, the man simply cannot carry on as he can't do heavy work.

If this remaining son is taken this 360-acre farm is idle. ** This is only one instance of what will happen if those men who probably never even saw a farm are allowed to have their way about it.

I have been disturbed a bit for some time about the chiropractic bill in Washington. ** It will take a lot of farm products to feed our boys.

My daughter has been 23 years old on February 1, 1945, and has been running the 160-acre farm, milking 7 cows, feeding 20 hogs, has 25 sheep and some young stock, and 3 head of horses. He is the only boy old enough to work. ** If this boy is taken it will just close our operations. His father is 66 past and older brother is 70 and it is really a major farm operation. There is absolutely no help through this section. ** Farmers are getting panicked, we are forced to sell stock, machinery, and close up.

Here is my case. ** Just to give you a rough idea of how much distress our boys in the draft boards give ** the Tydings Act. My oldest son-in-law enlisted and was killed while overseas. My youngest son-in-law enlisted. ** That left me one son to carry on operation of 360-acre farm and I am crippled too badly to do any kind of heavy work.

At the same time they entered the United States armed forces he was actually producing over 30 farm units besides farming 160 acres and feeding and producing the feed for over 40 head of cattle, milk cows, and beef. He had to take ** a loss at sale for it was such a bad day and so many farmers' are uncertain of their standings in the draft they are afraid to buy.

My boy got his call to go to Leavenworth. ** If he has to go so will his dairy cows and all as there is no one to take his place.

Mr. REED, Mr. President, I wish to dwell briefly on the subject of the decline in the size of the population producing food. In 1940 the number of people producing food was 113,242,000; in 1941 it was 29,088,000. In 1942 it was 29,048,000. In 1943 it was 26,659,000. In 1944 it was 25,521,000, the lowest farm population we have had in at least 50 years, at a time when the demand for food is greater than it ever has been in our history.

Breaking the figures down, in the year 1948 alone the farms lost 2,389,000 people, and last year, 1944, the farms again lost 1,374,000 people. The total loss since 1940 has been 4,748,000 people.

Adverting for a moment to the point which the Senator from Nebraska raises, General Hershey is primarily responsible. Of course, it is subject to the orders of the President. The President, I think, has gone further in disregard of the Tydings amendment as applied to the farm-deferment question that he is guardian in doing it.

A few days ago on the House side there was a conference participated in by about 150 Members of the House of Representatives. General Hershey came to the meeting, and at that time this matter was discussed. One of the Representatives from Idaho read a telegram he had received from the State dairy organization of Idaho which described the situation very much as I have done. General Hershey said, "If anybody in Idaho or anywhere else is telling the draft boards to disregard the Tydings amendment, he is not doing for the Director of Selective Service.

Yet here is the Missouri board, in the State from which comes the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the Vice President, issuing an order which to all intents and purposes repeals the Tydings amendment, and orders that all deferments be disregarded.

Mr.President, as the Senator from Nebraska indicated, there are two important phases involved in this case. One of them, of course, is the production of food. The other is of equal importance, if anything could be as important as the production of food. It is whether a law
passed by Congress, written into the statutes of this country and still remaining on the statute books—and that intent is expressed in plain language—can be repealed by the President or General Hershey, by the President and General Hershey; whether they can disregard the law, which is written so far along the road that the executive branch of the Government can repeal or completely disregard a law written by this body which has not been changed in a single syllable since it was put on the statute books.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It may add some emphasis to the Senator's statement when it is recalled that the Tydings amendment is pursuant to the constitutional power of Congress to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy.

Mr. President, I am also an able Senator from Colorado of course is correct. Let me add this further comment: Two years ago last November I had some excuse with the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Tydings) in writing the Tydings amendment into the Selective Service Act. The Committee on Military Affairs of this body was, I may say, rather "uncordial" toward the amendment. Finally, if I remember correctly, repeating a conversation of more than 2 years ago, the Senator from Maryland told me he went to the selective service headquarters and told the officials what he wanted, and asked them to draft the language of an amendment to the Selective Service Act which would accomplish what he desired, and the Selective Service itself prepared the language of the so-called Tydings amendment. So here is an amendment to the Selective Service Act which according to my memory, which I am quite sure is correct, was prepared by the Selective Service. It is still in effect, and should govern the whole country now, and all the way from the director down to the local boards. The Senator from Nebraska is very correctly said that draft boards are interpreting it differently the country over.

Mr. President, this morning I introduced a joint resolution following the language of a similar joint resolution which was to be introduced in the House today, in which the Director of the Selective Service is directed to plant his feet on the law, to stay by the law, and to instruct every one of his associates and subordinates, and the draft boards, that they are to comply with the law as it is. That measure was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because it affects primarily the production of food. The first great impact of this disregard of the Tydings amendment is upon the production of food, and the joint resolution contains instructions to the Secretary of Agriculture and Forestry to report back its findings to the Senate in 5 days.

Mr. President, this is a subject of such import that only the seriousness and the urgency of the situation justify my taking this time at the close of a long and weary afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, supplementing the remarks I made a few minutes ago on the floor of the Senate when I stated I joined with the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas in introducing the joint resolution which he has now explained, I should like to say a word or two more relative to my position. I do not wish to be misunderstood. Of course, I have no quarrel with the drafting of the joint resolution which is confronting this Nation which is most serious. Certainly, after the remarks which have been made by the junior Senator from Michigan (Mr. Francis) relative to the clearing up of the situation within the military forces themselves, certainly within the provisions of the joint resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Kansas, which calls for an investigation of draft board offices and into all the industries of the country, we of the Farm Belt should also welcome an investigation of the farm boys who might possibly have come within the provisions of the act. In other words, I wish to go on record as stating to the Members of the Senate that we should do our full share in providing the military authorities with the draft boys who do not come under the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I concur fully in what the Senator from Nebraska has said, and in everything I have uttered upon this subject I led for. Let me remind the Senator from Nebraska that the joint resolution in itself, in terms, plainly indicates a lack of intention to interfere in the taking of boys from the farms whenever they are found at any place where they do not come under the provisions of the Tydings amendment, which means they must be essentially employed on the farm. The joint resolution by its own terms makes that declaration.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for making a part of my speech. He took the words out of my mouth, and I wish to endorse what he said in my time, because possibly he explains the matter better than I could explain it. I also wish to compliment General Henninger, of Nebraska, who has had charge of the Selective Service of that State, and our different boards, for the splendid cooperation they have given to General Hershey.

I shall take just two exhibits to show to the Members of the Senate the reason why I join in supporting the joint resolution. A letter I received from a town located near one of the very fertile districts of Nebraska, where the farmers produce corn and meat, so essential to the military forces, as well as to the civilian population, carries this paragraph:

I am enclosing a report that was given to our local board at a hearing January 9, 1948, in our own town could not consider production whatever. They say they have orders for heavy calls which they absolutely must fill, and all they have to fill them with is farm boys.

Mr. President, they could make no other interpretation than that, in view of the directive which has been issued by General Hershey, which restates what was contained in the letter of the Director of War Mobilization, Mr. Justice Byrnes, which was used as the basis of his directive which he gave to General Hershey, which calls upon the draft boards to determine that agriculture is not as essential as the military needs, and therefore that farm boys should be drafted to fill the quotas. That is what causes confusion and will continue to cause confusion among the draft boards not only in my State, but among draft boards in all States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from Nebraska to read a statement from General Hershey saying that the service in the military was more important than service on the farm?

Mr. WHERRY. No, I did not say more important. If the Senator had been present.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator read the statement again?

Mr. WHERRY. The statement was made by the junior Senator from Kansas (Mr. Reed). He read into the Record from a telegram.

Mr. CHANDLER. If that is what he said I do not think it would admit of much doubt, because we must have enough men in the armed forces to win the war, and if we do not win the war there will be no use of talking about service on the farm.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree once again with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. The Senator was not present when I made a statement at the beginning of my remarks that we were perfectly willing to go along with all industry, and have the military authorities take our farm boys if in the opinion of the military authorities they need them, but that we should take them on the basis of the Tydings amendment. I think the Senator from Kentucky is of the same opinion.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator read out the extract from the letter to which he just referred?

Mr. WHERRY. I read from the telegram as follows:

In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II-B, local boards will consider the President's finding that "Further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through-25 age group is not necessary because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war efforts as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men."

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator subscribe to that?

Mr. WHERRY. I subscribe to this, that if we need to take the same percentage of farm boys to war that we take from any other industry and the military authorities say they need them to win the war, I have no objection. But I say to the junior Senator from Kentucky that it is going to cause confusion among draft boards throughout the country who have taken the position that the President has issued a directive that agriculture is not an essential industry, and therefore farm boys
should be taken like any other boys when they arrive at military age out the Tydings amendment being given the least consideration.

We have done a good job in Nebraska. In most of the States they have done a good job. But there is a directive which has caused confusion. We do not want confusion to exist. We want the Tydings amendment to be followed. It provides how farm boys shall be taken in order to win the war. I want to subscribe to the letter of the law. We do not want any directive from the President or the Director of War Mobilization, or anyone else if it creates confusion in any way will act contrary to the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am sure the Senator will concede that neither the President nor General Hershey nor anyone else who has any authority to issue a directive wants to issue a confusing one. Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that I will go along with him to take them; but until that time comes I want to have taken as the law of the land the prescriptions they should be taken, and that is according to the Tydings amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, if we can win the war without taking a maximum number of farm boys and at the same time let them continue to raise food for the country and for other countries we are undertaking to feed, that is what we want to do.

Mr. WHERRY. I subscribe to that statement.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not say that the directive did not confuse some people, because I have seen many confusing directives. The Senator from Kentucky had to do with me that there was no intention deliberately to confuse.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say to the junior Senator from Kentucky that I am not charging any intention to confuse with respect to the directive at all. I am explaining my position in joining with the junior Senator from Kansas and other Senators in the resolution that this order be clarified, and I think the junior Senator from Kentucky would be glad to go along with us. It is not a question of whether we are willing to furnish the boys. Certainly we are willing to furnish whatever the military authorities ask us to furnish, but we want the military authorities to take them in the order they desire and that is to take them according to the Tydings amendment.

Mr. President, it is not only a question of confusion. The question of need arises. Senator-Thomas said, "I have imposed upon it the determination respecting agricultural need after the Congress of the United States has enacted the Tydings amendment. Agriculture has already been determined to be an essential industry. If a man is engaged in agriculture and continues to be engaged in agriculture, the Tydings amendment provides that he shall be deferred to class II-C until a replacement can be made. That is the law. The directive wants to issue a confusing one. It is contrary to the action of Congress. The directive runs right over the Tydings amendment. That is what I am objecting to. We are not objecting to furnishing what we determine they shall do when the time comes to furnish them; but we say they should be taken in the way the law prescribes they shall be taken.

Here is a letter from Mr. Correll, from my section of the country. He is a farmer, a large operator. He says:

You would be surprised to see this country now. Our little towns that used to have 600 or 700 population are down to 75 or 100. Just a few old men who can't clean out of town. * * * All the farmers who have an operation large or small are gone somewhere else. I don't know where they are going to get men for these farms and I can't foresee how to farm next year without men or tools.

I have 30,000 bushels of corn that is in the field, not harvested, and I cannot find a man to husk them.

That letter is from Mr. L. L. Correll. I did not ask his permission to introduce it into the Record, but I read from it because Mr. Correll is one of our very fine citizens, and a man who is just as patriotic as anyone else in the United States with respect to furnishing men for the armed services.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the time has come when the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives should be the determining factor in determining what is an essential industry. No one in any Government department, either an administrator or executive, should override the will of Congress and issue a directive which runs around the fundamental laws of the land. The directive has been changed by means of a directive issued by anyone who says what is an essential industry, contrary to the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. President, I had not intended to make any extended remarks upon this subject, but the junior Senator from Kentucky suggested a few questions which brought about further discussion. The resolution was adopted by the best of faith. In submitting it there was no purpose of criticizing the military with respect to the men they need or the estimates they present. I have supported every military appropriation that has come before the Senate and every measure having to do with the war. I shall support every measure having to do with the war. But I wish to say that when it comes to farm production that production is just as essential as anything else. The Tydings amendment is the law of the land and is already in force. When the draft law, the Congress of the United States should make the determination and the change, and it should not be done by some executive of a bureau in Washington.
full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25.

Forward text of Justice Byrnes' letter to all local boards and boards of appeal. Direct all local boards to promptly review the cases of all United States registrants in class II-C excluding those identified by the letters "F" or "L." In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II-C, local boards will consider the President's finding that "further deferment of all men now housed in the 18-through-25-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men." Also direct local boards to issue orders for preinduction physical examination to all registrants ages 18 through 25 in class II-C excluding those identified with the letters "F" or "L" in accordance with the most expeditious schedules it is possible for you to arrange with the commanding general of your service command. In order to accomplish the review and preinduction examination as promptly as possible, local boards may conduct the review of any such class of registrants at the same time they are forwarding such registrants for preinduction examination.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

For nominations this day received, see the end of this Senate proceedings.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Bear Admiral George F. Hussey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of January 1943;

Bear Admiral Willard A. Kitts 9d, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of January 1943;

Capt. James D. Boyle, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be a pay director with the rank of rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 18th day of April 1943;

Col. William L. McKitterick to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 3d day of June 1944;

Col. Lawson H. M. Sanderson to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 5th day of June 1944;

Col. Christian F. Schilt to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 5th day of June 1944;

Col. Charles R. Sanderson, assistant quartermaster, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps on the cashier list with the rank of brigadier general, for temporary service, from the 23d day of December 1944.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edwin C. Wilson, of Florida, now Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs, Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Turkey, by Mr. McKELHAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Harry D. White to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Harry D. White to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nigel D. Campbell to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Ross E. Brown to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the routine nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Public Health Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 25, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22, 1945:

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Harry A. Wallace, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Commerce.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edwin Jackson Kyle, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Guatemala, by Mr. Joseph F. McQuigg, from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

F. McC. Hersey, of New Jersey, now Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Panama.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

To be Assistant Secretary

H. Struve Hensel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

THE JUDICIARY

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To Be Chief Justice


To Be Associate Justice


UNITED STATES ATTORNEY


PATENT OFFICE

Harold H. Jacobs, of Massachusetts, to be Examiner in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Frank H. Duffy, Jr., of Rutland, Vt., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt. (Reappointment.)

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Brig. Gen. Raymond H. Fleming, of Louisiana, for appointment as State Director of Selective Service for Louisiana under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Raymond M. Stone to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 16th day of December 1944.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Charles Patrick Brown, Infantry (temporary colonel) with rank from June 13, 1943.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Second Lt. John Baker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 29, 1942.

TO ARTILLERY

Lt. Col. James Stevenson Rodwell, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general), with rank from October 24, 1940.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from December 1, 1944.

Lt. Col. Thomas Lytle Martin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
To be colonel with rank from January 1, 1945
Lt. Col. George Sidney Andrew, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Roland Paget Shug, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Rafael Larrosa Garcia, Philippine Scouts, subject to examination required by law.
Lt. Col. Eligio Hewes Freeland, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Spencer Albert Townsend, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Richard Clarke Birmingham, Infantry.

IN THE NAVY
Capt. Frank G. Fahion, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of February 1943.
Commodore Thomas P. Jeter, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary duty in the Marine Corps while serving as chief of staff to commander, Battleship Squadron 2, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.
Capt. Marshall R. Greer, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of August 1943.
Capt. Peter R. Fitcher, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of May 1943.
Vice Admiral Frederick J. Horne, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

The following-named aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:
Jock C. Scott, from the 14th day of October 1941.
William H. Whitaker, from the 16th day of October 1941.
John B. Berteling, from the 9th day of January 1942.
Eimer P. Thompson, Jr., from the 12th day of March 1942.
Robert R. Read, from the 14th day of March 1942.
Albert L. Clark, from the 15th day of May 1942.
Stanley V. Titterud, from the 13th day of July 1942.
The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943:
Warren H. Keck, a citizen of Illinois.
George W. Eubanks, a citizen of Michigan.
The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of October 1943:
George W. Carrington, Jr., a citizen of New York.
William F. Lane, a citizen of Alabama.
The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of February 1944:
Andrew S. Parago, a citizen of Montana.
Albert E. Leonard, a citizen of Ohio.
Fred L. Tumac, a citizen of California.
Roland A. Marbaugh, a citizen of Ohio.
Donald P. Dickey, a citizen of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 2nd day of May 1944.
The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of August 1944:
Charles B. Spradley, a citizen of Texas.
James E. Garnier, a citizen of Louisiana.
Ernest B. Ford, a citizen of Vermont.

United States Employes' Compensation Commission
Hattie W. Caraway to be a member of the United States Employes' Compensation Commission for terms of 6 years from March 15, 1945.

Collectors of Customs
Ross E. Brown to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N.Y.
Harris Walthall to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

United States Public Health Service
Appointments and promotions in the regular corps

To be assistant surgeons
George F. Kamen
William C. Redmon
Randall L. Miller
Richard H. Linn
Frank A. Buel
Andrew P. Sackett
Edwin D. Merrill
Herbert F. Hager
Vernon R. Dennis, Jr.
Vernon O. Guenther
James B. Hurley
Robert L. Morrison
Clarke W. Manguard, Jr.
Dean W. Geynster
Isaac M. Ziegler
Arthur M. Petti
Jacob Wagner
John S. Sheehan
Harold B. Barrett
Edmund R. Clarke, Jr.
Irvin Garrison
Merle Bundy
George W. Gibbins
Ralph V. Eulitz
Willoughby J. Roathrock, Jr.

To be passed assistant surgeons
Will H. Auffran
Gene B. Habel
William P. Sillers III

To be temporary medical directors
William Hendon Gordon
Lorey E. Burney

Postmaster
Missouri
Ruth C. Forest, Mount Vernon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. Fr. Arthur J. Hasan, St. Margaret's Church, Duxter, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Almighty and Eternal God, we lift our hearts and minds to Thee in prayer. Grant that every thought, word, and action of ours will be for Thy honor and glory and the welfare of mankind. We pray Thee, O God of wisdom and justice, through whom authority is rightfully administered, laws enacted, and judgments decreed, to guide and direct with Thy holy spirit of counsel and forti~ the President of the United States that under his leadership our Nation will succeed to an early and convincing victory, and thereafter the establishment of effective means, in cooperation with other