

H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of Conrad Newman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1789. A bill to provide for the payment of \$20,000 to Clarence Leon Rounds, administrator of the estates of Gerald Rounds, deceased; Richard Gray, deceased; Virginia Grafton, deceased; and Geraldine Titus, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of the late Charles J. McNeil; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1791. A bill to alter the service record of the late Charles J. McNeil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of the White Van Line, Inc., of South Bend, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1793. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Micker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PIÑERO:

H. R. 1797. A bill for the relief of Arcadio Saldana Agosto; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1798. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of Theodore R. Flohl; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Hanson, Orth & Stevenson, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 1802 (by request). A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Weber; 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:

37. By Mr. FORAND: Joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress in relation to the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

38. By Mr. Gwynne of Iowa: Petition signed by women of Waterloo, Iowa, protesting the ruling of the War Labor Board declaring the brewery industry essential to the war effort and protesting any form of peace-time conscription of youth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

39. By the Speaker: Petition of the Insular League of Parent Teacher Associations of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the requested liquidation of the colonial system of government in Puerto Rico, and the right of Puerto Ricans to adopt their own form of government; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1945

Rev. John R. Edwards, D. D., associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, infinite in power and wisdom, we make our approach this day as servants of the Lord Most High. We recognize with thanksgiving Thy claims upon us through the blessings of Thy providence and in the light of Thy great mercy. We would live and move where the nobler elements of life are at the fore, where the voice of life's higher values is distinctly heard, where human wisdom is subject in fellowship to the mind of God.

May the decisions amid the labors and responsibilities of this day be in right perspective in the lives of these Thy servants and of all related bodies of our Government. We would recognize as our chief task in life our part in the building of a better world. In this endeavor, we sense the need of God's creative touch, of His cleansing grace, of His guiding wisdom, and of His uplifting power.

We commit to our Father's care all who are this day in jeopardy by war's destructive agency. We bespeak for them the embrace of Thy strong, pure, and affectionate nature amid the challenges and perils of this hour of crisis and of destiny.

We commend to Thy fatherly care the family of the Secretary of the Senate, whose death brings to a close a life of great faithfulness in this body. Be gracious unto his colleagues in their loss, we pray.

In the name of the saving Christ and for the glory of God we make our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 25, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

DEATH OF EDWIN A. HALSEY, SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the untimely death of Edwin A. Halsey, the Secretary of the Senate, is a great shock and a deep personal distress to me, as I know it is to every Member of the Senate. Ed Halsey had the respect, the admiration, and the personal affection, and complete confidence of every Member of the Senate of both political parties.

He was the nephew of John W. Daniel, one of the greatest Senators in the history of Virginia. He was born at Tye River, Nelson County, Va., on September 4, 1881. He has never ceased to take a deep interest in all the affairs of Virginia. He was beloved and respected all through Virginia, as he was in the United States Senate.

He came to the Senate as a page nearly 48 years ago, and from that time to this was in intimate personal contact with the Members of the Senate, a record which I do not believe is paralleled in our history. With great tact, wisdom, and courage, he has at all times upheld the dignity and honor of the Senate. In speaking for both of the present Senators from Virginia, Senator GLASS and myself, I wish to express our deep sense of personal loss and our highest estimate of his public service. The loss to the Senate itself is irreparable, but to the people of Virginia it is the more personal loss of a real friend.

He was elected Secretary of the Senate on March 9, 1933, and has served in that important office until now, rendering a service of most complete satisfaction and usefulness. He performed all the duties assigned to him with the utmost efficiency and with complete impartiality. He had charge, in large measure, of the inaugural ceremonies at the White House on January 20 last. As chairman of the Inaugural Committee, time and time again when I saw the strain upon him in the performance of this duty, in addition to the others he had, I urged him, on account of his recent illness, to conserve his health, but he would not spare himself in performing the duties assigned to him.

I know that many Members of the Senate will desire to pay tribute to his memory—to express their deep affection and admiration for him and for his record of great public service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it is with a degree of sorrow and regret which it is wholly impossible to express that I have learned of Colonel Halsey's sudden and untimely death. He was with us in the full vigor of his splendid powers when last the Senate met. Now he treads the valley of the shadow and has been gathered to his fathers.

It would be impossible for me to imagine a more totally competent Secretary of the Senate than Colonel Halsey has been for many years. Indeed, his whole life has been a devoted consecration to efficient public service.

It would be equally impossible, Mr. President, for me to imagine a finer personal character or a more generous friend. Although he was an earnest partisan, he never for an instant failed to be the servant of all the Senate. Republicans as well as Democrats were always the unfailing beneficiaries of his constant courtesies and his superb capacities. He admitted us not only to his great office but also to his great heart.

We shall deeply miss and mourn this able Senate executive, this sterling public servant, this magnificent American, this priceless friend.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in their expressions of regret over the death and loss of Colonel Halsey. I wish to join with them in their words of tribute to his memory and appreciation of his character and great ability. He entered the service of the Senate in 1897, nearly 48 years ago, as

a page. Through the years he worked up from one place to another until finally he held the great distinction and position of Secretary of the Senate. Forty-eight years of loyal, devoted, faithful service Colonel Halsey gave to the Senate and to his country. He not only performed the duties of his office of Secretary of the Senate but he assumed many additional duties in order that he might better help the Senate in its work and be of never-failing assistance to the individual Members of the Senate in the performance of their duties.

He made countless contributions of great and lasting value to the work of this body. He did much to assist the individual Members of the Senate. It is difficult to conceive how the Senate could have had a more thoughtful, a more faithful, a more indefatigable servant than it had in Colonel Halsey. He was the friend of each and every Member of the Senate, always with outstretched hand, endeavoring to lift some of the burdens resting upon the shoulders of Senators, seeking at all times to be worth while to the Senate and to its Members. He contributed greatly to the accomplishments of the Senate.

We shall sorely miss Colonel Halsey, Mr. President. We shall sorely miss his contributions through the passing days and years. His untimely death is not only a great loss to the Senate, but a great loss to the Nation, which he loved so well.

I know that I express the sentiments of all the Members of this body when I say that we extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Halsey, to their splendid son, and to the other members of the family.

Today, as Colonel Halsey leaves us, we can well and truly say, out of the depths of our hearts, in warm affection for him and deep appreciation of what he has accomplished—"Well done, Ed, thou hast been a good and faithful servant."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, my acquaintance with Colonel Halsey began more than 45 years ago. I came to Washington as assistant clerk to the Committee on Commerce of this body in October 1899. Colonel Halsey was then an employee of the Senate. In all the years that have passed he has served in varied capacities, with loyalty and ability, his party, his State, the Senate, and the Nation.

Colonel Halsey was faithful and efficient always. He was gracious, courteous, kindly. I have lost a friend.

"He is my friend," I said.

* * * * *

And lo! the thought of him
Smiles on my heart—and then
The sun shone out again.

I shall always miss the sound of his voice that is still, the touch of his vanished hand. But, Mr. President, his virtues, the warmth of his friendship, and his character, will live in my memory throughout all the days of my life.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the great sense of sorrow and loss which we all feel, and which in particular the Republican conference of the United States Senate feels, will be expressed in a formal way by resolutions to be submitted

to the Senate by a committee consisting of the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself. I do not know on what day these resolutions will be presented, but probably at the earliest convenient session of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, like the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], I first became acquainted with Colonel Halsey when I also was an employee of the Senate. It was in 1917, when I was serving as secretary to my predecessor, the late Senator Kendrick, of Wyoming, that I first met Colonel Halsey. He was not at that time the Secretary of the Senate; he was occupying another post of responsibility upon this floor.

I can say that those qualities in Colonel Halsey which the distinguished Senators who have spoken this morning have mentioned were quite apparent then. Ever gracious and understanding, he was ready always to meet and to extend to the secretaries and other employees of Senators every aid and assistance which throughout his service as Secretary of this body Senators have found him so ready to extend to us.

He was fair, he was able, he was loyal. He had a broad and intimate knowledge of the history of this body. He was jealous of the honor and the dignity of the Senate. It is difficult for me to believe that we shall easily find a person to measure up to his qualities or to the standard of public service which he established. No burden was too great for him to assume. No request from a Senator, however simple, was ever neglected at his hands.

Mr. President, I speak as one who has lost a friend. I have known Colonel Halsey for almost 30 years. Certainly no man could have given more of himself than did he to the performance of his public duty. It was in truth and in fact his devotion to duty, when he might have been taking care of his health, that brought about his untimely end. His death is a great loss to this body and to all who knew him.

My deepest sympathy goes out to the members of his family, whom he cherished with unalloyed love and devotion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as far back as 1917, I was an employee of this body, and it was at that time that I first met our lamented friend, Edwin Halsey. He had a responsible position in the Senate at that time, which he filled well, and he has continued to perform efficiently every official duty this body has entrusted to him.

I felt that I knew Colonel Halsey well, first as a fellow employee, and later as a Senator. The Senate has lost a very fine public servant. His devotion to duty and unremitting efforts to be of assistance to the Members of this body were, I venture to say, contributing causes to his early passing. We shall all miss him. He was a friend to us all.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, my acquaintance with Secretary Halsey began 6 years ago, when I became a Member of the Senate. There is an aisle in the Senate which divides those who hold

different partisan views. Colonel Halsey was the nominee and the choice of Senators on the majority side as Secretary of the Senate. Notwithstanding that fact, in my 6 years of service in the Senate I never saw Colonel Halsey make the slightest distinction, either in his personal service as Secretary or in the work of the Secretary's office, between Senators upon one side of the aisle and those upon the other. This comment applies also to the personal touch which all of us have with the Secretary's office. There never was the slightest distinction between Senators on the majority side, whose nominee and choice he was, and those of us on the minority side.

Col. Edwin Halsey was a most perfect gentleman. I fear we shall not soon look upon his like again.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I have known Colonel Halsey ever since 1917. In all that time I have known him intimately, and with the passing years I grew to appreciate the man more and more. By his courtesy, his friendliness, his willingness to do a service for a friend, and to carry out the duties of Secretary of the Senate, he set an example as an efficient and able official.

Eddie Halsey in my opinion would have been here now if it had not been for his sense of duty. He kept on working many nights when really he should have gone home. His death has created a void in the Senate, but by his character and adherence to duty he has given us a memory of a truly fine public servant.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in January 1937 when the late great Senator Joseph T. Robinson, the majority leader in the Democratic caucus, nominated Colonel Halsey, he made a comment which I have never forgotten. He said, "And now I am going to speak of the best public servant I ever knew, Col. Edwin A. Halsey."

My experience has taught me the correctness of the words that Senator Robinson uttered about Colonel Halsey. He not only spent his life in, but as the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] has said, he gave his life to the Senate. Efficient, faithful, loyal, he was a part of the Senate as perhaps few who are not of its membership will ever be able to be. He loved the Senate and the Senators as the Senators loved him. He will leave behind a memory of public service which will be an example to us all, a challenge to his successor, and something which will ever tug at the heartstrings of those whom he has left behind.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, little did I think as I saw Col. Edwin A. Halsey in the performance of his duties at the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States that that would be the last time I would look at this good man in the living flesh. When I learned this morning that this faithful public servant for all these years in the United States Senate had passed to the Great Beyond, to say that I was shocked, is putting it mildly indeed.

When I came to the Senate of the United States 6 years ago one of the first men I met was Col. Edwin A. Hal-

sey. From that hour until his death Colonel Halsey was my close and personal friend. In my early days in the Senate I went to him for counsel and advice in connection with my duties as United States Senator. He gave it honestly and freely. He was truly a conscientious man. I found that the counsel and the advice he tendered was of immeasurable value in smoothing my path as I moved along from week to week and year to year in this old historic Chamber.

Mr. President, every sigh of the whispering wind brings death somewhere, but in this world of tears and trouble it grieves us all the more when one so close, so dear, and so faithful has been taken from our midst. As has been said by many Members of the Senate, his death is an untimely one. Certainly that statement will never be challenged by the Members of the United States Senate or any friend who knew this man. But, Mr. President, Almighty God in His infinite wisdom plays no favorites in this hazardous game of life. In the words of the poet—

There is a reaper whose name is Death,
And with his sickle keen
He reaps the bearded grain at a breath,
And the flowers that grow between.

With deep reverence and a sad heart I extend my lasting sympathy to the devoted and lovely family of Colonel Halsey. May they take solace and comfort in knowing that he leaves behind thousands upon thousands of true and loyal friends who shall forever revere his memory.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I was shocked and distressed this morning to learn of the passing of one of my dearest friends, Colonel Halsey. As one of the younger Members of this body, I can only add to what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has just said that many of the younger Senators have benefited through Colonel Halsey's kindness, his generosity, his big heart, and sound advice; and I know that in this body, as has previously been said, he made no distinction between Senators, no distinction between parties.

Mr. President, I have known Colonel Halsey in this body only a comparatively short time, but before then I knew him in the Democratic conventions held in Chicago in 1932, in Philadelphia in 1936, and in Chicago in 1940. At each of those conventions he was sergeant-at-arms to which office he had first been elected by the Democratic National Committee in July 1928, to serve at the national convention held in Houston, Tex. in that year. At many previous Democratic national conventions, beginning almost with the turn of the century, he had served in connection with the press. It is needless to say that in these assignments the same fidelity to duty and ability distinguished him as during the years when he was Secretary of the Senate.

Colonel Halsey rendered yeomen service to the Democratic Party.

We have lost a close and dear friend, and the Democratic Party one of its stalwart and most helpful supporters. When our distinguished friend, the Secretary of the Senate, resigned as ser-

geant-at-arms last summer, the Democratic National Committee lost one who had made the work of the conventions at times a pleasure, and who had steered us in the right line during the turmoil and struggle of the conventions. Today, in his death, we lose one we cannot replace. My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his bereaved family.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, Colonel Halsey devoted his life to the service of his country. He died in that service. He died by reason of that service. Through forty-odd years he was a faithful employee of the United States Senate. Through forty-odd years he was the sympathetic friend of every Senator who sat in this body. We mourn his death. His loss is irreparable.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without saying a word about one of the best and finest friends I ever had. I have known Ed Halsey for more than 30 years. I never knew a more courteous or more kindly gentleman. He was a gentleman on all occasions. He was a gentleman of the old school. I never knew him to do an ungentlemanly act or utter an ungentlemanly word. I think he was one of the finest and noblest characters I have ever known. I do not think I have ever known a man who was more unselfishly friendly. During my whole experience in the Senate I knew always that there was one man in the employ of the Senate who was my friend, who thought of and helped me with my problems. I sincerely mourn his loss. He was a close and intimate friend for 30 years. I was devoted to him. It almost breaks my heart to think of a man like Ed Halsey being taken away in the very prime of life and in the very fullness of his great powers.

As has been stated by other Senators, he was a most capable, efficient, and faithful servant of this body. He was courteous to everyone. No more lovable, more delightful, or finer character was ever connected with this body.

My deepest sympathy goes to his wife and son and other members of his family. They have indeed experienced a great loss; the Senate has suffered a great loss; and the Nation has sustained a great loss.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in the tributes which have been paid to our departed and devoted friend. I wish also to join in extending sympathy to his widow and son.

I have not known Colonel Halsey as long as many of you have known him. In the brief time I have served here it has been my pleasure to be associated with him in the bonds of a fine friendship and to receive the benefit of his wisdom, counsel, and guidance in connection with the performance of many of my duties as a United States Senator. I think I can say that I have never had that relationship with one who was more kind, more generous, or more courteous in the service that he rendered to the United States Senate and to individual Members of the Senate. He was always alert, diligent, and conscientious. His loyalty as a friend endeared him to all of us.

He was cooperative and most considerate of us as he helped us to meet intelligently and courageously our responsibilities here. At all times he was bending his efforts, to the maximum of his strength, to perform fully and ably his duties as a public servant. I shall miss him. His death is a great loss, not only to this body, but to the country. At this hour I feel that another great soldier of my country has given the full measure of devotion in public service, and made the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I was genuinely distressed this morning when the news came of the passing of Colonel Halsey. I shall always remember his kind and considerate attitude toward me and the other Senators who entered this body 2 years ago. I am sure that my sentiments are shared by other Members who have lately come to the Senate.

Colonel Halsey was strong and devout in his party's beliefs, yet his high sense of fairness was never clouded by partisan feeling. He was helpful to all of us, and particularly helpful to those of us who were newer Members of this body. Not only has the Senate of the United States lost a splendid officer, but each of us has lost a good friend and the country has lost a great public servant.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, even before I came to the Senate, shortly after my election to this body, I received a letter from Colonel Halsey, who then occupied the position of an assistant on this floor. After I entered the Senate, my relations with him were always pleasant. He was a gentleman. He had all the attributes of a gentleman. He was kindly, polite, considerate, and a wise adviser, especially to the younger Members of this body.

Mr. President, one particularly commendable quality in his life and character was his long personal and intimate knowledge of the Senate itself. He studied the history of this body. He was intensely loyal to the Senate. He had a deep appreciation of the high traditions and lofty standards of the American Senate. Oftentimes he spoke to me of those standards and traditions. Oftentimes he recalled the things that he himself had experienced, that he himself had witnessed, that he himself had known personally in connection with the work of this body.

He was a loyal party man; but, as has been so truthfully said by Senators on the other side of the aisle, as an officer of the Senate he did not carry his partisanship into the discharge of his official duties. I found him always to be a wise man. He possessed a wisdom that was born of his long experience here and the observations which he made, as well as his natural good ability and his fine instincts and attributes as a gentleman. He was of great service here. He tried always to be of service to this body. He was always conscious of the finer and better traditions of the Senate, and he carried that consciousness into his private life and into his associations with men in the ordinary, daily affairs of life.

We have had many faithful servants of this body. I can think of many of them who have already gone on. We

shall have yet other faithful servants. But it is to be doubted whether we shall find a man who possesses all the fine qualities of courtesy and gentleness and the spirit of helpfulness and the disposition to do for the Members of this body in the high degree in which they were combined in Colonel Halsey; and at this time in our life, at this time in the affairs of this Nation and of the world, it would be difficult to find another officer who held in such high and reverent esteem the responsibilities of this body, and who loved the better traditions which have made the Senate of the United States great among the parliaments of the world.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing a brief word of regret and sorrow at the passing of Colonel Halsey. From the very first day of my service in the Senate Colonel Halsey made a special effort to be friendly and helpful to a freshman who did not know his way around. He continued that effort during all the time I have been a Member of this body. I feel, Mr. President, that I have lost a personal friend.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce I announce the appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, also as chairman of the Committee on Commerce I announce the appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF UNITED STATES WAR BALLOT COMMISSION

A letter from the United States War Ballot Commission, transmitting, pursuant to the so-called serviceman voting law, the report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements of that Board for the quarter ending March 31, 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 451) to authorize the continued operation of certain airport control towers by the Civil Aeronautics Administration—and relating to

General Mitchell Field, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 16"

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress in relation to the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use their best efforts to obtain acquiescence in the matter of the will of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in its unanimous desire to have a national cemetery established in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

POST-WAR COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I call attention to a petition I have received, signed by J. Richard Williams, of Edna, Kans., and nearly 100 other citizens of Mound Valley, Kans., and vicinity.

The petition reads as follows:

We, the undersigned voters of Kansas, being of the opinion that the May bill pertaining to compulsory military training after the war for all youth reaching the age of 17 years constitutes a national policy of the Nation, and not an emergency measure, and is so radical a departure from all our historic precedents that we can afford to proceed with caution and certainly without haste; therefore we most heartily request that you use your influence to the utmost to persuade Congress to postpone until the war is over any action on the May bill.

Mr. President, while I have the floor I wish to state my position on this and proposed similar legislation. I believe the advice in the petition I have just read—to postpone, until we have some sort of an idea what the post-war world is like, any decision on either compulsory military training or compulsory military service in peacetime—is sound.

I have not definitely decided how I shall vote on the bill providing for compulsory military training in peacetime. But if the measure calls for compulsory military service in peacetime—in other words for peacetime conscription into the military service at home and abroad—I would say I would vote against it.

The allocation of fighting troops from the United Nations on the western front in Europe this winter does not encourage me to support an international policing program for which we would conscript our boys as fast as they reach the age of 17 or 18.

I present the petition for reference to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—MEMORIAL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD and appropriately referred as a part of my remarks, without the signatures attached, a memorial signed by 86 citizens of Wichita, Kans., mostly cattlemen, opposing the confirmation of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and head of the R. F. C. The memorial was sent to me by Ludvig Nelson, a prominent citizen of Kansas.

There being no objection, the memorial, without the signatures attached, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator CLYDE M. REED,

Washington, D. C.

We, the undersigned citizens of Kansas, sincerely ask you to oppose the confirmation of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and R. F. C.

(Signed by 86 citizens of Wichita, Kans.)

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF AIRPLANE CRASHES

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 61), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 307, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 9, 1940; Senate Resolution 119, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 28, 1941; and Senate Resolution 60, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 4, 1943 (providing for an investigation of airplane crashes), is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the limit of expenditures thereunder is hereby increased by \$15,000. In addition to authority conferred in such resolutions, the committee is authorized to investigate all airplane crashes in air commerce.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM POLICY

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 36) continuing the Special Committee on Petroleum Policy reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 13, 1944 (relating to an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare), is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 417. A bill subjecting to assessment by local drainage districts in the State of Oregon lands acquired by the United States for military purposes and lying within the territorial areas of said districts, and making such assessments liens upon said lands and

providing for the payment by the United States of such assessment liens; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 418. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery in every State; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I introduce a bill entitled "A bill to forgive one-half of the unforgiven portion of the individual income tax for 1942."

I am advised that a similar bill will be introduced in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 419. A bill to forgive one-half of the unforgiven portion of the individual income tax for 1942; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 420. A bill relating to appointments to certain offices and positions in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 421. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 422. A bill to provide for improved agricultural land utilization by assisting in the rehabilitation and construction of drainage works in the humid areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 423. A bill to extend for 3 years the temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service provided for by the act of December 17, 1943; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 424. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. SCRUGHAM):

S. 425. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines caused to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution providing for the observance of October 11, 1945, as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 334) for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING THE PRODUCTION, ETC., OF FUELS IN AREAS WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I submit a resolution continuing the authority of the committee instituted under Resolu-

tion 319 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The resolution requests continuation of the authority for the investigation of the production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River. I have informally conferred with the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I request that the resolution be referred to that committee.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 60) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942 (authorizing an investigation concerning the production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River), and continued by Senate Resolution 61, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 4, 1943, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, to July 1, 1945.

SURVEY OF THE DISTRIBUTION AND UTILIZATION OF HEALTH PERSONNEL, ETC.

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, as agreed to June 2, 1940 (providing for study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services) is hereby further continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Resolved further, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress (providing for study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services) agreed to June 2, 1943, is hereby increased by \$25,000.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR—LETTERS TO SENATOR BUTLER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have not often requested the privilege of having printed in the RECORD any letters which have come to me. However, I have received this morning a letter from a former Governor of my State relative to the drafting of farm labor. I think the letter states very well the situation in the agricultural areas of the country, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

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

BY THE WAY RANCH,
Valentine, Nebr., January 25, 1945.
Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Congressman CARL T. CURTIS,
Congressman HOWARD BUFFETT,
Congressman KARL STEFAN,
Congressman A. L. MILLER:

The selective-service situation with reference to farms and ranches is serious, and if carried out as has now been directed by State authorities in Nebraska it will come near to denuding agriculture of young and capable help. According to their statement there are approximately 10,000 men on farms between the ages of 18 and 25. One-half of these are to be taken. Heretofore they were

in deferred classifications. Already a great many of them have been selected, and have gone or will be going within the next 30 days.

These young men are essential in food production entirely out of proportion to their numbers. They can and do work long hours, under all conditions, whereas older men cannot do that, and in cases where they are the only help in addition to an older man on a farm or ranch it means that production will be greatly reduced when they are gone.

I have in mind a farmer who last year produced about 400 hogs, and operates around 400 acres, as I recall. His last boy has been taken, and he told me that this year he would produce less than 100. Meanwhile there is a shortage of pork. The reduction of hogs in this State for the past year is 39 percent, and 100,000,000 bushels of corn lies on the ground, much of which will spoil unless it is fed up or cribbed.

There is no replacement help available. Those that might be able and willing to work go into war industries for shorter hours, higher pay, and easier conditions of working and living.

Attached is copy of a press release of January 24, 1945, State headquarters, Nebraska selective service. Note the quotation therein of Senator TYNDERS when his amendment to the Selective Service Act was passed by Congress. To me the use of that statement simply dodges the facts. I am not saying that any large section of land will be left uncultivated if these boys are taken. Somebody, somehow will make use of nearly all available land, but production under those conditions will be very, very much less than it would be under proper use. Moreover, it will mean very greatly reduced numbers of livestock, for no farmer or rancher who knows anything about his business or cares anything about it will entrust his animals to inexperienced, unwilling help. I reduced my own herd of cattle very sharply for that reason, and am getting along with one-half of the help I had then, but my contribution to the food supply will be proportionately less.

Farmers or ranchers are having a hard enough time of it as it is keeping their boys at home, for they want to go to war, and many of them are volunteering. The trend now of selective service only accentuates that situation.

The Tynders amendment when it was originally passed and for months afterward relieved the farm-labor situation that had become very acute. Large numbers of farm workers have been taken since then, and the new move to take considerable percentages of those who remain can mean only greatly reduced production of foods and fibers. Increased production during the last 2 or 3 years have not resulted from adequate farm help. Weather has had more to do with it, and no one can tell what the weather will be this year, or any year. If it should be seriously unfavorable the shortage of essential foods could amount to a calamity.

Congress is the only source now of relief. The selective-service boards have been given their instructions, and the majority of them will act accordingly unless they are reassured by the national legislative body.

Thanking you for your attention to this highly important subject, I remain,

Very truly yours,

SAM R. MCKELVIE.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with the same subject, I hold in my hand a letter written by a farm wife. Her letter recites in the plainest kind of language the true situation as it exists today on the farms. For the benefit of those who are interested in the subject, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LIBERTY, NEBR., January 20, 1945.

Senator BUTLER: Once again it seems that another of those grave miscalculations has been made in Washington, D. C.

I feel it my duty to bring this to your attention. Also, if it seems to have the value I think it has, would like to have you bring it to the attention of Senator WHERRY and Senator CAPPER and anyone else who might be interested and understand what I mean.

The agriculture situation cannot be understood by those who are not actually in touch with it at all times and I shall try to tell you what I see happening.

The young men are being taken from the farms now. The idea seems to be that the work can be carried on by older men. The farmer has produced enormous crops the last 2 or 3 years, not because of a great supply of manpower or equipment.

He hasn't told the world how it was accomplished but it's time someone tells.

In our locality every member of the family worked long and hard all year. Through the planting, growing, and harvesting season we worked 7 days per week and long days at that.

These young men who are now being taken from the farms are the ones who drove the tractors and handled the machinery to raise those crops. They worked from daylight till long after dark many nights. They have lights on the machinery so they can work such long hours. Many of them took their noon and evening lunch to the fields with them and never came to the house till they came in to go to bed.

Why did they work like this? Farmers are not so plentiful as they were a few years ago. Many boys were taken from the farms before anything was done about farm deferments. Many families are trying to carry on and do the work they did before some members went to the service. Many farms have grown larger because the land was there to be farmed and no one to farm it, so they expanded.

Any extra farm help absolutely could not be obtained around here last year, much less in the near future. These older men on whom the Government agencies are pinning their hopes could not do the work it would take to keep our farms producing. They lack the skill, the strength, and endurance of our younger farm hands. Many men who are rather elderly and many who are physically handicapped are doing all they can and much more than they should on the farms now.

The things that a farmer must know cannot be told or explained to anyone in a short time. He must learn by experience and by growing up with it. These boys of today who are from 17 years on up, are experienced far beyond what their ages indicate. They had to take over when older brothers went to the service and they have the ability and judgment of mature men. They possess the initiative and ability to understand the new developments and profit by them. In industry the laborer learns to do the one thing which is his duty to the job he has. He does this day after day.

In agriculture we have to learn to operate so many different kinds of machinery, must know how each machine is assembled, what each part does, how to repair and adjust the machinery. He must understand the different kinds of soil, how and when to handle each type of soil. What to plant and how to plant to best advantage. How to recognize and destroy obnoxious weeds. How to adjust each piece of machinery to make it accomplish the task for which it was made. The machinery must be changed on different sizes of crops, different conditions of soil, different types of soil, and different stages of

growth of crops or weeds. Also the farmer must be a fair blacksmith, carpenter, and understand care of livestock as well as the treatment of the farm animals in sickness and emergencies. You can see how impossible it would be to employ one who was inexperienced and accomplish anything, as it would almost be necessary to be with him and show him how, thus taking the time of one experienced man as well as one who was learning how. The person who has not been raised on the farm and does not have the welfare of agriculture in his veins, could not and would not work the long hours and take off so little time as our farm hands do.

Those who have been accustomed to doing this work realize how very necessary it is to care for everything on the farm when it is exactly at the proper stage of development, and they know how a broken piece of machinery can delay the farm operations and what it means in man-hours and machine-hours lost. The experienced farm hand knows just how to handle machinery as to speed and methods to make as few hours lost through breakage and accidents as possible.

It can be seen when one considers the skill and knowledge that a successful farmer must have that he cannot be replaced by three men who do not understand the art of science and who do not have the welfare of the farm in their minds and hearts.

While the boys have been doing the field work the rest of the family have been doing chores, caring for the homestead, helping in the fields where hand work is needed, making and repairing fences, caring for livestock, often making new parts and repairs for machinery, getting the different implements out of storage and ready for work and running the many errands which is a very big job which one can never have completed.

When you take into consideration that many of our farm heads are between the ages of 50 and 75 and the older boys have been taken in the service you can see we can hardly carry on if the rest of our help is taken from the farms. It looks now like there will be much more idle farm ground this coming season than we had last year. Farmers are discussing the situation and county agriculture agents are expecting it.

Next fall will be too late to do anything about it. What could not be planted and cared for this spring and summer can never be reaped in the fall. With the Nation, our servicemen, and many foreign countries to be fed we can't afford to hamper agriculture.

I'm enclosing a clipping from the Beatrice Daily Sun. It is a list of farm sales to be held. This began last August with the heaviest run of sales in the fall I have ever seen. The list has been as long, since early fall, as now, and many days a much longer list, and it will continue until March and longer, if too many farmers are forced to quit because of inability to find help or carry on alone. Think this over and see if we can spare these young men who are really doing one of the grandest jobs of the times and in the face of the greatest handicaps.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. D. SNYDER.

SALE DATES

January 19: Charlie Sykes, 2 miles north and three-fourths of a mile east of Clatonia, John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 22: Brunke Schmidt, 2½ miles east of Cortland, John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 23: William Paulsen, route 2, Beatrice, Ruyle & Heist, auctioneers.

January 24: Oscar Weichel, 5½ miles west and 1 mile north of Plymouth, John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 24: John Pard, 3 miles east, 3 miles south of Pickrell, Ridgley & Ridgley, auctioneers.

January 26: Horse and mule sale at Beatrice Fair Grounds, John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 29: John Javorsky, 3 miles west and 1½ miles south of Wilber, John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 30: Jim Essam, 2¾ miles south of Davis Confectionery, Beatrice, John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 31: Andrew Sorenson, northeast of Filley, Leach & Heist, auctioneers.

February 5: William Richtarik, 7 miles west and 1½ miles south of Wilber, John W. Heist, auctioneer.

February 5: H. D. Pearl, 1 mile south and 3 miles east of Wymore, A. M. Porterfield, auctioneer.

February 6: Rudolph Peters, 1½ miles east of Odell, Elmer Novotny, auctioneer.

February 7: Charles Theye, 1 mile south, one-fourth mile east of Odell, Schultes Bros., auctioneers.

February 12: William Broz, 4 miles north and 1½ miles west of Swanton, John W. Heist, auctioneer.

February 14: Menne Schuster, 9 miles northeast of Beatrice.

February 21: Waldos' purebred Duroc hog sale at DeWitt Sales Pavilion, McMurray & Heist, auctioneers.

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, an article written by David Lawrence on the subject of the legal question which has been raised by the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator.

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

LAW QUESTION RAISED IN NAMING OF WALLACE—OBSERVER CITES ACT OF CONGRESS BANNING POLITICAL JOB REWARDS

(By David Lawrence)

Did President Roosevelt disregard a law of Congress forbidding political rewards when he sent to the Senate the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator?

The statute referred to became law on August 2, 1939, when it was signed by President Roosevelt. Section 3 reads as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible in whole or in part by any act of Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election."

This is what President Roosevelt wrote in his letter of January 20, 1945, to Jesse Jones:

"Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued."

"He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited, and I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the new administration."

REWARD FOR ACTIVITY

The foregoing reveals that the Office of Secretary of Commerce, which was created

by act of Congress, was bestowed on Henry Wallace as a reward for political activity. Neither the President nor the Vice President are exempted from the provisions of the section in question.

If it is "unlawful" for a President or any other Federal official to give a public office as a political reward, is it lawful for the United States Senate to confirm a man who receives the reward? This is a question which bears on the spirit, if not the letter, of those statutes which have long been looked upon as a means of keeping Government free from pernicious influences. Offenses under not only the Federal Corrupt Practices Act but the Hatch Act are subject to fine and imprisonment if convictions are obtained.

There is nothing in the law which limits the making of the promise to any action taken or promise made during a campaign. The bestowal of a reward after the campaign is apparently as much banned as a promise. For the statute speaks of "reward for any political activity," and this logically could not materialize until after the service is rendered and a campaign concluded and the victor is in a position to award his plums to those who have helped him win.

INTIMATION IN WIRE

There has been some intimation that, even during the campaign—in fact, shortly after the convention was held which nominated Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term but rejected the renomination of Mr. Wallace for Vice President—a telegram was allegedly sent by Mr. Roosevelt to Mr. Wallace bearing on the subject of a promise of future office.

William K. Hutchinson, head of the International News Service in Washington, in a dispatch on Monday of this week, said that after the unsuccessful fight made at the convention Mr. Wallace received a telegram from Mr. Roosevelt purporting to read as follows:

"Tell Mrs. Wallace not to make any move to leave Washington. There will always be a place in my household for you."

Mr. Wallace didn't bolt the ticket, but went ahead to give it his active support. For several weeks there was public speculation last summer and autumn as to what post Mr. Roosevelt might have in mind for the retiring Vice President. This telegram, however, would not be persuasive except in relation to the January 20 letter. The words of the statute which bar any reward for political activity alone need to be considered, in view of the fact that the President now publicly admits that he is giving a public office as a political reward to Mr. Wallace.

IRRIGATION AND NEBRASKA'S FUTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Irrigation and Nebraska's Future," delivered by him at the first annual convention of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, at Lincoln, Nebr., January 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SERVICE LEGISLATION—ARTICLE BY ROBERT P. PATTERSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Do We Fight With One Hand Tied, Or With Everything We Have?" written by Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and published in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

A BANKER WHO SERVES AS A PRIVATE—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times entitled, "Banker, 48, Serves as Private in Line," referring to Pvt. (1st cl.) Edward J. Arthur, of Union, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

A CITIZEN ARMY—ARTICLE BY BRIG. GEN. JOHN MCAULEY PALMER

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "General Marshall Wants a Citizen Army," written by John McAuley Palmer, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of December 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POST-WAR DEFENSE PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY BRIG. GEN. JOHN MCAULEY PALMER

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How to Solve Our Post-war Defense Problem," written by Brig. Gen. John McAuley Palmer, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—ARTICLE FROM COLLIER'S WEEKLY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Do We Want National Health Insurance?" by Amy Porter, from Collier's magazine for January 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—EDITORIAL FROM KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Brazen Political Pay-off," commenting on the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, published in the Kansas City Star of January 23, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—LETTER TO THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter signed by Benny Austin, relative to the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, and printed in the January 24, 1945, edition of the Washington News, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SERVICE

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Forging New Chains," from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of January 22, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle in tribute to the late Senator Francis Maloney, of Connecticut, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE TO AUDIT AND CONTROL THE CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of sundry resolutions which I am about to report from that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that, as I understand the situation, the Senator from Illinois desires to have the Senate take action upon a number of resolutions

which he is about to report from the committee of which he is chairman. I believe that in the main, if not entirely so, the resolutions would simply extend until July 1 various committees and agencies which heretofore have been set up by the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true with respect to a number of the resolutions. Other resolutions would provide for such continuation for the full session of Congress.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that other resolutions provide for the extension of the life of committees which the Senator and his committee believe should be continued in their activities. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the resolutions, unless they are agreed to today the committees concerned will be without funds the day after tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that to be the situation, and I think that is justification for consideration of the resolutions at this time. I should prefer not to have the extensions made beyond July 1; but on the assurance of the Senator that the subjects dealt with by the resolutions are matters of real importance, and that the committees affected are doing work which should be continued, I shall offer no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Maine.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the resolution (S. Res. 45) submitted by Mr. McMAHON on January 22, 1945, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual 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.

HATTIE L. LAMBERT

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the resolution (S. Res. 22) submitted by Mr. BILBO on January 6, 1945, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Hattie L. Lambert, sister of John E. Lambert, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 33, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 33) submitted by Mr. GEORGE on January 15, 1945, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 102, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 12, 1943 (creating the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning), as amended by Senate Resolution 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 16, 1943, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation for the Senate with regard to this very important resolution. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was unanimous in its desire that the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning be continued. It was created by the Senate in March 1943 at the instance of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. At that time the Senate appropriated \$50,000 for the use of the committee, and at this moment the unexpended balance is \$20,050.32. I have conferred with the able Senator from Georgia with respect to the continuation of the work of the committee. I am a member of the committee. I am advised that before the end of the year has been reached the hearings will probably be completed, and that a final report will be made. The committee will then probably be dissolved.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 33) was considered and agreed to.

STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF INSURANCE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) submitted by Mr. VANDENBERG on January 6, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of old-age and survivors insurance, under the Social Security Act, in respect to coverage, benefits, and taxes related thereto. The joint committee shall report to the Congress not later than October 1, 1945, the results of its study

and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

Sec. 2. The joint committee is hereby authorized, in its discretion, to appoint an advisory committee of individuals having special knowledge concerning matters involved in its study and investigation to assist, consult with, and advise the joint committee with respect to such study and investigation. Members of the advisory committee shall not receive any compensation for their services as such members, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in connection with the performance of the work of the advisory committee.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpenea or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

Sec. 4. The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties under this resolution, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed until the Classification Act of 1923, as amended for comparable duties.

Sec. 5. The expenses of the joint committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or the vice chairman.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE WAR-MOBILIZATION PROBLEMS AND WAR-CONTRACTS MATTERS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably without amendment, Senate Resolution 46, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. President, the resolution provides that the committee shall continue its work until July 1, 1945. The committee was created by the Senate on October 20, 1942. The Senate authorized the committee to expend up to \$15,000. The committee has an unexpended balance of \$2,345.06, and is asking for no further funds. I am advised that the report of the committee will be completed by July 1, 1945.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 46) reported by Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs on January 25, instant, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 107 and Senate Resolution 216, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to study the problems of war mobilization; and that the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 198 and Senate Resolution 288, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to investigate war contracts, termination of war contracts, and related problems, be and are hereby continued to July 1, 1945.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF THE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an additional amendment, Senate Resolution 18, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 18) submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on January 6, 1945, which had been previously reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "Seventy-ninth Congress," and insert "Senate from February 1, 1945, until July 1, 1945"; and subsequently reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with additional amendments, in line 7, after the word "continued", to strike out "and may be exercised during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the"; and at the end of the resolution to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 241, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to May 24, 1940, and Senate Resolution 147, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 8, 1941, and Senate Resolution 39, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 28, 1943, and Senate Resolution 294, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 23, 1944 (relating to the investigation of the use of public lands), is hereby continued until July 1, 1945; and the limit of expenditures under such resolutions is hereby increased by \$5,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement for the RECORD with regard to Senate Resolution 18, which has been agreed to.

The original resolution was agreed to on May 24, 1940. A sum of \$30,000 was authorized by the Senate to be expended by the committee and at the present time there is an unexpended balance of \$4,582.87. Hearings are now being held under the resolution. Those in charge of the work have advised me that they will be able to complete their work by July 1, 1945, and make a final report at that time.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS BY WIRE AND RADIO—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 24, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 24) submitted by Mr.

McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. WHITE) on January 6, 1945, and reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce on January 6, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to October 19, 1943 (providing for an investigation of international communications by wire and radio), as supplemented by Senate Resolution 268, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 29, 1944, is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the limit of expenditures of the committee for such purposes is hereby increased by \$10,000.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF THE SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 31, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 31) submitted by Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HATCH) on January 11, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 155, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 26, 1943 (relating to an investigation with respect to the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power), as amended and supplemented by Senate Resolution 304, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 5, 1944, and Senate Resolution 318, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to September 5, 1944, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

HOWARD B. SMITH

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 39, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the limit of expenditures contained in Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to December 9, 1943 (authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act), as modified by Senate Resolution 238, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944, there is hereby authorized to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate to Howard B. Smith, the sum of \$2,805 as compensation for stenographic services rendered to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in reporting and transcribing hearings held before such committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I believe that an explanation should be made with respect to the resolution. The resolution involves an obligation which

was incurred with reference to Howard B. Smith, who was the reporter for the committee which proceeded under Senate Resolution No. 197. That resolution had to do with the investigation of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act. The sum of \$7,500 was appropriated on December 9, 1943, to carry on the work of the committee. Of that amount only \$2.01 remains unexpended. I understand that an attorney by the name of Carroll L. Beedy, a former Member of the United States House of Representatives from Maine, was employed as general counsel to the committee. Another gentleman by the name of Glavis was appointed as investigator for the committee. Those two men were fortunate enough to obtain the \$7,500 which had been appropriated for the use of the committee, leaving the reporter to hold the bag. I make that explanation to the Senate because, strictly speaking, there is no legal justification for the payment of the obligation, although the reporter really earned his money. With the exception of the sum which I stated, no money now remains in the fund. It would appear that under the doctrine of preferred creditors, the attorney and the investigator took most of the entire fund.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 39), submitted by Mr. AIKEN on January 22, 1945, was considered and agreed to.

STUDY OF AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 16, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been previously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was on line 6, after the word "to", to strike out down to and including the period in line 11, and insert "July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the date for submission of the report called for by Senate Resolution 252, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 30, 1944 (relating to a study into the legal and constitutional authority for the issuance of Executive orders of the President and of departmental regulations), is hereby extended to July 1, 1945.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF STUDY AND SURVEY OF PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment,

Senate Resolution 28, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. Mr. President, I believe that a brief explanation should be made of the resolution.

The Special Committee to Study and Survey the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises has been in existence since October 8, 1940. The Senate has authorized for the use of the committee the total sum of \$140,000. At the present time there remains an unexpended balance of \$4,596.85, and this resolution seeks an additional appropriation of \$100,000.

While in the opinion of the committee, the sum of money asked for is large, yet the testimony before the committee has demonstrated beyond any question that the committee is performing a great public service in the interest of the small businessmen throughout the Nation.

There is one other fact to which I wish to invite the attention of the Senate, but which is incidental to the appropriation of money. I refer to the number of employees who are engaged by the Small Business Committee. They are employees who have been borrowed from the executive branch of the Government to perform necessary services in connection with the functions of the committee. Some time ago the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] submitted a resolution requesting that all committees report to the Senate the number of employees who were being borrowed from the executive branch of the Government to help in performing the services of special committees of the Senate. That resolution was productive of enlightening information. This is no reflection upon the chairman of any special or standing committee who happens to be following this procedure. This procedure is not a new one; however, I am calling it to the attention of the Senate, for whatever it may be worth in determining whether or not the policy should be continued. The Small Business Committee has a great number of employees. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them, but they come from the Foreign Economic Administration, the War Production Board, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Department of Commerce, the Office of Price Administration, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the War Department. Those employees are drawing in salaries a total of \$82,200 a year, which is being paid by the executive branch of the Government, although that branch is getting absolutely no service from them. That is just one committee which is doing that. Other committees of the Senate are doing the same thing. The attitude I take—and I take it not as chairman of the committee but rather as a Senator—is that no individual can serve two masters. The Senate of the United States ought to assume its rightful position in connection with employees from the executive branch and ought either to pay them and take them off the pay roll of the executive departments or else send them back to the executive departments where they belong.

There is involved a very serious question of policy as to how far the Senate of

the United States should go in taking employees from the executive branch, bringing them here, giving them an office in the Senate Office Building, and using them for legislative purposes. We ought to do one thing or the other, Mr. President. We ought to face this question frankly. If the Small Business Committee needs \$80,000 worth of employees to carry on its functions it should appear before the proper committee and get the money there, rather than to borrow employees from the executive branch of the Government at the other end of the Avenue.

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

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. The Special Committee on the Problems of Small Business is perfectly willing to have the Senate adopt the policy which has just been suggested by the able Senator from Illinois. I want to point out that at the beginning of the activities of the Small Business Committee we were limited by the Senate to a very small amount to carry on the work of the committee, and had it not been for the fact that we were able to procure the assistance which we secured from the various agencies of the Government we would not have been able to have done the work we did for the protection of small business enterprise, in this country. I am sure the Senator from Illinois recognizes that; but I approve of the suggestion made by the Senator from Illinois that the Senate should adopt some policy and adhere to it.

I wish to point out further that it will be extremely difficult to secure the character of assistance we have secured from the various agencies of the Government merely by employing help temporarily in connection with the work of the committee because the men whom we have secured from the Government agencies are men of vast experience in the problems which confronted the committee, and if now we go out and try to hire clerks and experts to give the assistance to this committee which it has received in the past it would be very difficult, I am sure, to get that kind of help.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. There was some testimony before our committee the other day that if one of these employees were discharged from the Small Business Committee he would have no right to return to the executive branch, even though he is accredited to that branch; in other words, he would be out of a job. Is that true or not true?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not know of any case of that kind.

Mr. LUCAS. There was one witness who has been working for some committee—

Mr. WHERRY. The Liquor Investigating Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; the Liquor Investigating Committee, who came before

us and said that in the event the investigation of the committee was discontinued, and no funds were appropriated for its continuation, he would be out of a job; that, although he was attached to the Antitrust Division of the Attorney General's office, they would not take him back. I wondered if the same condition applied to employees, for instance, who have been in the service of the Small Business Committee for 2 years or more, and whether they would have the opportunity to go back and continue to work for the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure that every agency of the Government from whom we have borrowed help will be very glad to take back any of the employees we have, because they are all competent, able men, rendering very valuable service to our committee. I wonder how we would be able to get the same kind of help if we were compelled to hire it in the open market. As the employees who come from the Government agencies are under civil service, they have certain rights, whereas if we hired people off the streets to assist the committee, they would not have the same status.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reply to the Senator is simply that if these employees are not needed in the executive branch of the Government, as apparently they are not, the Senate itself ought to take care of them.

Mr. MURRAY. I think they are performing a service for the executive branch of the Government by their work with our committee. For instance, if we have an employee of the War Department or the Navy Department or any other department which has been carrying on the character of work that the committee has been carrying on in its investigation and study, in my opinion, such employee is performing a service for the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. With all due deference to my good friend from Montana, I take the position that an individual who is in the employ of the executive branch of the Government at \$6,000 a year could not be away from that job for 2 years and be of very much value to the executive branch, even though the Government agency still continues to pay him.

I want the Senator thoroughly to understand that I am not attaching any blame to him because he has followed a custom which has become established. I am merely calling it to the attention of the Senate, so that the Senate soon can determine and fix definitely a policy one way or the other with respect to it.

Mr. MURRAY. I am in full accord with the Senator from Illinois. I want to say that the Small Business Committee has rendered a very valuable service to the small businessmen of the country, and the committee would not have been able to do it if it had not been able to secure assistance from various executive departments. When we first started out it was thought that there was no need for such a committee, but when we got into the work and the war production program came on we found that small business was rapidly being extinguished. Through the efforts of this

committee that trend was stopped, and so the committee has done a very valuable piece of work for the country, I think, in saving the small business enterprise.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not questioning the work which has been done by the Senator and his committee; otherwise, we probably would not have provided for the committee an additional hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MURRAY. I appreciate that.

Mr. LUCAS. However, if the Senator from Montana or any other Senator who is chairman of a special committee can go to the executive branch of the Government and obtain all the employees he wants in order to carry on effectively the work of his committee, then there is no reason why every special or standing committee of the Senate should not do the same thing. In my opinion, there is no reason why I could not go to the executive branch of the Government and convince them, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, that I need at least six men who are on their pay roll to help me out.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In connection with this discussion, a few instances have come to my attention of some of the special committees asking an executive agency to hire certain persons. I believe that is a bad practice. I am in total agreement with the statement made by the Senator from Illinois that if any person is necessary to the conduct of the business of any of these various committees, the Senate itself should provide the funds, and under no conditions should we have to resort to the executive department for aid.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the testimony before some of the special investigating committees showed instances like that of one man who, as I recall, had been on three different pay rolls at different times within 60 days. Am I correct, I ask the Senator from Illinois? Certainly it was within a very short time.

Mr. LUCAS. I have forgotten the time.

Mr. MAYBANK. That leads me to believe that at times unexpended balances are used to transfer employees from one pay roll to another pay roll and then to another pay roll, and the work done under the various pay rolls is not tied together in any way so as to benefit any one activity.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As a new member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I wish to join in the report of the chairman and in the statement he has made with reference to continuing the various committees under the resolutions which have been reported this morning and agreed to.

I wish to state also, with as much force as I possess, that I appreciate the attitude of the committee in approving the appropriation for the Small Business Committee. I happen to be a member of that committee, and I join with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in stating to the membership of the Senate that we need a small business committee of the Senate in order to help the small businessmen throughout the country as various executive agencies issue orders which have a tremendous impact on the distribution and sale of their merchandise. I heartily endorse everything the Senator has said.

I also agree with what has been stated by the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. As I looked at the different proposals pending at the first meeting of the committee, it occurred to me they were conclusive evidence of the need for the adoption of the resolution I presented last August.

I am convinced that the Small Business Committee needs all the personnel it has today in order to do its work. I think it is one of the most important committees of the Senate. I am also of the opinion that if the employees were employed directly, they would be loyal beyond any question. I do not mean to say they are not loyal now; but being employed by a department, to a certain degree they have a loyalty to that department which otherwise they might give to the Senate committee in a study of the problems covered in the investigations.

The junior Senator from Montana appointed me on a subcommittee, together with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If I am correct, we have had about 50 subcommittee investigations, and the subcommittee has done a tremendous amount of work in helping to amend and clarify Executive orders which otherwise cause confusion quite generally clear through the production, the wholesaling, and the retail distribution of the merchandise.

I wish to commend the Senator from Illinois and the committee for the action they have taken. They have served notice on the Senate that it should take notice of this practice, and that we should investigate it. The life of most of the committees has been extended to July 1, and they go before the Committee on Appropriations and establish their justification for an appropriation if they need more employees.

Last August I raised a question about Senate committees borrowing persons from Government agencies and other organizations. Those I had in mind are most often provided by departmental agencies of Senate committees. They are not paid officials of the Senate, and they are not regular employees of the Senate committees.

Almost every Senate committee has at some time had the services of experts and clerical assistants loaned to them by Government departments. Some of these individuals often serve with Senate committees for months at a time. The practice of borrowing Government personnel is a long-standing one. I know

there are many reasons why the practice is continued, and I do not arbitrarily condemn it.

From time to time, however, there are aspects of this practice of borrowing Government agency personnel which have appeared to be highly questionable. In a few instances the practice has gone beyond propriety to the point of an abuse of the principles which should govern the work of Senate committees.

Before questioning any feature of a practice of such long standing, it seemed to me desirable to ascertain some facts about it. What agencies are loaning personnel to Senate committees? How many individuals are loaned out in this manner? What annual rates of pay do they receive? What Senate committees are furnished with this personnel? With knowledge about such facts, we could form a better judgment of the propriety of the practice, and what, if anything, we should do about it.

With that thought in mind, I offered an amendment to Senate Resolution 319 in the following language:

Hereafter standing or select committees employing the services of persons who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof shall submit monthly reports to the Senate (or to the Secretary during a recess or adjournment) showing (1) the name and address of any such person; (2) the name and address of the department or organization by whom his salary is paid; and (3) the annual rate of compensation in each case.

Senate Resolution 319, with this amendment, was agreed to August 23, 1944. Beginning with the end of August and continuing to the present time, monthly reports have been made by standing and special committees, including subcommittees, of persons employed by them who are not regularly employed by the committees or by the Senate itself.

I have observed those reports from time to time as they have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Recently I made a check of the over-all results from the time the resolution was passed up to and including December 31, 1944. The check is, admittedly, a rough one for several reasons. The indexing of the RECORD is not so perfect that it lists each and every one of these committee reports, so I may have missed some, especially those which are not in tabular form. The reports themselves are not all uniform, and that makes an over-all computation difficult. The details of the reports also change from month to month, and there are a few instances of overlapping items.

There is enough about these reports, however, to permit what accountants would call an unadjusted summary of the facts having substantial accuracy. That is what I now wish to place before the Senate.

In the period from the passage of Senate Resolution 319 on August 23 to December 31, 1944, a total of 14 Senate committees reported having borrowed personnel. Of this number 10 are standing committees and their subcommittees.

The number of departments or organizations furnishing personnel to Senate committees totals 26, of which 25 are Government agencies and 1 is a private organization.

The total number of individuals furnished to committees was 97; 95 from

Government agencies and 2 from private sources. The average number of individuals on loan to all committees over each month from August to December was 72. This does not mean that 72 different persons were loaned to committees each month. Many of the same people from the same Government agency serve the same Senate committee month after month. My figure simply means that if we take any single month and make an inventory of borrowed personnel, we will find on the average some 72 individuals from outside agencies at work with Senate committees.

The average total annual rate of pay received by these individuals is \$253,560. In other words, on the average during any month since these reports under Senate Resolution 319 began, there were borrowed by Senate committees 72 individuals whose annual rate of pay totaled \$253,560. Reduced to a simple statistical concept, each month 14 reporting Senate committees are being assisted by an average of 72 outside persons whose average monthly base rate of pay totals \$21,130.

I would have Senators bear in mind the limitations of statistics like these. A Senate committee may borrow a Government expert for a single month. Under the simple reports now being made, the committee would report that one employee, along with others, and list his annual rate of pay at, say, \$6,500. The committee may have him for 1 month only, and never again, but the facts would be reported as I have given them. We shall never know the true state of affairs until committee accounting is improved to the point where every individual serving a committee is actually paid out of the committee funds for the period he serves, whether it is 1 day, 1 week, or a year. Then committee accounts will show the facts in proper form.

Until we have facts reported in accurate form, we can only rely on estimates, averages, and other statistical assumptions. Within these limitations, the figures I have given do reflect the condition of affairs on this question of borrowing Government personnel for service on Senate committees.

I am not ready to offer conclusions on the facts as they appear to date. I think a longer time experience is needed; and I shall want more accurate accounting detail. It may be possible for me to have the General Accounting Office keep track of these reports and tabulate them. Perhaps the Committee on the Reorganization of Congress will take up the problem. Some supervision over the facts will have to be arranged.

I merely wanted to bring such facts as are presently available to the attention of the Senate; and to say that when the picture is more complete, I expect to present an analysis of them and discuss their broader implications.

Mr. President, the practice referred to by the Senator from Illinois is one about which I think the Senate should arrive at a determination, and I wish to join with the chairman of the committee and the committee in the policy they have adopted. I endorse everything they have said. I think the report is timely, and I hope that without objection the exhibit

I have may be printed in the RECORD, showing the conclusions of the investigation, and giving the statistics.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

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

Individuals borrowed for committee service and total annual rates paid

Committees and subcommittees	August		September		October		November		December	
	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay
Appropriations	4	\$19,500	4	\$19,500	4	\$19,500	4	\$19,500	4	\$19,500
Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Wartime Health			12	33,200	13	38,840	13	38,840	12	37,600
Military Affairs	4	15,800	2	7,800	2	7,800	4	15,800	4	15,800
Subcommittee on War Contracts	9	29,460	8	31,460	7	19,960	5	20,300	6	22,300
Special Subcommittee on War Mobilization	11	38,440	11	39,000	11	39,000	10	37,000	10	37,000
Naval Affairs	2	1 + 7,512	2	1 + 7,512	2	1 + 7,512	2	1 + 7,512	2	+ 2 7,512
Senate Navy Liaison Office	4	2 + 7,104	4	2 + 7,104	4	2 + 7,104	4	2 + 7,104	4	+ 1 7,104
Pensions	1	5,000	1	5,000	1	5,000	1	5,000	1	5,000
Public Lands and Surveys, Subcommittee to Investigate Public Lands			2	7,000	2	7,000	2	7,000	2	7,000
Special committees:										
Post-War Economic Policy and Planning	2	33,700	6	42,200	1	43,800				
Investigating the National Defense Program			5	23,100	5	23,100	5	23,600	4	17,600
To Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprise ⁶	13	36,400	11	28,800	12	35,300	12	35,300	12	35,300
Senate Small Business Committee ⁶	10	40,400	11	46,900	11	46,900	11	46,900	12	48,520
Total	60	203,316	79	279,576	75	260,816	73	263,856	73	260,236

¹ 1 person, \$162 per month subsistence additional. Also 1 person \$91.50 per month subsistence additional.

² 2 persons, \$132 per month subsistence additional. Also, 2 persons, \$91.50 per month subsistence additional.

³ 1 person, salary unknown. Paid by committee 4 days at \$25 per day, \$100. Not included above.

⁴ 1 person, salary unknown. Paid by committee 4 1/2 days at \$25 per day, \$112.50. Not included above.

⁵ Served 4 days only.

⁶ Reported separately, but occasionally commingled.

Senate committees

Department or organization providing and paying individuals	Appropriations	Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education	Military affairs			Naval affairs		Pensions	Special committees				Department or organization totals	Private
			Military Affairs	Subcommittee on War Contracts	Subcommittee on War Mobilization	Naval Affairs	Navy Liaison		Post-war Economic Policy and Planning	Investigate the National Defense Program	To Study Problems of Small Business Enterprise	Senate Small Business Committee		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)		
General Accounting Office	2								2					4
Federal Bureau of Investigation	1								1					2
District of Columbia Government	1								1					2
War Production Board		1		1	4	2	4				8	7		21
Navy Department	4		3								1	1		14
Federal Public Housing Administration	2													2
Office of Price Administration	1				2					1	1	2		7
Federal Security Agency	1													1
Veterans Administration	3							1						4
Federal Works Agency	1										2			1
U. S. Army	1													3
U. S. Navy	1													1
War Department		5	1											6
Reconstruction Finance Corporation		2									2			4
Smaller War Plants Corporation		3									1			1
Farm Security Administration		1												4
Foreign Economic Administration		1									1	1		3
Department of Interior				2										2
War Manpower Commission				2										2
National Housing Agency				2										2
Agriculture Department								2						2
Bureau of the Census								1						1
Treasury Department								1						1
U. S. Maritime Commission								2			2			4
Department of Commerce										1				1
Private: Starrett Bros. & Eken, Washington, D. C.								1						1
Total for each committee	4	15	5	12	12	2	4	1	2	7	5	14	13	95
														96

*Appropriations Committee
[KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman]*

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August to Sept. 1	For [Sept. 30] Oct. [2]	October (Rept. Nov. 1)	November (Dec. 5)	December 1944
1	John F. Feeney	General Accounting Office	(C. R. 14, p. 7605) \$6,400	(C. R. 16, p. 8762) 4,800	(C. R. 16, p. 8264) 4,800	(C. R. 17, p. 8921) 4,800	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3) \$6,400
2	Harold E. Merrick	do					
3	Thomas J. Scott	Federal Bureau of Investigation					
4	Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	District of Columbia government	(C. R. 16, p. 8261) 3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
	Total		(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500

Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning
[WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committees	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			August	Special	(Sept. 30 and Oct. 2) September	Oct. 31
			(C. R. 14, p. 7604)	\$3,700	\$3,700	(C. R. 16, p. 8262)
1	Claire Cahill	Bureau of Census			\$3,700	
2	Miles L. Colean	Starrett Bros. & Eken, Washington, D. C.			\$3,700	
3	John F. Feeney	General Accounting Office	Not known	\$100	\$112.50	
4	Harold E. Merrick	do			6,400.00	
5	Thomas J. Scott	Federal Bureau of Investigation			4,800.00	
6	Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	District of Columbia government			4,800.00	
7	Borge Hansen-Moller	Treasury Department			3,500.00	
	Total		(2) 3,700	(1) 100	(6) 23,200.00	(1) 3,800

¹ 4 days, at \$25 per day.² 4½ days, at \$25 per day.³ Served 4 days only.

Committee on Education and Labor

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

[CLAUDE PEPPER, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committees	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			Sept. 1	As of Oct. 1	As of Nov. 1	As of Dec. 1
1	Lauretta April	War Production Board	(C. R. 15, p. 8154)	(C. R. 16, p. 8262)	(C. R. 16, p. 8264)	(C. R. 17, p. 8844)
2	Philip C. Curtis	Navy Department	\$3,200	\$3,200	\$3,200	\$3,200
3	Billy Gene Durham	Federal Public Housing Administration	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
4	Doris B. Hazur	Office of Price Administration	1,440	1,440		
5	Harald Lund	Navy Department	2,800	2,600	2,600	2,600
6	Carl Malmberg	Federal Security Agency	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200
7	Eva Jo Marra	Navy Department	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
8	Love Morgan	Veterans Administration	1,800	1,800	1,800	
9	Ruth Morgenstern	do	2,000	2,000	2,000	
10	Dolores Rashella	Federal Public Housing Administration	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
11	Rene Roth	Federal Works Agency	2,800	2,600	2,600	2,600
12	Lt. Leslie Falk	U. S. Army	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
13	Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow	U. S. Navy	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
14	Rose Gerber	Navy Department				2,000
15	Jeannette Johnson	Veterans Administration	2,000			
	Total		(12) 33,200	(13) 38,840	(13) 38,840	(12) 37,600

Committee on Military Affairs

[ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, chairman]

Number of position	Name of individual serving committee	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	(Oct. 4) September	(Nov. 1) October	(Dec. 6) November	(Jan. 6) December
1	Helen A. Rice	War Department, Legislative and Liaison Division, Office of Chief of Staff	(C. R. 14, p. 7603)	(C. R. 16, p. 8263)	(C. R. 16, p. 8266)	(C. R. 17, p. 9000)	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3)
2	Theodore B. Stathart	War Department, Adjutant General's Office, Civilian Personnel Division	2,800	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$1,800
3	Col. David A. Watt	War Department, General Staff	6,000			6,000	6,000
4	Col. Lewis Sanders	War Department	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
5	Amy J. Tishendorf	War Department, Legislative and Liaison Division, Office of Chief of Staff				2,000	2,000
	Total		(4) 15,800	(2) 7,800	(2) 7,800	(4) 15,800	(4) 15,800

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR CONTRACTS

[JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman]

1	Marian Bonner	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	\$2,300	(\$2,300)	\$2,300	(\$5,600)	\$5,600
2	Kurt Borchardt	Smaller War Plants Corporation	5,600	5,600	5,600		
3	Marion Fostner	Navy Department	2,600	2,600	2,600		
4	Grace Mayer	Smaller War Plants Corporation	2,000	2,000	2,000		
5	Maj. Wm. E. Nefflin	War Department	3,000				
6	Vernice O'Mullane	War Production Board	1,620	1,620	1,620		
7	Doris Phippen	Navy Department	2,040	2,040	2,040		
8	Omer J. Regnier	Farm Security Administration	3,800	3,800	3,800		
9	Sigmund Timberg	Foreign Economic Administration	6,500	6,500			
10	Bertram M. Gross	Navy Department				6,500	6,500
11	Edna Ruben	Reconstruction Finance Corporation				2,300	2,300
12	Ann Cheathem	Smaller War Plants Corporation				2,300	2,300
	Total		(9) 29,460	(8) 31,460	(7) 19,960	(5) 20,300	(6) 22,300

¹ To Oct. 8, 1944.² To Sept. 14, 1944.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

[H. M. KILGORE, chairman]

1	Virginia W. Boyce	Department of the Interior	\$1,800	(\$1,800)	\$1,800	(\$2,000)	\$1,800
2	Ann S. Gertler	do	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
3	Hope C. Heslep	War Manpower Commission	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
4	Theodore C. Larson	National Housing Agency	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
5	Fritzie P. Manuel	War Manpower Commission	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
6	Darel McConkey	War Production Board	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
7	Cora L. Moen	Office of Price Administration	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
8	Walter Louis Moore	National Housing Agency	1,440				
9	Elizabeth H. Oleksy	War Production Board	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
10	Francis Rosenberger	Office of Price Administration	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
11	Herbert Schimmel	War Production Board	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
12	Dreyerle M. Prouty	do		2,000	2,000		
	Total		(11) 38,440	(11) 39,000	(11) 39,000	(10) 37,000	(10) 37,000

Committee on Naval Affairs
[DAVID I. WALSH, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	(Oct. 2) September	(Nov. 1) October	(Dec. 1) November	(Jan. 2) December
1	Capt. James A. Saunders.....	Navy Department, Office of Chief of Naval Operations.	(C. R. 14, p. 7603) \$6,000+	(C. R. 16, p. 8263) \$6,000+	(C. R. 16, p. 8266) \$6,000+	(C. R. 17, p. 8843) \$6,000+	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 77) \$6,000+
2	Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson.	Navy Department, Potomac River Command.	71,512+	71,512+	71,512+	71,512+	71,512+
	Total.....		(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+

⁶ Plus \$162 per month and rental allowance.⁷ Plus \$91.50 per month and rental allowance.

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

[DAVID I. WALSH, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	Sept. 27	Oct. 30	November	December
1	Lt. Frederic A. McLaughlin.....	Navy Department, Bureau of Naval Personnel.	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+
2	Lt. Joseph G. Feeney.....	do.....	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+	\$2,400+
3	Yeoman Eleanor W. St. Clair.....	do.....	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+
4	Yeoman Loretta F. Jochman.....	do.....	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+	\$1,152+
	Total.....		(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+

⁸ Plus \$132 per month subsistence and rental allowance.⁹ Plus \$91.50 per month subsistence and rental allowance.

Committee on Pensions

[JAMES M. TUNNELL, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	Sept. 27	Oct. 30	November	December
1	Louis J. Meyerle.....	Veterans Administration.....	(C. R. 14, p. 7604) \$5,000	(C. R. 16, p. 8261) \$5,000	(C. R. 16, p. 8264) \$5,000	(C. R. 17, p. 8843) \$5,000	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 78) \$5,000

Committee on Public Lands and Surveys

[CARL A. HATCH, chairman]

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PUBLIC LANDS

[PAT McCARRAN, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			September	Oct. 27	(Dec. 1) November	(Dec. 31) December
1	E. S. Haskell.....	Agriculture Department, Forest Service.....	(C. R. 16, p. 8263) \$5,000	(C. R. 16, p. 8264) 2,000	(C. R. 17, p. 8843) \$5,000	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 78) \$5,000
2	Elizabeth Heckman.....	do.....				
	Total.....		(2) 7,000	(2) 7,000	(2) 7,000	(2) 7,000

Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			August to Sept. 1	Oct. 1	Month left blank November (?)	Dec. 1
1	Joe L. Martinez.....	U. S. Maritime Commission.....	(C. R. 15, p. 7992) \$3,800	(C. R. 16, p. 8262) \$3,800	(C. R. 16, p. 8265) \$3,800	(C. R. 18, p. 9351) \$3,800
2	Franklin N. Parks.....	Office of Price Administration.....	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
3	Harold G. Robinson.....	U. S. Maritime Commission.....	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
4	Brig. Gen. Frank E. Lowe.....	U. S. Army, General Staff (listed finance officer, December).	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
5	Lt. Col. Harry Vaughn.....	U. S. Army, General Staff.....	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000
	Total.....		(5) 23,100	(5) 23,100	(5) 23,600	(4) 17,600

Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises
 [JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committees	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	(Oct. 1) September	(Nov. 1) October	(Dec. 1) November	(Jan. 1) December
1	Ruth B. Abrams	Foreign Economic Administration	(C. R. 14, p. 7604)	(C. R. 16, p. 8261)	(C. R. 16, p. 8265)	(C. R. 17, p. 8842)	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 78)
2	J. Russell Boner	Smaller War Plants Corporation	\$3,200	4,600	2,700	2,700	2,700
3	Agnes E. Crivella	War Production Board	2,700	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
4	Emerald G. Devitt	do	2,000	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
5	Elsie A. Digges	do	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
6	F. Preston Forbes	Department of Commerce	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
7	Carol M. Fuller	Office of Price Administration	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
8	Scott K. Gray	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
9	Stella J. Goepel	War Production Board	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
10	Dorothy M. Heckard	do	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
11	Kathleen Kimball	do	1,800	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
12	Elizabeth P. Lucas	do	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
13	Lois M. Miller	do	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
14	Harry J. Evans	Reconstruction Finance Corporation			6,500	6,500	6,500
Total			(13) 36,400	(11) 28,800	(12) 35,300	(12) 35,300	(12) 35,300

SEPARATE REPORT—SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE
 [JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman]

1	John W. Nelson	War Production Board	\$5,600	\$5,600	(?) \$5,600	\$5,600	\$5,600
2	Jessina Oslin	do	1,800	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
3	Grace F. Purdy	Office of Price Administration	3,200	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
4	Arthur G. Silverman	do	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
5	Lt. George H. Soule	Navy Department	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
6	Lillian Evelyn Spicer	Navy Department (War Production Board Oct.)	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
7	Frederick W. Steckman	Maritime Commission	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
8	Allen G. Thurman	do	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
9	Alfred J. Van Tassel	War Production Board	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
10	Olga Yelensics	do	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
11	Brainard Cheney	Foreign Economic Administration		6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
12	Margie L. Strubel	War Production Board		1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
13	Vernice O'Mullane	do					1,820
Total			(10) 40,400	(11) 46,900	(11) 46,900	(11) 46,900	(12) 48,520

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for the figures he has presented. We constantly hear from various sources condemnation of bureaucracy in government. If there is such a thing, we probably contribute to it under the policy we have been following in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution presented by the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 28) was agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate an original resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 55), as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 1, 1941; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 11, 1941; Senate Resolution 288, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 17, 1942; Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 25, 1943; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 20, 1943; Senate Resolution 235, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944; and Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to August 23, 1944 (relating to the investigation of the war

program), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief observation, and state to the Senate a few facts in connection with the committee concerned. The committee was organized March 1, 1941. The total amount authorized by the Senate to date has been \$500,000. There is an unexpended balance of \$102,955.10. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who recently succeeded former Senator TRUMAN as chairman of the committee, advises me the committee will need no more funds at this time.

I might say furthermore that the so-called Mead committee has a great number of employees, but it is employing most of its help directly, and the employees are on the pay roll of the special committee. The committee has only four or five employees who are borrowed from the executive branch of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS, COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 10, and ask unani-

mous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. Hill on the 6th instant.

The amendment was in line 3, to strike out "during the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ until July 1, 1945, an assistant clerk and an additional clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rates, respectively, of \$3,600 and \$1,800 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish briefly to explain the resolution. There are a number of resolutions in the same category as the one just agreed to, in respect to the termination date of July 1, 1945. Another practice has grown up in the Senate whereby the contingent fund of the Senate is used to employ clerks or additional clerks the entire year for services to be performed for a particular committee. The contingent fund is just what its name indicates. It is a fund from which will be spent money for something that is unexpected, something that happens from unforeseen causes, and which the Appropriations Committee cannot immediately care for. It cares for all special committees. It was never intended that clerks employed

the year around should be paid out of the contingent fund.

There is a place where Senators can go if they wish to have clerks placed permanently on the pay roll. If the chairman of a committee deems it necessary to have an additional clerk or two additional clerks the proper place to present his case is before the Appropriations Committee. So in all these resolutions—and there are some 12 or 15 of them, involving that many clerks—we have definitely provided that the clerks may continue on the pay roll and be paid out of the contingent fund until July 1, 1945. In the interim it will be necessary for the chairmen of the respective committees who are interested in these clerks to appear at the proper time and present their cases to the Appropriations Committee.

The resolutions I am now presenting involve clerks who are attached to the standing committees, with the exception of one, and that is the Committee to Investigate the Conservation of Wild Animal Life, which has been in existence for so long that it has taken on the status of a standing committee rather than a temporary committee. There are two clerks attached to that committee. So that resolution comes within the same category as the other resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution as amended has been agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE CONSERVATION OF WILD ANIMAL LIFE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 43, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. BAILEY on the 22d instant.

The amendments were, in line 6 to strike out "\$13,000" and insert "\$3,250"; and in line 8, after the word "purpose" to insert a comma and "said amount being sufficient for the employment of the two clerks of said committee until July 15, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority contained in Senate Resolution 246, agreed to April 17, 1930, authorizing a Special Committee to Investigate the Conservation of Wild Animal Life, hereby is continued from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate \$3,250 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purpose said amount being sufficient for the employment of the two clerks of said Committee until July 15, 1945.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate

Resolution 25, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. OVERTON on the 10th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "during the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That resolution No. 44, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Manufactures to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945, at the rate of \$2,040 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 26, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. STEWART on the 10th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "during the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 35, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Interoceanic Canals to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945, at the rate of \$2,040 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 49, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. MURRAY) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 14, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,880 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I

report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 50, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. MURRAY) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 251, agreed to June 4, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an additional clerk, to be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 51, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. HILL (for Mr. ANDREWS) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 7, to strike out "until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 170, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 29, 1941, as supplemented by Senate Resolution 326, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 53, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. TUNNELL (for Mr. GREEN) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 6, to strike out "to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 28, agreed to January 10, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,220 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect from February 1, 1945, until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO EXAMINE BILLS, ETC.—EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERK

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 64), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and shall examine all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

Resolved further, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ an additional clerk in his office, who shall, in addition to any other duties if required, perform such duties in connection with the examination of enrolled bills as may be directed by the Secretary. The compensation of such additional clerk shall be at the rate of \$3,900 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until July 1, 1945.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. GUFFEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 330, agreed to December 15, 1942, authorizing Committee on Mines and Mining to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred reported it with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "until" to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANCE BY BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. WAGNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 56), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Committee on Banking and Currency, hereby is authorized to employ such expert, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all the expenses incurred pursuant to this resolution until July 1, 1945 (which shall not exceed \$3,000), shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it without amendment, and it

was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 32) authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an assistant clerk, reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the foregoing resolution (S. Res. 32), with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "until", to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Resolution 15, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,400 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 54, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been submitted by Mr. HILL (for Mr. PEPPER) on January 25, 1945.

The amendment was, on page 1, line 6, after the word "until", to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Resolution 12, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Patents to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,400 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES IN RELATION TO THE NATIONAL WELFARE

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 36, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 36), submitted by Mr. BREWSTER on January 18, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 13, 1944 (relating to an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare), is hereby continued from February 1,

1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS FOR COMMITTEES

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 57), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority contained in the following resolutions hereby is terminated after June 30, 1945:

Senate Resolution 129, agreed to May 4, 1939, authorizing the Committee on Mines and Mining to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum;

Senate Resolution 311, agreed to June 23, 1944, authorizing the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum and \$1,500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent;

Senate Resolution 262, agreed to June 30, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an additional clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum; and

Senate Resolution 153, agreed to June 1, 1943, authorizing the Committee on Claims to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$3,600 per annum.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 160, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, agreed to July 10, 1935, authorizing a special committee to investigate the production, transportation, and marketing of wool, as extended, is hereby further extended and continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the said committee may report to the Senate at any time prior to December 31, 1946. The said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate \$5,000, in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it with an amendment, in line 9, after the name "Senate", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF THE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE INDUSTRY—MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the clerk of the Judiciary Committee has just come into the Chamber to report to me that a message was received this morning from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who was telephoning from Chicago, with respect to Senate Resolution 17. It is my understanding that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has not reported that resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct in his understanding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Nevada has requested me, on his behalf, to enter a motion to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from further consideration of the resolution. He desires this to be done in order that he may have the opportunity, when he arrives here on Thursday, to bring the matter before the Senate for its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to enter such a motion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On behalf of the Senator from Nevada, I enter that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I inquire the nature of the motion which has just been entered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I stated that the senior Senator from Nevada, who is absent from the Senate on official business, telephoned to the clerk of the Judiciary Committee this morning and requested that I enter on his behalf a motion to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from further consideration of Senate Resolution 17, which was submitted by the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of extending the work of the Judiciary Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, with respect to the investigation of the liquor industry.

Mr. WHITE. Is this a motion to discharge the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED—PRESERVATION OF COTTON AND WHEAT ALLOTMENTS

Mr. OVERTON obtained the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there is a noncontroversial bill on the calendar, namely, Senate bill 338, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I should like to obtain action on it. If any great amount of time is required, I shall not insist on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. OVERTON. I understand that there will be no debate, and that the bill can be disposed of promptly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I believe that to be true.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to

17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to preserve the allotments of wheat and cotton. Under the present law, if the allotments are not used for 3 years they are lost. There have been a great many diversions to war crops, and many allotments will be threatened after this year. Many farmers are in the service, and cannot plant their crops.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have made inquiry of such minority members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as I was able to consult, and I know of no opposition to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "amended", to insert "or under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to strike out "acreage used for the production of any war crop, designated by the Secretary, in" and insert "for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 3, after the word "emergency", to strike out "on."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 5, after the word "crop", to strike out "year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "planted to" and insert "a farm on which."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 7, after the word "be", to insert "was planted."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the words "production of", to strike out "such", and in the same line, after the word "war", to strike out "crop" and insert "crops designated by him."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 9, after the word "such", to strike out "acreage" and insert "farm, or because the owner or operator was serving in the armed forces of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in establishing acreage allotments under subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or under the Soil Con-

servation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations prescribed by him, may provide that for any crop year (beginning with the crop year 1945, during the present emergency, any farm, with respect to which a cotton or wheat allotment was established for the 1942 crop shall be regarded as a farm on which cotton or wheat, as the case may be, was planted, if the Secretary determines that because of the production of war crops designated by him on such farm, or because the owner or operator was serving in the armed forces of the United States, the cotton or wheat production history of the farm for such year is not representative of the normal history of the farm.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY OUT OF RESPECT TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to state that, upon completion of the necessary business of the Senate today, it is the intention to move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next as a mark of respect to the late Secretary of the Senate, Colonel Halsey. Accordingly I make such a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may it be agreed that I will be permitted to address the Senate for approximately 10 or 15 minutes?

Mr. HILL. Of course, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request that, on the completion of the necessary business of the Senate today, the Senate adjourn until Thursday next as a mark of respect to the late Secretary of the Senate, Col. Edwin A. Halsey.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield further, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session the Committee on Commerce may have permission to file reports on any legislative or executive matters before it.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Assuming that the Committee on Commerce reports during the interim, is it the expectation that the Senate will proceed on some basis on Thursday with the George bill and the nomination?

Mr. HILL. So far as the present occupant of the majority leader's chair knows at the present time, that is the intention.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 35, Calendar No. 21, being the river and harbor bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

THE CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

MR. OVERTON. Mr. President, I pause in the consideration of the pending bill in order to pay a brief but well-deserved tribute to one of the greatest friends the cause of river and harbor improvements has ever had in the history of our country. On last Thursday, at his home in Aurora, Ill., Frank R. Reid passed into the great beyond. Mr. Reid was a Member of the House of Representatives, where he served from 1923 until 1934, when he voluntarily left that service in order to resume the practice of law. While he was a Member of the House of Representatives he was chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, and as such he prepared and had passed through the House, and he aided in passage through the Senate, and aided materially in having approved, the flood-control bill of May 15, 1928, relating to the lower Mississippi Valley. That is a historic enactment, because in it the Congress of the United States declared for the first time that flood control of the lower Mississippi Valley is a national obligation.

After Mr. Reid left the House of Representatives he continued to display an unfailing zeal and interest in flood control and river and harbor improvements. There was not a meeting of the Flood Control Association relating to the lower Mississippi Valley at which he was not present, according to my recollection; and there was not a meeting of the National River and Harbor Congress at which he was not present. At one time or another he held every high position in that congress.

Mr. Reid was a gentleman who made and held friends. He was sympathetic. He was affable. He was one of the most brilliant presiding officers I have ever known. His passing is a great loss to the cause of river and harbor improvement and of flood control in this Nation. I desire personally to extend my condolence to the members of his family. He was a devoted husband and a loving father.

Mr. President, the pending bill is a successor to the river and harbor bill of last session, which was House bill 3961. That bill and the companion bill, the flood-control measure of last session, had a very rocky road to travel. From the time when the Senate reconvened after the November election until the Seventy-eighth Congress was adjourned sine die, those two bills occupied practically all the time of the Senate. The flood-control bill was enacted into law and was approved by the President on December 22, 1944. But the river and harbor bill finally went on the rocks in the consideration of what is known as the Elliott amendment.

After giving thorough consideration to the whole subject matter and, I think,

in line with what I said on the floor of the Senate during the concluding days of the debate last December, I conceived the plan of preparing a bill which would be free of any controversial projects whatsoever, and which would not embrace any new projects. My purpose was to have authorization made for quite a large number of projects as to which there was no objection, and to avoid delay in the consideration of the bill resulting from hearings on new projects. So I prepared the pending bill, containing 291 projects which are uncontested, and to which there is no objection. Each of the 291 projects has been approved by the Chief of Engineers. All of them have undergone committee hearings. Each has been voted upon favorably by the Senate. The additional projects which were inserted in the bill, to which there was no objection on the part of the Senate, were agreed to by the House when it adopted the conference report. Therefore, the bill contains projects which have been agreed to in both the Senate and the House, and which have even been agreed to without debate, because all of them are meritorious and none of them are subject to objection.

Among the projects which we have eliminated from the bill—projects which are controversial in their nature—is the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, in Alabama and Mississippi, which had an estimated Federal cost of \$66,000,000. On January 2, 1945, the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors adopted a resolution providing for a restudy and review of that project. Later on, in due course, a report on it will be made.

I wish to thank both of the very able and distinguished Senators from Alabama [MR. BANKHEAD and MR. HILL] and the able and distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [MR. BILBO] for their cooperation with me in connection with that matter, and for agreeing not to offer during consideration of the pending bill, either in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, an amendment having to do with the Tennessee-Tombigbee project.

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

MR. OVERTON. I yield.

MR. VANDENBERG. Inasmuch as I perhaps wielded on the floor of the Senate the ax which did considerable damage to the Tombigbee project, I should like to state that the course which the Senator from Alabama now outlines in respect to a resurvey is precisely the course which I said I would approve. I am very happy that such a course is to be taken. I think that when the conclusive down-to-date report is available from the Chief of Engineers the Senators from Alabama and Mississippi will be entitled to another day in court.

MR. OVERTON. I agree with the Senator from Michigan.

The next project which was eliminated was with reference to the Beaver-Mahoning Rivers in Pennsylvania and Ohio. The total project was to be constructed at an estimated cost of approximately \$38,000,000, of which all but \$1,500,000 had been previously authorized.

I wish to thank the Senators from Ohio for their cooperation in agreeing to the elimination of this project from the pending bill.

We have also deleted from the bill the Savannah River and Clark Hill Reservoir in Georgia, the estimated cost of which is \$28,000,000. We eliminated the project because it was authorized in the flood-control act which was passed at the last session of Congress.

There has also been omitted from the bill the Santee and Congaree Rivers project in North Carolina and South Carolina. The estimated cost of construction of the initial stage of the project was \$25,000,000. That item was inserted in House bill 3961 by the Senate. It was agreed to in the Senate but the House conferees insisted on its rejection because local interests desired to be heard in connection with the matter. The House conferees took the position that the local interests had not had an adequate opportunity to be heard. The Senate conferees receded. Therefore, we considered the project as falling within the classification of objected-to projects.

I wish to thank the senior Senator from South Carolina [MR. MAYBANK] for his willingness to cooperate with the Senate Commerce Committee in the elimination of this particular project from the pending bill.

Mr. President, there are also not contained in this bill the Missouri River Basin multiple-purpose projects. Provision was made in the river and harbor bill at the last Congress for an authorization of \$200,000,000 to initiate those projects. However, the projects were authorized in the flood control act of last year, and to include them in this bill would be merely an attempt to reauthorize them. They have therefore been eliminated. However, there remains in the bill the navigation project in the lower Missouri River Basin from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River.

Mr. President, as I stated a few minutes ago, the rock upon which House bill 3961—that noble ship—went to pieces was the Elliott amendment which provided that the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws should not be applicable to lands which receive their waters from the Central Valley project in the State of California. The amendment, which was adopted on the floor of the House last year, is not contained in this bill. When it came over to the Senate for consideration the Senate Commerce Committee recommended its elimination. It was eliminated on the floor of the Senate, but the Senate conferees yielded, and it was restored to the bill. The Senate rejected the conference report and later a motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was rejected, but before a vote could be taken on that motion the Seventy-eighth Congress adjourned sine die.

I wish to thank the very able and distinguished Senator from California for his willingness, his splendid cooperation, and his manifestation of patriotism in being perfectly willing that this very controversial item be not included in the pending bill. I understand that the able

author of the amendment, Representative ELLIOTT, has indicated that he will not urge the inclusion of the amendment in Senate bill 35 when it reaches the House.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that this bill does not contain provisions with reference to power and irrigation which were included in House bill 3961. The reason for that is perfectly obvious. The identical provisions with reference to power and irrigation which were included in the river and harbor bill were likewise made a part of the flood-control bill. They were in identical language. The flood-control bill has become law, and therefore the power and irrigation provisions are now law. There is no necessity to include them in the pending bill.

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

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In other words, section 5 of the flood-control bill which was passed at the last session of Congress, now known as Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, and which made provision with reference to the distribution of electric power generated at the reservoir projects, will apply to the projects in the pending river and harbor bill in exactly the same way that it applies to the projects in the flood-control bill. Am I correct in my statement?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct. Section 5 and section 8 of the flood control act apply not only to the projects contained in the pending bill, but also to all projects under the control of the War Department, whether authorized in this bill, in the flood-control bill, or in any other bill.

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

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Have any of the projects which were eliminated from the similar bill which we considered before the adjournment of the last session of Congress been restored to the pending bill?

Mr. OVERTON. No; none of those projects has been restored to the present bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Then, the pending bill is practically the same bill which was passed by the Senate during the last session of Congress.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

The estimated cost of the 291 projects contained in this bill is \$381,968,332. This is \$320,530,000 less than the estimated cost of the projects in last year's bill, or, in other words, almost a 50-percent reduction in the estimated cost. The reduction has been brought about not only by reason of the elimination of controversial projects but also by the elimination of what would be a duplication of projects.

Now I wish to say to the Senate that is the intention, I think, of both the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives and of the Senate Commerce Committee, to prepare later on in the session another river and harbor bill. In that river and harbor bill both committees will consider all new projects which have been reported since

hearings on the bill of last year and any project which has not been authorized in the pending bill, and will also consider any controversial projects and also any amendments, for instance, the Elliott amendment or any other amendment which may be more or less controversial in nature, the purpose being to get the pending bill through as rapidly as possible, because there is no controversy in reference to any project or general provision in this bill.

I have a letter from Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, which I wish to take the liberty of reading in part to the Senate as evidence of what is intended. This letter was written on January 12, addressed to me by Judge MANSFIELD, and in it he says:

DEAR SENATOR OVERTON: I have examined with interest Senate bill 35, introduced in your behalf by Senator BAILEY. It is my understanding that the bill seeks to authorize the uncontested projects as contained in the rivers and harbors bill (H. R. 3961), which failed of passage in the last Congress.

I express the sincere and earnest hope that the bill as introduced may be promptly passed by the Senate. If and when that is accomplished, I shall immediately proceed in an effort to obtain similar action in the House. If no controversial items are added, I have every confidence it will be accepted by the House.

Since the bill was reported to the Senate by the Commerce Committee, some few additional reports on new projects have been received and no doubt others will be submitted by the Board and Chief of Engineers from time to time. It is my intention, and in this I am sure I shall have the enthusiastic support of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, to report another rivers and harbors bill to take care of additional projects during the present session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter written by Judge MANSFIELD be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point and also a copy of my reply to Judge MANSFIELD in which I approve the course he outlines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter was as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1945.

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON,
Chairman, Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, Senate Commerce Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR OVERTON: I have examined with interest Senate bill 35, introduced in your behalf by Senator BAILEY. It is my understanding that the bill seeks to authorize the uncontested projects as contained in the river and harbor bill (H. R. 3961), which failed of passage in the last Congress.

I express the sincere and earnest hope that the bill as introduced may be promptly passed by the Senate. If and when that is accomplished, I shall immediately proceed in an effort to obtain similar action in the House. If no controversial items are added, I have every confidence it will be accepted by the House.

Since the bill was reported to the Senate by the Commerce Committee, some few additional reports on new projects have been received and no doubt others will be submitted by the Board and Chief of Engineers from time to time. It is my intention, and in this I am sure I shall have the enthusiastic

support of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, to report another river and harbor bill to take care of additional projects during the present session of the Congress.

I think it highly important in the public interest that S. 35 should be enacted into law as soon as possible. While the bill specifically provides "that no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged unless the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect," there are a number of projects the bill will authorize which already have been certified as "being necessary and desirable in the interest of the national defense." In addition, and as you are of course advised, authorization of the projects will enable the engineers to proceed with the preparation of plans and specifications in order that there may be no delay in the construction of projects if and when they are needed when the war is over.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely,

J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on
Rivers and Harbors.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1945.
Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on
Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 12th instant advising me that you have examined S. 35, being the river and harbor bill introduced in the Senate, and that it meets with your approval.

I am very pleased to observe that as soon as the bill has passed the Senate you will undertake to have it acted upon favorably in your committee and by the House. I am especially interested in your statement that you will later in the year undertake hearings on a new river and harbor bill, embracing projects that have been favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers subsequent to the consideration of last session's bill by the Senate Commerce Committee. I most heartily approve of this course.

I thank you for your continued cooperation in the enactment of this important legislation and can assure you that I shall do all in my power to aid you in the furtherance of your views and plans with respect not only to the pending bill but to future river and harbor bills.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN H. OVERTON,
United States Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I cannot close this general presentation of the pending bill without thanking the members of the Commerce Committee for their splendid cooperation. This bill has been unanimously recommended by the Senate Commerce Committee for passage by the Senate. I cannot refrain from expressing my very deep and warm appreciation of the courtesy and the able counsel which have been given to me at all times by the chairman of the Commerce Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. In this as in all other matters in which I have had any occasion to be active before his committee he has been

extraordinarily helpful, patient, and sympathetic.

Mr. President, there are a few committee amendments to the bill, but they are only clerical in nature. The first section of the bill as prepared contained an enunciation of general principles and also the authorization of various projects. On the recommendation of the War Department we divided the first section into two sections, section 1 relating to the general principles enunciated by the bill, and the second section relating to the authorizations. Because of that separation a renumbering of the sections has been required. Those are the main amendments.

There is another amendment to strike out the word "of" and insert the word "for," and then another amendment where there was a typographical error in referring to a House document, and that is corrected. This completes the amendments.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was on page 23, line 6, to strike out "chief" and insert "Chief".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, line 8, after the word "and", to strike out "669" and insert "659".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 39, line 8, after the word "liability", to strike out "of" and insert "for".

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments except for renumbering the sections. Without objection, the amendments renumbering the sections are agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment heretofore offered by me and lying on the table be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, line 3, after the word "navigation", it is proposed to insert "flood control."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that is merely in connection with an item for a preliminary examination and survey. I have no objection to any preliminary examination and survey amendments that may be offered, and therefore I make no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator if there would be any objection to the amendment I left with the committee providing for an examination of the possibilities of deepening the channel to Beaufort, S. C., through St. Helena Sound or through Port Royal Sound?

Mr. OVERTON. Has the Senator the amendment prepared?

Mr. MAYBANK. I sent it to the committee, and have it not with me at the moment. I can prepare it, however. It merely provides for an investigation.

Mr. OVERTON. There will be no objection to it. I do not think it is contained in the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; it is not.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator had a copy of it there would be no objection to providing for a preliminary examination and survey. As I understand, that is all the amendment proposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is all, of the channel to Beaufort, S. C.

Mr. OVERTON. There will be no objection to it. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be permitted to offer it later, and that it be incorporated in the bill as passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Carolina send the amendment to the desk?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. LANGER] intends to address himself to the bill.

Mr. LANGER. No.

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator going to speak before the bill is passed?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In that event there will be ample time for the Senator from South Carolina to prepare his amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, before the Senator from North Dakota speaks let me say that I have had prepared a list of the projects contained in the pending bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Menemsha Creek, Marthas Vineyard, Mass.	H. 365, 76th Cong.	\$37,500
Wickford Harbor, R. I.	S. 105, 77th Cong.	22,000
Great Salt Pond, Block Island, R. I.	H. 330, 77th Cong.	8,000
Pawcatuck River, R. I. and Conn.	H. 839, 76th Cong.	30,000
Mystic River, Conn.	H. 349, 77th Cong.	20,000
Thames River, Conn.	H. 367, 76th Cong.	(*)
Connecticut River, below Hartford, Conn.	H. 368, 76th Cong.	72,900
Clinton Harbor, Conn.	H. 240, 76th Cong.	21,900
Guilford Harbor, Conn.	H. 149, 77th Cong.	25,500
New Haven Harbor, Conn., except the further improvement of Quinnipiac River.	H. 307, 76th Cong.	1,673,000
Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.	H. 819, 76th Cong.	529,000
Norwalk Harbor, Conn.	H. 220, 76th Cong.	29,500
Mianus River, Conn.	H. 549, 78th Cong.	26,500
Greenwich Harbor, Conn.	H. 125, 76th Cong.	31,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway.	Apr. 14, 1942 ³	1,010,000
Jamaica Bay, N. Y.	H. 700, 76th Cong.	270,000
Jones Inlet, N. Y.	H. 409, 77th Cong.	900,000
Northport Harbor, N. Y.	H. 109, 76th Cong.	15,000
Peconic River, N. Y.	H. 237, 76th Cong.	20,000
Lake Montauk Harbor, N. Y.	H. 369, 76th Cong.	65,000
Orowoc Creek, N. Y.	H. 126, 76th Cong.	15,200
Passaic River, N. J.	H. 420, 76th Cong.	(*)
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N. J.	May 20, 1942 ³	3,390,000
Way Cake Creek, N. J.	H. 624, 77th Cong.	30,000
Compton Creek, N. J.	H. 673, 76th Cong.	16,000
Shark River, N. J.	H. 102, 76th Cong.	118,000
New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway.	H. 133, 76th Cong.	1,500,000
Manasquan River, N. J.	H. 356, 77th Cong.	143,000
Toms River, N. J.	H. 393, 77th Cong.	141,000
Cold Spring Inlet, N. J.	H. 262, 77th Cong.	15,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea.	H. 580, 76th Cong.	1,036,000
Do.	H. 340, 77th Cong.	3,380,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, and the maintenance of enlarged channel opposite the Philadelphia Navy Yard.	(*)	(*)
Delaware River at Camden, N. J.	H. 353, 77th Cong.	373,000
Inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del.	H. 344, 77th Cong.	224,000
Indian River, Del.	H. 330, 76th Cong.	151,000
Nanticoke River, Del. and Md.	S. 69, 77th Cong.	54,000
Susquehanna River, above and below Havre de Grace, Md.	S. 67, 76th Cong.	18,000
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.	June 30, 1942 ³	2,388,000
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md., and channel in Curtis Creek.	(*)	150,000
Mill Creek, Md.	H. 100, 76th Cong.	4,200
Broadwater Creek, Md.	H. 622, 77th Cong.	30,000
Cadie Creek, Md.	H. 465, 76th Cong.	5,500
Channel to Island Creek, St. George Island, Md.	H. 99, 76th Cong.	10,000
Saint Catherines Sound, Md.	H. 242, 76th Cong.	10,900
Black Walnut Harbor, Md.	H. 217, 76th Cong.	21,000
Town Creek, Md.	H. 219, 76th Cong.	25,000
Duck Point Cove, Md.	H. 241, 76th Cong.	19,500
Lower Thoroughfare, Deals Island, Md.	H. 238, 76th Cong.	22,000
Crisfield Harbor, Md.	H. 457, 76th Cong.	(*)
Pocomoke River, Md.	H. 429, 76th Cong.	4,250
Waterway on the coast of Virginia.	H. 268, 76th Cong.	263,000
Occoneecho Creek, Va.	H. 223, 78th Cong.	37,000
Oyster Channel, Va.	H. 716, 76th Cong.	29,000
Onancock River, Va.	H. 358, 76th Cong.	(*)
Tangier Channel, Va.	H. 141, 77th Cong.	10,100
Cranes Creek, Va.	H. 687, 76th Cong.	7,500
Totuskey Creek, Va.	H. 686, 76th Cong.	44,000
Hoskins Creek, Va.	H. 129, 77th Cong.	16,000
Urbanna Creek, Va.	H. 285, 76th Cong.	9,600
Whittings Creek, Va.	H. 582, 76th Cong.	11,500
Broad Creek, Va.	H. 381, 76th Cong.	20,500
Pamunkey River, Va.	H. 671, 76th Cong.	10,000
Appomattox River, Va.	H. 223, 76th Cong.	110,000
Hampton Creek, Va.	H. 559, 76th Cong.	15,000
Cape Charles City Harbor, Va.	May 12, 1942 ³	158,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost	Project	Document No.	Federal first cost	Project	Document No.	Federal first cost	
Norfolk Harbor, Va.	H. 224, 76th Cong.	\$35,000	Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida.	H. 696, 76th Cong.	\$208,000	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers.	H. 231, 76th Cong.	\$10,290,000	
Little River, Va., maintenance work.	(*)		Do.	June 5, 1943	5,100	Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis.	H. 432, 77th Cong.	(*)	
James River, Va.	H. 728, 77th Cong.	27,000	Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River, Fla.	H. 371, 76th Cong.	3,200,000	Do.	(*)	(*)	
Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.	H. 117, 76th Cong.	39,000	Little Manatee River, Fla.	H. 552, 76th Cong.	77,000	Do.	H. 103, 76th Cong.	11,500	
Chowan River, N. C., and Blackwater River, Va.	H. 101, 76th Cong.	135,000	Tampa Harbor, Fla.	H. 119, 77th Cong.	60,000	Do.	H. 547, 76th Cong.	88,800	
Pembroke Creek, N. C.	H. 235, 76th Cong.	9,500	Do.	S. 183, 78th Cong.	607,400	Do.	H. 263, 77th Cong.	17,000	
Channel from Pamlico Sound to Rodanthe, N. C.	H. 234, 76th Cong.	5,000	Anclote River, Fla.	H. 243, 76th Cong.	10,000	Do.	H. 449, 78th Cong.	(*)	
Channel from Pamlico Sound to Avon, N. C.	H. 316, 76th Cong.	16,500	Pithlachasotee River, Fla.	H. 86, 77th Cong.	51,000	Do.	H. 137, 76th Cong.	33,000	
Rollinson Channel, Waterway connecting Swan Quarter Bay with Deep Bay, N. C.	H. 236, 76th Cong.	27,000	St. Marks River, Fla.	H. 345, 77th Cong.	71,000	Illinois waterway, Ill., and Indiana Harbor and Canal, Ind.	H. 145, 76th Cong.	25,900,000	
Neuse and Trent Rivers, N. C.	H. 239, 76th Cong.	22,500	Intracoastal Waterway from Apalachicola Bay to St. Marks River, Fla.	H. 442, 76th Cong.	32,500	Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth.	H. 214, 76th Cong.	6,000,000	
Channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay with Cedar Bay, N. C.	H. 623, 77th Cong.	11,000	Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga., and Fla.	H. 342, 76th Cong.	6,500,000	Scioto River at Portsmouth, Ohio.	(*)	75,000	
Waterway connecting Pamlico Sound and Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	S. 87, 76th Cong.	20,000	St. Josephs Bay, Fla.	S. 17, 77th Cong.	(*)	Coasts of the Great Lakes; harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels.	H. 446, 78th Cong.	2,030,635	
Do.	H. 99, 77th Cong.	35,000	Do.	(*)	225,000	Baudette Harbor, Minn. Harbor at Knife River, Minn.	H. 216, 76th Cong.	15,000	
Channel from Back Sound to Lookout Bight, N. C.	S. 247, 77th Cong.	7,000	Watson Bayou, Fla.	H. 555, 76th Cong.	(*)	Ashland Harbor, Wis.	H. 686, 77th Cong.	14,000	
Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	H. 746, 77th Cong.	50,000	Pensacola Harbor, Fla.	Apr. 3, 1943	162,000	Menominee Harbor and River, Mich., and Wis.	H. 337, 77th Cong.	24,000	
Inland waterway, Beaufort to Cape Fear River, N. C., including waterway to Jacksonville, N. C.	H. 334, 76th Cong.	54,000	Alabama-Coosae River, Ala.	H. 414, 77th Cong.	60,000,000	Green Bay Harbor, Wis.	H. 228, 76th Cong.	(*)	
Do.	H. 660, 76th Cong.	24,000	Mobile Harbor, Ala.	Oct. 26, 1942	475,000	Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, Wis.	H. 95, 76th Cong.	56,000	
Do.	H. 346, 77th Cong.	9,000	Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala. and Miss.	H. 276, 76th Cong.	6,750,000	H. 421, 78th Cong.	11,000		
Do.	H. 131, 76th Cong.	675,000	Do.	H. 382, 77th Cong.	115,000	Milwaukee Harbor, Wis.	S. 29, 76th Cong.	110,000	
Do.	S. 83, 76th Cong.	790,000	Dauphin Island Bay Channel, Ala.	H. 333, 76th Cong.	88,000	Racine Harbor, Wis.	H. 816, 77th Cong.	(*)	
Northeast (Cape Fear) River, N. C.	S. 170, 76th Cong.	73,000	Bayou Cordon, Ala.	H. 824, 77th Cong.	6,880	Do.	H. 255, 78th Cong.	47,000	
Intracoastal Waterway from Cape Fear River, N. C., to Winyah Bay, S. C.	H. 327, 76th Cong.	11,000	Bayou La Batre, Ala.	H. 281, 76th Cong.	27,500	Waukegan Harbor, Ill.	H. 116, 77th Cong.	34,000	
Winyah Bay, S. C.	H. 211, 76th Cong.	1,260,000	Biloxi Harbor, Miss.	H. 258, 76th Cong.	4,000	Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.	H. 233, 76th Cong.	910,000	
Berestord Creek, S. C.	H. 602, 76th Cong.	21,000	Do.	H. 326, 76th Cong.	6,000	St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.	H. 129, 76th Cong.	74,000	
Charleston Harbor, S. C.	H. 156, 77th Cong.	1,820,000	Pass Christian Harbor, Miss.	S. 214, 77th Cong.	17,000	Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River, Mich.	H. 661, 76th Cong.	150,000	
Shipyard River, S. C.	Apr. 11, 1942	246,500	Bayou Galere, Miss.	H. 112, 76th Cong.	6,000	Manistee Harbor, Mich.	H. 380, 77th Cong.	147,000	
Abappoole Creek, S. C.	H. 97, 76th Cong.	10,800	Bayous La Loutre, St. Malo, and Yscloskey, La.	H. 116, 77th Cong.	35,000	St. Marys River, Mich., South Canal, Bridge Island.	H. 679, 78th Cong.	1,412,000	
Russell Creek, S. C.	S. 41, 76th Cong.	15,500	Mississippi River, Baton Rouge, La., to the Gulf of Mexico.	H. 215, 76th Cong.	4,200,000	St. Marys River, Mich., power plant.	H. 339, 77th Cong.	3,500,000	
Savannah Harbor, Ga.	H. 283, 76th Cong.	281,000	Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Algiers at New Orleans, La.	S. 188, 78th Cong.	8,000,000	St. Clair River at Southeast Bend, Mich.	H. 309, 77th Cong.	135,000	
Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.	H. 610, 77th Cong.	(*)	Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, La.	H. 594, 78th Cong.	160,000	Detroit River, Mich.	Oct. 26, 1942	85,300	
Intracoastal Waterway from Cape Fear River, N. C., to Saint Johns River, Fla.	H. 114, 77th Cong.	(*)	Calcasieu River and Pass, La.	H. 465, 77th Cong.	55,000	Sandusky Harbor, Ohio.	H. 328, 76th Cong.	(*)	
Fernandina Harbor and Amelia River, Fla.	H. 284, 77th Cong.	(*)	Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway.	H. 428, 76th Cong.	6,300	Lorain Harbor, Ohio.	H. 161, 77th Cong.	30,000	
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean.	H. 322, 77th Cong.	725,000	Do.	H. 383, 77th Cong.	48,000	Do.	(*)	(*)	
Do.	S. 230, 78th Cong.	3,200,000	Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway to Harlingen, Tex.	H. 402, 77th Cong.	600,000	Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.	H. 232, 76th Cong.	191,000	
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean, and plans for the alteration of channel alignment.	(*)	2,032,000	Do.	S. 248, 78th Cong.	25,500	Feb. 14, 1942	30,000		
St. Johns River, Fla., Palatka to Lake Harney.	H. 603, 76th Cong.	290,000	Neches and Angelina Rivers, Tex.	H. 685, 76th Cong.	10,000	Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio.	H. 321, 77th Cong.	33,000	
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to Lake Harney.	H. 445, 78th Cong.	25,500	Trinity River and tributaries, Tex.	S. 60, 77th Cong.	18,000	Erie Harbor, Pa.	(*)	(*)	
Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla.	Oct. 26, 1942	11,789,000	Lavon Reservoir on East Fork of Trinity River, Tex.	S. 158, 77th Cong.	27,000	Do.	Oct. 26, 1942	467,000	
Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla., Vero Beach.	H. 261, 76th Cong.	7,300	Houston Ship Channel, Tex.	S. 98, 76th Cong.	23,000,000	Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.	H. 352, 78th Cong.	3,171,000	
Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla., to Sebastian Inlet.	H. 336, 76th Cong.	19,000	Do.	H. 403, 77th Cong.	15,000,000	Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.	Apr. 16, 1942	108,000	
Canaveral Harbor, Fla.	H. 367, 77th Cong.	830,500	Guadalupe River, Tex.	H. 533, 78th Cong.	3,733,000	Wilson Harbor, N. Y.	H. 679, 76th Cong.	131,000	
St. Lucie Inlet, Fla.	H. 391, 77th Cong.	46,000	Aransas Pass-Corpus Christie Channel, Tex.	H. 226, 76th Cong.	21,300	Rochester Harbor, N. Y.	H. 139, 76th Cong.	10,000	
Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.	H. 530, 78th Cong.	711,000	Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex.	H. 256, 76th Cong.	8,675,000	Sackets Harbor, N. Y.	Jan. 6, 1944	121,000	
New River, Fla.	H. 553, 76th Cong.	60,000	Channel from Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.	Aug. 21, 1943	484,000	Cape Vincent Harbor, N. Y.	H. 363, 76th Cong.	59,000	
Miami Harbor, Fla.	June 24, 1942	5,781,000	Lavaca and Navidad Rivers, Tex.	H. 319, 77th Cong.	30,000	San Diego Harbor, Calif.	H. 390, 77th Cong.	165,000	
Do.	Mar. 19, 1942	78,000	Do.	Dec. 10, 1943	120,000	Newport Bay Harbor, Calif.	S. 138, 78th Cong.	259,000	
Intracoastal Waterway from Miami to Key West, Fla.	Oct. 26, 1942	1,830,000	Clear Creek and Clear Lake, Tex.	H. 337, 76th Cong.	70,000	Santa Barbara Harbor, Calif.	H. 348, 77th Cong.	(*)	
Footnotes at end of table.			Do.	H. 337, 76th Cong.	70,000	Morro Bay, Calif.	H. 283, 77th Cong.	800,000	
			Do.	H. 337, 76th Cong.	127,500	Morro Bay, Calif., and further harbor development as desired by the Navy Department.	H. 266, 76th Cong.	74,000	
			Do.	H. 347, 77th Cong.	635,000	Monterey Harbor, Calif.	Nov. 3, 1941	483,000	
			Do.	H. 104, 76th Cong.	(*)	Monterey Bay (Moss Landing), Calif.	H. 466, 77th Cong.	(*)	
			Do.			Redwood Creek, Calif.	H. 715, 76th Cong.	25,000	
			Do.			Oakland Harbor, Calif.	H. 217, 77th Cong.	7,600	
			Do.			San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, Calif.	Noyo Harbor, Calif.	H. 682, 76th Cong.	600,000
			Do.			Crescent City Harbor, Calif.	H. 688, 76th Cong.	1,610,000	

Footnotes at end of table.

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Crescent City Harbor, Calif., and the construction of an inner breakwater.	(6)	\$200,000
Chetco River, Oreg.	H. 817, 77th Cong.	190,000
Coquille River, Oreg.	H. 672, 76th Cong.	(*)
Umpqua Harbor and River, Oreg.	S. 86, 76th Cong.	55,000
Umpqua River, Oreg.	S. 191, 77th Cong.	34,000
Yaqquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.	S. 119, 77th Cong.	162,000
Depoe Bay, Oreg.	H. 350, 77th Cong.	214,000
Salmon River, Oreg.	H. 551, 76th Cong.	5,000
Bayocean Peninsula, Oreg.	(*)	120,000
Willamette River, Oreg.	H. 544, 75th Cong.	3,600,000
Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho.	H. 704, 75th Cong.	58,625,000
Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.	(6)	50,000
Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to the mouth of Snake River, Oreg., and Wash.	S. 28, 76th Cong.	39,000
Do.	H. 324, 77th Cong.	30,000
Columbia River, Oreg., and Wash.	H. 704, 75th Cong.	49,470,000
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and Bonneville, Oreg.	H. 218, 76th Cong.	45,000
Columbia and Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.	H. 241, 77th Cong.	12,000
Do.	H. 630, 77th Cong.	81,000
Baker Bay, Columbia River, Wash.	H. 443, 76th Cong.	170,000
Willapa River and Harbor, Wash.	H. 481, 76th Cong.	30,000
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River to Aberdeen, Wash.	(6)	160,000
Quillayute River, Wash.	H. 218, 78th Cong.	(*)
Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.	H. 331, 77th Cong.	10,000
Olympia Harbor, Wash.	H. 699, 76th Cong.	88,000
Tacoma Harbor, Wash.	H. 124, 76th Cong.	160,000
Stillaguamish River, Wash.	H. 286, 77th Cong.	35,000
Lake Crockett, Wash.	H. 303, 77th Cong.	225,000
Metlakatla Harbor, Alaska.	H. 138, 76th Cong.	120,000
Craig Harbor, Alaska.	H. 558, 76th Cong.	80,000
Meyers Chuck Harbor, Alaska.	H. 222, 76th Cong.	25,000
Wrangell Harbor, Alaska.	H. 284, 76th Cong.	189,000
Wrangell* Narrows, Alaska.	H. 260, 76th Cong.	2,731,000
Sitka Harbor, Alaska.	Mar. 14, 1944 ¹	385,000
Skagway Harbor, Alaska.	Apr. 11, 1942 ²	16,000
Petersburg Harbor, Alaska.	H. 670, 76th Cong.	80,000
Port Alexander, Alaska.	H. 578, 76th Cong.	31,000
Gastineau Channel, Alaska.	H. 325, 77th Cong.	155,000
Elfin Cove, Alaska.	H. 579, 76th Cong.	38,000
Seldovia Harbor, Alaska.	H. 702, 76th Cong.	50,000
Kehi Lagoon, Oahu T. H.	H. 379, 77th Cong.	(*)
Port Allen Harbor, T. H.	H. 180, 77th Cong.	75,000
San Juan Harbor, P. R.	(*)	400,000
Ponce Harbor, P. R.	May 21, 1942 ³	211,000
Fajardo Harbor, P. R.	H. 286, 76th Cong.	
Total, 291 projects.		381,968,332

¹ Listed geographically as in the bill.

² Document and Congress; "H" indicates House; "S" indicates Senate.

³ Date of report of Chief of Engineers, which was not printed.

⁴ Maintenance only.

⁵ In accordance with report on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers.

⁶ No additional cost to the United States.

⁷ River and Harbor Act, Aug. 30, 1935.

⁸ Reduction of \$2,100 in cost.

⁹ Work already accomplished in the interest of the war effort.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, at the appropriate place in the bill the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] desires to offer as a preliminary survey item the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert in section 5, following the item on Cooper River, S. C., on page 49, after line 6, the following:

Channel from the ocean through St. Helena Sound or through Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, S. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 35) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, following my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of letters which I have received during the past few weeks commenting upon the proposed full employment bill, recently introduced by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and myself.

These letters are from the following officials: Leo T. Crowley, Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration; Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State; Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration; John B. Blandford, Jr., Administrator, National Housing Agency.

I should particularly like to call the attention of the Senate to the following statement on the bill made by the Honorable Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration:

In accordance with our traditional economic concepts the initial burden of achieving continuing full employment is placed upon private, non-governmental sources. Government participation is limited to encouraging and creating the optimum conditions conducive to the meeting of this burden by private enterprise alone. But, if private enterprise cannot alone meet this burden, direct Government investment and expenditures which not only will assure full employment but will add to the wealth of the Nation must, as the bill provides, be undertaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,

January 24, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: In your letter of December 16, 1944, you ask me for my views on a proposed bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment.

The proposed bill requires that the President shall transmit to Congress at each regular session a report on the estimated number of jobs needed to insure continuing full employment for the coming fiscal year or years, the estimated amount of investment and other expenditures which will provide such

jobs, and the estimated volume of prospective investment and expenditures. If prospective investments and expenditures are less than the amount necessary to assure full employment, the President is required to recommend a program for encouraging non-Federal investment and expenditures. To the extent that such expenditures are insufficient to take up the lag the President is required to recommend a program of Federal investment and expenditures.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of the objectives sought to be attained by the bill and the approach taken toward that end. Every American able and willing to work has the right to a useful and remunerative job and it should be, as section 2 declares, the responsibility of the Government to guarantee that right by creating conditions which will tend to bring about continuing full employment.

In accordance with our traditional economic concepts the initial burden of achieving continuing full employment is placed upon private, nongovernmental sources. Government participation is limited to encouraging and creating the optimum conditions conducive to the meeting of this burden by private enterprise alone. But, if private enterprise cannot alone meet this burden, direct Government investment and expenditures which not only will assure full employment but will add to the wealth of the Nation must, as the bill provides, be undertaken.

The right to individual economic security, no less than the right to engage in private enterprise, is an indispensable component of a vigorous and healthy democracy. Mass unemployment and the resulting economic insecurity breed the very evils which endanger private enterprise and all other democratic institutions. It is the duty of government to be prepared to meet any threats to its existence from enemy attack; it should be no less its duty to be prepared to meet any threats which may arise from economic conditions. The proposed bill recognizes and undertakes to discharge that very obligation.

I have been advised that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
January 22, 1945.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: With reference to your letter of December 16, 1944, enclosing a copy of your bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment," I am happy to make the following comments on this measure, which I understand has not yet been introduced in Congress.

As you know, my associates and I are most interested in the development of an effective program for full employment in the United States. Such a program is intimately related to our general efforts to build a secure and prosperous world in the post-war period. Therefore, it is essential that the specific methods which are employed to promote high and stable levels of productive employment should be formulated with a view to their international implications.

It would be particularly unfortunate if the measures taken by this, or any, government were such as to hinder, rather than assist, the efforts of other countries in dealing with this problem. It should be recognized that in case of a serious threat of unemployment there is likely to be a strong pressure for the use of methods which would attempt to create employment at the expense of other nations. These methods would clearly be self-defeating in character, and tend ultimately to worsen, rather than improve, the employment situation in all countries.

Because of the necessary impact of a domestic full employment program upon our foreign economic relations, there are certain principles which I think should be borne in mind in the drafting of any final legislation on this subject, and in the working out of a specific program. For instance, attempts to create full employment at home, by the stimulation of uneconomic production, would clearly lessen the volume of beneficial foreign trade which we might otherwise enjoy. Similarly, if a full employment program is to provide the maximum material well-being for our people, it should rely substantially on foreign trade and investment as a means of providing employment opportunities. Finally, it would be unfortunate if a domestic full employment program should introduce added rigidities into our economy and thus lead to new restrictions and controls on foreign trade. As you realize, other nations in the past have attempted to further domestic economic programs by resorting to exchange controls, import quotas, and other devices destructive of international economic collaboration.

You will be interested to know that the Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy is now studying the international aspects of the full employment problem, including the effect of various possible types of domestic full employment programs upon our foreign economic relations.

The Department has not been informed as to the relationship of the proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
December 29, 1944.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: As requested in your letter of December 16, I have examined the draft bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment (Confidential Subcommittee Print No. 1, dated December 11, 1944) and have given thought to the approach taken therein. I hope that my comments, which are set forth below, may prove helpful to you in the development of a bill for the consideration of the next Congress.

Permit me to congratulate you on having initiated and given impetus to the legislative effort to deal with the formidable problem of involuntary unemployment. There has developed a realization that it is the responsibility of governments to provide an economic framework which will minimize the dislocations that lead to depression and to intervene directly to maintain employment opportunities when other measures fail. At the International Labor Conference in Philadelphia the United States Government accepted and sponsored the principle that each government recognizes its duty to maintain a high level of employment. All other governments present, as well as the worker and employer delegates, joined in voting for a resolution that this principle should be incorporated in the peace settlements. Although there has been an increasing public recognition of this responsibility in the United States, there has not yet been sufficient legislative consideration of the problems involved to result in the framing of legislation.

Much of the structure and content of the bill under consideration appears to me to be highly commendable. The introduction of the concept of the National Production and Employment Budget, with its primary emphasis upon the level of total expenditure necessary to buy the total volume of goods and services that would be produced at the levels of employment contemplated, I consider a constructive contribution. I believe the proposal to establish a joint committee on the Budget, composed of members from

six existing Senate and House committees concerned with financial matters, is fully deserving of congressional study. Many other passages in the proposed measure seem to me to be admirably conceived.

The relatively brief period of time available for study of your bill has not been sufficient to enable me to formulate and prepare for you final comments. I am attaching, however, a memorandum prepared for me by A. F. Hinrichs, Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics, which sets forth a number of considerations germane to the problems dealt with by your proposal which may be of value to your committee. Your immediate objective appears to be to open the problem and its means of solution for discussion. This is the introduction of your bill accomplishes. Any reservations I may have would not be germane to the next step which I presume will be taken, namely, a series of hearings and studies of the devices that can be used to achieve the main objective, maximum employment.

Please call freely upon me and the staff of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for assistance. The Department of Labor exists "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." No measure could possibly contribute as much to this objective as an act which would assure "continuing full employment."

Due to the limited period of time afforded me for the preparation of these comments I have been unable to ascertain the relationship of your proposal to the legislative program of the President.

Sincerely,

FRANCES PERKINS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
December 28, 1944.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Your draft bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment" is a proposal of real importance and significance. Any proposal to relate our Federal fiscal policies to our national economy in such a way as to maintain full employment and insure high levels of business activity is worthy of our deepest consideration. Such a proposal is of equal significance to all segments of our economy, including agriculture.

As I have stated many times before congressional committees and elsewhere, the first essential to solving post-war farm problems is maintaining full industrial production and employment of workers, because farmers sell and will continue to sell most of what they produce on the domestic market. Only through full employment at good wages can they have plenty of customers able to pay fair prices for their products.

The consequences of widespread unemployment in this country in the post-war period could well prove to be detrimental not only to the welfare of our citizens who are unemployed, but would be most costly to the rest of our people and to the Federal Government itself. As a matter of fact, another depression might strike at the very foundation of our entire political economy.

We have not had time to make a detailed analysis of your proposed bill. However, insofar as the objectives and the general approach of the bill are concerned the proposal offers possibilities with which we are in complete sympathy. It is my hope that you will perfect and introduce this bill in order that it may be given fullest consideration. At a later date we will be happy to testify or present evidence based upon our further study and analysis of the measure.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,

January 9, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have studied with unusual interest the draft bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuous full employment."

When the war is over all of us will turn our hands and minds to the creation of a new and vastly more prosperous America. Full employment at good wages, a better income and a better life for farmers, reasonable profits for businessmen, and security and opportunity for all—these will be the things toward which all of us will work.

The world we live in when the peace finally comes will be an unsettled world—potentially a revolutionary world. If we in America are to carry our full share of responsibility for stability in international affairs, we must have a strong and prosperous economy here at home.

We must make our system work effectively and efficiently in the interests of all of us. We must fully employ all our resources and all our manpower to raise our standards of living, to provide good jobs, vastly improved housing, medical care, and education for every family in the land. If we fail to do this, our system will have failed, and America will have failed to carry out its full responsibility for world economic leadership.

Much the greatest opportunity for expanding production and employment rests with free private enterprise. I am sure that the leaders of industry, labor, and agriculture will do everything within their power to bring about the fullest possible employment of our labor and other resources. But, in the last analysis, only the Federal Government, I believe, can assure the conditions under which free private enterprise can operate most effectively.

I therefore strongly favor the assumption of this responsibility by the Federal Government through legislation carefully drawn and fully debated by the Congress. The draft bill to establish a program for assuring full use of our resources of productive power and of manpower seems to me to be intelligent and practical steps toward carrying out this principle.

The construction of a national production and employment budget for our economy would, I think, represent an important advance in governmental and business planning and policy determination. The proposal to estimate each year the full employment capacity of the Nation and to set off against that capacity the consumption, investment, and normal governmental expenditures which actually are expected in that year is an excellent means of determining the required additional expenditures, private and governmental, which are needed to assure full employment. This method, I believe, is more practical than any proposal to set rigid limits upon the volume of aggregate investment expenditure which would balance our savings at full employment, year in and year out.

The National Budget principle also has the merit of focusing the attention of Congress and the executive agencies, as well as business and the general public, upon the several types of programs by means of which aggregate expenditures on goods and services can be increased. I particularly like the provision that programs having the effect of increasing consumption and private investment should be thoroughly canvassed before additional Federal expenditures are resorted to.

Business investment should be stimulated in every reasonable way. New ventures should be encouraged, while monopolies should be sharply curbed.

Unless our businessmen are encouraged to move out aggressively to create new industries, to modernize old industries, and to seek expanding markets, both at home and

abroad, we cannot expect our economy to function fully in the public interest.

However, under the best of circumstances there will be occasions when the full investment necessary to provide full use of our productive capacity will not be forthcoming from private and normal governmental sources. Under these circumstances, the firm assurance that the Federal Government will provide the necessary additional expenditures to maintain markets is essential. For this reason, I am glad to see that the commitment of the Government to step in during the years when private expenditures fall short is clear and unambiguous.

All enterprises undertaken by the Government should, of course, be projects useful in their own right. There should be no unnecessary leaf raking or boondoggling. There are, however, almost unlimited projects of obvious social value which could be included in a long-range public-works program.

A firm commitment by Government to devote to useful public projects any portion of our national resources which would otherwise run to waste in idleness should actually minimize the contribution which the Federal Government will have to make to keep total national expenditures, public and private, up to full employment levels.

It will do this, I believe, by inducing consumers to spend more freely because of greater assurance of stability of jobs and income; by inspiring confidence on the part of business in the adequacy and stability of its future markets; and by assuring State and municipal governments dependable and growing bases on which to finance desirable improvement projects.

The success of such a program requires, of course, that the Federal Government shall have planned well in advance a useful program of public projects, carefully integrated with State and local public works, which could, if necessary, be set in motion on short notice. It would also require vastly improved reporting of the volume of actual and prospective private and State and local government capital expenditure. In this connection, it appears desirable to give closer attention than is explicitly provided in the bill to regional distribution of employment and expenditures.

I hope the bill will be fully discussed by the Congress. Public hearings, with testimony by Government officials and representatives of business, agriculture, and labor, and by other interested persons should contribute greatly to public understanding of the problems which lie ahead of us in peacetime and the best means of their solution.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
December 29, 1944.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Let me acknowledge your letter of December 16, asking for my comments about subcommittee print No. 1 of a draft bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment." This will also supplement the acknowledgment of even date of Commissioner Ferguson of the Federal Housing Administration to your letter to him of December 22 on the same subject.

Upon reading this interesting bill, its contents seem to me to lie within that area of broadest general policy where the Congress itself to best equipped to make judgments. If the bill were to be enacted, its operations would, of course, affect the Government as a whole and the country as a whole; but the bill contains no technical materials presently which are peculiar to the problems and experience of the National Housing Agency.

Subject to the foregoing limitations, and reiterating that the content of the bill is within the realm of high policy, my comment, briefly, is as follows:

The objective of full employment, sought first and primarily through the medium of private enterprise, secondly, through public stimulation and assistance to private enterprise, and thirdly, by useful and necessary supplementary programs financed in whole or in part by the Government, is an objective upon which there is now fairly common agreement. It will interest you to know that the National Housing Agency, in its thinking about post-war housing, is pursuing these three lines of approach in the order and emphasis listed. Of course, our estimates of post-war housing need are based upon the consumer need for housing as well as upon the amount of housing construction required to contribute appropriately toward full employment.

Practically all of the policies and activities of the Government, as defined by law, have some direct or indirect effect upon the success of the country in achieving the objective of full employment under our present system of democracy and initiative. Therefore, machinery designed to focus governmental activity more clearly and dramatically upon this objective and to coordinate it more thoroughly toward this end at the highest policy level, seems to me very desirable. It also seems to me that the kind of focus and coordination at the high policy level, which the draft bill emphasizes, is even more important than detailed reorganization of existing governmental agencies.

In short, the draft bill deals with our most important problem next to winning the war and the making of a permanent peace, and I think that the provisions of the bill are well thought out. As to whether the mechanics of operation which the draft bill contemplates are the best available methods for the accomplishment of the objective, that would seem to me to be a matter within the province of the Congress and the Chief Executive rather than mine.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that it has no objection to the submission of this report on the draft bill.

Thanking you for the request that I comment upon this draft bill, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
JOHN B. BLANDFORD, Jr.
Administrator.

DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS AND WORLD PEACE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the subject upon which I am about to speak is one I have approached with extreme caution and gravity, realizing fully my role as an American legislator charged with the most solemn duty in what may be the most solemn hour of our Republic. For what is being done and written today concerning a post-war organization of the world by which the peace is to be kept will determine more than any other one thing the fate of our great country. And it is certain to determine the extent of our prosperity, the type of institutions we are to have, and whether in the years to come millions of American mothers are again to weep over the memory of brave sons buried on foreign battlefields their graves marked only by a white crosses.

Mr. President, I shudder—and I use the word advisedly—I shudder to think what will happen to the United States and to civilization itself if the present effort to build a community of nations within the framework of a durable peace does not

succeed. I refer to the efforts now being made to create what in effect will be a new League of Nations as symbolized by the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks.

I say these things with the deliberation of a man who is much saddened by the need that forces him to speak. For, Mr. President, we are not on our way to peace. We are following a formula which will lead to certain and even more terrible wars in the future.

Dumbarton Oaks, I believe, or any agreement drawn up on similar premises, is ultimately doomed to failure. I state this not as a personal opinion. It is simply a matter of inevitable cause and effect, based on equally inevitable facts.

I believe, on the other hand, that there is a program which, in this modern world, can succeed, and may maintain the peace. This, too, is not stated as a personal opinion. It is a studied conclusion, again based on an objective analysis of the facts, facts which, if anyone wishes to read them in complete detail, can be found in the brilliant work, *The Gentlemen Talk of Peace*, by William B. Ziff, a work to which I shall again refer.

I feel that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are the product of a noble and humanitarian point of view. I think it will be accepted by his friends and foes alike that this effort by the President of the United States to create a world organization of peace-loving nations is the product of a desire to see a final end to this terrible business of war. As loyal patriots in this crisis, we have followed our Commander in Chief and have given his program every opportunity to prove itself. Those of us who have been in the Republican opposition feel that on this most important of all issues there has been no other choice to make, and that the President of the United States must in this emergency face the world equipped with a single American mandate—with a united nation behind it.

When in the course of events it becomes clear, however, that the proposals espoused by the President of the United States and the American State Department are based on a totally mistaken estimate of events, and that the result will be to lessen rather than to increase the security of this country in the world of the future, then it becomes equally necessary that we demand a new course, a course in which a proper and judicious mixture of realism is intermingled with the elements of hope and of humanitarian doctrine.

That time may now have arrived. There is little use in deluding ourselves further. The set of ideas on which the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is based cannot succeed. I, for one, hope that they will succeed, and that I am wrong in this estimate, but for reasons which I shall shortly outline for the consideration of Senators, I am prepared to say now that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals not only cannot succeed, they will never be placed into effect even provisionally. This is now perfectly clear to those who can read the signs of the times which are emblazoned on the very heavens. They are as plain as a pikestaff to those with eyes

to see that we are now at what may be the greatest turning point in human history.

I should like to caution the Members of the Senate that this is no longer a matter of party view. It is no longer a matter of saving face for those who may have mistakenly espoused a program which now turns out to be a sorry illusion. It is a matter, fellow Senators, of national life or death.

This is not an academic question concerned with protocol or questions of ordinary political maneuver. This is a question which has already been written in the blood of over half a million American boys and may yet be sealed with the blood of hundreds of thousands more. It is a question which involves the destruction of our property, the wastage of our national resources, and the blasting of the very nature of the institution by which our Republic is to be governed.

In the last World War 10,000,000 men met death on the battlefield. Another 21,000,000 were wounded, in addition to other millions who were listed as missing. Wartime conditions brought about as many as 30,000,000 of other deaths among the civilian population.

The economic and physical costs of this terrific orgy of blood-letting have been estimated as high as \$338,000,000,000.

These figures are appalling enough, but they are minor in comparison to what is now occurring. Let me quote from Mr. Ziff's work:

In addition to the millions who will have been killed on the battlefields when the present struggle is terminated, untold legions will have been permanently crippled, great masses of men will emerge maimed in mind and spirit as well as in body. In military casualties the Germans alone have lost close to 5,000,000 men; the Russians, perhaps 7,500,000; the Chinese, 4,500,000; and the Japanese, somewhere around 2,000,000. The civilian deaths due to the war are upwards of 13,000,000 for China and 11,000,000 for the Soviet Union. Over 3,000,000 Jews have been exterminated by Germany in the abattoirs of Poland. The Poles must have lost among all classes of citizens as many as 4,000,000. At least 40,000,000 people of all nationalities have been torn up by their roots in Europe and perhaps as many as 30,000,000 in Asia. Uncounted millions will have been destroyed by epidemics and disabled by wounds or starvation. The figures of those afflicted with soul-sicknesses and dangerous psychoses will dwarf completely those of any other war in history.

It is pointed out that—

Without taking into account imponderable losses of economic destruction, the actual cost of the present war was probably over \$500,000,000,000 by the beginning of 1944. The United States alone was spending money at the rate of \$276,000,000 a day.

In the over-all global cost, World War No. 2 will probably run into the fabulous sum of two thousand billion dollars. Even in these days of astronomical figures this amount staggers the imagination. It is not merely a figure, Mr. President, but it represents steel and coal and oil, chemicals, and a vast accumulation of human energy and effort. It represents a wastage of what should be the inalienable possession of the peoples of the world and the heritage of our unborn children. It spells for the next gen-

eration the heavy threat of financial ruin, and promises them the economics of scarcity instead of plenty. It does not take into consideration unseen costs which are virtually measureless. How shall we replace, for example, the minerals from our soil which are now sent so freely to Europe and Asia in the shape of food products, plastics, and other materials derived from agriculture?

A study of these appalling facts should make it clear to anyone that we can no longer dally with the present emergency. We cannot dance after some new Pied Piper of Hamelin.

Impassioned zealots, no matter how noble their motives, may in this emergency prove dangerous to our Republic despite—and I say this after studied thought—despite the fact that they are situated in high places.

Within a short time the President of the United States will again meet in discussion with the Prime Minister of the British Empire and with our other ally, Marshal Stalin, head of all the Russias.

Let us cut away the obscuring cover of fine phrases which hides the real object of this meeting from view. That real object is plain to all of us—it is how to save the peace after it has been won, how to keep the United Nations still united when the war is over.

The misgivings with which the future may well be faced are pointedly brought to our attention by the situation in Europe, for the principal members of the United Nations are now following policies which have little to do with that mutual cooperation so desperately required by humanity which has already endured far more war and blood-letting than it can stand.

The meeting between the three great statesmen is not intended as a pleasant session of routine discussions. It is intended as a desperate effort to mend differences which are now all but unbridgeable.

If this meeting does not succeed, and it appears to me perfectly clear that it will not, then we must start all over again in our efforts to find a basis for a common peace.

Let us survey the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and look into the practical and realistic reasons why they fly in the face of fate.

No matter how one looks at it, the plan is for a new League of Nations—only this time a league with teeth in it. This means we must have a world set-up embracing some 66 independent states and several more, such as Iraq, which are presumably on their way toward independence.

Of these three-score and six independent states, only four are in a position which could possibly enable them to meet the problems of the present century. Great Britain, unfortunately, is not one of these four. The four are the United States of America, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the Republic of China, and the United States of Brazil. I include the latter country in the category of potential masters of the globe since it fits the circumstances by which tomorrow's power pattern is to be measured. All Brazil lacks today is people.

I remind the Senate that it was Mr. Ziff who wrote that other great realistic work which so strongly influenced our Nation at another critical moment early in the war. It was called *The Coming Battle of Germany*. His new work is, I think, of even greater importance to the American people. My attention was called to it some 5 months ago when together with others I had the privilege of seeing it in galley form. We can judge the future by the past. During these months I have stood by and waited to see the developments and have been literally amazed to note with what exactness the forecasts made by him have come true. He stated, for example, that the Atlantic Charter would not be backed up by its authors and would be quietly abandoned; that the Soviet Union would install the Lublin committee by unilateral action as the rule of Poland; that our foreign policy would force De Gaulle into the lap of the Soviet Union. He described the situation in Greece in detail and predicted with accuracy the subsequent struggle which has taken place there between the ELAS resistance forces and the British.

Almost in the words subsequently used by Prime Minister Churchill, he forecast that the United Nations would seek to compensate Poland for the territory lost to the Soviet Union by giving her East Prussia and those portions of the Reich east of the Oder and Neisse Rivers, and that the Germans would be removed from these territories by a great population exchange. He forecast the view of the War Crimes Commission set up by the United Nations, which has now finally declined to carry out the previous threats to try German leaders criminally. His statement of the Chinese situation and other situations generally have been coming true day by day with uncanny accuracy.

My attention was further called to all this by a large number of editorials which have been appearing day by day in the various newspapers throughout the country, as well as in my own section. These newspaper editorials have emphasized the things which I have noted and which I express here. Among them is an editorial from a newspaper which has won the Pulitzer prize for the excellence of its editorials, namely, the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, which not only typifies the highest standard of journalism throughout the Nation but also the way the people of our section of the country are beginning to think. In one of these editorials to which I refer the Bismarck Tribune states that unless we elect to do something now, there most certainly will be another war. It calls attention to the fact that "the nature and extent of that war is indicated with probable accuracy by William B. Ziff in his new book, *The Gentlemen Talk of Peace*."

I have noted the editorials of such representative newspapers as the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, the Jackson (Miss.) News, the Evansville (Ind.) Courier, the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal, the Pontiac (Mich.) Press, the Denver (Colo.) Post, the Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democratic Times, the Birming-

ham (Ala.) Age-Herald, and scores of other newspapers, large and small.

The opinions expressed by these publications are not the opinions of people in a few large cities, they are the views of the average run of people of the United States; they are the grass-roots reactions; they are the expressions which you and I must heed if we are to feel the actual pulse of our country and know what the common man is now really thinking.

There is an indication that the people in the grass-roots part of the country at least are becoming confused and angry at all this fumbling and juggling of our national requirements for future peace.

They know, too, the promise on which the Dumbarton Oaks plan is based, and that the small countries like Finland and scores of others are no longer living organisms in terms of the post-war future, and that they will not exist as sovereign entities maintaining their own armies, navies, currency, and diplomatic corps.

Let us take Bulgaria as a single example so that we may see this condition outlined in clear terms. How can such a state discharge the obligations of a modern manufacturing and trading power? It obviously cannot. An independent political fragment, it cannot be compared in terms of organized social strength with such a state as the vital and self-contained United States of America, or the Soviet Union. Such national independence no longer makes sense in terms of economic production, trade, or military relations.

Such states will be forever at the mercy of their larger neighbors. If they are not conquered by force of arms, they will be conquered economically, and perhaps ideologically as well. They are no longer free agents, a fact which we are compelled to consider in our estimate of the nature of the world in which we live.

For we are living in the midst not only of war, but of a tremendous international revolution which derives its force from the great changes technology has brought about. Yesterday Bulgaria could manufacture muskets, or even cannon, as well as any other state. It could attend to the wants of its citizens as easily as could the largest nation, and, if attacked, might hold up the invader for many months until help could reach it.

Today, none of this is the case. Today, in the air age, a small state cannot resist invasion for more than a matter of hours, or, at most, days. Every new invention places it at an increasing disadvantage. Does anyone dream, for example, that Bulgaria can manufacture and mass-produce airplanes, motor cars, and the other paraphernalia of a modern civilization at war or at peace, with the same capacity as the United States or of the Soviet Union?

These are the physical facts which must be considered.

England itself, in the long-term future, will no longer be a great and powerful state, but a small island nation precariously situated off the edge of Europe. If Europe is totally held by a single power, war will find England in grave

danger, cut off from her resources in Asia and the South Seas exactly as if she did not possess them. We had some warning of this in the current struggle, when Great Britain was deprived of the rubber of Malaya and the East Indies, exactly as the United States was cut off, although these territories were the physical property of Britain. In the air age such a separation from the sources of material power can prove fatal. Military men tell me that if Europe were held by a single power it would be literally possible to "Pearl Harbor" Great Britain overnight.

The era of finance power also is declining, a circumstance which will prove extremely hurtful to Britain and her future.

I am not an aviation expert. I only present the views of one of the ablest experts in this country. Mr. Ziff argues—and the future will determine whether he is right—

Our interest in the British situation would arise alone from a single fact which cannot be ignored—geographically, strategically, Great Britain is to us as the eye is to the human brain and the human nervous system. It is an extension of our primary economy. If Great Britain were to go down or to be attached to Europe, the whole chain of island defenses which now secures our hemisphere against assault, would disappear. The situation will be very clear when I point out the great ease with which we are able to attack the Germans without any real possibility of retaliation in kind against us. If Great Britain were in the possession of a hostile Europe, the shoe would be on the other foot, and it would be we who would be under attack. And then, too, there is her Dominion, Canada, with her 3,000 miles of contiguous territory.

To return to the analysis of the real situation which exists, of the four potential masters of the globe, there are only two which fit the conditions under which power can be held. One of these is the United States of America. The other is Soviet Russia. It is these two states alone which can determine whether there is to be war or peace and who will finally decide under what conditions the new world order of tomorrow is to be effected.

I do not urge that we ignore the other states of the world. Quite the contrary. I think that they and their interests must be intimately consulted, but that they cannot be consulted on the basis of the type of organization which has been projected by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. This is only because such an organization cannot exist side by side with the present unequal grouping of sovereign states, with their power politics and partisan hopes and views.

Those who are attempting to implement the Dumbarton Oaks proposals will assert that they will put an end to power politics, and an end to national partisanships, by the creation of world courts and world agreements of various kinds. They admit that none of this worked in reference to the last League, but this time they are going to add force in the shape of police power to compel law-breakers and criminal nations to keep the peace.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the creation of an international police force is a

virtual impossibility. Even if it were created, as Mr. Ziff says:

The terminal results would be nothing else than the erection of a world superstate. Whoever controlled this world police force would control the globe, irrespective of constitutions or fine legalisms which might be written into the international law. The police force itself would immediately become an object of intrigue and conspiracy, with various groups and states trying to muscle themselves into absolute control. It would form a new Praetorian Guard which would establish itself finally as the ruling caste.

This is pretty well understood today, and the diplomats no longer argue the point. What they do argue, however, is that the world itself can be divided into spheres of influence in which the major states will exercise police power.

I am utterly amazed at the naïveté and innocence which prompt such fantastic beliefs as this. If it is possible, for example, for one large state to police a number of small states, who do you think will be the final boss? How do you think the small states will vote, for example, at the councils of the League? Is it your idea that they will vote against the boss when the boss has both the military weight and the legal right to suddenly come in upon them on one pretext or another and throw the existing regime out on its ear?

Did we not see every evidence of this in the German penetration of central Europe and the Balkans? The Germans took Austria, Hungary, Rumania, and the other states of that region by diplomatic, ideological, and economic means, long before they attached them to the Axis as military appendages. Germany was the big market for its small agrarian neighbors. It supplied them with manufactured goods, and by its control of the money exchange it had the little states always waiting hat in hand, humble supplicants before their wealthy overlord.

This is a situation which, as Mr. Ziff describes it—

can hardly be altered by some international code which all parties are bound to respect. Any theory of industrial equalization or guaranteed access to markets and raw materials by all countries is compelled to assume a limitation of sovereignty on the part of each state over its own territory. This would mean the end of the state itself and a new social order. As long as the present political divisions exist there are no controls which can be instituted which would have the slightest real effect.

In addition, I should mention another fact. In competition for markets the dictatorial state possesses—ominously for us, Mr. President—immeasurable advantages over a free nation like the United States. A dictator's mere presence as a competitor is sure to involve manipulations, subsidies, and concealed discriminations completely destructive to the law of free enterprise which presumably governs the international market.

For example, let us take one of our largest corporations, such as the Standard Oil Co. In competition with a dictatorial state, the Standard Oil Co. would be as a pigmy compared to a giant. The Standard Oil Co. is, after all, in business to make money. It is not an extension of the State Department of the

United States of America. It cannot be given surreptitious orders by the American military.

But a comparable trade organization, in the hands of a dictatorial state, could easily have other objectives than those of pure trade. Its objectives need not be to make money. They might easily be political, or even military. In any competition, the dictatorial state is able to employ its own kind of bookkeeping, depending upon what the goals are, a condition which our largest corporation could hardly meet.

I tell you this because I would like to make it clear that, in any competition between ourselves and a large authoritarian state for control of the smaller nations—a competition which, incidentally, is certain to go forward, as it did before this war—in such a competition it is we who will lose, since the authoritarian state will begin the struggle with overpowering advantages.

The author states that—

Each of the major countries involved in the so-called new League of Nations will be concerned with a totally different set of national problems and goals. England cannot give up India without volcanic results in her material situation. China cannot yield on the question of industrialization of the East. The Soviets must seek outlets on warm water. The western states must gaze with frank misgivings on Soviet control of the Balkans, whether by military occupation or by the indirect domination of so-called "friendly" governments.

And he poses the inescapable fact which we have been hesitant to mention—

The instant the Soviet Union sits on the blue waters of the Adriatic it occupies an impregnable military position, outflanking all that remains of Europe. Europe then would be impossible to hold, should the Soviets determine to devour it.

Let me digress for a minute at this point. I am not anti-Soviet. I am not anti-anything. I am only pro-the United States and pro-peace. I think it would be tragic if through our ignorance of the circumstances now operating in the world, events should finally throw us willy-nilly into conflict with the Soviet Union or any of our other great international neighbors.

I, for one, wish all people in the world well. I see no reason why, if we realistically face the facts, we should not be able to create a new and workable world order in which all of us will be able to retain the institutions to which we are attached and which are part of the tradition and historic views we hold as a people.

Returning to the question of a new League of Nations, it is ridiculous to assume that there will be any free agents in the world, independent of the conditions of power by which the future will be organized. For instance, Mr. President, we now recognize the independent existence of the three Baltic countries, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Can anyone doubt that these countries will in the real sense become a portion of the Soviet Union itself, irrespective of whether they continue on the map as allegedly independent states? Who, then, will govern their foreign views and their

voting at any council of states? Who do you think governs that of Iraq, if not Great Britain? And who do you think governs that of Cuba or Nicaragua, if not the United States of America? The idea of their free and independent voting is a fiction which can only in the end lead to the gravest trouble.

It is proposed that there be five great states which will rule the world and sit in the central council of the League, the camouflaged power body which is to determine how events are finally to shape themselves. One of these is the United States; another is Soviet Russia. A third is the Republic of France. France has been ruined and desperately hurt by this war, and apparently is well within the Russian sphere of influence. No ruler in France today can afford to ignore the fact that a single dominant power is emerging on the European Continent, and that the major political party of the French State is now the Communist Party.

Another state is China. The condition of China again becomes one of peculiar and particular interest to us. Let us again face the realities. China and Britain must be at loggerheads in the world of the future. China is a state of approximately 500,000,000 people. The demographers, or students of population increase, tell us that by 1970 China may have a population of 800,000,000, granted that it is allowed to industrialize and to introduce modern methods of sanitation and feeding. An industrialized China of these dimensions, cooped up in narrow coastal areas, will look hungrily toward the south, where are located the great rice-bearing fields inhabited by a kindred people and now in the possession of western nations, principally the British. When 8,000,000 people die of starvation alone in a single year on the Yellow River, we can be certain that Chinese policy will gravitate inexorably toward the rice-bearing areas of Burma, Indochina, and Thailand. The Chinese also will look hungrily toward the islands of the East Indies—empty, rich paradises with immense stores of raw materials, well capable of absorbing perhaps several hundred million settlers. In the air age, these lands can no longer be protected by a far-away island citadel.

If we do not understand in advance the realities of the power forms of tomorrow, it may be deemed certain that the people of many other states do. We have never had to compete in terms of power politics in the past while others have. The net result is what we have seen in Europe, where the British and the Russians are quietly at each others' throats in an effort to enforce their conception of the future upon the populations of strategically situated European and Asiatic countries.

I believe it is perfectly plain that the British, in their endeavor to install antiquated machinery of government in the shape of monarchial regimes throughout Europe, are not going to succeed. They will fail. The power of the present revolutionary situation in Europe is certain to defeat them. The small, modern state is no longer economically sound.

The British—and ourselves, if we support British policy—will find themselves guilty of the greatest of all political crimes, namely, failure. To the emaciated people of Europe, again to quote Mr. Ziff, "racked in body, sick of the world they live in, humiliated by the very conditions of existence, the declarations of our diplomatic leaders will seem empty and unattractive."

At the best, Europeans will be badly confused as to our purposes and our capacity to wield power. We may even find ourselves in league with the remnants of the old reactionary regimes against the underground groups, a result which would mean a major tragedy to our policy and bankruptcy to American diplomacy.

This type of intervention cannot fail to throw Europe directly into the hands of the extreme radical elements, as was the case when the western nations so mistakenly intervened in Russia after the last war in an effort to crush the rising Communist state. They succeeded only in hardening resistance, and in making certain the success of the Communist state.

Under the Dumbarton Oaks scheme, as it is now envisaged, the struggle for control must go forward. It is inevitable, as it is also, in my judgment, inevitable that we would lose it.

Perhaps the greatest weakness of Dumbarton Oaks is the reliance upon force and power to keep alive an antiquated world. When I say an antiquated world, I mean a world whose political forms have become outmoded, a world of small, archaic states no longer able to fulfill the functions of government, of trade, of manufacture, and defense in relation to their citizens. The result of this hodge-podge can be only a continuation of the old struggle for control, this time under different auspices and under cover of a new League of Nations. The smaller state cannot be an aggressor any more, and the larger state will have been given the moral authority to dominate and conquer its neighbors.

Every American must realize that the grave danger, in or outside of Dumbarton Oaks, with its unrealistic attitude toward the world, is that whoever controls the Eurasian land mass is the potential master of the globe. In short, let us put it in this way: If a single power is able to control Europe, that single power may also be able to control Asia. It certainly will control Africa. It will then have in its possession more than nine-tenths of the population of the world, and a similar proportion of the world's physical resources. Look at the world as a whole, and it will be seen that under those circumstances the United States would be the center of what the military men call a double-envelopment movement. It would virtually be surrounded on all sides. Instead of the great oceans protecting us, we would find Asia only 56 miles away from the northernmost tip of North America. The great hump of Brazil would be nearer to Old World Africa than to the United States.

Those are physical circumstances which we cannot omit examining. The United States is the richest country, the

greatest prize in the world for any future conqueror. It therefore is the one with the most to lose. It must consider most carefully its relationship to the future in terms of the new facts which have arisen. Either we are going to be able to make a world organization which will work, or we are going to be forced to face the future in such terms as to prevent the creation in the world of any single power overwhelmingly larger than we, or capable of greater potential military and economic strength than our own. To do less than this would be to court disaster.

In chapter after chapter, Mr. Ziff's book traces the ineffectuality of peace treaties in the past. At no time in history have any of the treaties and arrangements which have been made to keep the peace lasted longer than the expediencies of the nations involved. No matter what agreements were arrived at, they were always vacated by the national need or by the arrival of some new political factor or ruler. I challenge anyone to show a single arrangement which, though solemnly entered into, has been lasting. National morality in the long run has always been determined by the national need. One has only to look at the way in which we entered Iran. I do not criticize it. I approve. Similarly, we occupied Iceland and Greenland though they were the properties of a sovereign who was friendly to us. His country was occupied by Nazi armies. I refer, of course, to good King Christian of Denmark.

Despite the fine phrases which have been uttered in reference to Dumbarton Oaks, no concert of powers in history has started out with poorer prospects than this one. Everyone came together and mouthed fine legalisms, but when put to the first test of strength, Dumbarton Oaks shows itself even more flimsy than the previous concert of Europe, which originated in Berlin; or its successor, the late and unlamented League of Nations.

We find the Soviet Union, for example, asserting its willingness to agree to an arrangement, but its unwillingness to allow itself to be policed in case it should be adjudged in the wrong. This, of course, would make a complete farce of any proceeding. We note the Soviet Union refusing to attend the important aviation conference in Chicago on the plea that one of the attending powers, the Swiss Republic, was in reality Fascist. At the same conference we find Great Britain insisting on the creation of international cartels, which, in effect, would freeze the carrying trade of the world. The United States, to its credit, refused to agree, which, of course, meant no agreement whatsoever.

At every turn in the game we see exactly the same result—no agreement. We have noted the Soviet Union and Great Britain struggling with each other over the potential spoils in Europe, a struggle, which as I have stated, is certain to end in British discomfiture. The supporting factors which lend themselves to victory in this struggle are no longer in British control.

It is almost hopeless to believe that we are going to be able to make a Dumbarton Oaks world. Such a league would

be based on the most erroneous of all assumptions, that it is going to be possible to create a practical league of nations independent of the terms of the peace conference itself.

This separation from the stream of power facts which dominate the physical affairs of the world can only confine the deliberations within a vacuum and condemn them to sterility. The discussions can be little more than diplomatic shadow boxing and reflect only the exigencies of underlying power politics.

It is dangerous to expect that one can ignore the real factors which are operating in the world, and yet still achieve a successful peace. It is useless to believe, for example, that the Soviet Union can be excluded from warm water ports on all the big oceans by some type of arrangement or agreement, or that Russia will fail to take advantage of its present opportunities to make the Soviet State secure in all directions—in short, to make its position in all respects an invulnerable one. One can hardly blame the Soviet Union for this. Nor can we expect that the shrewd, practical-minded leaders of the Soviet will recede from this position for the sake of the legal Dumbarton Oaks obscurities. In my opinion, it is a certainty that the Soviet Union wants the Dardanelles and intends to have them. This may constitute a problem of the first magnitude which will have to be solved in some way. It is simply purblind for us to ignore this very real element behind the aspirations of the U. S. S. R.

In the same breath it must be stated that Great Britain will not allow its entire physical position to crumble without some proper alternative being offered it. If the imperial world is to collapse, Britain will be a poor nation and perhaps militarily weak as well, unless some method can be found to refit it into a reorganized world. Until such a method is forthcoming, it is certain that the British people, led by their able Prime Minister, will bend every possible effort to make their own position secure, even if it means the use of the terrifying expedients now to be observed in Greece, Italy, and elsewhere.

The same condition goes for China, and for all the other elements which go to make up the world economy. These are the real, the physical elements which exist, and Mr. President, I warn that they can be ignored only at our own peril.

If there is to be a world league which is to keep the peace and to keep the nations of the earth from each other's throats, the time to create it is now. Decisions are being made now by the unilateral action of the powers. The time for palaver is past. If we and the other nations believe in an international league which in some fashion is to keep the peace, the agreements must be made at once. If this cannot be achieved, the Dumbarton Oaks plan must be junked as a diplomatic blunder, and we must reorient our thinking all over again.

We might start by reasoning that though we have already won one world war and undoubtedly will win this one, a third such victory would well-nigh ruin us.

The men who worked at Dumbarton Oaks are unquestionably skilled in diplomacy. They are unquestionably, as is the President of the United States, sincere. So, I believe, are leaders and peace delegates of all of the nations. I think they and all the people are desperately sick of these recurring disasters and would like to see a final end to them. There is, in my judgment, a way by which this can be done. The general outlines to that way have been pointed up briefly in this discussion and in detail by Mr. Ziff.

In my opinion and in the opinion of others in this Congress who have yet to make themselves heard, some such proposal as suggested, represents an alternative to pure isolationism to those who oppose Dumbarton Oaks. If the Dumbarton Oaks plan cannot work, to them pure isolationism is no more satisfactory and will in the end they feel see us disastrously hurt. The great fault with Dumbarton Oaks is the great fault of Versailles.

Without exception the authors of these plans seek the benefits of a peaceful world, but are unwilling to create the conditions which would guarantee it. Their poor, blind caution and conventional old-line diplomacy suffer from that gravest of faults: It is unrealistic. Realism now demands that an end be put to the grab-bag of small states, and that the world be reorganized along lines of the sound, modern economy.

The small state today is merely a battleground in which the bigger states can compete. It serves no useful purpose. A modern, living state must have the capacity to fulfill all functions in reference to its citizens. It must be able to defend them and to provide the raw materials required in industry as well as the electric power and other sources of industrial strength. This means it must stretch over a wide area, reaching into tropic, semitropic, and temperate climes. It must have great space like the Soviet Union so that if it is attacked, it can fall back. It must possess decentralized sources of manufacture, as did the Russians. If the Russian industrial region had ended at the Leningrad-Moscow-Stalingrad line, Russia would today be a vassal of the German Empire.

If the world could be consolidated into a number of regions, each of comparatively equal size, the impulse to war would largely be at an end. None of these regions would be so small as to make attack attractive. Each would possess the resources and the internal market which would make them largely self-sufficient and able to get along with each other.

The world breaks down naturally into such great regional areas, which Mr. Ziff refers to as "power aggregates."

War between them would not be inviting—

He points out—

and would logically be resorted to only under the most extreme provocation. The differences of these regional units with each other could be resolved by simple agreement since they would no longer be complicated by the fears, suspicions, and temptations provided in the present political splintering of the world.

Thus we would settle at their source all the dangerous questions which unite to create international instability, derangement, dislocation, and disorder. We would create a system of regionalism which would be sane, rational, and genuinely globalist in character.

It is of the gravest importance to us that, whether the world can be so constituted or not, some such arrangement be made in reference to the entire west. By the west I mean North and South America, and the total group of islands which control the approaches to our shores. This would involve a consolidation of North and South America, and experts say, although as a layman I only present their views, and do not myself so urge, the British Isles together with the great bulk of the islands of the Pacific are included. Here, they say, would be at once an impregnable military situation, which could be assaulted from no side without the gravest risk on the part of the attacker. Here would be something almost equally as important—an extension of our frontiers into new vistas, by which our economic system could find a new West for exploitation and development. The tremendous surplus of manufacturing instruments and plants which will exist in America after the war could then be usable in the development of these huge territories. They would not be separate from each other, but would possess a common government, a common army, a common currency, and a common and widely expanded prosperity. Here is a plan worthy of the noble imagination of Americans, interested in a prosperous and safe future.

As an American Senator I feel it is nothing more nor less than my duty to present the plan, as distinguished from the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, to my fellow Senators upon this floor.

In a day of rocket guns which can spout deadly projectiles 50 miles into the air and bombard our cities across entire oceans, or of massive attacks which military men assure me can be directed against us over the north polar routes or across the narrow gap of water separating Africa from the hump of Brazil, it is clear there will be no security for any of us in this hemisphere unless there is a true hemispheric unity. What is there so frightening about this noble and entirely reasonable proposal? It offers to all the states and all the persons involved tremendous self-contained markets, direct access to all raw materials required by our humungous factories, a higher standard of living to all concerned, and the ultimate in cooperative friendship. Above all, it allows for a real security plan which would effectively prevent anyone from attacking the states of this hemisphere, a plan based upon the true long-term mutuality of outlook which should distinguish the west in its view toward the future.

In my judgment and that also, I believe, of other Members of Congress who have yet to make themselves heard, this plan constitutes the only possible alternative to the failure of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

In his own words, Mr. Ziff's proposals "can lay no claim to perfection. Never-

theless it would mean the taking of a tremendous stride forward on the part of the human race in terms of worldwide social organization and would appear to remove the largest part of the instigation to international crime, by adjusting the world's political divisions to its economic frontiers. The major claim to be made for this design is that it fits in with the premises of the workaday world in a technical age. It presents no obstacle to the efficient operation of the earth's machinery or the use of its resources. Man would be able to take his breath for a new plunge forward into eternal progression."

Today, our present foreign policy seems destined to failure, yet many of the gentlemen who belong to my party have elected to bind themselves to this policy and to this failure.

I do not protest because this is bad party policy alone. I do so because it is also bad Americanism. It is unrealistic, unsound, and uneconomic. It destroys the last vestige of independent thinking in this country, and deprives us of the benefit of that great institution which exists even in monarchial England, where it is referred to as "His Majesty's loyal opposition."

The torch has now been thrown to the younger men of Congress, to men who dare think outside the conventional grooves which the ruling political powers have graven for them.

Those who have held so strongly for an international league propound it as the sole alternative to isolationism. This is a sorry untruth which can only confuse the American people as to the real situation and the real issues.

The proper remedy does not lie in any of these extremes. It lies in an intelligently directed regionalism by which the political organization of the world can be brought into line with economic and social realities.

When Mr. Roosevelt returns from his historic meeting with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin, he must have in his hands a commitment from them by which the issues facing the world can be determined now. We expect him to bring back the bacon if there is anything at all to the mission on which he leaves and the premises on which it is based. He must return to us with more than fair promises and glittering words, for the hour is dangerously late. Either he must possess a mandate to which the other great states have subscribed, and an assurance which can be placed into effect now, or we shall have found ourselves confounded by another Versailles, or perhaps even another Munich. The questions of Poland, Greece, Iran, and all the other dangerous questions now confronting the world, must have some practical resolution in terms of agreement now. We must know now what is intended in reference to the future of Germany or we shall find ourselves at each other's throats finally, debating ideological questions and questions of self-interest, when that piratical state shall come to an end and be occupied by the troops of the United Nations.

If the discussions to be held between the three great leaders of the United Nations are again to result without decision,

if they turn out to be only a mirage of words, then we must resolutely turn our backs on this fantasy of world leagues and world courts. We must find another and more realistic course by which the ultimate security of our hemisphere will be guarded. If necessary, we must utilize to the full the bargaining power granted us by our present military superiority and economic position.

It is futile to turn to the international league soothsayers. Their schemes have been blasted to kingdom come by the actions of the nations themselves, as well as by the inevitable logic of events. We see all of the states reaching out to solidify their own power, with very little reference to the fine pledges made at Dumbarton Oaks.

We note the Russians taking issue with Kent Cooper of the Associated Press, as to what constitutes freedom of the press and alleging that theirs is infinitely superior to ours. In Yugoslavia Britain it is said to have delayed shipment of relief supplies gathered in the United States, an act which is charged with political implications. We note the British, accused of political terrorism in Palestine, acting against the unfortunate Jews, completely oblivious to the opinions of the Mandates Commission of the all but defunct League of Nations, which charged them with turning the mandate upside down. We see Britain acting with a high hand in India and endeavoring to turn the clock back in the various states of western Europe by imposing the rule of monarchial regimes.

In Poland, the Russians are accused of having liquidated the liberal elements, and of destroying those very patriots who fought in the underground for our side against the Germans.

Mr. President, this morning I picked up yesterday's Washington Star, and what did I find? I found an article dealing with Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, sister of the Indian nationalist leader Nehru, who will speak in Washington tonight. What does she say about Dumbarton Oaks? She says:

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals for world security simply repeat old talk about disarmament and sanctions.

We feel capable of solving our own problems and that we have a right to do it without interference. The complete unanimity demanded by Viceroy Wavell and Prime Minister Churchill as a condition for Indian independence could only be achieved in a dictatorship.

So says the sister of the greatest leader in India next to Gandhi.

I have before me a newspaper article headlined London, January 25, as follows:

Former War Minister Leslie Hore-Belisha said today the Atlantic Charter and Dumbarton Oaks proposals were already "becoming obscured."

We note Lord Woolton, Minister of Reconstruction, urging Britain to undertake a trade war on a big scale and advising his country that they should seek overseas trade "rather than concentrate on filling needs at home." France declares she will never accept foreign inter-

ference or any jurisdiction by a world security organization over her colonies.

Mr. President, that is what France thinks of Dumbarton Oaks. The assurances written in the Atlantic Charter have been disavowed by their very authors under circumstances so tragic as to make all commitments, pledges, and treaties appear worthless.

I have mentioned Britain, Russia, and France, but I must exclude no nation. They are all in the same unhappy position of self-seeking, of attempting to guard their own boundaries and their own future prosperity and security without reference to what may happen to the others.

Must I remind the Senate that these are not events which occurred previous to the Dumbarton Oaks pledges? These are events which have followed Dumbarton Oaks and they are being placed into effect by the cannon and airplanes of our allies and by the inexorable forces of events which are acting without us while our statesmen nobly tilt with the windmills of an international league.

Is it not time that there is inserted in the deliberations of American statesmen a little common sense and a little proper regard for the physical future of Americans? Is it not time that the lives and property of Americans be given some thought in place of this vague set of international pipe-dreams which will be adjudged by history no less silly and no less futile than those which so ingloriously failed when the late and unlamented League of Nations collapsed of its own dead weight?

If there is to be justice, let there be justice for American mothers, for the American taxpayer, and for the American dead whose bodies now rot in foreign soil clear around the globe. If there is to be justice, there must be justice toward all, not only to the struggling states of Europe and Asia but to the dead and wounded, the orphaned, and to the rest of us who now stagger beneath the burden of the most colossal war debt in the history of mankind. If there is to be justice, Mr. President, let there be justice to the millions of unborn, who of right deserve protection against a recurrence of this terrible black night of destructive evil.

Before God, and in the high name of justice, let us determine that this disaster shall not recur again.

Are we to wait forever in this sad valley of delusion called Dumbarton Oaks—wait for still further conferences from which nothing can result; wait for the signing of still more documents, which under analysis will turn out to be as meaningless as those which preceded them? Must our minds remain paralyzed while this is taking place?

We cannot crucify the hopes of mankind upon a cross of phony international legalisms. We cannot continue to remain as we are today, our hands tied, our minds frozen in the psychology of do-nothingism. Everywhere decisions vital to our continued existence are being taken. The decisions by which the post-war world is being formed are being made now. The face of the future world is being hammered into shape by events

and circumstances which we pretend do not exist. And we sit with our hands in the sands of international dope dreams.

Let us put an end to these fantastic dreams of the millennium—dreams which fly into the face of reality. Let us endeavor, in cooperation with our allies, to effect a common-sense reorganization of the globe. In short, let us attempt to place in effect those real measures and opportunities which are open to us and within our power to implement.

Now is the time to act if humankind is to be saved and to be spared another and even more terrifying disaster whose coming is even now discernible.

If in this crisis our eyes are to be blinded by such mirages as those exemplified by Dumbarton Oaks, we shall allow the opportunities for sane and international organization to pass us by. It is we in the Senate who shall have to answer to history for an omission which will be regarded as a crime against the American people, their future, and the future well-being of all mankind.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I regret that more Senators were not in the Chamber to hear the address of the Senator from North Dakota. I do not mean to imply that I agree with him in all his conclusions; but he delivered a thought-provoking and interesting address, and I am glad that I was present to hear it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. It is always a pleasure to hear the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I am glad that he is our neighbor.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR WARTIME CRIMES

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I shall not consume much time with the few remarks which I have to make. With the present attendance in the Chamber, I might well ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD without reading, but I shall be as brief as possible.

In the past several weeks American thinking has been changed by startling and rude events. Almost overnight the people of the United States have been moved from a sense of extreme optimism to one of sober concern by announcements of grave conditions on the war front, on the diplomatic front, and at home.

There was the sudden turn on the battlefields of Europe. Allied leaders—both civil and military—altered their sights to a "long bitter road ahead." The crises and strife in Greece, Poland, Italy, and other liberated countries are serious threats to Allied unity. Disturbing diplomatic controversies have come into the open, and the consequent outbursts of public opinion have severely strained harmony and cooperation.

At home the picture is equally disturbing. Widespread shortages—in war materials, labor, food supplies, and other civilian goods—are revealed by administration officials. The slump in war production brought a sharp crack-down on manpower and the curtailment of civilian production. Agitation is growing for a labor draft and more stringent controls over industrial mobilization. Re-

conversion plans are tossed aside as industry buckles down to military demand. Dwindling stocks of food—"at the lowest point since the war began," according to O. P. A.—led to cancellation of stamps and increased rationing. On every side sober news is reminding the American people "there are still two wars to be won."

Compare this picture with the general climate of opinion generated throughout the country during the summer and late fall. Those were the days when optimism and confidence flew high. Allied armies were winning tremendous victories on every front—there was talk from high quarters of a speedy victory. Winnie and Joe and Frank were the best of friends, with no visible difference to mar the smooth course of their countries' relations. There were comparatively no problems of liberated countries.

At home American labor and industry were highly praised, as they should be, for their superhuman contribution to war production. Civilian restrictions were being eased; rationing was lifted from many products; and the food situation was pictured as growing increasingly better. Plans for reconversion were rapidly going forward—with Government leading the field. War agencies held out hopes of early relaxation of controls. It was an atmosphere of comparative quietude. We almost forgot there was a war.

The momentum of this pleasant state of affairs carried just a little beyond November. Then the sharp reversal set in, which has left our people confused and bewildered. Unable to understand the turn of events, they want to know what happened. What went wrong with the victory that was upon us? What about the plans for reconversion, the stocks of food, war, and civilian materials that were on hand?

The situation calls for a responsible explanation, but before we consider those that have been offered by certain officials of the Government, let us document the conditions which have turned the rosy landscape of last summer into the dark winter now enveloping the situation at home and abroad.

Consider for a moment the public opinion generated from May to November with regard to the home front.

The manpower situation was viewed by officials, with minor exceptions, as satisfactory. Here are a few of the statements:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], in nominating Roosevelt at the July Democratic Convention, said:

Our industry, our labor, our agriculture, our finance, our manpower * * * have all been fused into an irresistible stream whose momentum will drive the war lords of the Nazis and Nipponese back.

President Roosevelt in a speech to the New York State A. F. of L. convention, on August 22, 1944, said:

You deserve and have the gratitude of the American people for the patriotic and outstanding production that you have given to our Army, Navy, and our Merchant Marine which are now winning the war of liberation—a record in production unequalled in the history of this or any other country.

Former Senator TRUMAN, in speaking to the A. F. of L., on September 4, said:

Labor has made a magnificent contribution to the war effort.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] stated on October 3:

He [Roosevelt] has led in organizing our resources for total war—so that we have enough men on the fighting fronts and enough war production to back them up.

True, Army and Navy officials, as well as certain production leaders, in August reported lags, bottlenecks in war production, and labor shortages.

But according to official Washington all was well.

On August 23, 1944, Donald Nelson, testifying before the Truman committee, said that all critical munitions programs, with minor exceptions, were being met, and that war industry could not use more than 100,000 of the 700,000 workers released from munitions production.

Two months later, on October 27, 1944, the President said in a speech at Philadelphia:

Never before in history have the soldiers and sailors of any nation gone into battle so thoroughly supported as the American soldiers and sailors fighting today in Europe, Asia, and the Pacific.

During the summer attention was focused on reconversion and the speedy return to peacetime production.

As early as May, Maury Maverick, head of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, was urging priorities to small businesses to increase production of civilian items and thus cushion the ultimate transfer from war to peace production.

On June 18, Donald Nelson, of W. P. B., gave industry the signal to move in the direction of conversion to peacetime production by releasing aluminum and certain surpluses to manufacturers. He said that it is essential to prepare now for the return to civilian production.

In August, W. P. B. lifted its ban on the making of hundreds of items directly beneficial to civilian consumers. Included in the list were vacuum cleaners, ranges, washtubs, egg beaters, lawn mowers, and sewing machines.

On September 7, 1944, Mr. James Byrnes filed a report on reconversion providing for a 40 percent cut in war production on VE-day. It promised a relaxation of controls to permit manufacturers a freedom in planning for the resumption of civilian production and a speedy return to civilian production.

October 12 brought the announcement by W. P. B. that it planned to ease the curb on farm machinery production.

A visit was paid by Edward J. Kaiser on October 19 to the White House, where he presented an immediate specific pattern for reconversion, which he said he and other manufacturers could carry into operation right away. According to Mr. Kaiser, the President was tremendously impressed, and official Washington spoke this wise:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in July:

Already we are preparing for the return of our national economy to the practices and conditions of peace.

Candidate Roosevelt on September 23, 1944:

We are even now organizing the logistics of the peace just as Marshall, King, Arnold are organizing the logistics of this war.

Early in the spring O. P. A. provided ration-book holders a breathing spell. Many point values were reduced and some foods were removed completely from the list. In September larger amounts of food—some point-free—were placed at the disposal of housewives.

Marvin Jones, of the War Food Administration, in a letter to Chester Bowles, of O. P. A., said:

It is our view that there are ample and prospective supplies of these products to justify removing them from the ration list.

This was on August 31, 1944.

War Mobilizer Byrnes said of this action:

The release of the rationing restrictions on these foods has been made possible by the magnificent production job done by our farmers and by the processors of food. The War Food Administration, under the able direction of Marvin Jones, is to be congratulated on its accomplishments. The action now announced is in accord with the policy of Government to lift wartime restrictions as quickly as possible. When the supply of other foods make possible their removal from the ration list they will be promptly removed.

In harmony with the rosy picture at home, all was calm and confident on the war and diplomatic fronts during the summer. Civil as well as military leaders were of the opinion that the Germans were tottering and practically knocked out. Campaign speeches dripped with this optimism.

Former Senator TRUMAN declared on August 31, 1944:

Victory is now in sight.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] joined in the chorus on October 3, 1944, with:

Now that Germany is nearly smashed *

The President said on October 27, 1944:

The war in Europe has reached the final, decisive phase.

The problems of international peace were to be solved easily and smoothly by the personal friendship of three men, by the Atlantic Charter, and the Four Freedoms.

Former Senator TRUMAN said on August 31, 1944:

Under his (Roosevelt's) leadership we have met one crisis after another, in peace and war. Our President has worked with these men during these trying years. He talks their language—the language of nations. He knows the reasons which govern their decisions. At no time in our history has a President possessed such knowledge of foreign leaders and their problems. None has ever so completely won their confidence and admiration.

Mr. Roosevelt said on October 22, 1944:

We have achieved a very practical expression of a common purpose on the part of four great nations, who are now united to wage this war, that they will embark together after the war on a greater and more difficult enterprise—that of waging the peace—com-

mitted to trust in each other, work together as we have done so closely, so harmoniously and effectively in the fighting of the war and, at the same time, in the building of the peace.

James F. Byrnes said on October 30, 1944:

The four leaders have achieved a unity that was considered impossible in the last war, and informed persons know their success has been due in great measure to the patience, tact, and balanced judgment of the President.

Mr. Roosevelt said on November 2, 1944:

I have spent many fruitful hours talking with men from the more remote nations *** all of them are part and parcel of the great family of nations. It is only through an understanding acquired by years of consultation that one can get a viewpoint of their problems and their innate yearning for freedom.

All was well on the diplomatic front. War nerves had been quieted. Harmony united the Big Three. Power politics was nowhere to be seen. The future was bright and glorious.

And yet, underlying that situation, as with the manpower, production, and food situations at home, there were some ugly facts, as we now know, but the comforting blanket of optimism and tranquillity had been smoothly drawn over them.

Nothing was allowed to mar this picture at home and abroad until after November. Then rapidly and progressively the veneer was torn away and the facts began to show up.

Early in December W. P. B. Chairman J. A. Krug told of serious shortages in critical materials. Speaking at a meeting of the N. A. M., he said, "40 percent of our war production is lagging," and he called upon industry to man the plants to the fullest. Mr. Krug, James Forrestal, Robert Patterson, and Paul McNutt called for more labor for war production by the application of employment ceilings and priority controls, with no civilian production if it would require labor needed for the war program.

On January 1, 1945, James F. Byrnes vigorously demanded a tightening of selective service, cancellation of priority and allocation rights for nonwar plants, suspension of racing, compulsory service for IV-F's, and strengthening of W. L. B. enforcement powers. He said:

We must direct our efforts to channeling this released manpower into critical war programs and industries needed to support them.

All along the line the post-election outlook on the production front quickly lost its previous note of confidence. In December General Somervell told of critical shortages, and gave little hope of relaxation to industry, even upon the fall of Germany.

On December 16, W. P. B. froze civilian-goods production at current levels, and blocked its own earlier plans for expansion of civilian production in 1945. All reconversion plans were stopped cold.

On January 18, 1945, W. P. B. Chairman Krug announced that industrial alcohol and aluminum were back on the crucial list and that sheet aluminum production was 50,000,000 pounds below

requirements. Inventories of metals are the lowest since 1942.

Philip Wilson, W. P. B. vice chairman for metals and minerals, said that the Army Air Forces' plan to furlough enlisted men to work in aluminum mills would help fill the need for 5,000 additional workers.

And so production, which had reached miracle proportions in the summer and was to be geared to reconversion, was tightened all along the line.

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

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. One of the great aluminum mills in my State of Oregon was closed down because of what was said to be an overproduction of aluminum. However, a considerable amount of the taxpayers' money was spent in building a great aluminum plant in Canada. Am I to understand that the Senator has evidence that there is now a shortage of aluminum?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have been quoting from Mr. Krug, who announced that aluminum and alcohol had been returned to the crucial list. I thank the Senator for his valuable contribution.

The food situation grew suddenly darker in December. Controls were clamped back on and rationing tightened. According to Price Administrator Bowles, "supplies of commercially canned fruit have been short for several months" and civilian supplies are "at the lowest point since the war began." Mr. Bowles now ruefully admits that there was an error in judgment.

In his message to the Congress, on January 6, 1945, the President called for "the total mobilization of all our human resources for the prosecution of the war."

Selective service now demands more recruits. The President also said:

The Selective Service Act should be amended to provide for the induction of nurses into the armed forces. The need is too pressing to await the outcome of further efforts at recruiting.

It has since developed that the shortage of nurses was known all summer.

The forces that seemed to lay calm and unperturbed on the diplomatic scene through the summer months have since exploded with disruptive fury. The Atlantic Charter was only scribbled notes. It now develops that the Big Three have not seen eye to eye for many months with respect to a great number of extremely crucial situations.

The clashes between British, Russian, and American foreign policies were touched off by the situation in Italy, when Britain virtually vetoed Count Sforza as Italian Foreign Minister. Then came unrest in Belgium, which was put down by British soldiers. The political turmoil in Greece was like a stick of dynamite; one touch and allied harmony was badly shattered. The upheavals in Poland have driven sharp wedges into international peace. Each one of those crises indicates that grave differences exist between the major powers on the basis of future international peace.

Forgetful perhaps of last summer's rosy outlook and harmony between the Big Three, President Roosevelt said in his message of January 6, 1945:

Perfectionism may obstruct the paths to international peace * * * the statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter does not provide rules of easy application to each and every one of this war-torn world's tangled situations.

War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes said on January 1, 1945:

We have already made one too early start toward reconversion. During the spring and summer a wave of optimism swept the United States and our allies. We had to undo what had been done on reconversion.

This, then, is the story as explained by official sources: One, that an unforeseen resurgence of the Nazi war machine is the cause of our present difficulties; and, two, a charge that the American people were responsible for a premature optimism—a relaxation and let-down in the war effort. By this explanation it is sought to fasten our current troubles on two conditions seemingly outside official control, but the explanation does not explain. There are too many questions unanswered, and there is still an accounting to be made.

If optimism—false and ill-based as it is said to be by many high officials—brought about the present state of affairs, there must have been something radically wrong last summer. Optimism does not spring forth native from the soil. It is a quality which responds most to cultivation. The important question is, Was the optimism of last summer and fall affirmatively fostered; and if so, by whom?

Our people have been ready at all times to follow honest and courageous leadership. They know well that a war must be won; and they need only to be told plainly what is required of them. But how can our people be otherwise than confused when the Government itself gives them a mixture of unfounded optimism, conflicting statements, and concealment of important and bitter facts within the sugar-coated pill? How can our people know what is required of them when their Government blows hot and then cold?

First, we were led to believe by the declarations of high Government authority that the war was almost over, and barely 2 months later we are being grimly reminded that there are two wars to be won. Industry was given the go-ahead on plans for peacetime reconversion, and when it was halfway through the intersection the red light flashed it to a halt. At one moment labor is praised to the heavens for the superb job which workers have done, only shortly thereafter to be reprimanded for slacking on the job. Amid assurances of ample supplies, rationing restrictions are removed from consumer goods, but barely do we adjust ourselves to point-free shopping when new and more drastic controls are imposed.

Is this change in the fortunes of war the real cause for the crack-downs now sought to be imposed?

The answer to that question is a simple one. Reverses are always to be expected in war. And when they come they compel greater efforts behind the battle lines and on the home front. But can we use the Nazi break-through in December as an excuse for the present crack-downs? On the contrary, it is quite possible to say that the military reverses in December were aggravated by the failure last summer to do those things which would have strengthened the military later in its hour of need.

The Administration cannot escape the consequences of its own actions. It cannot squirm out of the stubborn logic of events. Last summer the administration took credit for the military victories as a brilliant testimonial to the Commander in Chief. It was then that they boasted of abundant supplies of men and equipment. It was then that they spoke of production miracles. Administration spokesmen breathed the heavy optimism that Germany was finished, and the war just about over. Administration agencies fostered the talk of reconversion. The administration cultivated the optimism.

How strange it is, too, that the political confusion and controversy in Europe did not come out into the open until after November? The Greek situation had been rumbling beneath the surface for months, but no real information about it was permitted to jar the notes of harmony piped to us before November.

A similar controversy enveloped the Polish situation. The deadlock between British-supported Poles in London and Soviet-inspired Poles in Lublin existed all summer—in fact, ever since the Russians had stopped before Warsaw, sacrificing the Polish underground forces in that city.

In Italy conditions had been openly growing worse for months, but this, too, remained in the shadows of hushed diplomacy.

Why were production, manpower, and rationing controls relaxed from May to November? The people were not responsible for the wave of optimism—they were deceived by it and they are now the victims of it.

On January 1, 1945, in expiation, Mr. Byrnes declared that glowing prophecies will no longer be heard until they are sound. The administration made those prophecies—and Mr. Byrnes' statement is the clearest and most damaging admission that the country was misled by false prophecies.

If the manpower situation is now critical, the administration's tactics are responsible. Let me show by a simple piece of evidence how true this is. In a sincere and revealing letter to former Senator TRUMAN, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1945, on page 149, the vice president of the Beech Aircraft Corporation, which has an excellent production and labor record, declared:

During the months of October and the early part of November we experienced great difficulty in retaining our working force at a constant level. * * * We consider that this was an entirely natural development which was caused directly by the overoptimistic statements made by many of the most

prominent individuals in positions of high authority among the Allied Nations, with regard to early termination of the European War. The public press at that time carried almost nothing but statements about post-war reconversion, cancelation of contracts, termination, cut-backs, and post-war planning. The Government officially acted through its various agencies to continually warn the manufacturer of these factors and to prepare him for these anticipated events.

It is no wonder that this strong emphasis * * * should have produced the result which it did produce, that of inducing people to leave war industries to seek peacetime jobs. The reaction was entirely normal for people with American traditions of self-reliance.

Similar evidence can be produced to show that the production let-down and the present gravity of the food and supply situation stem from the same tactics.

Here, then, is the pattern. From May to November we have glowing accounts of military victories, predictions of early peace, eulogies of harmony and unity between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, paeans of praise for the Commander in Chief, and a love feast over production miracles, manpower surpluses, and foods too plentiful for rationing.

But after November everything is wrong. This pattern does not happen by chance. It is too obvious to require an explanation. Either failure in planning or gross ignorance of conditions by those who should know better, are alone to blame. Production, manpower and food shortages do not appear overnight. When they come—as they did in December—they reflect conditions of 6 months earlier.

And now to retrieve the consequences of such mismanagement, the controls are being tightened, as though manufacturers, workers, farmers, the boys whose physical defects kept them out of the armed forces, and all the rest of us, were the ones responsible for the let down.

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank those of my Republican colleagues who are present for being so patient as to remain until this late hour to listen to a few remarks I shall make this afternoon on a matter which I believe to be of extreme importance to the people of the United States. I also wish to thank the Acting Majority Leader for his patience and indulgence in waiting to this late hour.

Mr. President, within a few short weeks there will be held in the city of Mexico a very important continental conference, at which there will be present representatives of the various nations of the Western Hemisphere, to discuss matters which, in my opinion, will be of more importance to the United States than even the matters which have been discussed this afternoon by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that the interest of the United States, as a post-war proposition, will be within the continents of the Western Hemisphere, and it is with reference to that particular hemisphere that I beg the indulgence of the Senators who are now present while I make a few brief remarks.

More than 135 years ago—in 1810, to be exact—distinguished citizens of Chile ventured the idea of a confederation of states embracing all the countries of Spanish America, and in the following year declared themselves in favor of an alliance of all American nations. In 1818 the Argentinean, San Martin, and the Chilean, Bernardo O'Higgins, looked forward to the formulation of some sort of a continental plan of unity. The great Simon Bolivar, the George Washington of Spanish America and the creator of five republics, brought together, in the city of Panama, in 1826, the delegates of the American republics, and in so doing he gave expression to the fraternal aspirations of a goodly part of the Western Hemisphere. The flame of pan-Americanism was periodically rekindled by Peru from 1846 to 1864, and it can be said that the United States of North America did not hold itself aloof from this continental ideal from the very beginning.

From the most humble efforts, apparently fruitless, the ideal of a genuine inter-Americanism is today emerging triumphant, for with the passing of years since the struggles for political independence, this ideal has not faded into the oblivion of idle dreams, but, on the contrary, new personalities have appeared on the American scene to carry forward with honesty, sincerity, intelligence, and enthusiasm the torch of pan-Americanism, and to champion the principle of the equality of American states and their absolute rights and privileges as sovereign and independent nations.

From its inception the ideal of pan-Americanism has emphasized the absolute equality of American states, and this regardless of territorial extent, population, economic wealth, or military strength. These guiding tenets of inter-American relations reached their summit of expression at the Eighth International Conference of American States held at Lima, Peru, in 1938, when our Secretary of State, the beloved Cordell Hull, was moved to observe that "in our Conference we have demonstrated our unshakable determination to respect the integrity of individuals and of states, to uphold the sanctity of the pledged word, and to make needed changes through the orderly process of consultation in a spirit of mutual accommodation."

Let us not speak today of the many set-backs suffered by the inter-American ideal throughout the Americas and throughout the years, for the time has come to center our attentions and efforts upon every possibility which will bring the republics of the Western Hemisphere into a closer union. In order fully to comprehend the practical reasons which should impel us to nurture more intensive and extensive relations with Latin America, it is necessary to penetrate into the economic field, and to examine, even though superficially, the tremendous contribution of this area to the present war effort of the United Nations.

The Latin-American republics are predominantly agricultural, although they are indeed the sources of important mineral products. These republics are only moderately industrialized, and are de-

pendent upon imports of manufacturers and semimanufacturers for the maintenance of their light peacetime industries, transportation, and consumer goods. Therefore, their normal trade with the United States is largely the exchange of raw materials for manufactured goods.

The United States, self-sufficient in many agricultural products but deficient in certain strategic materials for its manufacturing industries, is now a major importer of all Latin-American minerals, and these products can be added to sugar, coffee, hides, and skins, which have been major import items during years of peace. Fibers and crude rubber will be accorded high priority positions until supplies are again available from far-eastern sources. Wartime needs and the disruption of normal trade channels have accentuated the essential requirements of the United States and of the Latin-American republics, and the trade between them since 1940 has reflected the measure of this dependence and the ability of each to serve the other. The United States has released manufactures to maintain their national economies, together with such special equipment as will aid the various countries in expanding operations in those fields of production which are important to the United States for the prosecution of the war.

The same needs are bringing about such improvements in manufacturing technique and in the substitution of less strategic materials and synthetic products by the American manufacturers and such a desire for industrialization by the Latin-American republics that it is quite possible that the nature of the present interdependence may be modified during the next decade. Nevertheless, it has been fully demonstrated that the resources of the Latin-American republics are of inestimable value and that it would be most unfortunate if the United States did not have full access to them.

To mention one very critical material, the case of copper affords an excellent example of the importance of the Latin-American field. Although the United States long has been the leading country in the production of refined copper, economic conditions indicate that this will not continue to be the case many more years, because, first, our domestic copper reserves are being rapidly depleted, which in turn is associated with higher costs of producing copper; second, no new fields of copper ore have been discovered recently in the United States; and third, other countries, particularly Central and South Africa, and Chile have large fields of high-grade copper ores which can be processed very cheaply. The United States has dropped already from first to third place in copper exports during the last decade. Our less favorable copper ore situation is further indicated by the fact that the average percentage of copper in our ores has dropped from 1.41 percent in 1929 to approximately 1.10 percent in 1941, according to the United States Bureau of Mines. Estimates by various metallurgists as given in a report by the United States Tariff Commission as of January 1, 1944, indicate that there are available approximately 24,000,000 tons of copper reserves

in the United States. Our post-war annual consumption has been estimated by the Director of the American Bureau of Metal Statistics, at 850,000 short tons of new copper. If this amount were produced annually, it would lead to a depletion of our known reserves at the end of the next 25 or 30 years. Unquestionably our Latin-American neighbors can assist us not only in conserving our copper reserves, but also in building up a stock pile. Various metallurgists, according to the American Mining and Metallurgical Engineers Report of 1937, have estimated that the Latin-American countries have reserves of at least 30,000,000 short tons of copper. Of this amount 28,000,000 short tons are estimated to be in Chile, and of this 95 percent is controlled by American capital.

With appropriate modifications, the same story can be related with reference to Latin America and the supply of such critical materials as tin, petroleum, quartz, fiber, cinchona (quinine), rubber, and many others.

As stated before, the economy of the Latin-American countries, considered as a whole, is predominantly agricultural. The transition to an industrial economy is hampered by both material and cultural factors. Among the first, we need mention only a scarcity of coal and oil, poor location of mining of the available mineral resources, inadequate transportation facilities due especially to topographic conditions, and scarcity of capital, equipment and technicians. Of the less tangible influences, probably the most important are an indifference to material gain and progress as these are conceived in industrial countries, and the relative absence of a business spirit and a spirit of enterprise among the wealthier and more influential classes. Widespread poverty and lack of purchasing power among the great bulk of the population is a major barrier to extensive industrialization.

Foremost among the factors favoring industrial growth are a wide variety of rich mineral, forest, and agricultural resources and abundant potential supplies of hydroelectric power. To these must be added a growing population, an awakened national consciousness, a rising spirit of business enterprise, and favorable governmental policies. In their desire to achieve greater economic stability and independence, and to raise the standard of living of the masses through a more balanced economy, the governments of the more progressive Latin-American countries have adopted extensive programs for the aid and encouragement of manufactures. More recently the United States, in pursuance of its good neighbor policy and its war production program, has done much to further this development. Finally, newer technical developments in the field of the chemical industries, electric power and air transports appear likely to free Latin-American industry from some of the handicaps under which it has labored in the past.

It is important to know also that the present war crisis has both stimulated and hampered the growth of manufacturing in Latin-America. The indus-

tries chiefly to benefit have been those relying on domestic raw materials and producing for general consumption, such as textiles. The extreme scarcity of shipping, combined with Allied restrictions upon exports, has reduced customary supplies not only of finished manufactures but also of much needed machinery and indispensable materials from abroad. Although the activities of some manufacturing industries have been curtailed as a result of these conditions, on the whole there have been substantial increases in production in the war years, both to meet domestic needs and in some important instances, to supply a rising export trade to other Latin-American countries and even to the Allied Nations. It is clear that the effect of the present global war has been greatly to accelerate the trend toward industrialization in Latin-America. While some painful readjustments will come at the end of the present war boom, manufacturing will undoubtedly resume its peace time course on a higher level than in the pre-war years.

From the viewpoints of both Latin America and the United States, the requirements of hemisphere defense call for a far greater degree of industrialization in our sister republics to the south than prevailed at the opening of the present conflict.

Thus it is, that of all the projects and plans, of all the schemes and aspirations, receiving the attention of our Government during these tense and perilous times, there is none which, from both a practical and idealistic point of view, calls for more sincerity and earnestness of effort in the post-war period than the stimulation of the good-neighbor policy among, and the establishment of a united front by the nations of the Americas. But let us be realistic about these matters. In my opinion the success of pan-Americanism should not, for it cannot, depend exclusively upon the cold and calculated aspects of the mutual material benefits to be derived therefrom. True, pan-Americanism must build its foundations, not only upon the granite of pragmatic considerations, but also upon the marble of cultural respect and understanding. We can learn much from the literatures and arts of our neighbors, and it is to the authors and creators of these, the real lasting values of a people, that we must go if we are justly to appraise the less tangible, but certainly the most workable key to mutual good will and successful intercourse.

It does not require superior sagacity to understand the sensibility of the pan-American ideal; and the only reason why the movement had to await an international crisis to receive any real attention from our Government is simply the almost complete lack of interest in or knowledge of Latin America on the part of our citizenry and leaders alike since the birth of the Republic. It has often been stated that the lack of a considerable group of informed citizens may become a real danger, particularly in a country like the United States where foreign policy is based largely on public opinion; at least, this has been so during the greater part of our history. The

sad truth is that such a lack does exist at the present time in the United States with reference to Latin America. We talk about Russia, England, France, and other countries. After the war our interest should be south of the border. The real irony of the situation lies in the lack of knowledge on the part of the American people with respect to Latin-American affairs, and the little interest, apparently, they have in Latin America. To be sure, there have always existed small groups of thinking citizens who made every effort to nurture pan-American relations, but even in university and governmental circles their voices were too weak to be heard above the din of other issues, perhaps far less important. The present world crisis has brought into focus not only the desirability of practical pan-Americanism, but also the need for such a scheme if we are to witness the healthy operation of plans for hemispheric solidarity.

In discussing the general features of the good-will policy toward Latin America, naturally I have dealt in generalities. However, in order to appreciate the problems involved, I only have to call attention to one specific matter, and that is the treaty now before the Senate, made by this country with the Republic of Mexico, involving the distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande and Colorado Rivers. That treaty was agreed to between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, through consultation between, and the advice of, the State Department of this country and the Office of Foreign Relations of the Republic of Mexico.

In my opinion, the policy of good will between the two countries was certainly attended to in considering this convention. No one would accuse the Honorable Cordell Hull, until lately Secretary of State for this country, of not being a patriotic and loyal American, and of not protecting American rights in an equitable and just way, or of being in favor of giving away American rights that should be protected. I have always maintained that the greatest characteristic of the American people is its emphasis of fair play. In arriving at the agreements of the convention between Mexico and this country on the distribution of the waters indicated, I firmly believe that the State Department took full care of the rights involved.

Everyone knows that in coming to any kind of an agreement, a spirit of give-and-take is necessary. We know that the water reserved for the citizens of Texas in the treaty are derived from the Mexican side of the border. Hence, it appears only fair that in dealing with a foreign country this country should also be fair. But there are in this country individuals—few, thank goodness—who would want Mexico to provide all the waters for the necessities of Texas, but at the same time would be unwilling to do something for the Republic of Mexico. There are people in this country who feel that only our rights should be protected.

If we are to have good will, we also must entertain some respect for the rights of other governments. Also, I have always maintained that the Republic of

Mexico is the key to our standing in Latin America. If we do not treat that Republic in a fair way, following just and equitable principles, what are the other countries south of Mexico to say? If we do not treat our nearest neighbor justly, what are they to expect?

By the kindness of the people of New Mexico, I happen to represent that State in this august body. No one knows better than do the people of New Mexico that most of my time is devoted to their interests; and in this instance, I feel that the treaty now being considered by this body takes care of New Mexico's interest, and at the same time indicates to the world at large that we in New Mexico are not motivated only by selfish interests in dealing with a friendly foreign nation.

I consider it imperative to add my voice to that of those Americans throughout the hemisphere who zealously support the principle of inter-American unity, toward the end that the establishment of a sincerely conceived plan of action will be an actuality, and that this plan be perpetuated for the mutual benefit of all the Americas in every field of human relations after we have effected the peace which we so anxiously await.

REPORT BY ARMY AND NAVY MUNITIONS BOARD ON STRATEGIC MATERIALS (S. DOC. No. 5)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have been deeply interested in the address of the Senator from New Mexico, and especially in that part of it which concerns the strategic and critical materials which the United States has been receiving from Latin America during the present war. In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a report made by the Army and Navy Munitions Board and submitted to the Senate on January 6.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF LESLIE L. BIFFLE AS ACTING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. HILL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 63), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Leslie L. Biffle be, and he is hereby, appointed Acting Secretary of the Senate, and that said Acting Secretary be, and he is hereby, empowered to do and perform all official acts pertaining to the Office of Secretary of the Senate not specifically devolved on the Secretary by law, and under the same responsibilities now devolved on the Secretary; that he so continue during the further order of the Senate, and that the salary of the said Leslie L. Biffle be continued the same as now received by him as the Secretary to the majority of the Senate.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO ACTING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the Acting Secretary of the Senate may take the oath of office.

There being no objection, Mr. Leslie L. Biffle advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the President pro tempore.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE APPOINTMENT OF ACTING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. HILL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 65), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the appointment of Leslie L. Biffle as Acting Secretary of the Senate.

FLORAL WREATH FOR THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE EDWIN A. HALSEY

On motion by Mr. BYRD, it was

Ordered, That the Acting Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, directed to purchase a floral wreath on the occasion of the funeral of the late Secretary of the Senate, Col. Edwin A. Halsey, the cost thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

POEM IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there may be printed a poem written in tribute to Colonel Halsey by Horace C. Carlisle, of Alabama.

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

EDWIN A. HALSEY

E-very Member of the Senate
D-own unto the smallest page,
W-onders why dear Colonel Halsey,
I-n the flower of his age,
N-cw, at such a time, should die,
A-nd bid them the last goodbye.
H-e, a friend to everybody,
A-lways ready to help, stood
L-ooking for a chance to render
Some assistance, when he could.
E-ven down unto the end;
Y-ea, he proved a ready friend.
F-ar and near, Ed Halsey's praises
R-ightly will for years be sung,
I-nside and outside the Senate,
E-verywhere, the old and young,
N-ow, in their deep sorrow sing,
D-eath, O Death! how sharp they sting!"
I-n this hour's grievous sorrow,
N-one can soothe, but God alone.
D-eath's the dawn of faith's tomorrow
E-ver God cares for his own.
E-ven in Christ's latest breath,
D-id He triumph over death.

—Horace C. Carlisle.

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 PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Capt. Vincent R. Murphy, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for

temporary service, to rank from April 11, 1943;

Several officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade);

Sundry officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign;

Lieut. Charles H. Kretz, Junior, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant;

Several ensigns of the line, United States Navy, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign;

Ensign James V. Bartlett, D-V (s), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade);

Several ensigns of the line, United States Navy, to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign; and

Sundry officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as I must leave the Chamber, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have a nomination on the Executive Calendar confirmed. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of H. Struve Hensel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Struve Hensel of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there are also on the Calendar five other nominations in the Navy. The first is that of Frederick J. Horne, a very distinguished officer, to be admiral, to continue while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations. There are also a number of nominations in the Marine Corps. I ask unanimous consent that all these nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Navy and Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

The clerk will proceed to state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTER NOMINATION RECOMMITTED

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Myrtus P. Spangenberg to be postmaster at Waymart, Pa., which nomination previously had been passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that, without objection, at the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the nomination will be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of T. Hoyt Davis, of Georgia, to be

United States district judge for the middle district of Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William M. Payne to be postmaster at Natchitoches, La.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

DEATH OF EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I offer resolutions, and I request unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 66) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Col. Edwin A. Halsey, late the Secretary of the Senate.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Secretary of the Senate, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Wallace Murray, of Ohio, now Director of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Herman B. Baruch, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and consul general at Sydney, Australia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29, 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

H. Struve Hensel to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

T. Hoyt Davis to be United States district judge for the middle district of Georgia.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Frederick J. Horne to be an admiral, to continue while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

Frank G. Fahrion to be a rear admiral, to rank from February 21, 1943.

Marshall R. Greer to be a rear admiral, to rank from August 28, 1943.

Peter K. Fischler to be a rear admiral, to rank from May 11, 1943.

Thomas P. Jeter to be a commodore, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Battleship Squadron 2, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from October 20, 1944.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Jack C. Scott
William H. Whitaker
John B. Berteling
Elmer P. Thompson, Jr.
Robert R. Read
Albert L. Clark
Stanley V. Titterud
Warren H. Keck
George W. Bubb
George W. Carrington, Jr.
William F. Lane
Andrew S. Farago
Albert E. Leonard
Francis J. Stutler
Roland A. Marbaugh
Donald F. Dickey
Charles B. Spradley
James E. Garner
Ernest B. Ford
Richard M. Bickford
Ira Goldberg

POSTMASTER LOUISIANA

William M. Payne, Natchitoches.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1945

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

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

Thou who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, unto us have been committed heavy responsibilities; be ever present here, for it is so difficult for us to be always wise and strong. In all ways qualify us for excellent service and grant that we may realize the sanctity of politics. Help us to combat the aggressions of the strong against the weak and the rich against the poor. O draw us nearer to Thee as we say to our souls: "Oh, for a man to rise in me, that the man I am may cease to be."

Holy Spirit, we pray for the constant presence of Thy wise guidance; under the spell of big horizons, broaden us with a self-revising estimate of our enlarging outlook. Grant that our dominant strength may not pale in defending the standards of an ever-changing world. Back of the tragic unrest of the suffering and appealing multitudes in the pathways of war, speak, Almighty God, first to the life of each human being, then to the larger life of our Nation, and then to the vaster life of humanity. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 25, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced

that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 340. An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter of resignation, which was read:

JANUARY 26, 1945.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

TOM PICKETT,
*Member of Congress,
Seventh Congressional District, Texas.*

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 24, 1945.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Virginia my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Third District of Virginia, to become effective February 15, 1945.

Yours sincerely,

DAVE SATTERFIELD, JR.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 25, 1945.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the authority granted by section 5001 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means did on January 17, 1945, elect JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan, and DANIEL A. REED, of New York, to be members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to fill vacancies caused by the retirement of Wesley E. Disney, of Oklahoma, and Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts, and to serve with the following other House members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, who have previously been duly elected by the Committee on Ways and Means as members of such joint committee: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON of North Carolina; JERE COOPER, of Tennessee; HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota.

Respectfully yours,

R. L. DOUGHTON, Chairman.

DIRECTORS OF THE COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the following Members of the House: Mr. BLOOM, New York; Mr. GRAHAM, Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public

Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Committee to Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures to fill the existing vacancy thereon the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

THE SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. FORAND, Rhode Island; Mr. TALBOT, Connecticut.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

THE SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. KEOGH, New York; Mr. BUCK, New York.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY

THE SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. SASSER, Maryland; Mr. HÉBERT, Louisiana; Mr. PRICE, Florida; Mr. HESS, Ohio; Mr. KEEFE, Wisconsin.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

THE SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, section 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the House: Mr. CANNON, Missouri; Mr. COX, Georgia; Mr. REECE, Tennessee.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

THE SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 55, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy, to fill existing vacancies thereon, the following Members of the House: Mr. BROOKS, Louisiana; Mr. SPARKMAN, Alabama; Mr. BRADLEY, Pennsylvania; Mr. BATES, Massachusetts; Mr. KEARNEY, New York.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

THE SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 60, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, to fill existing vacancies thereon, the following Members of the House: Mr. LEFEVRE, New York; Mr. SIMPSON, Illinois.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

MR. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have seven privileged resolutions from the Committee on Accounts allocating money from the contingent fund of the House for expenses for the special and select

committees and for the new standing committee. I present the first resolution (H. Res. 97) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 237 of the Seventy-third Congress, continued under authority of House Resolution 44 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, House Resolution 11 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, House Resolution 65 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, House Resolution 20, Seventy-eighth Congress, and House Resolution 75 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the special committee appointed to investigate the conservation of the wildlife resources of the United States and related questions, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$7,500, effective from January 3, 1945, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. That the official committee reporters shall serve said committee at its meetings in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

MR. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a second privileged resolution (H. Res. 108) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 465 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and continued by House Resolution 55 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Post-war Military Policy, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$7,000 in addition to the unobligated balance of the sum heretofore made available during the Seventy-eighth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such study and investigation or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

MR. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] chairman of the Committee on Post-war Military Policy, appeared before the Committee on Accounts together with the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. The Committee on Post-War Military Policy was set up in March of 1944, and the Committee on Accounts granted the committee \$25,000. During the last session the Post-War Military Policy Committee did not use all the money that has been allotted to it and had an unexpended balance of approximately \$18,000.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] told the Committee on Accounts that he felt \$25,000 would be sufficient to carry on the work of his committee for the next 2 years unless something unforeseen should develop. He previously had made a similar statement on the floor. The Committee on Accounts, therefore, recommended that the unexpended balance of approximately \$18,000 be made available to the Committee on Post-War Military Policy and recommended that an additional amount not to exceed \$7,000 be provided.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

MR. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a third privileged resolution (H. Res. 109) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1945, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation in monthly installments for the employment of the following employees to the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

Clerk, at the rate of \$3,900 per annum.

Assistant clerk, at the rate of \$2,640 per annum.

Assistant clerk, at the rate of \$2,100 per annum.

Janitor, at the rate of \$1,560 per annum.

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

MR. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

MR. RANKIN. Of course, this allocation does not cover the salaries and expense of the investigators. That is a matter that will have to be taken care of later, is it not?

MR. COCHRAN. No provision has been made for any expenses for investigation. This is simply for the clerks every standing committee is entitled to. This is a unanimous report of the committee. The members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, both the chairman and the ranking member, stated that the committee had held a meeting and are in agreement. While this does provide for an additional assistant clerk, the Committee on Accounts felt it was justified in granting one because of the fact that they have 80 file cases and about 20 unopened boxes full of papers, and because the files are not cataloged or indexed; further, because when any individual from any one of the Government agencies comes before the committee they feel that some official of the committee should be present while that person is looking over the records.

MR. RANKIN. I am familiar with that phase of the situation, because I was present at the meeting, but I just wanted to serve notice now that this amount does not cover the salaries and expenses of the investigators and assistant investigators we are bound to have to pursue the investigations of un-American activities.

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

MR. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Just why does a permanent committee have to spend \$1,560 for a janitor? What does the janitor do? In looking over the legislative bills, I found something like 30 janitors on the pay roll. Little committees like the Committee on the Territories have a janitor. I do not know what they do with them. I do not know what the janitors do or why the committees have to have them. Why spend that money for janitors? If you want to re-organize Congress, here is a pretty good chance to do it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Time and again the effort has been made to change the word "janitor" to "messenger." I do not know what they do, but I do know they must keep the committee rooms clean.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Why do they have to have a special messenger? Cannot the clerk look after it, or can he not call a page? Committee after committee that meets once or twice a year has a janitor. I do not know what in the world they need a janitor for. The Committee on the Territories, next to me, has not met three times a year, I believe, but it has a janitor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Do not blame me. Your Committee on Appropriations takes care of such appropriations.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I am not blaming the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. Blame the Committee on Appropriations. Let me say the Monroney committee might take care of that when the Congress is streamlined.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. But I do blame the gentleman because he brings out a resolution here providing for another janitor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Because every other committee of the House has one, and further because this man must look after some large rooms as well as keep the files clean.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That does not excuse this one.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HART. I agree in great measure with what the gentleman from Michigan has said, but if there is one committee that I know of that does need a janitor it is this committee, because of the tremendous mass of filing material and the number of filing cabinets and the size of the room in which these are to be contained.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I have a lot of filing in my office, and I do not have a janitor to do it. My clerks do the filing.

Mr. HART. I am not attempting to justify the general practice of furnishing janitors to committees, but I do say that if there is any committee in this House for which a janitor can be justified it is this one.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] appeared before the Committee on Accounts last week, together with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS], of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The House has set up the Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing

committee. It is the duty of the Appropriations Committee to provide funds for the employment of committee clerks and their assistants, but it has always been the policy of the Committee on Accounts to provide funds temporarily for the payment of clerical assistants until provision can be made in an appropriation bill.

Under the resolution introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] the Committee on Un-American Activities is provided with a clerk at a salary of \$3,900 per annum; an assistant clerk at a salary of \$2,640 per annum; a second assistant clerk at a salary of \$2,100 per annum; and a janitor at a rate of \$1,560 per annum.

These salaries will be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until provision is made for them in an appropriation act.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] told the Committee on Accounts that there are some 70-odd filing cabinets filled with valuable records and papers that were accumulated by the Dies committee in addition to a great many boxes containing papers and a large amount of material which has been received from the three regional offices of the Dies committee. They are most anxious to obtain a clerk and the other employees mentioned in the resolution in order to properly preserve and take care of these records and begin to function as a regular standing committee of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 110).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 18, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by H. Res. 550 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and continued by House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and House Resolution 66 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on the Civil Service, not to exceed \$30,000 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available for conducting the studies and investigation, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. The chairman of the special committee the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] requested \$75,000. The Committee on Accounts, in keeping with its policy of trying to reduce expenditures, recommended that the House Civil Service Committee be provided with \$30,000 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available. The unexpended balance at the present time is approximately

\$13,000, out of a total of \$84,500. The committee recommended the desirability of continuing the investigation but in view of the fact that it cost approximately \$71,000 during the 2 years of the Seventy-eighth Congress, it felt the appropriation should not be as large as was requested by members of the committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 111) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 408 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 60 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed the unobligated balance of the sum heretofore made available during the Seventy-eighth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Sec. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER], chairman of the Post-War Economic Policy and Planning Committee, as well as the ranking members of the committee, the gentlemen from Tennessee [Mr. REECE and Mr. COOPER] appeared before the Committee on Accounts last week. This committee was created during the last Congress and an appropriation of \$100,000 was provided for their studies and investigations. They have spent approximately \$30,000, leaving a balance on hand of approximately \$70,000.

The House continued the Post-War Economic Policy and Planning Committee under House Resolution 60 of the Seventy-ninth Congress for a period of 2 years. Both the chairman and the ranking members of the committee stated they felt that the committee would be able to carry on its work with the unobligated balance of the sum heretofore allocated.

The resolution does not provide any new funds but simply carries the old balance forward.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND INVESTIGATE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM IN ITS RELATION TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 112) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 294 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and continued by House Resolution 18 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and House Resolution 64 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the national defense program in its relation to small business in the United States, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$45,000, effective from January 3, 1945, in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available for conducting the study and investigations authorized by said House Resolution 18 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or any subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the committee appointed to study and investigate the national defense program in its relation to small business in the United States, appeared before the Committee on Accounts last week together with members of his special committee. This special committee was authorized in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and has been continued in each succeeding Congress since then. For the years 1942, 1943, and 1944, the special committee was granted funds in the amount of \$92,500 and the total expenditures for these years amounted to a little over \$90,000, leaving a balance of approximately \$2,000 on January 1, 1945.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] stated the committee desired to expand its activities into other fields, including taxation as it affected small business. The Committee on Accounts felt there is now considerable duplication of effort in connection with tax studies by the Congress and felt that a further investigation by the Small Business Committee into this field was not justified. We have now the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which is composed of members of the House Ways and Means Committee and members of the Senate Finance Committee. We appropriate \$75,000 for their experts every year. There is also a special committee studying post-war taxes in addition to the Ways and Means Committee, as well as the Senate Finance Committee.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] submitted a budget in which he estimated that his expenditures for the fiscal year of 1945 would be \$90,000, which is as much as this committee spent during the period since its inception.

The Committee on Accounts recommended that the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] be reduced by one-half.

The Senate has a committee that is also looking after the interests of small business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ACTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 113) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 102 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 88 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to investigate acts of executive agencies which exceed the scope of their power or authority, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$30,000 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the select committee appointed to investigate acts of the executive agencies which exceed the scope of their power or authority appeared before the Committee on Accounts this morning, together with members of the select committee.

This committee is serving as a check upon the action of Government agencies in carrying out various laws passed by the Congress. As chairman of the Committee on Accounts I felt that this jurisdiction belonged to the Committee on Expenditures in the executive department. That all such complaints should be filed with the Committee on Expenditures and that there was no necessity of having this special committee. The Committee on Accounts, however, agreed to allocate \$30,000 to the select committee appointed to investigate acts of the executive agencies which exceed the scope of their power and authority.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by the Honorable Ben Dean, of Grand Rapids, Mich., president of the Kiwanis International.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Democratic Steering Committee commanding the services of the retiring chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. ROBERT CROSSEY.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a communication which I have received from Mr. Crowley.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from an organization in my district.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of other special orders that may have been heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House today for 15 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I make at that time.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, first, to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a magazine article which I have written, and secondly, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from one of my constituents.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Sunday edition of the Hartford Courant entitled "Connecticut

War Workers' Production Leading Nation."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt of law and a copy of a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Richard L. Neuberger, entitled "A Dissenting Opinion on Congressional Junkets."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a table relating to unemployment.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an excerpt.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem, The O. P. A.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from a publication called the Union.

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

There was no objection.

NONESSENTIAL TRAVEL

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a directive by Mr. James F. Byrnes.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, and each case to include some resolutions.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include an analysis of the bill which will be under discussion today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a letter from an important constituent.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein three editorials.

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

There was no objection.

CARE OF PRISONERS OF WAR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the constantly mounting number of American prisoners of war is clear evidence of the increasing desire on the part of the relatives and friends of those concerned to see that their welfare is adequately protected so far as possible.

The American Red Cross and other agencies are doing a splendid job in this field. There are many people, however, who feel that the Congress has a further legislative responsibility in this matter.

As evidence of the growing concern of American citizens over this problem, may I say that I have recently received petitions from hundreds of good American citizens requesting that the Congress take action to provide for more equitable treatment in the matter of promotions and pay grades for our prisoners of war. These petitioners respectfully call attention to the fact that our prisoners of war in Germany and Japan are for all practical purposes unable to speak for themselves. They feel that these prisoners of war are prevented through no fault or failure of their own from engaging in active warfare and that they suffer day by day as great hardships as many of their comrades on the fighting front. Their status as prisoners of war indicates and demonstrates their valor in the performance of their duty toward their country.

These petitioners maintain that an injustice is being perpetrated upon our prisoners of war because of little hope of receiving higher ratings, rank, or pay status. These good patriotic citizens, in their exercise of the fundamental right of petition to the Congress, request immediate action to the end that legislation may be provided to give suitable and proper recognition to our prisoners of war group.

I am today filing these petitions with the House Military Affairs Committee in the hope that it may challenge the attention of the membership of that great committee and stimulate and crystallize action in this field.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix by including a statement by Mr. Hal W. Kennedy, assistant deputy county counsel of Los Angeles County.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution by the Daughters of the American Revolution endorsing the Committee on Un-American Activities.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK R. REID

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker—

We saw not the lift of the curtain,

 Nor heard the invisible door,

As he passed where life's problems uncertain

 Will follow and vex him no more;

We lingered and wept on the threshold,

 The threshold each mortal must cross,

Then we laid a new wreath down upon it,

 To mark a new sorrow and loss.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I announce the death last Thursday afternoon at his home in Aurora, Ill., of my predecessor, Hon. Frank R. Reid. Prior to his congressional career, he had served as State's attorney of his county, as assistant United States district attorney, as representative in the Illinois General Assembly, and as special assistant corporation counsel of the city of Chicago. Ten years ago he voluntarily relinquished the seat he had occupied in this House for 12 years. His interest in its activities, however, never waned, and, as a visitor, he was frequently on the floor at every session of Congress, excepting this, since his retirement. His service in this body was constructive and his advancement rapid. As a freshman Member, he was assigned to the Committee on Flood Control.

In 2 years he was its chairman. He was intensely interested in aviation, and early recognized its tremendous importance as an adjunct of the Army and Navy. This and his innate sense of justice were, without doubt, the motivation for his acceptance of the responsibility as chief counsel for the late Col. William—Billy—Mitchell in his court-martial trial in 1925 for criticizing the Army's air-force policy. His brilliant defense of that officer, while unavailing to a court steeped in Army discipline, aroused a hitherto dormant public to the realization that our country's success in future wars, if we had any, was in direct proportion to the adequacy of our fighting power in the air. The Army found the defendant guilty; the public acclaimed him as a martyr. In later years when the intervening hand of death had removed Colonel Mitchell from his earthly sphere, his attorney, Frank Reid, had the satisfaction of witnessing the complete exoneration of his client, the removal of the stigma against his record, and a tardy recognition of his keen foresight and brilliant services by promotion, posthumously, to the rank of brigadier general.

It was during Frank Reid's incumbency as chairman of the Committee on Flood Control that the great Mississippi River flood of 1927 occurred with its tremendous toll of human lives and destruction of property. His dynamic energy and untiring service at the time and following that catastrophe will ever be remembered by the people residing in the valleys of the Father of Waters and its tributaries. In a fortnight, he had become a national figure. No man living did more to arouse public interest in the necessity of effective flood control than did Frank R. Reid. None exerted more influence to commit Congress to a definite plan to prevent or minimize future similar dis-

asters. As president and as a member of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, he, after his retirement from Congress and even until the time of his death, exerted his energies and continued his activities for this much-needed control of streams and protection of homes and businesses.

Those of us who knew him well enjoyed his explosive pent-up energy, his unselfish desire to serve, his rather brusque mannerism, and his celerity at repartee. He dearly loved a joke and could take as well as give. There has always been a certain amount of confusion between him and me on account of the identical pronunciation of our respective surnames. I recall the many times he chuckled and appreciated the humor in an incident which took place a few weeks after I had succeeded him as a Member of this House, when one of the Capitol employees in attempting to distinguish between us had characterized him as "the ex-Mr. Reid."

Now Frank Reid is no more. He brought with him to this Chamber kindness, energy, independence, and constructive leadership. He retained those attributes even unto death. The Nation and the State of Illinois have profited from his service.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday afternoon at 3 o'clock the Honorable Frank R. Reid, a former Member of this House, died at his home in Aurora, Ill.

Several days before I had been notified that he had suffered a slight stroke and, though I was grieved at the sad news, I was not at all surprised because of the strenuous life which Frank Reid lived and the tireless energy he poured forth in every task he undertook.

When I was first elected to this body 16 years ago, as a young man I was assigned, at my personal request and the generous consideration of Mr. Reid to the Committee on Flood Control of the House, of which he was then chairman. This was shortly after the most disastrous flood in our history, when the Mississippi River, with torrents of water poured into its channel from the Ohio, Missouri, and other tributaries, broke its bounds, overran its banks, flooded hundreds of thousands of acres of our most fertile farm lands, washed away bridges, inundated houses, destroyed livestock, and drowned hundreds of people.

No one can imagine the appalling damage to life and property—which ran into tens of millions of dollars—which that flood caused in 1927 unless he traveled down the valley in its tragic wake.

Frank Reid saw it all, understood it thoroughly, and out of a heart which beat in sympathy for suffering humanity he succeeded, in the face of overwhelming odds, in driving through Congress the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, appropriating \$325,000,000 for flood control in the Mississippi Valley.

Calvin Coolidge, who was then President, nearly fainted when he signed the bill, because up to that hour it was the largest peacetime appropriation in the history of our Republic.

After serving 12 years in the House from the Eleventh District of Illinois, in the Sixty-eighth to the Seventy-third Congresses, inclusive, Mr. Reid voluntarily retired in January 1934 to resume the practice of law. Often he told me that he spent 12 years in Congress, but that was 10 years too long, and even urged me to leave Congress—not that he despised nor had little respect for this body but he knew our problems, difficulties, and heartaches, the disappointments and despair as well as the victories and glory.

After leaving Congress, Frank Reid never lost his interest in it. He divided his time about equally between Chicago, New Orleans, and Washington. He enjoyed a wide and profitable practice, for which he was eminently qualified. After graduating from the University of Chicago he graduated from the Chicago College of Law, served as county attorney, State's attorney, assistant United States attorney, and as president of the Illinois State's Attorneys Association. Before coming to Congress in 1922 he served as a member of the Forty-seventh General Assembly in Illinois, and later was secretary of the Illinois League of Municipalities.

Mr. Reid first won national fame by acting as chief civil counsel in defending the late and lamented Gen. William Mitchell. The history of Billy Mitchell's trial some day will be fully written, and when it is the name of Frank R. Reid will shine in deathless splendor.

Frank Reid was a brilliant lawyer. He possessed a quick, alert, and hair-trigger mind. His knowledge was wide, his information accurate, and his insight keen.

At times he was blunt and abrupt; at others he could be caustic and sarcastic; but never in the 16 years I have known him—in times of trial and of tranquillity—did I ever hear him utter a profane, vulgar, or dirty word. On occasions people misunderstood him, but his hard, marble exterior covered a tender heart and a gentle spirit.

There was nothing maudlin or sentimental about Frank Reid. He was all wool and a yard wide, genuine to the core, and loyal to the end. Sometimes I accused him of whistling to keep up courage and he would only smile. He possessed a restless spirit and he was a hard driver—but never did he drive anyone as hard as he drove himself.

After leaving Congress Mr. Reid never lost his interest in problems of flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, conservation, and utilization of our water resources. He took an active part in all waterways organizations and for several years was president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I had the honor to succeed him as president of that organization for the past 6 years, but no man in all its history did nearly so much for its successful operation as did Frank Reid. His name is a household word not only in the Mississippi Valley, but everywhere that waterways and their related problems are discussed.

It is safe to say that no man in our generation and perhaps no one else in future generations will do more for the development of our rivers and harbors,

the control of floods, the conservation of our soil, and the utilization of our water power than our late and lamented friend.

Born in Aurora, Ill., he married a lovely girl in Aurora, Ill. They have 5 fine children and 10 grandchildren. To us who knew him so well it seems rather fitting that he should have died in Aurora where he was born, lived his life, and among the people whom he loved so well.

John G. Neihardt, one of my constituents and America's greatest epic poet must have had Frank Reid in mind when he wrote :

Let me live out my years in heat of blood.
Let me die drunken with the dreamer's wine.

Let me not see this soul house built of mud,
Go toppling to the dust—a vacant shrine.
Let me go quickly like a candle light,
Snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow.
Give me high noon—and let it then be night.
Thus would I go.

And grant me, when I face the grisly thing,
One haughty cry to pierce the gray, perhaps.
O let me be a tune-swept fiddle string,
That feels the master melody—and snaps

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I served for 10 years in this House with Frank Reid, and during that entire time I served as a member of the Committee on Flood Control under his chairmanship. A warm personal friendship developed between us. I respected, honored, and loved him. He was a very extraordinary person—a hard worker and one of the ablest men I ever knew. There was in his make-up all the elements of greatness. He rendered valuable services to his country which sustains a great loss in his passing.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I gladly join in tribute to the memory of Frank R. Reid, who passed away at the age of 65 on January 25, at his home in Aurora, Ill.

Frank Reid was elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress and served through the Seventy-third Congress. Throughout his term of 12 years he was a member of the Committee on Flood Control. During his second term, in the Sixty-ninth Congress, he was made chairman of the Committee on Flood Control and served as chairman with distinguished ability for 6 years.

The great flood of 1927 in the Lower Mississippi Valley occurred while he was chairman of the Committee on Flood Control. He immediately assumed leadership in promoting flood control along the lower Mississippi River. He was in contact with all of the flooded areas during the progress of the overflows, and he repeatedly visited and inspected all sections of the lower valley, conducting public meetings following the flood. He was instrumental in promoting public meetings not only in the valley but throughout the country to mold public sentiment for flood control as a national policy. Comprehensive hearings under his bold

and courageous leadership were conducted by the Committee on Flood Control. No one contributed more than he to the crystallization of public sentiment in favor of legislation for the control of floods as a national responsibility.

When he voluntarily retired from Congress his interests in the improvement of rivers and harbors continued. Few, if any, public meetings to promote the improvement of waterways were held during his term as a Member of Congress and after his retirement up to his death in which he did not participate and in which his influence was not felt in behalf of the continued improvement of our natural resources.

Frank R. Reid will long be remembered, especially in the lower Mississippi Valley, for his untiring efforts in behalf of protecting the most important valley in this or any other country from floods.

At the time of his passing he was engaged in the preparation of a valuable publication devoted to waterways, known as the National Rivers and Harbors Reporter. He continued to the very last to advocate the improvement of the rivers of the United States as among the most valuable of the country's resources.

Frank R. Reid had a keen mind. He was an indefatigable worker. He was courageous and devoted to the last to the progress and welfare of his country.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I esteem it an honor to speak on behalf of the State of Louisiana, to join my colleagues in tribute to the memory of a former Member of the Congress, the Honorable Frank R. Reid, Sr., of Illinois, who died in his home town of Aurora on the 25th of January.

While I did not have the privilege to serve with Congressman Reid during the 12 years that he was a Member of the Congress, it was my pleasure and good fortune to know him personally, and his friends in Louisiana were legion. As a member of the House Flood Control Committee and as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Congressman Reid was one of the leaders in this country in flood-control matters, and many times visited Louisiana attending meetings to help give relief and solve the question of protecting this country from recurring floods which were so disastrous in human lives and property damage.

I well remember meeting Congressman Reid in Louisiana when he accompanied President Hoover on an inspection trip during the great Mississippi River flood of 1927, and many times thereafter at flood-control meetings. Not only did he have a brilliant record in the Congress, and served his great State of Illinois with distinction, but he deserves great credit for his efforts for flood control in the entire Mississippi River Valley. Congressman Reid was a friend to Louisiana and to the entire South. He was a lovable man, a great public servant, and his work lives after him. At

this time I am reminded of a quotation by Byron:

But there are wanderers o'er eternity
Whose bark drives on and on, and anchor'd
n'er shall be.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of anything that could be added to the tributes that have been paid to our former colleague, Hon. Frank R. Reid. I can endorse and underwrite everything that has been said concerning him. I served on the Committee on Flood Control under his chairmanship and was a member of that committee until I became a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs some years ago. I was a member of that committee when the flood of 1927 occurred that was one of the greatest and most disastrous in history. I know what Frank Reid did in that great emergency. He was a great chairman and the work that he and his committee did has done much to prevent disastrous floods.

It has been said that the way to find out a man and to know him is to serve with him in Congress, but when you serve upon a committee with him is when you really find him out. Frank Reid was an able, a loyal, and a patriotic American, who rendered great service to his country. I mourn his loss.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. My regret at learning of the death of Frank Reid is not based upon his great services on flood control, but springs from my friendship for him that was formed during those services he rendered back in the trying days when Gen. Billy Mitchell, one of the outstanding heroes of America, was being persecuted because of his great vision and his urgent demand for an adequate aviation corps.

I was one of the men who fought along with Mr. Reid here during that contest. The last time he ever appeared on this floor he came over, laid his hand on my shoulder and said, "John, I don't think the people now think that you and I were so badly wrong when we were battling with Billy Mitchell for the building up of an aviation corps."

Two of the best friends I have ever had in my life grew out of that fight, Gen. Billy Mitchell himself, one of the finest souls I have ever known, one of the greatest heroes of America, and one of the worst-treated men this Nation has ever seen, and Frank Reid, who went through the battle here trying to stave off his court martial.

If Mr. Reid had been successful and General Mitchell could have had his way there would have been no Pearl Harbor.

Japan would never have dared to attack the United States, and probably millions of American lives would have been saved.

This Nation will never know what it owes to Frank Reid for his patriotic efforts in that great contest. May his noble spirit rest in peace; and may his "lofty scene be acted over in states unborn and accents yet unknown."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I arise with a heavy heart today to pay a tribute to our former colleague and our real friend, Frank Reid. I saw him in the city of New Orleans late last year at a large meeting of the Mississippi River Association; and I watched him unselfishly give of his time and efforts there, as on many other occasions. Frank Reid, who died in Aurora, Ill., Friday afternoon, sincerely and actively devoted his life to the cause of the development of the great Mississippi Valley. He gave of his ebbing strength even to the very end of his life for this cause, and we who live in the lower end of the valley are profoundly grateful for his foresight, ability, courage, and utterly unselfish leadership in presenting the problems of the valley to the people of the United States.

The Members of the Louisiana delegation in the House of Representatives has sent a joint letter of condolence to his widow. This letter portrays our deep sorrow, but everywhere in the lowland country where men have sought to harness the river waters and have fought the ravages of the flood, there is sorrow today. A great leader has gone; but he lives still in the hearts of our people.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, to different persons words have different meanings. The word "great" is an example. To some a certain person is greatest of all, while to others he is a demagogue. One visits an inauguration and sees in the man all the regal look of a king—to some he is even God's anointed. Another sees in him self-will in action. All of us are inclined to call the man great whom we like; yet, at the same time, we are unable to see the good qualities in anyone whom we do not like.

Today the test of a true statesman is to have an open mind—to give up his preconceived prejudices. Then, in the words of Henry Van Dyke, and then only do we "think without confusion clearly." In every walk of life there is a distressingly large number of individuals who will go to great lengths to avoid mental exercise. Even greater numbers are hindered by their emotions or self-will, and even self-pity, from thinking unselfishly.

I have been seeking to find the acid test for true greatness. For a score of years, scholars have endeavored to define it. Not long since, a group of eminent scholars and philosophers of the world, including Dr. H. G. Wells, sought to name the seven greatest persons in the world. A former member of this distinguished body, Bruce Barton, discussed it at length in one of his books. It is not

of so much interest as to the names of the persons chosen as it is that a definition of greatness can be wrought from the list of names. The real test is this: "That life is the greatest which costs the world the least and gives to the world the most in return."

One thousand names of men and women, great and near great, are on a list and all eliminated but seven. Remember, now, they were chosen not because of religious standing or faith, but by using this test given. Here are the names and the reasons:

First on the list was the man Jesus. He was chosen, not because He was the most religious man, but by reason of the fact that He cost the world nothing and gave to the world everything, even what was mortal in His own life, for the redemption of the world.

Second on the list was an old man, who could have been the ruler of his subdivisions had he chosen to be a hand-shaker or a honey fugler and sought to be popular. But he dared to speak the truth—yes, the truth—in order that men may be free. Yes; he, too, cost the world nothing, but gave his all—his life—that men might know the truth. I refer to Socrates, of course, who was compelled to drink the poisonous hemlock.

Third on the list was the only American in the group. A man born as lowly as the Son of God. His first meal was a little goose grease off the end of a string which Mrs. Sparrow placed in his mouth, at the same time saying, "It would be better if Nancy's baby could only die, because he ain't got no chance." We know his life. He had nothing but sorrow and suffering. Yes; Abraham Lincoln cost the world very little, but gave his own life to save this greatest of nations and for the freedom of a race.

Fourth on the list is a lady. Her prayers resulted in visions, then convictions; and with the aid of Divine Providence she conquered mighty enemies and was betrayed by those whom she saved. Joan of Arc cost the world so little, but gave her all; and in the end, like Bruno, went heavenward in the chariot of fire.

The fifth was Asoka. He was placed on this list as the most unselfish man who ever walked the globe and who not only gave himself but completely forgot himself.

Sixth on the list we have a man who did not suffer martyrdom but suffered much worse—banishment. He saved the people of Austria-Hungary and was banished by those whom he saved. I refer to Louis Kossuth. He loved those who in the world's terms said they were his enemies, and in his famous speech at Birmingham, after suffering, he said, "I did not save the people of Austria-Hungary. They saved me." It has been said that the three greatest orations ever delivered were Christ's Sermon on the Mount, Kossuth's speech at Birmingham, and the speech which John Brown made to the judge who sentenced him to death.

The seventh, and last but not least, on the list is Savonarola, priest and prophet, who likewise cost the world practically nothing, but in the end was compelled to forfeit his life because he loved the lowly and the weak.

Why do I mention these names in discussing the life of William McKinley? I think it better illustrated this way:

I must tell you of a little girl. She was compelled to listen to a crank deliver an address on a street corner. The crank was ranting, "I tell you there is no heaven. I tell you there is no heaven. I can prove there is no heaven." The little girl looked to the face of her father and said, "Daddy, then why doesn't he go to h— and quit making so much fuss about it?"

I think we have one of the greatest in the person of William McKinley, who demonstrated more love for his fellow-men than any citizen of this country—without making a fuss about it.

William McKinley, twenty-fifth President of the United States, was born in Niles, Ohio, in 1843. He was educated at Poland Academy and Allegheny College, though he never finished his course in the latter institution. In 1861 he volunteered in the Union Army and entered the Ohio Infantry as a private. He served 4 years, rising by merit to the captaincy of his company and to the rank of major when mustered out in 1865.

Entering politics as a Republican, he was elected to Congress in 1876, and was reelected for six successive terms. In 1882 his election was contested and he was unseated, but he was returned at the next election. In 1890 a Democratic legislature grossly gerrymandered his district, making it easy to defeat him for reelection.

His reputation in Congress rests chiefly on the tariff bill that bears his name. This bill and his able advocacy of it before the House distinguished him as the leader of the Republican Party on the tariff question.

In 1891 McKinley was elected Governor of Ohio by a large plurality and was reelected in 1893. In 1895 a systematic canvass in McKinley's behalf for the Presidential nomination was instituted by his supporters and was continued until the convention of 1896. He was nominated, and, after an extremely bitter campaign on the issue of the gold standard versus free coinage of silver, was elected as champion of the gold standard.

President McKinley's first term is memorable chiefly for the occurrence of the Spanish-American War. That his policy during 1896-1900 was acceptable was shown by his unanimous renomination and by his reelection in 1900 by an electoral majority of 137. His second term began most auspiciously but ended tragically. On September 5, 1901, he visited the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, that day having been set apart in his honor and called the President's day. On the afternoon of the following day, while holding a public reception in the Temple of Music, he was shot twice by Leon Czolgosz. The wounded President was removed to the residence of John G. Milburn, president of the exposition, and he died there September 14.

One time while a Member of this Congress of these United States of America, friends from the district which he had the honor to represent reported to Congressman McKinley that enemies back in the district were circulating malicious

gossip about him and that he had better make a public reply. He answered, "I have no enemies. My constituents have a right to express what they claim to be their opinions. I need criticism and I love those who criticize me. They help me most."

Conciliatory and gracious, respectful of his opponent's point of view, he never would consent to belittle those who did not see eye to eye with him. He would have been shocked, and his great heart would have recoiled in horror at a "smear" campaign. Never pugnacious, never profane or vulgar, never self-assertive, he sought no quarrels, he put on no airs, he cherished no ambition to be the master of anyone, he refused to indulge in personalities.

Members of Congress, might this not be a charter of action for all of us? If we love our enemies we lose them. The man who indulges in personalities or gossip is talking about himself. The man who smears, either by public utterance or by use of the printed page, exposes his own cheap biography to public view and places his asininity on parade.

Selfish groups did not intimidate Congressman McKinley. He never followed a personality. He stood for Principle. His only concern was, "Is it right?" And to those who could not share his convictions he was so affable and genial, so friendly and sincere, so kind and generous, so humble and genuine that people who differed with his policies did not for an instant distrust him. People believed him, consequently they believed in him.

One day in this great body a Member, who was temporarily under domination of self-righteousness, endeavored to coin a phrase "Midwest isolationist." We do not know how the other Midwestern States reacted to the remark, but we of Ohio followed the example of William McKinley. We hold no resentment. Never reply to an untruth. Let me direct your attention to his last address setting forth his views on the future of America:

Geographic and political divisions will continue to exist, but distances have been effaced. Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. God and men have linked the nations together. No nation can longer be indifferent to any other. And as we are brought more and more in touch with each other, the less occasion is there for misunderstandings, and the stronger the disposition, when we have differences, to adjust them in the court of arbitration, which is the noblest forum for the settlement of international disputes. We have a vast and intricate business built up through years of toil and struggle, in which every part of the country has its stake, which will not permit of either neglect or undue selfishness. Our capacity to produce has developed so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention. Only a broad and enlightened policy will keep what we have. No other policy will get more. By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. The period of exclusiveness is past. Gentlemen, let us ever remember that our interest is in concord not conflict; and that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war.

Post-mortem eulogy is only back pay. For our living great we have only epitaphs; only for our dead epitaphs.

Long before men, who were too lazy to think, were calling others whom they wished to discredit such names as "Communists," "isolationists," "Fascists," "visionary daydreamers," "pink professors," our beloved McKinley from the then forward Midwest—as it always has been and it is now—reflected his beloved Ohio as one of the first internationalist Congressmen and later as one of its first internationalist Presidents.

The leader of the majority side of this great deliberative body, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] once said, "To me a philosopher is a man who seeks the truth." A man unselfishly guided seeking the truth soon lives the truth. Many of us will need that this week. May we have that guidance which McKinley had while we are adjudicating this great question we will be debating this week. May we have this courage which will automatically guide the truth-seekers to refrain from any statement unless we are led by that truth in these critical hours. If millions of men have courage over there, surely we can have the moral courage to do what is right in the great issues debated this week as well as the great issues which will follow regardless of consequences to ourselves. Is the issue on which we are asked to vote this week imperative and needed, or is it one which if adopted will place free men in shackles and chains? Rightly guided like the great martyred McKinley and thoroughly garrisoned with this truth which guided him, we will have the courage to do right as He gives us to see it right. The harvest of right action needs no word of explanation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and second anniversary of the birth of William McKinley. At home in my native city of Canton, Ohio, where President McKinley spent most of his life, citizens are honoring his memory by wearing a carnation—his favorite flower. At church services and a birthday banquet, expressions of love and reverence are being expressed in a more formal way.

With the recurring birthdays, fewer and fewer persons are living in his home town and in the counties he represented in this Chamber who can say they were his intimates. The old anecdotes of his career from the mouths of contemporaries are being kept alive by persons who never knew him. The lawyers who spoke with him from the same political rostrum in his home county, as well as the Democratic stump speakers who campaigned against him, are gone. Those of us who are left must resort to the cold-written

history to learn about him and his brilliant career.

We in this body have particular reason to pause a moment in his memory. He was a political product of this body, starting from here after seven terms of distinguished service on his upward march to the Governorship of Ohio and then to the Presidency of the United States. His career is proof that earnest and intelligent application in this body often leads to higher preferment.

As a Member of Congress from his home county and some of the adjacent counties that were a part of his district, I count it fortunate that as a boy I heard him speak often from the famous McKinley porch in Canton and, therefore, I carry in my memory an exact picture of his fine countenance and presence.

APPOINTMENT AS DIRECTORS OF THE COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the act of June 10, 1872, 17 Statutes 360, the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Hospital for Women the following Members of the House: Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey, and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 107 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 8 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule on the May bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 which the Committee on Rules brings to the House for consideration. Eight hours' general debate has been proposed. The members of the Committee on Military Affairs thought that time reasonable, and the Committee on Rules agreed. The reporting of this bill, however, is not to be taken as an indication that all members of the Committee on Rules are enthusiastic about it as written. I think it fails and fails woefully to satisfy the demands of public opinion. The public is looking to the Congress for a work-or-fight bill, and this is no such measure. It is hardly more than a pretense and an illusion, and unless it is strengthened by amendments giving it real substance, making it at least in part what the country is entitled to, I shall be indifferent as to whether it is

adopted or thrown out. I think the question is so important that the Members of the House should strive as best they can to be present during the 8 hours' debate.

I have no particular desire to attack the measure. My complaint is that it is hardly more than a gesture and fails to meet the needs of the hour.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is the gentleman satisfied that legislation of this kind meets the constitutional requirements?

Mr. COX. I do not think that there is any constitutional objection to the measure. I am simply doubtful if the good that could possibly result from its adoption would even remotely compensate for the injury that will result.

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

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

Mr. MASON. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me in my thought that the gesture in this bill will do a lot more harm than good in that it promises to solve a problem that confronts the Nation, and this bill utterly fails to solve that problem.

Mr. COX. I will let the gentleman's question stand. I am not satisfied with the bill, and I question if the good will offset the bad.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Georgia has stated, this measure provides for an open rule. It also gives sufficient time for extensive debate and unlimited amendments. That gives us all the opportunity of a comprehensive consideration of this measure.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, I am undecided whether or not I am for this bill. My decision will probably be decided by the presentation of the older Members of this body, both Republicans and Democrats alike, whom we all greatly admire. In addition, the nature of the amendments will play a very important part in my decision, as well as the validity of the arguments advanced in the course of the debate.

We recall with deep satisfaction that since the declaration of war there has been no dissection among this membership which as a body have wholeheartedly and conscientiously supported all legislation deemed essential to bring this war to an early and successful conclusion; establish an equitable world peace and to bring our boys back home. At the slightest request of the Chief Executive we have given him untold billions and have clothed him with unprecedented powers for the successful prosecution of the war. Complete harmony to this end has existed and in this purpose there has been no partisanship.

It is with regret that we, having proceeded with the indicated harmony deemed essential in the war effort, have been confronted with the continually

bickering and squabbling among some of the executive departments—dissension in the State Department resulting in complete reorganization; cabinet members drunk with power fighting each other for more power; overlapping and conflicting bureau directives. At this moment we are confronted with the spectacle of the replacement of a tried and experience administrator to make way for one untried and unexperienced, and this situation precipitated by the President for the declared purpose of paying a political debt. Both the Congress and our people are seriously wondering why it is necessary to bring to the service physically handicapped men for the prosecution of the war while Mr. Roosevelt for political reward has eliminated the admittedly capable and experienced administrator, Jesse Jones, from a post which is so essential to the over-all prosecution of the war. There is no complacency or lack of cooperation on the part of the American people except as it may have been inspired by utterances from the executive departments themselves. Immediately before the election our people were told that the war would be over in Europe before December. We were told that there was no shortage of anything for our fighting men. In a concluding speech our people were assured by the President that equipment was complete to the last cartridge. Ration points were lowered on everything. We heard of reconversion on every hand. Our executive department boasted of the many cancellations of contracts. Plants were being shut down. Men working in these plants were discharged and were complaining of actual unemployment. That was before election. Now we find higher ration points than ever before. Now we hear of shortages in war equipment so serious that the President is demanding this labor draft bill with the prospect that in the near future there will be demanded a general draft of all civilians. Before election we heard nothing about a coal shortage. Emergency after emergency has been the shibboleth and battle cry of this administration. As you know, the question of a new miners contract comes up shortly. Who is doing anything about it? I venture the assertion that there will be no action taken to successfully anticipate this emergency. When the war is successfully ended we will have a peace emergency. This will be followed by others.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to read an extract from a Minneapolis paper apropos the remarks he is now making?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The title of the article is "Poorly Clothed Yanks Freezing on Western Front." It is by Jack Bell who is with the Seventy-seventh Division in Belgium. He says:

Fifty American soldiers sat in a big room. Their eyes were red. Their faces drawn. They had not shaved for several days. Their combat jackets and trousers were wet and muddy. On the floor beside each were his shoes, socks, and overshoes. The doctors went down the line examining their bare feet. The men flinched as the medics lightly

pressed unnatural white or bluish spots. Their feet had been frozen.

They had been frozen according to this article because the boys had no dry clothing to change into. Presumably, the clothing which should have gone to these boys over on the western front had been sent to other countries.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Surely.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering if the gentleman from Minnesota would like to have a lot of fellows in this country stay out of the war plants and thus keep those 50 soldiers from having the necessary uniforms and shoes and so forth to keep their feet from being frostbitten and to make them more comfortable?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman wish to be put in the position of condoning the lack of clothing on the western front as pointed out by this article? Would the gentleman explain to the House what the great Committee on Military Affairs, of which he is the able chairman, is doing to rectify this situation?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield any further.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am not condoning anything. I am trying to get these fellows to work to furnish these troops.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am sorry I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

I express the hope that all these will be determined with that far-sighted statesmanship as will make possible that our young men and women in the armed services and those not old enough for service, all, who have never lived a normal American life, will find that out of this confusion of administration and the holocaust of war there may yet come to them the peace, contentment, and opportunity of American life to which they are entitled as a heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that every Member of this body is impressed with the seriousness of this pending legislation. We all know that it involves grave constitutional questions. We all realize its serious implications. The very fact that this membership will give to this debate their constant attention is indicative of the seriousness of which it is regarded and the further fact that at this time they have not determined their course of action, which course will depend largely on the earnest debate which will ensue.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to enter into a political discussion or undertake to answer some of the political observations made by my friend who has just preceded me because this bill is too important a bill, bearing on the conduct of the war and the life of our Nation, to have the debate befogged by partisan considerations. I take the floor at this time to discuss the bill generally and urge that we view it from one angle, and that is the national interest of the United States of America. The

pending bill, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] said, is only a limited national service act.

But I cannot agree with my dear friend in his statement that it is an illusion. The bill will do a lot of good, if enacted into law, in connection with the conduct of the war. I would not take issue with my friend from Georgia if he said the bill does not go far enough; but the bill in its present form certainly is a contribution, and if enacted into law, will make a real contribution on the homefront toward the winning of this global war.

It is a limited National Service Act, applying only to men between the ages of 18 and 45. The purpose of the act is to assure production of those things necessary to win the war. The passage of the bill is in the national interest of our country.

Those of us who were here a few years ago voted for the Selective Service Act. By our votes we voted to induct those covered by that law into our armed forces to fight and, if necessary, to die for our country. We used compulsion by operation of law, to take human beings from their little world, from their families, from their every-day walks of life, to serve, to fight, to die if necessary, that our country might live. The history of this war shows that this generation of Americans who are in our fighting forces have risen to the heights of greatness. The historians of tomorrow will record the greatness of the youth of this generation.

The purpose of this limited bill is to give to those in uniform, our fighters at the front, our sons, our relatives, our friends, our fellow Americans, the weapons of war necessary to win. This bill is a marked step in that direction. In my opinion, as I have said before, because of that, the national interest of our country calls for its passage. Yes; the sacrifices being made by millions of Americans, those who are serving in our armed forces, and certainly those who have paid the supreme sacrifice, call for the passage of this bill, and even more, I will admit, but at least for the passage of this bill. You and I voted to have men fight for and, if necessary, die for our country. The least we can do is to vote to have, when noncooperation exists, men work for our country in time of war. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY], we cannot permit fear or any other human emotions to interfere in doing for country what is our clear duty. And that is—to pass this bill.

The present bill is an important one. It is an improvement over the bill as introduced. That is to be expected. The hearings in the committee in executive session, as was natural to expect, made improvements in the bill. According to the account carried in the newspapers it was reported out of committee by a vote of 20 to 5.

The American Legion supports the bill. I have a very fine observation made by the National Commander Scheiberling, of the American Legion. In an article appearing in the January issue of the magazine, *American Federation*, he ably and effectively said, in part:

As our armed forces are fighting for total victory, we must give them total support.

This responsibility does not rest with any one organization or group of organizations. It rests with the American people—all of us. * * * If we fail our fighting men, they must be prepared to share the blame equally. And if we do fail our fighting men, it won't matter who is at fault. Our whole way of life will be gone.

The American Legion's position on the production of the tools of war is straightforward and simple. We are pledged to no interruption in the flow of equipment and supplies to our fighting forces; no gaps in the ranks of voluntary manpower needed to produce the tools for victory.

The press generally supports the bill editorially, and in this connection I quote from an editorial entitled "War Work Bill," that appeared recently in the Washington Post:

As it stands, the bill would invoke a minimum of coercion to fill all essential wartime jobs. First, it would freeze men of military age in the jobs they now hold by voluntary choice. They could shift to other jobs, however, with the consent of their Selective Service boards, and the right of appeal would be preserved. Second, if manpower shortages should still be in evidence after this freezing, registrants in nonessential industries could be requested by their draft board to shift to war work. Then, if still further action should be necessary to attain full production for war, registrants could be ordered to take essential jobs they are qualified to fill. To avoid compelling any one individual to work for any one employer, the workers would have to be given "a reasonable choice of employers." In other words, they would be required to work for their country at war and not for the benefit of any employer.

Without discussing the details of the bill at this time, as I shall probably enter the debate on the bill when it is considered under the 5-minute rule; on the one hand we have groups who, in good faith but erroneously oppose; on the other we have the great national interest of our country. You and I are elected to represent hundreds of thousands of American citizens. We are here in a representative capacity, and our people have imposed upon us the duty and responsibility of acting for them in this chamber for their best interests and the best interests of our country.

As I said, without bringing political considerations into this debate, because this bill transcends politics, and I hope the debate will continue along the line of non-political argument, confined to a discussion of the merits of the legislation, you and I are here as representatives of our constituents and as Americans charged with the duty and responsibility imposed upon us by the Constitution, we have the vote in this Chamber representing the hundreds of thousands of citizens back home. They have selected us. The duty and the responsibility rests upon us. I respectfully submit that in the exercise of this responsibility we must approach the problem fearlessly and with the best interests of our country uppermost in our minds. Imperfect though this bill may be in the opinion of some—the situation calls for its passage. The bill may be amended in this particular or that particular, but I hope and urge that this bill, in substance, be passed by this body.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 107 makes in order the bill H. R. 1752. This resolution was reported by the Committee on Rules following a rather lengthy hearing on H. R. 1752, which is, perhaps, popularly known as the work-or-fight bill. I am not certain just how much "work" it provides for, and certainly it does not provide for any "fighting." Instead of that, it is really a work-or-pay-a-fine bill, or a work-or-go-to-jail bill.

The bill is filled with inconsistencies. Very frankly, I am not certain what it contains. I do not know what many of its provisions mean, and I am not alone in this position, because the members of the Committee on Military Affairs who reported this bill seemingly could not agree among themselves as to what many of the sections of the measure really mean.

I question greatly the constitutionality of this bill. This is a matter, as I understand it, that the Military Affairs Committee did not discuss in their hearings.

I do not know just exactly what the need for this legislation may be, for seemingly no widespread investigation has been made to learn what the needs for manpower in the various war plants in this country really are. I do know that many reports have been coming to us of the wastage of manpower. I do know that many, many war plants have been closed down in the last year. I do know that other war plants have had their production restricted as the result of orders received from those in power here in Washington.

I do not know whether this bill is an antistrike bill or a labor bill. Section 2 prohibits any voluntary stoppage of work by any individual. That could be taken to apply to strikes. But, when the question was asked whether or not this would prevent a man from striking, some on the committee said "Yes," some said "No." Before our committee some said, "We will let the local draft board pass upon the question as to whether or not it is a legal strike." Of course, in many war plants there are a large number of men working who are registered with different draft boards. So you might conceivably have a situation where one draft board would say it is illegal for you to strike and to quit your job, and if you do you will go to jail. Another draft board might say it is a legal strike. Then, on the other hand, those in the classification of 18 to 45 might not be permitted to strike, while men over 45 would be.

There is also a question as to whether or not a man who may be drafted under this bill may be compelled to take a position where he will be forced to also join a union against his will.

Labor generally is opposed to this bill. Management seemingly also is opposed to the bill. On the other hand, the men charged with the military safety of this

country have told the Committee on Military Affairs, and through that committee the Rules Committee and the House of Representatives, that its passage is necessary. There is a question in my mind whether the men who lead our military forces know as much about getting production out of the factories of the country as do the men charged with heading the management thereof, or the men who represent labor.

I am firmly of the conviction, however, and I hold to the opinion, that were it not for the fact that those high in this administration had totally underestimated the needs of this Nation for war, if they had not been wrong in their judgment as to what would be required of the productive facilities of this country, this bill would not be before us now.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing, that I believe this rule should be adopted and that the House should give this bill its most careful consideration.

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

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I can see from the way this debate is shaping up that this is probably one of the most controversial measures that we have ever had before the House. In the light of present conditions I think it is equally one of the most crucial and one of the most important. If this were peacetime I think I could find just as many objections to this type of legislation as any Member of the House. I am willing to concede it is full of errors, full of things we do not like, probably ambiguous, and I am willing to concede also any of the objections that any Member wants to make to it; yet I do not think that is the question or will be the question in our ultimate and final vote on this bill that we will have to decide.

Maybe this measure should never have come to the floor of the House; perhaps it was a mistake to have agitated the subject at this late day in the war; but it is before us, it is here and we are going to have to vote upon it. We will have to tell the country and the armed forces whether we are going along with this type of legislation. I am not here to contend that any Member of this House could not have written a better bill. I suppose we all think we could have written a better bill. But that is not the question. This is the measure that we are here to vote upon. It is on this measure, when you come to vote aye or nay on the final passage, that you are going to have to ask your conscience, both Democrats and Republicans, whether in this hour, notwithstanding our objections, you can give a vote of no confidence to the Chiefs of Staff of the American armed forces. That is the question involved here and no other question. Many of us are going to vote for this measure with deep reluctance, and with deep misgivings.

It has been said in the press that I intend to offer certain amendments. I could offer a whole lot of amendments. I think there would be a lot of amendments that would improve this bill. But

so far as my present intention goes I do not expect to offer any amendment. I shall support some amendments, and I shall oppose others but I cannot at this moment think of any amendment that the enemies of this measure can put on here that is going to drive me away or cause me to cast a vote of no confidence in the Chiefs of Staff and our Commander in Chief in this critical period of the war. I expect to support the measure no matter what you put on it.

This debate so far has taken a wide range. It looks like we are going to debate everything from the necessity of rationing food to the foreign policy of the State Department. Many of us are going to talk about a better method of settling this thing. There are going to be all sorts of suggestions that we ought to do this, and that, and the other. As a rocking-chair general, I do not yield to any man. I am just as good a rocking-chair strategist as any of you. I expect I can tell General Marshall more ways to win this war than he ever dreamed of. The trouble with them is that they are all cockeyed, and the only difference between us rocking-chair generals and General Marshall is that he knows what he is talking about. He has told this Congress that this law is necessary, and during the consideration of the measure by the Committee on Military Affairs the President, your Commander in Chief, did the very unusual thing of writing to that committee and saying to them what I am saying to you now, that notwithstanding your objections to the details of this measure, notwithstanding the fact that many of us could have written, as we will concede, a better measure, notwithstanding that we believe there are certain defects in it—notwithstanding all these things, this is a necessary measure for the winning of this war, and he urged us to pass it.

Let us boil this thing right down to what it is. This Congress, without political consideration, both Democrats and Republicans, from the time we began the preparation for this terrible conflict back in 1940, without regard to party, has given to the President and to the armed forces every single measure that they have asked for as a necessary thing for the conduct and successful conclusion of this war. This is one time when we seem to be in danger of faltering. There is but one question involved here, as I said before, can we afford to tell the country, can we afford to tell the boys in the trenches all over the world that we are going to deny them one single thing here in this very critical hour, probably the most critical hour? Are we going to deny them one single thing that the Commander in Chief has asked us for and that the Chiefs of Staff have asked us for? That is the only question involved in the passage of this bill. You can talk about any number of things that you wish to talk about. You can bring in any unrelated subject, but there is but one thing involved here, and that is are you this first time in the history of legislation over this war going to give a vote of confidence or a vote of no confidence in this administration and in your Chiefs of Staff?

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman were convinced in his own mind, having regard to his responsibility as a Member of this body, the civil government, that the passage of this bill would decrease production rather than increase it, would he still feel compelled to support it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is an academic question. I do not believe it. As a matter of fact, I believe the very contrary of that.

Mr. HALLECK. Is not that the fundamental question that everyone must resolve? Will it increase production or will it decrease production?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is just where I do not agree with the gentleman. I think the only measure we have before us is this measure, and this is a measure that the Commander in Chief says he needs; this is a measure the Chief of Staff says he needs. I think their judgment about how to run this war is better than mine, and I intend to abide by it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, we are not presently discussing the bill, we are discussing the advisability of considering the bill. The only question before the House is, Shall the House bring up this bill for 8 hours of general debate, and then read the bill section by section under the 5-minute rule, so that every Member of the House may offer such germane amendments as he or she may see fit, that is, to perfect the bill?

Certainly this is not a political bill. It must not be a political partisan bill. We are in a war and we must win that war, not Republicans, Democrats or new dealers, but all of us. I agree very often with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who just spoke, but I do not agree with him that there is just one question here, which is, Shall we vote for this bill as it is written even without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i," in order that we may show to the world that we are expressing a vote of confidence in our military leaders? I believe in our military leaders, but I shall not support any bill which I am convinced is not good legislation just because this group demands it. The gentleman from Virginia of course means that he will vote for perfecting amendments, and maybe I misunderstood him. I am sure that no person or group of persons controls him, and that in the end whatever he does will be the judgment of the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, and no one else.

The purpose of this work-or-fight bill as stated by the report of the committee, is to provide a means of meeting during wartime the manpower requirements in civilian activities, occupations, and endeavors found essential to the war effort. I take it that we are all in harmony with this purpose. It is an admirable and laudable purpose. What we are trying to do in the bill is to write a formula—a rule of action—that will accomplish the objective.

At the moment I do not know whether I am going to vote for this bill when it is finally whipped into shape, or whether I am going to vote against it. Possibly I might vote against it today. Again I may vote for it after I have heard the debate and had the benefit of the committee's explanation.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only politics that makes strange bedfellows. I just do not remember the time when apparently all organized labor and organized management, ranging from the C. I. O. to the National Manufacturers' Association, have come to Congress unitedly supporting specific legislation. This anomalous condition is worthy of more than passing notice. I do not believe these groups are united and marching arm in arm on this issue because of personal affection or a desire to be helpful one to the other. However, the IV-F men who come under the penalty provisions of this bill must render service in the manager's factory and under the labor rules and regulations made legal by virtue of compliance with the National Labor Relations Act. The Congress would hardly be warranted in ascribing any motive to the attitude of these two groups other than a sincere belief on the part of each that this bill will not work; that is, that it will not get the additional production necessary in the war effort.

If after the evidence is all in and the arguments are closed, one is convinced that this bill is more likely to retard production than it is to help production, then his duty is clear. Of course, no one can give a positive answer. Personally, I do not want to embark upon a new philosophy of attempting to draft certain members of society and place them in designated factory work without giving to them much of the same consideration given to others who are drafted and placed in the military service. In a democracy there must be equality under the law.

Mr. Speaker, it is seldom indeed that so many Members are so much at sea as to just what their duty is in connection with legislation. This is no time for prejudice, emotion, or political partisanship. It is a time for deep thought and sincere and patriotic action.

For my part, in the final analysis I am going to do that which my conscience tells me is for our best interests in the end, and I am sure my constituents would not want me to do otherwise.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, we have had some very splendid statements here, some very laudable statements, and some statements made upon a very high plane of patriotism and duty. I almost feel a bit presumptuous in attempting to add anything to what has been said. I do want to say that I regard this bill as a most momentous one. I regard this hour as a most momentous one. I regard the crisis in which the country finds itself as most momentous and I regard the position of the boys in uniform in the fox holes and on the high seas under the frozen conditions which exist on the fighting fronts as most momentous. I

cannot bring myself to believe that any man or woman who has enjoyed the confidence of their constituencies sufficiently to be selected by them to represent them in this House of Representatives in this momentous period of the country's history would be small enough or would be unpatriotic enough to do otherwise than as they regard their patriotic duty under the conditions which face us. I am sure that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] felt and meant what he said. I am sure my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] meant and felt what he said. I think one did not understand the other. I think they both have in mind what you and I have in mind, namely, to endeavor to give the support to those boys over there which they are entitled to receive from us at this time. I do not think my friend from Virginia meant to say that this bill could not be improved upon. I think he knows that it can be improved upon. Of course, you and I and no other person has a monopoly on how this bill should have been written.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield briefly.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will give me the opportunity to correct the gentleman from Michigan, I never said I did not favor any amendment to the bill. On the contrary, I said that I would.

Mr. COLMER. That is right. I think I understood the gentleman. None of us has a monopoly on the correct version. There are some amendments I want to see written in this bill. Time would not permit a detailed discussion of them. There are some amendments that should be written into this bill, and I may want to have an opportunity to say something about it myself later on. I do want to say this: Some 2 weeks before this bill was introduced originally by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], a man of courage and of great patriotism, I began working on a bill to try to attain this objective. I wrote a bill with the help of the legislative counsel. Unfortunately I did not get the views of the military authority, and, of course, when I went before the Committee on Military Affairs, not being a member of that committee, I did not expect to get very far with my viewpoint after the military and other agencies of the Government had gotten together on the so-called May bill.

I say that in fairness to everybody. There is no criticism of anybody, especially of the Military Affairs Committee. It was their responsibility to write this bill and recognize it.

I would not say that, regardless of the form this bill took, I would vote for it, but I will go this far along with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that it would be pretty hard to find something that could be put into the bill that would prevent giving my voice and my support to those boys on the fighting front.

Nobody in America has made any sacrifice in this war with the exception of

the boys who are over there and those who are in distress in soul and heart and mind, who are left behind to grieve for them. The rest of us are more prosperous and better off than ever before. Most of us are living better than we ever lived before in our lives. The only sacrifice, I repeat, has been made by those whom you and I have called into the uniform of their country. Why should not the man who stays at home be forced, if necessary, to make some contribution to this war effort? Who will rise and tell me now in the brief time I have remaining, that the same Congress which reaches out and taps the young, virile manhood of this country on the shoulder and tells them to come in and put on the uniform of their country and go over there and die for it, has not also the authority and the duty to reach out and tell the other man who is getting higher wages than he ever got and who is living better in most instances than he ever lived, that he must make his contribution to the winning of this war? Mr. Speaker, the fact that no one rises to challenge this statement is indicative of the fact that it is unchallengeable.

A moment ago I spoke of the bill which I had introduced to meet this situation which now confronts us. And while I realize that without the backing of the War Department, the Executive, or those responsible for the war effort, my bill would have little chance of passage, I am still, nevertheless, of the opinion that it was an all-out and forthright approach to the problem. In fact, my objection to the bill under consideration is that it is another weak attempt to meet a real problem. I have learned in my service here that when we attempt to enact a bill to meet a problem of the country, that we compromise in an effort to meet the objection of so many segments and groups of our people that, in the end, the legislation fails to squarely solve the problem and too often the result is so much eyewash. That is what happened in the Smith-Connally bill, when we set out so boldly to do something about strikes in war industries during the war. Nevertheless, my desire to approach some degree of equality of sacrifice by all of our people in this war impels me to the support of this measure, unless it is too badly crippled by further weakening amendments as we consider it.

My own approach to the problem in my bill to which I referred, nevertheless, I think, was more forthright.

Briefly, the bill would set up another branch of the military forces to be known as the supply forces. All persons subject to the provisions of selective service, who are in a deferred status, would automatically be included in a pool known as the supply forces and be placed on inactive status subject to the call of the President as Commander in Chief to render such service as is considered essential to the war effort. When the services of such person so deferred were needed for the war effort, he would be called from inactive status to active status in the supply forces. The provisions of the bill would apply to, first, those persons presently deferred because of physical disability, the so-called

IV-F's, who are not presently engaged in essential war work and who could pass a prescribed physical examination; second, those persons not engaged in an occupation essential to the war effort; third, those persons who are enjoying occupational deferment but who strike or leave their jobs; fourth, those persons who were engaged in a job essential to the war effort who acquired a record, after the passage of this bill, of willful absenteeism for which there was no reasonable justification; and, fifth, all other persons subject to the provisions of the selective-service law not herein enumerated who are not specifically exempt by law.

The bill also provides that net profits on war contracts in excess of \$10,000 shall be limited to 6 percent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time, 11 minutes, to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include some brief excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. While the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] was addressing the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] asked him whether he believed there would be more production or less production in the event of the passage of this bill, and I believe the gentleman from Virginia did not answer that question. So I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he thinks the only thing that should govern our votes is the fact that President Roosevelt wants it, or are there some other things that should govern our votes, and what are those things?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I think there are three or four important questions to determine. I approach the discussion and consideration of this bill with an open mind. It should not be political or partisan in any sense. I think the first thing to determine is whether or not this legislation is necessary; second, will the provisions of this bill increase or diminish production; and third, is the bill as finally submitted, constitutional or unconstitutional.

As far as I am concerned, therefore, in the consideration of this bill I shall constantly keep these main issues before me. The matter before us at the moment is the consideration of the rule. I favor the adoption of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have had granted to me time to discuss another matter. With the Speaker's indulgence I shall use the time allotted to me to speak on this other matter. Because I have so much to say and my time is so limited I regret that I shall not be able to yield. I am going to speak on the equal-rights amendment.

EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1945, I introduced House Joint Resolution No. 71 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which is as follows:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress and the several States shall have power, with their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

This amendment shall take effect three years after the date of ratification.

This resolution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution.

At least 7 other Members of the House have introduced identical or similar resolutions, and approximately 73 Members of the House have joined as sponsors in supporting this suggested amendment.

A similar amendment was introduced in the House and Senate of the Seventy-eighth Congress. These were referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and House. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate reported the resolution favorably. A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee made a unanimous favorable report to the full committee, but the full committee did not take favorable action.

The National Woman's Party, headed by Miss Alice Paul, has since 1913 spearheaded in the movement to secure equal rights for men and women without regard to sex. Miss Paul was a very active and effective leader in helping to secure the franchise for women. Thirty-one national organizations of women and teachers have endorsed this proposed equal-rights amendment. They are as follows:

General Federation of Women's Clubs.
National Education Association of the United States.

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

National Woman's Party.
National Association of Women Lawyers.

Women's National Democratic Club, Inc.

American Medical Women's Association, Inc.

American Society of Women Accountants.

American Women's Society of Certified Public Accountants.

Osteopathic Women's National Association.

National Association of School Secretaries.

National Council of Women Chiropractors.

Women's Auxiliary to the National Chiropractic Association.

Association of American Women Dentists.

American Federation of Soroptimists Clubs.

American Alliance of Civil Service Women.

American Council for Equal Legal Status.

National Association of Women.

National Association of Colored Women.

Mary Ball Washington Association of America.

Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Mothers and Women of America, Inc.

Congress of State Societies.

Pilot International.

St. Joan Society—Catholic Women.

We, The Mothers, Mobilize for America.

Alpha Iota Society.

Avalon National Poetry Shrine.

Wheel of Progress.

League of Professional Women.

Industrial Women's League for Equality.

These organizations represent a total of about 3,000,000 women, from every walk of life.

In introducing the resolution I not only seek to carry out the wishes of those 31 organizations of women, but to carry out the direct and specific pledges of the Republican national platforms of 1940 and 1944. These planks were unanimously approved by the Republican National Conventions, 1940 and 1944. The plank approved by the Republican National Convention at Chicago in 1944 is as follows:

We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women. We favor job opportunities in the post-war world open to men and women alike without discrimination in rate of pay because of sex.

As we recall, the Democratic platform in 1940 was silent on this important question. As evidence of the growing interest and acceptance of this proposal by the two major political parties, the Democrats approved a plank in their platform in 1944 in which the following language was used:

We favor legislation insuring equal pay for equal work regardless of sex.

We recommend to Congress the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women.

It can be seen that the two great major political parties stand committed in favor of this proposed amendment. President Roosevelt and Senator Truman, Governor Dewey and Governor Bricker, as well as each and every Republican and Democratic Member of the House and Senate in accepting their respective nominations and in approving the platforms of their respective parties, and in receiving the support of the voters of the Nation, stand pledged to submit this amendment for the consideration of the people of the several States. Being a delegate to each of those national conventions and helping to adopt the platform, and being elected on the platform in 1940 and 1944, I feel in honor bound to do what I can to carry out this pledge of my party and myself.

Our distinguished Republican leader of the House, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, who gave

valuable aid in having the equal-rights plank placed in the 1944 Republican platform, said:

I am for the amendment absolutely and unqualifiedly.

Former Senator John W. Townsend, of Delaware, chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, in commenting upon this plank in the Republican platform, stated:

The Republican Party is proud to have been the first to carry the banner of equality for women. I am wholeheartedly for the amendment and believe it will not be long before it will take its place beside the suffrage amendment in our National Constitution.

The distinguished Senator, WARREN AUSTIN, of Vermont, who presented the equal-rights amendment to the platform committee, said:

This amendment is very close to my heart and I am particularly gratified that it will be placed in the Republic platform. I had the honor of submitting the favorable report of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to the Senate in the spring of 1944 and I am very happy that it has now been approved by the whole Republican convention.

The proposal received the commendation of Governor Wills, of Vermont; Governor Bottolfsen, of Idaho; Governor Schoeppe, of Kansas; Governor Vivian, of Colorado; Governor Bacon, of Delaware, and former Governor Landon, of Kansas, as well as other governors.

Hon. Harrison Spangler, who was chairman of the National Republican Committee at the time of the convention of 1944, assured the National Woman's Party before the session of that convention began, that he had no doubt that the Republican Party would adhere to its traditional stand for justice and equality, and again endorse the amendment. Following the endorsement of the amendment, he congratulated the women workers of the Republican Party for its consistent championing of this great cause.

Hon. Henry P. Fletcher, general counsel of the National Republican Committee, the Honorable B. Carroll Reece, national committeeman from Tennessee, and scores of other Republican men and women of national prominence, commended the Republican convention on its action and are supporting actively and effectively this proposal.

This amendment merely provides that there shall be no discrimination against women or men on account of sex. We know that many of our Federal laws and some of the laws of each of our 48 States, as well as some of the ordinances of cities and towns, discriminate against women on account of their sex.

On the other hand, some Federal, State, and city laws discriminate unfairly against men, and deny to them the equal protection of the law. A case in point is the law which protects women against industrial poisons, but fails to give the same protection to men exposed to exactly the same dangers to health and life. Under the proposed amendment, no such discriminatory laws would be valid.

There are approximately as many women citizens as there are men. These discriminations against a citizen or

group of citizens is undemocratic and un-American.

Can anyone say that women are less intelligent or less patriotic than men? Statistics show that women own 65 percent of the savings accounts, 40 percent of all real estate, 60 percent of the total national wealth, and they are beneficiaries of 80 percent of the more than 60,000,000 insurance policies outstanding. They have struggled heroically and patriotically in the building of our Nation, from the landing of the Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock in 1620 and the earliest settlements in Virginia. They have carried on in loneliness and sorrow while their fathers and husbands and sons won glory on the battlefield, and they, too, have gone to war as nurses, WAC's, WAVES, MARINES, SPARS, and WASPS.

They have gone down in the valley of the shadow of death and brought forth sons and trained these sons who have defended our country on land and sea, in the air, and under the sea. They have nursed and trained our children, brought joy and comfort, honor and success, to their husbands, sons, and daughters. They have been the builders and the chief supports of the three great pillars of our national structure—the home, the school, and the church. They have taken an active and intelligent part in the office, the shop, and the mill. They have come to the Nation's rescue in helping to provide food, clothing, ships, planes, guns, tanks, shells, and other munitions of war.

Who can say that men have surpassed them in science, art, music, literature, or government, when they have had a chance, even though they have been discriminated against by Federal and State laws?

It was the heart and leadership of a woman that gave us the Red Cross, the Y. W. C. A., and many other great organizations, that touched the heart strings and the purse strings of the men and women of the world in aid of the needy and the distressed of every land, of every race, creed, and color.

The home, the church, and the school; and these great humanitarian organizations could survive without a man but not without a woman.

If this amendment is ratified by three-fourths of the States, on and after 3 years from that time there can be no discrimination by Federal or State laws on the basis of sex. This does not mean that there will be no difference between men and women in abilities, or in industrial, political, or social opportunities. It merely means that in the enactment of laws by Congress and by the legislatures of the several States, and by the ordinance of cities, neither men nor women shall be discriminated against on account of sex.

This proposed amendment will not introduce any new principles into the American conceptions of justice and right. It will simply bring our Constitution and laws into harmony with the great fundamental principles upon which our Nation was founded, and for which we are fighting today.

Let it be understood that the proposed amendment is no attack or reflection on

the millions of industrious, patriotic, home-loving, God-fearing American fathers and husbands who sincerely and dearly love their wives, children, and homes. It provides merely that there shall be no legal discriminations against fathers, husbands, mothers, wives, or any other persons on account of sex.

FIFTY CENTURIES OF STRUGGLE

In the beginning of recorded history people were divided into two groups, one of which was a very small group whose members arrogated to themselves the right to become emperors, kings, dictators, and masters over the others, and a much larger group, classed as dependents, slaves, or servants. They were governed without their consent. They were held in subjugation by force. They yearned to be free. They desired religious, political, social, and industrial freedom. They struggled through the centuries. Millions of them gave their lives for freedom. Occasionally empires and kingdoms were overthrown and the people enjoyed temporary liberty.

Finally the British barons wrested from King John that great document, the Magna Carta. A few of the important rights of the barons were set out in writing, which King John was forced to sign. The common people and women had very little place in that great document. This large group struggled against oppression. Thousands of them left their home in Europe and sought homes in the New World. But the long arm of power and might of the few reached across the Atlantic and imposed their will upon those who came here seeking religious, political, social, and industrial freedom. After nearly 80 years of struggle, in the American Revolution we broke the power of those oppressors.

Our founding fathers wrote the Constitution. It is an immortal document. It is as high above the Magna Carta in human rights as the heavens are high above the earth. We achieved religious, political, social, and industrial freedom for the white men of America. But in that great instrument we sadly neglected to recognize the rights of white women, black men, and black women. Black men and black women remained slaves; white women for the most part were denied social, political, economic, and industrial liberty.

We fought another great war to save this Nation and to free black men and black women. We adopted the thirteenth, the fourteenth, and the fifteenth amendments that made black men and black women free, and gave the black man the right to vote. But white women and black women were denied the right to vote. Until the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted, women, like idiots, aliens, and convicted criminals, were still without the right to vote except in a few States. I never could understand why we denied our mothers, our wives, the mothers of our children, this great group of patriotic, liberty-loving citizens, the right to vote and placed them in a class with idiots, criminals, and aliens.

It was my great good fortune to be a delegate to the Republican National Convention at Chicago in 1916, and to serve

as a member of the resolutions committee in that convention. A very substantial majority of that committee wrote a plank into the platform urging that American women be given the right to vote on the same terms as men. The convention approved that plank in the Republican platform. In 1918 I was elected a Member of the House of Representatives. I was sworn in on March 4, 1919. President Wilson called an extra session of Congress, and after the House was organized and certain preliminaries were disposed of, the first vote that came up in the House was the adoption of the resolution proposing the amendment to the Federal Constitution giving American women the right to vote. It was my pleasure to vote for this resolution. It was adopted, and later ratified by the States and became the nineteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution. American mothers, wives, and sisters had the ballot. They were no longer classed with criminals, idiots, and aliens.

But American women are not entirely free politically, economically, socially, or industrially because of discriminatory laws passed by Congress, by legislatures of the several States, and by city ordinances.

This proposed amendment will remove those discriminations and prevent the enactment of any more such laws in the future. It will make American women citizens of this great Nation in truth and in fact. Then American women can rejoice with American men in the realization of the dreams of the common men and women of 50 centuries ago.

In the near future I hope to discuss more in detail discrimination against women by reason of sex in the Federal and State laws and in the ordinances of towns and cities.

In the community-property States, all property acquired by either spouse after marriage, except that acquired by gift or inheritance, is community property and belongs theoretically to the husband and wife equally. But, as a matter of fact, the husband usually has sole control of it during the marriage and can use or dispose of it without the consent of the wife. Cases have been brought to the courts, and the right of the husband has been sustained to deny her the right to support her own children by a previous marriage out of the income she has earned after marrying him. In some States he can will away his share of the community property, but she cannot will away a cent, if she dies first, even to her own children. And in some States she has to pay an inheritance tax before she can take possession of his share of the community property if he dies first; but, if she dies first, he enters automatically into possession of her share, without paying any inheritance tax.

Equally unfair are many laws relating to property rights under the common law.

In some of the States, a woman may have, by her own efforts, bought and paid for lands, or she may have inherited the lands; yet she cannot sell these lands or any interest in them unless her husband joins in the conveyance. Any conveyance made by her without his joining in

is null and void. On the other hand, the husband with real estate in his own name and perhaps acquired largely by the intelligence, industry, or funds of his wife, can legally sell and convey the lands. Of course, if the wife should outlive the husband, she could assert dowry rights.

In many other States the earnings of the wife and minor children belong to the husband. In some jurisdictions the mother may be a woman of excellent character, industrious, and the real head of the family, while the husband may be the opposite type. Yet the father is favored as the legal guardian of the children. This is sometimes very unfortunate. I remember a little fellow, 8 years of age, who had both his feet cut off by a railroad train. The railroad denied liability. It was necessary to institute an action against the railroad. The father insisted on his legal right to be appointed guardian of his young son. The mother was an intelligent, hard-working woman with most exemplary habits. The father was just the opposite. The railroad agents, knowing the unreliability of the father, without consulting me or the mother, entered into a compromise settlement, settling the lawsuit for \$250. We managed, after considerable effort to have this settlement set aside and finally collected from the railroad approximately \$13,000. This mother would never have thought of selling her child's two feet for \$250 if she had been joint guardian of her child.

I know a man not far from my home who had a wife and 12 children, ranging from a few months to 16 years of age. They were all at home. They owned no land, no personal property except their meager clothing and household goods and one fine Jersey cow. The mother was responsible for the family having one cow. The cow was the mainstay of the family. The father traded that fine Jersey cow for an old second-hand Ford car. No persuasion could have induced that mother to have made such an improvident trade. But under the laws of Kentucky the father had the legal right to swap the family cow for this old Ford.

In many States married women are not permitted to teach in public schools, or if a woman should be a teacher and marry, she would forfeit her right to teach even though she might be the sole support of her husband and children. These laws do not apply to men.

In one or more States women are not allowed to hold a position as clerk, secretary, or stenographer to any committee of the legislature. In many jurisdictions the causes or grounds for divorce are much more rigid against women than against men. In a number of States matters relating to women are still governed by the old common law, or its principles. The old common law gave very little recognition to the political, economic, social, or industrial rights of women. In some States men may marry again on same day on which a divorce is granted them, while women must wait 10 months before they can again marry.

In some States and some cities women may be required to work longer hours than men and receive less pay for identi-

cal services. There is no State in the United States in which there are not one or more glaring discriminations under their respective laws against women on account of sex.

In many States intelligent, loyal, and patriotic women do not have the rights accorded to aliens and persons convicted of crimes in this country.

May I repeat that this amendment merely proposes that neither Congress nor State Legislatures nor city councils may pass any law that will discriminate against women or men by reason of sex. There is no more reason for discrimination of this sort than there would be for discriminating against men or women in the right to vote.

We should, without further delay, submit to the States for ratification this constitutional amendment and grant equal justice under the law.

MR. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

MR. SPEAKER, my criticism of this measure is that it does not go far enough. It is not a work-or-fight bill. Until the Congress adopts such a measure it will have failed to recognize that total war calls for total service.

DID THE PRESIDENT VIOLATE A STATE- UTE?—MORE THAN JUST ANOTHER PAY-OFF

MR. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MR. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one familiar with the political situation which has existed during the last several years should be amazed by the booting of Jesse Jones out of the Department of Commerce and the attempt to install therein Mr. Henry Wallace.

The amazing aspect of the removal and the reward is the candor and the brutal frankness with which the President puts on fair, clean, white paper the sordid, brutal nature of his action.

The political corruption of this administration has long been a matter of common knowledge. Several years ago a Senate committee, controlled by members of the Democratic Party, disclosed that money appropriated by Congress for the relief of the needy and the unfortunate, the hungry, the cold, and the sick had been used for political purposes. That is a matter of record.

The deal by which the Communist, Earl Browder, was released from the Federal penitentiary in return for his political support for the fourth-term candidate, was equaled only by the corrupt methods by which Boss Tweed, Tammany Hall, the Pendergast and other city political machines attained their ends.

The administration's blocking of legislation which would have ended one phase of Dan J. Tobin's teamsters' racketeering in the city of New York was paid for by the political support of Tobin's union in the last election.

Payments of Federal money have been made, first to one group and then to another, each with the idea that it was bread cast upon the waters, which, when

it returned, would take the shape of ballots in the box. Over and over again the administration has paid, by the granting of special favors, for the political support of Phil Murray and the Communists in his organization.

In the last campaign, when the ungodly and subversive Communists crawled into bed with the President, instead of kicking them out, he merely told them to roll over.

A Democratic Member of the other body, as long ago as June of 1937, from the floor of the Senate frankly and accurately said:

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

Jesse Jones, because of his honesty, his competency, his square dealing, had the confidence of the Congress, and billions of dollars were voted, extraordinary powers were granted, to the agencies which he headed because the Congress believed the money would be spent, the power exercised, by Jesse Jones, in the interest of national welfare. He has been a faithful public servant and as his reward he is publicly kicked out of the Cabinet to make way for Sidney Hillman's P. A. C.'s 1948 Presidential candidate.

To Mr. Jones the President wrote:

This is a very difficult letter to write—first, because of our long friendship and splendid relations during all these years and also because of your splendid services to the Government and the excellent way in which you have carried out the many difficult tasks during these years.

Did the President find it difficult to put on the mask of hypocrisy? Did his conscience hurt him because he was about to sneak a knife into the back of an efficient public servant?

In the second paragraph of his letter, the President wrote that he had told Wallace at the end of the campaign, and note that phrase—at the end of the campaign—that, because of his services in the campaign, he deserved almost any job which he—Wallace—thought he could satisfactorily perform. So Wallace picked the job—a job in the Cabinet, the one in which he could do the greatest harm to American institutions, to American business, which he has consistently berated; in which he could have the greatest opportunity to remake America—and the President gave it to him.

The President was careful to state that "at the end of the campaign" he had promised a job to Wallace.

If a job, directly or indirectly, by word, letter, or by inference, was promised to Mr. Wallace prior to the election, in return for political support during the campaign, then President Roosevelt violated section 249 of title 2 of the United States Code, which reads:

It is unlawful for any candidate to directly or indirectly promise or pledge the appointment, or the use of his influence or support for the appointment of any person to any public or private position or employment, for the purpose of procuring support

in his candidacy. (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 310, 43 Stat. 1073.)

Business—political and other kinds of business—is transacted through word of mouth, by writing, or by agreements which are implied.

There is an implied promise where the conduct on the part of one leads another to believe that, if certain things are done, the one doing them will be rewarded.

Was Mr. Wallace led to believe, by word or act, or by surrounding circumstances, that, if he relinquished his ambition, his desire to be the Vice-Presidential nominee in 1944, or, if defeated in that ambition, he wholeheartedly supported the New Deal, he would receive some reward? If he was, then he was "promised" something.

Was there, prior to Wallace's appointment as Secretary of Commerce, an understanding, explicit or implied, between the President and Mr. Wallace that Mr. Wallace should have some political position with the administration in return for support of the President, the administration, the New Deal cause, during the then pending campaign?

In the New York Times of July 12, 1944, under date of July 11, Arthur Krock wrote:

Four years ago, when the President was informed on the telephone by his floor managers at the Chicago convention that the leaders were about to nominate him for a third term but were resisting his selection of Henry A. Wallace as running mate Mr. Roosevelt sent word that his acceptance would be conditional on the choice of Mr. Wallace.

That is a statement to the effect that Mr. Roosevelt would not accept a nomination at the hands of his party unless Mr. Wallace was rewarded by being nominated as Vice President.

That statement on the part of the President is sufficient to show that, in 1940, the President was at least willing to exert his political power to give a political nomination to Mr. Wallace.

On July 14, 1944, and prior to the Democratic National Convention, according to the New York Times, the President wrote a letter, which reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON
Hyde Park, N. Y., July 14, 1944.

MY DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: In the light of the probability that you will be chosen as permanent chairman of the convention, and because I know that many rumors accompany all conventions, I am wholly willing to give you my own personal thought in regard to the selection of a candidate for Vice President. I do this at this time because I expect to be away from Washington for the next few days.

The easiest way of putting it is this: I have been associated with Henry Wallace during his past 4 years as Vice President, for 8 years earlier while he was Secretary of Agriculture, and well before that. I like him and I respect him and he is my personal friend. For these reasons I personally would vote for his renomination if I were a delegate to the convention.

At the same time I do not wish to appear in any way as dictating to the convention. Obviously the convention must do the deciding. And it should—and I am sure it

will—give great consideration to the pros and cons of its choice.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
Hon. SAMUEL D. JACKSON,
Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

The convention was held. Sidney Hillman was demanding that Mr. Wallace be given the Vice Presidential nomination. On the question of whether the President then deserted Mr. Wallace and agreed to accept Mr. TRUMAN, I find no direct evidence. We do know that Mr. Wallace acquiesced in the arrangement and the query naturally arises, Did the President, directly or indirectly, promise, by inference or otherwise, to give Mr. Wallace a position with the administration, and did Mr. Wallace acquiesce and in return campaign for the fourth term?

James B. Reston, in a special to the New York Times, which was published August 11, 1944, wrote:

President Roosevelt recently reassured Vice President Henry A. Wallace that he wants him to have an important place in the Government if the Roosevelt administration is returned to office in November.

Mr. Roosevelt is said to have sent a message to Mr. Wallace congratulating him on his fight for the Democratic Vice Presidential nomination and telling him that so long as the present administration remained in office an important post would be open to him.

Was that statement by Mr. Roosevelt held out as an inducement to Mr. Wallace to do a little campaigning for the fourth term and thereafter, because of it, did he speak for the administration.

If Mr. Wallace thinks or feels as does the average, normal human being, he must have been somewhat disappointed by his failure to receive the Vice Presidential nomination. Undoubtedly, Mr. Wallace knew that, if the President desired to exert his power at the Chicago convention, he could have forced through the nomination of Mr. Wallace.

If Mr. Roosevelt had said in July of 1944, as he did prior to the convention of 1940, that he would not accept the Presidential nomination unless Mr. Wallace was nominated as his running mate, does anyone doubt but that Wallace would have been nominated as the Vice Presidential candidate?

Disappointed and chagrined as he must have been because of the President's refusal to go all out for him, did Mr. Wallace need encouragement in order to bring him out wholeheartedly, enthusiastically, and vigorously in support of the fourth term? If he did, he must certainly have received it when the President sent him a message telling him that "so long as the present administration remained in office an important post would be open to him—Wallace."

Was the "important post" to which the President made reference and which he promised would be open to Mr. Wallace "as long as the present administration remained in office" to be a gift or a reward for past services, or was it held out as an inducement for Mr. Wallace to get into the collar and really plow in the political field a few furrows which would bring home the votes at the November election.

Perhaps we are not justified in saying what was in Mr. Roosevelt's mind when he gave Mr. Wallace the assurance of an important post in the administration "so long as the present administration remained in office." We are justified, however, in looking at his words; and the Times quotes Mr. Roosevelt as telling Mr. Wallace that he wanted him to have an important place in the Government if—just note that word "if"—the Roosevelt administration is returned to office in November.

Was that a gentle hint that the prospect of a job would be made better "if" Mr. Wallace got out and campaigned?

Did Mr. Wallace know the meaning of that little word "if"? Did that sentence mean that "if the Roosevelt administration is returned to office in November"; did it mean that "so long as the present administration remains in office," a political job would be open to Mr. Wallace, "if" Wallace went out on the hustings and did his stunt; and if his efforts were successful and the President was re-elected, Wallace would get a job? If it did and the President so meant it and Wallace so understood it, then did the President violate the statute?

Are we justified in believing that Mr. Wallace understands ordinary language, is actuated by ordinary intelligence? Would not the average man under like circumstances be led to believe and understand not only that if the administration remained in office he would get a job but that if he wanted a job he had better get out and see that the administration was returned to office at the coming election?

In his article of the 26th, David Lawrence asked if the President disregarded another statute forbidding political rewards when he sent Wallace's nomination to the Senate. Lawrence quoted section 61b of title 18 of the United States Code, which reads as follows:

It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible in whole or in part by any act of Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election.

He then cited the President's letter of January 20, 1945, to Jesse Jones and stated that the President attempted to give the office of Secretary of Commerce to Mr. Wallace as a reward for his political activities. But if he did, that alone would not be a violation of the statute.

Mr. Lawrence overlooks the fact that a man may be rewarded for political activities without violating any statute. The statute to which he makes reference and the one which I have cited makes it an offense only if the reward is given in fulfillment of a promise, express or implied, for political support.

As I read the two sections, if an individual goes out and without any promise of reward by way of appointment to a political office supports either a candidate, an administration, or a program, there is no reason why he cannot be rewarded for his support.

On the contrary, if his support is given because of a promise of political prefer-

ment, express or implied, then if the reward is bestowed as a result of that promise, the one giving it is guilty of a violation of both sections.

If Mr. William K. Hutchinson, head of the International News Service in Washington, in his dispatch quoted by Mr. Lawrence was correct, in his statement that Mr. Roosevelt, prior to the election, sent Wallace a telegram reading: "Tell Mrs. Wallace not to make any move to leave Washington. There will always be a place in my household for you," and if Mr. Roosevelt intended by that wire to advise Wallace that he would have a place in the administration in return for Wallace's support, and later Wallace, relying on the promise, supported the administration and was appointed to be Secretary of Commerce, then it might be said that the President had violated the sections above referred to.

If the foregoing quotations are true, is it not the duty of the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, to institute an investigation, present the matter to a grand jury, to ascertain whether Mr. Roosevelt, in appointing Mr. Wallace, has violated section 249 of title 2 of the United States Code, part of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, or section 61b of title 18?

It might be well to call Mr. Reston and all those who are familiar with political events at the Chicago convention and since, so that the people may know whether the Chief Executive has been unjustly maligned or whether a Federal statute has been violated.

Is there a fairly well-defined public opinion that the appointment of Mr. Wallace was in part influenced by the fact that he had, during the campaign, as the President wrote, "displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country," and that Wallace's campaigning was inspired by the hope of a political reward?

Some people seem to believe that the appointment was in part a reward for political service rendered during the last campaign. A searching investigation should be made so that, if that opinion is unfounded, the people's faith in their Chief Executive may be reinforced.

In brief, the question is, was the appointment the fulfillment of a promise, direct or implied, made to Mr. Wallace in return for his political support?

Whether the President did or did not violate a Federal statute, it is now evident to the youth of the land that a faithful, honest, efficient public official, who has given years of his life to the service of his country, can and will be publicly kicked out of office in order that a political supporter, who has few qualifications for the job, may be rewarded for that support. What a disgusting, nauseating example to put before the innocent, honest, patriotic youth of America who heretofore have believed that the good and faithful servant would at least, if not rewarded, be treated justly.

The President, by his own letter, stands disclosed, not as a man thinking first of the interest of his country, of an efficient administration, but as one who will ad-

vance his political interests, the political interests of his friends, at the expense of the public service.

The President's letter was amazing only because of his confession that he was using a public office and public funds to pay a private political debt.

Back over the years, the youth of our land have been told to look to the official acts of Washington and Lincoln as examples of honesty, of truthfulness, of faithful public service, devotion to one's country. The boys and girls were inspired to follow in the footsteps of those true Americans—to strive to be honest, truthful, self-sacrificing, and wholly devoted to our country and its institutions.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt's firing of Jones, whose record of disinterested public service he praised, to make available a highly important public office as a reward for political work, is a sorry, sordid example to place before American youth. It tends to disillusion them, impair their faith in public officials. The President should give more thought to the war, less to the political arena.

Harry Whiteley, editor of the Dowagiac Daily News of Dowagiac, Mich., on the 22d last expressed views which are similar to those of many an editor outside the great metropolitan districts. It is as follows:

One of the first of the campaign pay-offs is revealed today as the announcement is made that Henry Wallace, he of the cowlicky hair, is to replace Jesse Jones, the pillar of financial stability, in the office of Secretary of Commerce. So far as we are concerned it fits the pattern that a small majority of the voters wished on themselves. Not having any responsibility in the matter we expect to sit back and watch the writhers writhe and the left-wingers cheer, without a pang for either of them, and no self-pity. The raw brutality, the simpering sentimentality, and the cold-blooded political practicality of the appointment should leave us stuttering, gasping for breath and alarmed for our sacred institutions, but it doesn't. It leaves us sort of sick a good deal like seasickness, but we have been tossed by the waves for 12 long years so why should we not be getting used to it? We have in this replacement the complete picture of new dealism in its natural, raw state. Mr. Jones, long the hero of the cash boxer, the exemplar of business as practiced by the New Deal when it first went into the lists, having run his course in the fullness of time, gives up to the delightfully naïve—or isn't he naïve—Wallace with the unkempt hair and the rough-carved mug, whose eyes, filled with the light of mysticism, are nevertheless turned directly on the glory seat, and whose strategy is to cash in to the full on the present wave of paternalism and land himself right in the chair of the Great White Father, providing he can ever wear the present occupant down and out. Mr. Wallace has played the game according to the old story books. He has risen from the ranks and made his sacrifice and contributed his philosophy, which is to solve all the world's problems without much work and revamp our social and economic structure here at home so that instead of the dread ogre of capitalism which has throttled the worker and made slaves out of everybody, to their great profit, we shall have the fine upstanding figure of the labor organizer in the person of the outlander Sidney Hillman, leading the way to fame and glory, at the country's expense. And instead of a chicken in every pot and two cars in every garage, we are to have eternal bliss in the way of social security in which everybody supports every-

body else but no one does too much work. That is the ultimate goal and now, under Henry Wallace, we expect to reach it immediately, or possibly not later than we get the war over. It is all so simple and we now have so simple a mind to direct the economic phases—a mind in tune. As we said before, we enjoy these scenes no end, having no responsibility for them. We like to see the Rooseveltian plan unfold itself in such grand exhibitions as this, and we only hope that the dear old country which has punished itself with so many penitential flagellations the past 12 years will not faint under the latest impositions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1752, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on the 8th day of December 1941, the Congress of the United States passed a resolution in which it placed subject to the will and disposition of the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States the entire personnel of the Army and the Navy. It declared war against Japan, and to effectuate that declaration and bring about the winning of the war with complete victory it placed at the disposal of the Commander in Chief the entire resources of this Nation.

Prior to that time the Congress of the United States, believing that we saw approaching war clouds, had enacted what is known as the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 which brought into the armed forces up to that time about two and one-half million young men of this country. In order that that declaration might be made effective the Congress later extended the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and that extension will terminate, unless the Congress takes other action, on the 15th day of next May, less than 6 months. The pending bill (H. R. 1752) is an amendment to that act.

When introduced, that bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. We conducted rather extensive hearings at which we undertook to give reasonable opportunity to those who were for and those who were against it. I think we did a fair job of that. I have enjoyed rather than resented the debate here today on the rule, some of which was rather critical of the bill but that is within the right of the Members of the House of Representatives. I hope that when I undertake to discuss this bill on the merits that I will confine myself to such statements as will enable me when I vote to vote consistent with my talk.

I want to get over to the membership of this committee the admission that I, myself, am not entirely satisfied with the bill. I wanted a work-or-fight bill. I wanted it so that when a man was reclassified he would be made immediately available for induction in the armed forces if he refused to go to work. What this bill actually is, in my judgment, is a bill to provide a system by which a man must either work, fight, or go to jail or pay a fine. But it is surrounded with all kinds of precautionary protection to the man who is to be inducted.

Let me now give you briefly some of the salient things about the bill.

First of all, the bill does not come into effect until all methods or means by voluntary action have been exhausted. I do not want you to forget that. It is compulsory only as a last resort.

The bill provides that, in addition to his liability for training and service in the land or naval forces, every registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not a member of the armed forces or not exempt or deferred from training and service shall be liable to perform work in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural endeavor essential to the war effort.

It provides that any man between 18 and 45 may be directed to leave non-essential work and enter war work as near his own community as possible.

It provides that veterans have a preferred status as far as being directed into essential work is concerned. The Selective Service may postpone calling veterans for war jobs.

The bill provides that any man directed into war industry must be given a reasonable choice of employers with the right to appeal under the provision of the Selective Service Act if a decision adverse to him is rendered.

It provides that conscientious objectors may be excused from civilian war work and directed to take employment in the national interest.

It provides for the determination of essential war plants and facilities on the basis of geographical areas—and I think this is vitally important—types of activities, types of occupations within activities, and types of plants, facilities, and farms, and that determination rests with the Director of War Mobilization or any agency authorized by him.

It provides that local selective service boards are given the responsibility of determining whether any registrant

shall be frozen into a job or be directed into more essential war work.

The bill also provides that the Director of War Mobilization and Reconstruction shall from time to time after conference with other agencies, including labor, agriculture, and government, certify or cause to be certified to the Director of Selective Service the extent to which in the various areas the plants, facilities, and farms are available for recruiting by management, labor, agriculture, and government, and whether or not they have failed to meet the emergency. That means, of course, if they have already met it by voluntary methods, he does not have to make a certification. That comes back again to the proposal that it is not mandatory until voluntary methods have been exhausted.

The penalty provisions do not apply unless a person against whom they are sought to be enforced is found to be guilty of willfully violating the act; in other words he must be a willful violator.

A person volunteering for or ordered to employment shall receive the same travel and subsistence pay during such travel that he would receive if the request constituted an order to report for induction at the place of his employment, and similar travel and subsistence back to the place from which he was first requested or allowed to travel, by making application within 30 days after the date of separation from the employment.

Finally we give all of these men who may be inducted into industry, under what has been called "compulsion," the benefit of the provision of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, and that is the act which Congress passed to give to the courts the right to suspend the enforcement of executions and judgments, to refuse to oust a tenant, and to provide for his defense by the district attorney in the district where he resides. Those are some of the general provisions that have been made in the legislation in order to constitute a safeguard for all of these men so as not to be caught by too stringent a form of legislation. As I said awhile ago, I make no apology for believing that a man who deliberately refuses to work or deliberately fails to work in an essential war plant at home, in perfect safety, in order that the men on the battle fronts of the world may have the munitions and arms and equipment and clothing, ought to be inducted into the military service without ceremony and required to take a gun and go to the battle front. Those are my views. They may be a little strong, but it is just what I believe, and I am frank enough to tell it to you.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did the gentleman and his committee find out about how many men and women were engaged in essential war plants of the country?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Philip Murray, of the C. I. O., testified, my recollection is, that there are about 53,000,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How many workers is it proposed to obtain by this bill? How many men and women do we need in industry?

Mr. MAY. We need 900,000 for the armed services and 700,000 for industrial work, or 1,600,000 total.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Now, do those persons who are drafted or taken in under this procedure receive the same wages as those who are there in the plants; that is, those who have gone in voluntarily?

Mr. MAY. Why, of course, they will be put on the same wage scale as those who have already entered those industries. I am sure there will not be any employer in industry who would want to start out discriminating between his employees because the Government said to certain of these employees, "You must come in and work here."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am coming right to that point. We know there are tens of millions who have gone in voluntarily and are working in those plants. They are not given the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. Upon what theory do we give to those people who have stayed out and who refuse to go in, whom we now have to force in, on what theory do we give them additional benefits over those who have already gone in? I am asking the gentleman for information.

Mr. MAY. Upon the same theory that the Congress proceeded on when we passed the bill here to authorize the migration of people from one section of the country to another to aid in the agricultural effort in other parts of the country, when we passed an act providing, I think it was, \$100,000,000, to provide for their transportation to and from work.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But this goes a little further. It gives these people these benefits that the soldiers and sailors have. It gives them civil rights and exemptions, such as exemption from being dispossessed for nonpayment of rent and exemption from a judgment being levied against them, and so forth. My point is—and I am asking for information—why should this group be favored in that respect over those who are patriotically going in and doing the job without being forced to do so?

Mr. MAY. Those who have already been in the jobs for 2 or 3 years have been provided for with reference to their transportation, so far as the Army had to do with them and so far as the Navy had to do with them. We merely state that these men who are required to work in these plants where perhaps they do not want to go, if they do go and work there, they ought to have their transportation to and from those plants.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As a committee, we would want to have this information. We do give them an added inducement, do we not, to go into these plants and work?

Mr. MAY. Well, we hope they will regard it as an added inducement, and that by reason of it they will not hesitate to go in, and that this bill would become effective under a voluntary system.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am not referring to transportation. I am re-

ferring to the civil benefits for soldiers and sailors.

Mr. MAY. I cannot yield further to the gentleman. I must yield to some other gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am interested in paragraph (n) (1) on page 1, with reference to classification of farmers. I am interested in knowing how far the Director of War Mobilization may go in saying to one farmer or one class of farmers "You will have to close down your farm and engage in something else." For instance, under this bill will the Director be able to say to a cotton farmer or to a cane farmer, "You have to cease farming operations and go to Nebraska and raise wheat"? Would such a thing be possible under this bill?

Mr. MAY. I do not think it would be possible. Furthermore the plan of the bill as contemplated by the committee is that men shall be utilized in the community where they live, just as far as possible. If a man owns a cotton farm in Georgia it would be against the spirit of the legislation to move him to California to grow fruit, or to move him up into Michigan to grow potatoes, or to Nebraska to grow wheat. I have no idea in the world that a man with the experience, intelligence, and patriotism of Mr. James F. Byrnes would resort to any such method. The gentleman, of course, knows about as much about what is in his mind as I do, and I am not speaking about his mind. I am perfectly willing, however, to risk the judgment of Justice Byrnes.

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

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Did I understand the chairman to say that where a man refused to abide by the law, and was convicted, he could pay a fine or be sent to jail for the violation?

Mr. MAY. Yes; that is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Suppose he goes out from jail or leaves the courthouse after paying the fine and continues in his wayward conduct, could he be placed in jeopardy twice for the same offense?

Mr. MAY. According to my reading of the Constitution he could not be placed in jeopardy twice for the same offense. I think that is expressly prohibited in the Constitution.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is true, then the man who paid the fine would be excused.

Mr. MAY. He would be excused, for that particular violation, but he would be like a man who is charged with carrying a concealed weapon and who had been convicted once. If he carries that weapon on a different day, he has committed a separate offense and could be convicted again.

Mr. MICHENER. Then the Government would have to start proceedings all over again, serve notice, and go through all of it?

Mr. MAY. I do not anticipate there will be many men who will pay a fine of \$10,000 under this law; neither do I anticipate there will be many of them

who will want to go to jail for 5 years. Consequently I think the penalties in this bill will operate to the same extent that penalties operate in existing laws. They deter men from violating the law, particularly if the penalties are severe, as they seem to be in this legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. Psychologically I agree with the gentleman, but in drafting a law I have always thought it better to think of possibilities rather than probabilities. My other question is this: As I understand the gentleman, he said that conscientious objectors would not be required to engage in war work. Does that mean that a man, by claiming he is a conscientious objector, will not be required to work in any industry that is engaged in making equipment which the boys at the front need?

Mr. MAY. That question will arise in the local draft boards where the man is known by the members of the board. He is their neighbor, and they will know about him as well as about his good or bad faith. They will determine the question of his good faith. If they know about him and know what his practices have been and what his conduct has been in the past they will determine it and decide it and decide where he shall work and direct him to do it. If he disobeys that order, then he is subject to the penalties of this bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. As I understand the bill, it does not require any employer to hire a registrant who might apply for work. Is that correct?

Mr. MAY. I do not believe it does.

Mr. COLE of New York. What happens in case a registrant is directed by Selective Service to apply for work, he applies for work but the employer refuses to hire him?

Mr. MAY. It would be his duty to go to a plant where he could be hired. In the first place, the local draft boards will not send men to plants which have an adequate supply of help but will send them to some plant in the vicinity of the man's home where there is a shortage of manpower. If there is none in that community they will look around the surrounding communities, referred to in this bill as an area, and find a place there for him.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then the mere application by a registrant for a job does not exhaust his responsibility; apparently he must seek until he finds one; or will the effort be made to find one for him? Furthermore he is paid nothing for the extra trips he makes trying to find a job. Is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may answer the question?

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

Mr. KILDAY. If the gentleman from New York will turn to page 4 of the bill beginning with line 13 and refer particularly to line 23 he will find that when the individual receives the notice from his draft board it is up to him to apply for employment and accept it when tendered to him. So, if employment is tendered to him he has discharged his obligation and is through unless his draft board should send him to another plant. But his obli-

gation specifically is to make application and to accept the employment tendered.

Mr. MAY. I believe the gentleman from Texas misunderstood the question of the gentleman from New York. The question is: When he has been sent to a plant and is rejected whether he must go to another plant.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is one of the questions.

Mr. KILDAY. Whenever he is directed by his local board he has the specific duty to perform what his board directs him the same as a man directed to report for induction.

Mr. COLE of New York. As I understand, the registrant must apply to a plant for work and if work is tendered to him he must accept it.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. If he is rejected then, according to the Chairman's statement he must go to some other plant and make application. Is there any end to it?

Mr. KILDAY. The bill does not spell out the regulations to be adopted or the system to be followed, but it is contemplated that he will be directed where to apply for employment; and when he has done that he has discharged all the duty incumbent on him.

Mr. COLE of New York. And does he receive travel allowance for making these applications?

Mr. KILDAY. No; he receives travel allowance for going to the place where he is assigned to work.

Mr. COLE of New York. Assuming that he is hired.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. But if he is not hired he gets no travel allowance?

Mr. KILDAY. He is not going to a place unless he is hired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then the bill contemplates that the draft board shall have authority to send a registrant to a particular place without the approval of the employer at that plant.

Mr. KILDAY. It does not. I do not want to take up all the time of the chairman, but it will take a great deal of time to go into the bill in detail; it will require a great deal of discussion.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. I yield for a question.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I wish to ask the gentleman two questions: First, Is it true as reported in the press that the question of constitutionality was not considered by the gentleman's committee? And, second, a related question: Why did the committee discriminate against the class of male citizens from 18 to 45, who may be ill, disabled, or otherwise disqualified to do the work required of others included in the bill?

Mr. MAY. Answering the first question as to the committee's not considering the constitutionality of the legislation, any such report is entirely in error. The committee studied at length the subject of the constitutionality of the bill and sought the advice of counsel, consulted the decisions of the courts and determined for itself that it would be constitutional; or at least voted it out after discussing it.

In answer to the second question as to the age group 18 to 45 being discriminatory, it is not discriminatory as between those within the age group. The question of whether we should have gone up to 60 years or any other age is a question that the committee decided, and in its judgment the committee included the age group 18 to 45, the same as that now fixed in the statute for inductions for military service.

There is one other thing here I want to make clear for the committee and that is a statement that you have heard here on the floor today to the effect that this is an antistrike bill. It is not anything of the kind. It does not deal with the question of strikes at all.

The question whether or not this is an antistrike bill was raised in reference to section 2 in the Rules Committee, and we left it up to the members of the committee to determine for themselves just like the House Military Affairs Committee determined the matter for itself. We were asked whether or not should a hundred men quit a job or strike, they could be inducted as strikers under the provisions of this law and if that constituted a violation of it. The issue hinges entirely on the question whether or not a man's relation of employee to his employer has been broken. Under the decision of the courts, particularly in the case of *Jeffrey De Witt Insulater Co. v. National Labor Relations Board* (91 Fed., 2d ed., 134) that matter has been settled. In that case the question arose in this way: A bunch of workers had gone on strike. They were negotiating with their employer. The employer succeeded in getting enough of them to go back to work and resume operations on a particular day. When operations were resumed the group that were involved in the difficulty continued to stay out on strike. The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit expressly held that there was no termination of the relationship of employer and employee, but that they were just a bunch of men out there saying to the employer, "When you accede to our demands we are ready to go back to work." They held that the relationship never having been terminated they did not come within the provisions of the act.

This bill was written with a view of avoiding that very difficulty.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few minutes to speak about certain proposed amendments that we have heard discussed which will probably be offered. I did not oppose granting an open rule because the House of Representatives has a high degree of intelligence and its Members have great capacity to discriminate between what they ought to do and what they ought not to do. Therefore this bill comes to you under an open rule with the privilege of offering any amendment you want. However, I want to caution you against extraneous matter being injected into what we have tried to make a simple, plain, easily understood manpower bill.

We had up both of the controversial amendments which I understand are to be offered, and the committee rejected them because we did not want to split the House of Representatives into two opposing camps, fighting over something

that is not material to the vital question of backing up the men on the battle fronts of the world or over our home front manpower problems. We all know they are plenty difficult.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are two questions to be settled here; they are plain and simple, and so far as I am concerned, I have already definitely settled them.

The first one is, are we going to take the advice and suggestions of the leaders of certain outside minority groups, or are we going to follow the suggestions and advice of our military leaders to whom we have delegated the responsibility of winning the war?

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. MAY. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In the report that the gentleman's committee filed on this bill there is incorporated a letter to the President from General Marshall. May I inquire of the gentleman if General Marshall was not addressing himself to the gentleman's bill then pending before his committee, which was really a work-or-fight measure?

Mr. MAY. General Marshall's letter was not directed to the committee, but it was joined in by Admiral King of the Navy and sent direct to the President of the United States, as I recall it merely suggested the military needs without reference to any particular bill.

Mr. COX. That letter was dated January 16.

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. COX. The bill then pending before the gentleman's committee was a work-or-fight bill; is that not true.

Mr. MAY. I thought it was a work-or-fight bill.

Mr. COX. And not the bill that the gentleman's committee reported, the committee refusing to approve the bill to which the general was addressing himself when he wrote the President.

Mr. MAY. I will tell you how that happened. The committee very earnestly considered the propositions that were presented, and they were all presented. We were trying to bring to the House of Representatives, as I said a moment ago, a piece of legislation, without controversy, that everybody could support. We considered all those things and rejected them. I did not get, as I told you, what I wanted, and I never do. It is the result of deliberation and thought and discussion and information received. I want to say here now that the members of the Committee on Military Affairs never did a finer job of trying to cooperate with each other in this difficult situation. We brought here what we think is a bill without extraneous matters injected into it. We think it is a work-or-fight bill, very largely. We think it will do the job of getting the necessary manpower, and of controlling it after we get it, in the production of war materials and supplies for our armed forces. If we had not thought that, we would not have brought it to the floor of the House.

A court in the trial of matters coming before him listens to the witnesses in person and his findings of fact, unless palpably contrary to the evidence, are upheld on appeal and that is a sound rule. I think it applies with like justification to the procedure of a congressional committee whose members hear and cross-examine the witnesses.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Then what is the bill that the gentleman has brought in other than a bill to compel the IV-F's, so-called, to get into war industry? Is that what the substance of the bill is?

Mr. MAY. The first bill that I introduced provided that the Selective Service Bureau should reclassify anyone who was not at work or who refused to work and make him immediately available for induction into the armed forces. It stopped there. But the committee in its combined judgment decided that we had better adhere to the penalties set forth in the original Selective Training and Service Act, which provides for a fine of \$10,000 and imprisonment of 5 years, either or both.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman permit me to say that the bill does what the National Selective Service Act already does. They are doing it out in my State, sending these IV-F's to defense plants to work. They have been doing that. I think that is generally true all over the country.

Mr. MAY. The administration and the war leaders asked for legislation, and they wanted the authority of the Congress of the United States rather than a mere set of regulations by any bureau, even though it is the same penalties set up under the Selective Training and Service Act. I think most Members of Congress feel that we should govern our people by law rather than Executive decrees.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman will agree with me that it is generally understood that the draft boards are sending IV-F's into defense plants, and have been for some time, to work.

Mr. MAY. They are sending anybody that qualifies under their regulations to go into the military service. I may say that this is not confined only to IV-F's, but there is a group of some four or four and a quarter million men classified as IV-F's within the ages of 18 and 45, and I think that is too great a reservoir of manpower to be dissipated and not utilized. I am still, Mr. Chairman, for the principle of work or fight.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I am yielding myself only a few moments at the present time to make some observations on the general situation in consideration of this bill. Later, at the close of the general debate, I shall take more time to answer any questions to be asked at that time.

This is not a new subject for the House of Representatives. It has been before the Congress for 2 years. About 2 years ago the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy asked for a National

Service Act. At about that time two Republican Members, one in the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and one in the Senate, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], introduced such legislation. Lengthy hearings were held in both the Senate and House committees, consuming weeks. There are pages and pages of testimony on it. General Marshall and Admiral King have also upon numerous occasions asked for a National Service Act.

I cannot help but be reminded that the situation today is not entirely unlike one 3 or 4 years ago, when questions of necessity were raised and questions of provisions were raised. This bill today is in effect nothing but a National Service Act for all males between the ages of 18 and 45. It does not include women. It was introduced in the House as a so-called work-or-fight bill, but the military compulsion features were removed from the bill by an overwhelming vote.

I believe most people today look upon, and certainly all men in the service feel, that the American Army and Navy uniforms are sacred to patriotic service for our country. We have not reached the time when we will ever degrade that uniform by saying, "You work or have the privilege of wearing the uniform." I may say that the testimony of the Navy Department was completely against any idea of military compulsion. From a practical point of view, the Navy testified, they had no use for any more IV-F's, and the Army said they could find very little use for them, anyway, and they had enough at the present time.

One point has not been mentioned in discussing the provisions of the bill. There are 7,000,000 men in the United States between the ages of 38 and 45 not in the military service, a very large pool. It is much larger than the IV-F pool. Those men are all available for assignment to farms or to wood lots or to various avocations at certain periods of the year when extra services will be required.

I do not look upon this bill as perfection; far from it. It is half-baked still.

Some of the questions that are raised are as to the necessity. I remember that the question of necessity was raised in this House on the extension of selective service only 90 days before Pearl Harbor, and some of the very men who voted to disband our Army are here today. Possibly they have the best right to oppose this bill of any Members of the House. It was a question of necessity then, it is a question of necessity now.

We say that the President said nothing about it before election. I do not think he did say very much about it. But the Army had asked for a National Service Act before that. Both parties throughout the campaign, while they may not have said too much about the necessity, and may have led a great many of us to believe that the war was going better than it was, stated their implicit confidence in our military leaders. I heard Governor Dewey make the statement on several occasions that, were he elected, he would continue the present superb leadership and back them to the limit. I heard many others say the same thing.

None of us expected Von Rundstedt to create the bulge. The bulge cost us a

terrific number of men and the extreme hardship of fighting in the wintertime has caused us even more men. It has cost us at the rate of 3 to 1 in loss of equipment as against loss of equipment in normal temperatures and normal climates. We have all made mistakes. I have made mistakes on some of my votes. We made mistakes in predicting how the war was going. America is a Nation of extremists and it was only natural many thought the war would end October 17—November 5—December 23—oh, wonderful, but it did not end. At least I can say I never have thought it would end easily. We are now at hardpan. That is where we are today. We are at the hardpan. We have driven the enemy across France and across Belgium and now we are at the gates of Germany. Anybody who thinks it is going to be easy, even from now on, is wrong. It is costing us lives, thousands of casualties every day and thousands of tons of equipment. I know of no better person to speak on necessity than General Marshall. General Marshall has testified in the strongest terms not only favoring this piecemeal measure but for a real National Service Act. You are going to hear some very passionate objections to this bill; and it is very easy to find reasonable grounds on which to base the objections.

Certainly I do not hope to see many men on this side of the aisle raise objections on the basis of arguments of the P. A. C. It is very easy to lift words from their mouths as to whether production will go up or not. It is, to be sure, within their power to slow down production. We have reached the point where practically every family in the United States has a son or a nephew or brother in the Army or Navy. We have reached the point where almost every family in the United States has had a casualty somewhere in the picture, either missing or wounded or who has passed on forever. Regardless of who is President of the United States, or whether he has made mistakes; regardless of who is in control of the labor organizations; regardless of who is head of the National Association of Manufacturers; regardless of how either party acts upon this bill in this House, I think the time has come when the average American citizen wants to be told what is the thing to do to win the war as quickly as possible and to lose as few more lives as possible. I think they are willing to listen to us, if they have not heard from anybody else.

The greatest no man's land in this bill in line with questions is: Is it an anti-strike bill? It is neither; because it does not say. There should be in this bill, for the benefit of labor I am talking now, provisions which say: "Nothing within the provisions of this act shall be construed to be against labor's full right to collective bargaining, maximum hours and overtime." If that were written in the bill the question asked by one of the gentlemen on the Committee on Rules would not be in order. This bill does not make absolute demands on any man. He has some choice as to whether or not he will go into an open or closed plant. But I think if we only put ourselves in the position of the young man with a rifle

overseas who believes in collective bargaining and believes in labor unions and in their right to strike—he may have an only brother or somebody there—I do not believe he would say, "he ought to join certain labor unions." No.

In addition to the provision for labor, that nothing in the act will mitigate against collective bargaining and all the rights now enjoyed by them, there must be a provision giving any man the right not to join a union if he so chooses to do. I may say for the benefit of those who have inquired about the matter that such an amendment, covering both points in full, is going to be offered, and if that amendment is not agreed to in the House, I hope there will be a roll call on this proposal.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 11 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, when this proposal first came to the House I was one of those who was skeptical as to the necessity for it. I believe if you will refer to the early part of the hearings you will see I could not conceal my skepticism in the questions propounded to various witnesses who appeared before the committee. However, our purpose in holding hearings, as always, was to determine the true situation as it exists. After having spent the weeks which we did spend in the consideration of this bill I am now convinced that it is essential to the war effort.

In that connection I would like to say to you the hearings prove that within the first 6 months of 1945 there is necessity for 1,600,000 additional men. Nine hundred thousand of those men are to enter the armed forces—the Army and the Navy. That is the program of the War Department. Those are the demands placed upon the Selective Service System. The quotas will go out accordingly and they must be met as quotas under the Selective Service System must be met.

In addition to that 900,000, because of the stepped-up production program, 700,000 additional men are required in industry. In applying the demand for 900,000 to the inventories which we have in the Selective Service System, we find we are able to get 570,000 men for the armed forces out of the registrants and those becoming 18 years old during this period of time. That means that 330,000 men within military age must be taken from necessary industry and from necessary agriculture. Therefore, we have not only 330,000 men who must be replaced in necessary industry and agriculture, from men not now occupied in essential positions, but, in addition, 700,000 men; therefore a total of 1,030,000 men in the United States who must be channeled out of unnecessary activities into necessary activities.

Those figures are official. They are not denied. The 900,000 is the figure of the War Department, based upon more than 700,000 casualties on the battlefields throughout the world and for the military campaigns which are projected for the immediate future.

All production agencies agree that the 700,000 men are necessary to meet the expanded production. As against those positive figures, vouched for by the President; the Chief of Staff; the Chief of Naval Operations; the War Production Board; the Selective Service System; Gen. William E. Knudsen, the production genius now on duty with the War Department; and others who are principally concerned in equipping and maintaining and commanding the Army, we have some vague expressions from Philip Murray, a representative of the A. F. of L., and a representative of the National Manufacturers Association.

Incidentally, the representative of the National Manufacturers Association spoke against the bill for 2 hours and then admitted that he had never read it. Those are the only things that you find in this record opposing the positive recommendations of those you expect to win the war for you. I say to you I take my stand with General Marshall and Admiral King. Those who prefer to accept vague insinuations of Philip Murray and the A. F. of L. may take their stand where they please.

Now let us get to the mechanics of this bill. There seems to be objection from the same individuals in one instance because it is not rigid enough and in another because it is entirely too rigid. The bill is adequate for the purpose contemplated. It is neither harsh nor oppressive, but it is adequate.

In the first instance the bill defines the obligation of men between 18 and 45 in the United States in connection with the support of the war, and incidentally the men between 18 and 45 are the ones now liable for military service under the law, and men in that age bracket who may not be physically qualified, or who may not be acceptable to the Army because of their age for total military service, are called upon by this bill to do what they can for the war. We are calling upon them for very little when compared to what must be endured by the men sent to the front.

We next provide, Mr. Chairman, that the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion or such agency as he may designate—and understand that the permission to delegate the authority is with reference to this phase of the bill only—shall certify the plants and types of activity which are essential to the war effort.

The bill then provides that any man between 18 and 45 employed in essential industry or essential agriculture shall not leave that employment without the permission of his local draft board and without a justifiable reason.

The Director of War Mobilization must confer with representatives of management, labor, agriculture, and Government in determining the occupations and areas in which the critical shortage of labor exists. So while it is the responsibility of the Director of War Mobilization, action must be taken only after consultation with all of the other elements involved.

Mr. Philip Murray's principal objection to the bill was that he wanted to hold up action on it while we had a con-

ference of those various agencies, yet all the time that provision was in the bill requiring such a conference of those agencies, and it is preserved in the bill.

In following up the detail of how this will work out as to the first section only, the man who is working in an essential industry must stay there or secure the permission of his draft board to leave. That is subject to appeal the same as any other decision of a selective-service board and to the very same appeal agency as the men now ordered to the military service enjoy. After this decision has been made by the Director of War Mobilization, after conference with the representatives of industry and labor, he will certify to the Director of Selective Service the type of men needed, the categories, and what not. The Director of Selective Service will direct his local boards to make a request upon the registrants of those boards to enter industry. They are then given a period of time in which they may voluntarily enter industry. Understand, now, that is the second opportunity to volunteer, because before there is any certificate from the Director of War Mobilization, a campaign is conducted by management, labor, Government, and agriculture to secure those employees. When this fails the request goes out; then the second period to volunteer; then, if a sufficient number do not volunteer, the local boards will direct the individuals within the categories mentioned and with the skills required to seek employment in the industries where they are required. If a man fails to stay on the job where he is frozen, he will be subject to exactly the same penalty as if he had been a registrant ordered for induction into the Army but refused to comply. He will be subject to trial in his own local Federal district court for violation of the law.

Why should we demand any less of a man that we have working in an air-conditioned airplane plant or airplane engine plant at high wages, with overtime, and having the privilege of staying at home with his family, if he is within the same age brackets as those who are sent off to die? Why should you demand any less or expect any less from him than from the other men?

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. What do you do with the fellow who does respond, is assigned to a plant, and then stalls on the job to the extent that he does not produce anything and the employer discharges him? What becomes of the status of that individual under this bill?

Mr. KILDAY. That individual would be in the same situation as any one else not employed in essential industry. He is no longer employed in essential industry and he is in the same category as others similarly situated. Mr. Chairman, if he fails to accept employment as directed by his local board, he will also be subject to the same penalty as the man who refuses to report for induction.

Now, certain statements have been made here on the floor. I realize when opposition develops, any opposition that

may produce results is as good as any other opposition. There is some opposition here because this is not strictly a work-or-fight bill and I understand the gentlemen who use that term mean that you either work at a plant or you are inducted into the armed forces. The Army and Navy have told us that they have no desire for, nor need, and cannot utilize a work corps to be composed of men who would be put in the armed services, yet not physically qualified for full military service and deprived of the rights of a soldier and the benefits of a veteran. If they were placed in a work corps you and I know they would do nothing with them but feed them or have them take leaves or something similar.

One of the principal objections to the original bill was that it provided for a work corps of that kind. Your committee took that provision out which leaves it so that every man in the military age group capable of performing military service may be assigned to full military service under the bill and those others who refuse to do what they should do and what they are directed to do are subject to civil penalties after trial in a civil court.

Now, none of us were very anxious to have to adopt this sort of legislation, because it is a rather new departure. We have made the penalty clause rather complete in protecting the men who may be brought to trial.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a couple of questions?

Mr. KILDAY. If the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. TABER. Why was the top limit of 45 placed in this bill?

Mr. KILDAY. Under existing law men are subject to induction for military training between the ages of 18 and 45. This places upon the same bracket the obligation of supporting the war. There is no reason in my mind why the men in this reasonable classification of 18 to 45 should not do what they can do the best and those who are not rendering military service should do exactly what their brothers in the same age bracket are doing, that is, supporting the war.

Mr. TABER. I do not think that that answers the question.

Mr. KILDAY. I am sorry.

Mr. TABER. The key to that is this next question. Are there in the pool of 4,000,000 men who are listed, those who are not engaged in war work such as is defined in the bill, enough people to fill the requirements?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know what 4,000,000 the gentleman refers to. I take it that is the IV-F group.

Mr. TABER. That is the group referred to in the President's message and in Mr. May's statement on page 2 of the hearings.

Mr. KILDAY. The 4,000,000 is the IV-F group. But in addition to that you have your age bracket of 38 to 45 in which there are 7,000,000 men.

Mr. TABER. Was there any inventory of those who were not engaged in war work sufficient to base the bill upon?

Mr. KILDAY. Not in the 38 to 45 group, because for a major portion of the

time they have not been subject to active military service and have, therefore, not been classified. We cannot tell until they are classified just where they stand. They have not been called upon to request their occupational deferment nor have they had a physical examination, and therefore we do not know very much about them. But with these classifications and the inventories we have of them, we feel sure there is a sufficient number in the pool to take care of the shortage.

Mr. TABER. Why should the top limit of 45 be applied to those who are required to work in the factories?

Mr. KILDAY. I thought I made that clear. We were trying to make a reasonable classification. We placed the military service in the bracket 18 to 45 and then within that age bracket those who were not qualified by reason of age or physical condition should serve the same as their brothers in the same age bracket. The classification should be reasonable.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. If I understand the gentleman, and I am asking purely for information, because of the gentleman's great knowledge of this bill, the fundamental principle of this bill is to get people who are not working in essential employment into jobs that are critical?

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. I live in a town where the most critical industry is a foundry. They need foundry help and cannot get people to work in that foundry because of the character of the work. This law goes into force and effect, we will say, and you have a pool of men that are available to be put to work. Under the provisions of this law is it not the duty of the local selective-service board to give the registrant called under this law a reasonable choice of employment?

Mr. KILDAY. Within the category certified; yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. If there is only one critical occupation in a community, then do I understand it is the gentleman's contention that the local selective-service board could order any registrant to that one job without any choice as to the type or character of employment?

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman that it is not my concept that a man in this war should have the right to choose to work only in his own town. When the opportunity for volunteering comes, and he is then told the categories of labor and the skills needed in the area in which he is to be employed, if he prefers that choice rather than working in his home town, then he will have to go to the place where employment is available, as near his home as possible.

Mr. KEEFE. He has the choice then under the provisions as shown on page 5, subsection (c), which says:

It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith, provided the order gives him a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work.

That is what I am trying to understand in the situation as it might relate to the gentleman's town or my town

where the critical employment is employment in which they cannot get people to work. If you direct a man to go to that one place, a foundry, and work, can he under this bill say, "You have not offered me a reasonable choice of employment, and I refuse to go to that place to work"? That is what I should like to have the gentleman explain.

Mr. KILDAY. I should like to be relieved of explaining the language the gentleman has just read, because I opposed it in the committee, and could never understand what it meant.

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Let me use my time and I will try to explain it the way I see it. I do not like legislation setting down in so many words "that a man shall be given a reasonable time to do this, that, or the other." The way I want legislation written is to set it out in such a way that he is given that reasonable opportunity. The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion is permitted to certify the necessary employment and the areas after consultation with industry, who know where those things are, and with labor and everybody else, but before he can make that certification he has to conduct his recruiting campaign for those areas. So in that instance the man in your town has a reasonable choice. He may say, "I am not going to sit here and be sent into that foundry because the law says the Director can follow this up with a request and then a direction. I am going over to the next town and get me a job over there in the airplane plant." But if he does not do that, then when the directive comes through he still has another choice. He has his choice on two occasions, not in words only but by the mandatory provisions of the bill. So you are going to "direct" only the adamant, recalcitrant man.

I tell you now that, in my humble judgment, when the first call for volunteers goes out you will, in almost every case, get all the help you want, but on the second call for volunteers I think you will get them all. My prediction is that you will never try a man under the provisions of this act and that you will very rarely direct him into the particular plant where his services are most required.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas draws any distinction between the Government's right to draft a man to fight and the Government's right to draft a man to work.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman and I argued that out in the Committee on Rules the other day. I should like to take a day sometime to discuss the Constitution with the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should be very happy to be enlightened on it, if the gentleman will do it.

Mr. KILDAY. Our power is to raise and maintain armies. It is not armies

of men; it is armies equipped with munitions of war.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is there a difference between drafting a man to work for the Government and drafting a man to work for private employers?

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot see the distinction. If we are going to maintain in this country the profit system and depend upon it to produce weapons of war, and they are not able to get the men to turn them out in the time required, then I am not ready to quibble about whether you are putting them to work for a private employer. What I want to know is who is going to get the product. If the Army and the Navy are to get it, I say it is perfectly constitutional.

I prefer not to continue this discussion further at this time.

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

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

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is there anything in this bill that would permit or authorize the drafting of a man already in an essential industry for another industry that the War Manpower Commission or the Director of Mobilization would think even more essential?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not think so.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand, if a man is once in an essential industry, he is not subject to this bill unless the War Manpower Commission or somebody else holds that his industry is no longer essential. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. KILDAY. He would have to stay there unless his local selective-service board would permit him to leave. I was trying in the little time I have left here to find the provision which I think takes care of the gentleman's situation, but at the moment I cannot find it and should like to discuss it with him after a while.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He is speaking very intelligently on this bill and I should like some information on it.

From my experience with war industries, having many of them in my district, I find that there are two categories of men. The first category includes the man who tries to obtain a job in a war industry but is not properly qualified for any position and consequently goes from place to place and is turned down by all of them. Naturally, he is a IV-F to start with. What happens to him?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know what you are going to do with the fellow who just cannot do a day's work. I guess we are going to have to get along without him.

Mr. HINSHAW. I mean what happens to him under this bill? Is he subject to be fined \$10,000?

Mr. KILDAY. No; he is not. If you will read the bill, you will find his obligation is to make an application for employment and to accept such employment if it is tendered to him. If the employer has his record with the U. S. E. S., as he will have, and knows all about him and that he is a nomad, then of course he is not going to tender the employment and he has discharged his duty. Of course, we do not want that

sort of a fellow cluttering up a war plant anyhow.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right.

Mr. KILDAY. Therefore you have not lost anything.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am asking the gentleman to elucidate for the RECORD. After all, people will read the RECORD and will hear about it. There is one more category involved. We all know, of course, that the Army has allowed certain men to go into the Reserve on an inactive status in order to fill highly skilled positions. In my area in recent months there have been large-sized layoffs in certain industries, such as the shipbuilding industry and in certain portions of the aircraft industry. Those men temporarily, of course, do not have work available to them and there are a good many thousands of them who are now laid off. Do they have to wait until it is determined that their industry is going to start up again before they can get a job or are they to go into the military service and then be taken out at a later date to carry on these very important activities?

Mr. KILDAY. The bill contains a provision to the effect that a man who has served in the Army and is a veteran may be exempt from service under regulations that the Director may prescribe. I am frank to state to you that that is not in any final form. I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] suggested that something should be in the bill, even if we had to work it out at a later date so that if we get to conference it would be germane at the conference and could be worked out.

Mr. HINSHAW. What about the laid-off men? In the Calship, for example, in California they recently laid off 8,000 men because they were not assured of orders. A good many of those were of course in one category and some in others.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, they were men not engaged in a necessary industry. They will be subject to the provisions of the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. But on the other hand their skills are very necessary to industry and they ought to be given the opportunity to work at their highest skills for the benefit of the war effort.

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman I do not care what kind of bill we pass here, if we do not have a sensible administration of it then there is no use passing a bill. The bill provides that the Director of War Mobilization and reconversion shall detail men to the Selective Service System from all the agencies to advise them with reference to matters of this kind. So I take it the U. S. E. S., which is charged with getting labor for these plants, would send in advice to them, "Let us not take the Calship yard men because the yard has a new contract." Or they will say, "Here, we have men in the Calship yard that we can take to another shipyard to fill the skills in their line."

It is going to require careful administration. That is the reason I insisted on the local selective-service boards having that duty and not giving it to any bureau of the Government to send in hired employees to direct the men as to what they shall do, but to leave it in the hands of

the patriotic volunteer American citizens who serve on the draft boards and who are neighbors and friends of the people affected.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one more question? In other words, here is a large area with a great many draft boards in it. Of course, the members on the draft boards, each individually, can have one idea and others have another, and there is no very general coordination to the degree which is necessary so that they can carry out these various instructions.

Mr. KILDAY. Well, we have that situation with reference to the Selective Service. Not only can the registrant appeal but the Government can appeal. I think we have it pretty well coordinated now, and this is going to be the same system, with all of their previous experience and the same organization controlling it.

I am going to have to ask the gentleman to excuse me. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, this is a hypothetical question. It goes entirely to the matter of compliance and not to the merits of an open or closed shop. This is the question: Suppose a registrant in a community is ordered to report to work in a certain war production industry, giving him a reasonable choice of those industries. Suppose it is in a community where there are all closed shops. Or suppose that the work which has to be done is all done in a closed shop.

The registrant reports. He says, "I am ordered to go to work in your plant, and I want to go to work." The labor recruiting officer says, "All right. This is a closed shop. Join the union and you can go to work." The registrant says, "I am ordered here to work and not to join a union." Then he says, "You cannot work." The question is, has this registrant complied with the law or not.

Mr. KILDAY. That could be discussed pro and con for a long time and no one could convince the other, but, coming to the point of a man in a community in which they are all closed shops, the man who does not agree with the closed shop idea is ordinarily in the minority. The draft board does not have to send everybody to that area. If you have sensible administration of this law, your draft board will inquire whether he objects to joining a union. If that is all there is in that district, surely they would not send him there. On the other hand, I think as a matter of law, if they refuse to accept him, having made application, and they decline him because he did not come under the terms of their closed-shop agreement, they have not tendered him employment, and he has complied with the law. That would be my opinion.

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

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman's committee was so kind to us this morning that I could not refuse to yield.

Mr. COLMER. I call the gentleman's attention to page 2, section 2, "a registrant liable to perform such work," and so forth, "shall have a duty not to voluntarily discontinue such employment" and so forth. Under that section if a

man willfully goes on strike, does he come under that provision?

Mr. KILDAY. He does not, under the consistent rulings of the Federal courts. They have held consistently that a man who goes on strike has not discontinued his employment. He is still an employee, though not working. The relationship of employer and employee continues to exist, so he has not voluntarily discontinued his employment, and he would not be subject to law. In addition, he would be able, if charged in court, to defend himself on the ground that he had a justifiable reason for leaving his employment. The right to strike is a legal right, and therefore is a justifiable reason for leaving his employment.

Mr. COLMER. Then does not your language say that the local board has determined that it is the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such employment, under the wording of the last sentence of that section?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. He has to apply to his local board, but you will have to read the cases and get the legal meaning of "voluntarily discontinue employment."

Mr. COLMER. Then if a man goes on strike, the local board says that he left his employment in the best interest of the war effort?

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, no. Now, I refuse to yield any further on that question.

Mr. COLMER. But you did yield to me. Let us follow that up.

Mr. KILDAY. You and I can reason anything out to an absurd conclusion.

Mr. COLMER. Now, the gentleman has been so nice to me.

Mr. KILDAY. I am going to have to refuse to yield any further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to finish what I started with the gentleman from Mississippi. Where a man strikes he is not discontinuing his employment, under the consistent rulings of the courts of the United States. Then the other part, that the local draft board has concluded it was in the best interest of the war effort, of course, is just an absurd deduction from the previous statement. It is clear that he would not be subject to the law. But I never did get to tell you what happened to the fellow who complies with the regulation. If he volunteers, as he is requested to do, or if he accepts employment as he is directed to do, he then would have, if employed in a Government-owned plant, the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Commission, as to injuries or sickness due to his employment. If he is in private employment he would have the benefits of the workmen's compensation laws of the State in which he is employed. So that during the time he is employed he would be protected that way.

There is another matter that I deem to be a matter of basic justice in connection with legislation of this kind: We would not be justified in passing legislation of this kind unless the men affected were protected with reference to the positions which they held at the time they were directed to discontinue them and go into temporary employment.

Many of these men are in industries which are classified as nonessential, but they have long seniority and pension rights. Many of them may be reaching 45 years, the age at which perhaps industry would rather have a younger person so they could avoid the burden of pensions and payment of unemployment benefits from sickness. Those are very valuable rights to such men and we should give them the right to come back to their previous employment when their temporary war service is over, the right to go into those plants and take the positions they had before. This bill provides that they shall have the right to do that.

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Some question was raised as to the application of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. This bill gives to those men who have to change their employment by the direction of the draft board and whose income is reduced by reason of such changed employment the benefit of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. Not every man who goes into the armed forces is relieved of his debts during the war period but only to the extent that his ability to pay has been diminished by his military service. It still is an obligation to the extent of his ability to pay. But if by reason of war service his income is reduced, this means his ability to pay is reduced, and to that extent he is given relief. When he comes back he must pay his debts. The law will protect his insurance by guaranteeing payment of premiums and give him 2 years after he gets back within which to take it up. So we give the man who volunteers or who takes a job at the direction of the draft board this protection, and I think you will all agree with me that we should give it to him. I hope you will agree with me further when I say that during my 6 years of service here I have never seen as good a job done on a piece of legislation as I have in trying to work out a solution for this most difficult situation.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, it is neither easy nor pleasant to oppose my chairman or a majority of the members of our Committee on Military Affairs.

It is even more difficult to support the position of an organization that has opposed one in an election.

However, any Member of Congress is or should be big enough not to allow personal friendship or animosity toward any individual or organization to unduly influence him in casting a vote on major legislation.

The philosophy back of this particular bill is so fundamental and the foundation upon which it rests is so basic that all personal considerations must be entirely forgotten.

Mr. Chairman, modern wars are won or lost by total populations. Every man, woman, and child is directly and vitally affected. Today's war is everybody's war. It is fought not only by the men in the front lines of combat but also by the people on the home front—those who work in factories, in forests, in mines, and on farms—who produce the food, fiber, and the weapons of war.

Often innocent women, helpless children, and decrepit old men in distant cities and remote areas are the ones who perish first.

Logically, since it is everybody's war, everybody should share equally—as far as is humanly possible—the burdens and sacrifices of war. From a realistic and practical point of view this never can be, but it is the ideal toward which we should strive. This being the case, the manpower problem must be faced and answered before all the other complex and intricate problems can be solved.

That there is a manpower muddle today cannot be denied. However, it is for the most part a man-made problem created by the overlapping, conflicting, and duplicating agencies of government. Not shortages but shortsightedness has produced it.

The Army asks for one thing, the Navy demands another; the War Manpower Commission moves in one direction, the Selective Service in the opposite; the Director of War Mobilization announces one program, while the Commander in Chief keeps all of them in a dither by never determining a strong, definite policy or placing authority and responsibility under a single head.

Through cunning, trickery and deception, a vacillating and cowardly administration has intimidated those responsible for enacting laws and promulgating regulations, and at the same time has frustrated administrative and enforcement officials. The confusion and chaos of our present manpower problem has been produced not so much by a shortage of either materials or men but by bad management, mistaken calculations, and maldistribution of what we have.

If there be a shortage of war supplies and matériel, it is due not so much to the lack of facilities or shortage of manpower, but to a division of authority between management and labor, between Government and the people, which has all but eliminated the element of responsibility for results.

Certainly every Member of this House wants to see increased production. There is no difference of opinion or dispute among us so far as the purported objective of this particular bill is concerned. We all want more planes, ships, tanks, guns, and ammunition with which to fight this war. Always, it is better to have too much than to be caught with too little.

On my questioning of the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, it was admitted that Von Rundstedt's drive in the middle of December was due to neither the lack of weapons nor lack of manpower on the western front. One great problem now is transportation. Miles of supplies and millions of tons of equipment are bulging American warehouses. They can be seen in trains on

our sidings, lining our freight yards and stacked high on our docks at ports of embarkation. When one views all the matériel we have assembled in England he wonders how the island keeps from sinking. Because of the immense damage done to transportation facilities, it is as difficult to get supplies from the ports of Europe to our front lines as it is to get the goods from here to Europe. It would seem, therefore, that manpower shortage is more exaggerated than real.

Those of us who oppose this legislation contend that if we had a full or even an efficient utilization of manpower, this legislation would be unnecessary. The truth is, we have not a shortage of manpower but a waste of manpower and in certain plants where the Army and Navy have stated that additional workers were needed, labor and management have discovered that a surplus existed and men and women have been laid off.

This proposed legislation is based upon opinion rather than factual data. No census has been taken or a survey made in a thorough and exhaustive manner of the needs for additional workers in our war plants. It is true that there is a shortage of manpower in some while there is a surplus of manpower in others.

No earnest or sincere effort was made in the beginning to ascertain by volunteer agencies just what our manpower needs are. For the most part our committee listened only to Government officials rather than to witnesses who possess first-hand knowledge of this baffling problem. The Senate committee is acting more wisely by visiting shipyards and inspecting war plants personally to see for themselves what the picture really is.

It is admitted that there are some shortages but these shortages are local and spotty. This bill seeks to solve a local problem on a national basis. It would subject 99 percent of the laboring men of this country between the ages of 18 and 45, who are honest, loyal, industrious, and patriotic, to rigid regulations and compulsion in order to reach the other 1 percent that is now needed for war work. We have been told that our war industries will need anywhere from 90,000 to 700,000 additional men during the next 6 months—but no one can be sure of the figure given us. Why should we penalize the many good men in order to reach such a few bad ones? Whatever shortages exist should be dealt with locally through cooperative methods, and the foolish and futile attempt should not be made to solve the difficulty by a blanket law of compulsion.

No man in this Chamber has a higher regard or greater admiration for General Marshall and Admiral King and our other great military and naval leaders than I have—so long as they fight the war and stay in their own fields.

Nevertheless, I do feel that the leaders of industry, labor, agriculture, and our civil government are better qualified to speak about the problems of production and of manpower in our plants, factories, on our farms, and in our mines than are the military and naval strategists.

Bear in mind, gentlemen, that American labor—the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen,

and other labor organizations are opposed to this bill; that the leaders of American industry—the National Association of Manufacturers, and similar organizations—are against this legislation; that for the most part the leaders of agriculture are opposed to it. The American farmer is our most independent citizen and forever wants to remain free.

If we have a shortage in production what are the causes for it? Here are some:

First. Low wages—in some industries such as our foundries—which should be raised.

Second. Bad working conditions—inadequate housing, unsanitary surroundings, and long and difficult transportation from residence to factory.

Third. Idleness, produced not so much by inherent laziness as by industries engaged in war work on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. As long as the wages of the worker are guaranteed, with a 10-percent profit to the employer, the employer cares not so much how many he hires or how hard they work, because the more he spends of the taxpayers' money, the more profits of 10 percent he will reap for himself.

Many of our large defense plants are full of men and women who spend some 30 to 50 percent of their time stalling or loafing, gambling or reading, sleeping or talking. The Senate committee found this to be true at Norfolk and all of us have seen much of it in plants we have visited and have heard it from our own friends working in war plants, and whose honesty we do not question.

Fourth. Hoarding of labor which was vicious some time ago but which largely has been eradicated through cooperative efforts between labor and management and the War Manpower Commission. With all its faults, under the War Manpower Commission on which is represented Government, labor, industry, and agriculture, many past abuses have been abolished. Government itself has been and still is one of the worst hoarders of labor. The armed forces have sinned, too.

Fifth. Absenteeism caused by illness, accident, and other factors which cannot be cured by legislation.

Sixth. Turn-over in plant personnel due largely to cancellation of contracts, changes in designs, and methods of producing equipment; due to the very flexible nature of war itself.

Seventh. The overloading of certain plants in congested areas with contracts that should go to available plants with idle men in other areas. Many contracts should be farmed out to smaller firms.

Eighth. Work stoppages, strikes, and lock-outs. Most employers and workers are honest and patriotic Americans. They have sons, daughters, brothers, and husbands, fighting on every continent and on every sea. Their blood as well as their hands is in this war.

But there are a few buccaneers in business and certain racketeers in labor who have put their own individual welfare above the Nation's and who have sought personal gains and private profits instead of backing up our fighting men. Of course, these individuals are despicable

and deserve only the contempt of all true Americans. They should be and could be properly punished under existing law if this administration would carry out the mandates of Congress.

What we need in this respect is not more legislation but some honest, efficient, and fearless administration. The immediate application of the work-or-fight principle requires no additional legislation.

Perhaps this bill was designed to prevent a particular threatened strike, but this administration should not attempt to accomplish by indirection and surreptitiousness that which it is afraid to do by direction. And Congress should not be made the "goat" for the Executive's failure to enforce our present laws. Is someone trying to "pass the buck" to us?

Ninth. Cancellation or termination of contracts—cut-backs ordered by the Army and the Navy themselves; the widespread belief created among our people by high Government officials last fall that the war in Europe would soon end and that victory was just around the corner; the Washington talk of reconversion perhaps contributed more than anything else to the lag in production or the failure to accelerate it.

If we have a shortage of the weapons of war today, it is due not to the shortage of manpower or materials but to overoptimism created last autumn before November 7. More than 1,500,000 men and women left war industries—most of them left because of lack of war orders, not because of lack of patriotism. Many of these workers were literally forced out of employment, while others left jobs voluntarily because they were led to believe that Germany would soon be defeated. Naturally, they were looking after themselves and their families by getting jobs in peacetime industries.

The Aluminum News Letter, which reached our desks only yesterday, states:

In 1944 the aluminum industry went far enough "over the top" in supplying war needs to permit W. P. B. to close down entirely a number of Government-owned aluminum plants.

The small-arms plant in St. Louis, in my State; the Weldon Springs Ordnance plant in St. Charles County, Mo.; the ordnance plant in Lowell, Mass.; and many other similar plants all over the country were curbed in their production or completely closed and thousands of men and women were thrown out of employment—all because we were lulled into a sense of false security—not only by the daily press and magazines, by certain Members of Congress, but by the Army and Navy as well, and certainly not the least by the Commander in Chief.

Last October we were short of nothing, except votes. In Philadelphia and Chicago we were told how great was our production, how victorious were our arms, how soon the boys would be coming home, and how 60,000,000 jobs in peacetime would be furnished. The majority of the people—though a rather small majority—believed this rosy picture that was so glowingly and glibly painted for them.

Then something happened in the middle of December and suddenly we have discovered a great shortage of manpower

and of production in the weapons of war. The shortage is not because of the lack of manpower but because of our mistake in judgment and of our failure to utilize the manpower that was available. Now to cover up the mistakes that were made it is proposed to set up a straw man and knock him over.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed legislation might cover up the mistakes, the erroneous judgment, and the miscalculations of those in high authority, but it will not achieve its alleged objective.

History has proved and experience has shown that free labor has been and is always more efficient and productive than forced labor. With all our faults, mistakes, strikes, and bad management we have demonstrated to the world that American free labor can and has out-produced the slave labor of Germany, Japan, and Italy combined. The miracle of this modern age is the industrial output and productive capacity of America.

At this stage of the war are we going to raise up a Hitler in America to get rid of one abroad? Are we in this trying hour going to abandon the freedom for which our men and women are fighting and dying? Are we going to adopt the system which we are paying so much in blood and treasure to destroy? Has democracy failed and we must now employ totalitarian methods to destroy dictatorships? This conscription is the quintessence of the Nazi-Fascist philosophy we are fighting against.

This bill, sir, is merely to get the American people in the harness and to reduce our people to penal servitude. We are not justified in punishing the many for the weaknesses or misdeeds of the few. Give the majority of our people credit for intelligence and patriotism. We might force, under the threat of severe penalty, certain Americans to enter a factory, but we cannot force such individuals to work without wasting twice the effort we would get out of them. Place a drafted worker alongside a voluntary worker on the assembly line and you will weaken the morale of both. It is impossible to legislate patriotism, industry, or morality. What all of us Americans need in this dark hour is more internal conviction and less external compulsion. I hold in disdain as much as my chairman does the bowery bum, the pool-hall loafer, or the man who cowardly hides behind a tractor instead of a tank, or a cow instead of a machine gun. Remember, however, that food is the primary weapon of war and that Napoleon said: "An army fights on its stomach."

It is a bit strange, Mr. Chairman, that such legislation as this—seeking more governmental power and control over the lives of our citizens—should now be considered by this body, just after Congress has established a board composed of three men—former Senator Gillette of Iowa, former Governor Hurley of Connecticut, and Lieutenant Colonel Heller of California—to dispose of \$100,000,000,000 worth of war equipment and goods declared by the Army and Navy to be surplus. And do not forget that today in many of our States producing critical war materials there are thousands of American men and women drawing unemployment compensation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not necessary and if enacted into law it will not work. Most of our industrialists who deal with labor and the problem of production daily have estimated that the delay, confusion, and red tape that such an act would inject into a factory would cut war production from 10 to 15 percent instead of boosting it.

This proposed legislation is not progressive, it is oppressive; it is not liberal, it is reactionary; it looks not forward but it looks backward; it belongs to the Old World, not to the New World. If for one moment I thought the enactment of this bill into law would increase our production I would be wholeheartedly for it. Instead, I feel that if passed it would retard rather than accelerate production; it would create untold confusion; it would lead to the loss of our civil liberties. Powers that are once delegated or given away are never easily or willingly returned. Because it is contrary to conscience, repugnant to reason, and obnoxious to the spirit of our traditions and institutions, I cannot support it.

Sir, I am against this bill because I want to keep America a land where every man can walk the earth his own king, the equal lord of every other man, to go his own way, work out his own will, weave into the warp and woof of the magic days the dreams that haunt, the duties that inspire and urge him on.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, there seems to have been some confusion about the type of legislation which the Chiefs of Staff, General Marshall in particular, requested from the Congress. The question has been raised as to whether General Marshall wants the bill which is now before us, or whether he prefers the work-or-fight bill which was originally introduced; I would like to call your attention to page 7 of the report which was filed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] from the Committee on Military Affairs in support of this bill. On that page is a letter from General Marshall and Admiral King in which they point out the positive need for legislation without any attempt to tell the Congress how the legislation should be worded or in what manner or through what agency the legislation should be administered.

I would like to read two short paragraphs from the letter:

As the agents directly responsible to you for the conduct of military operations, we feel that it is our duty to report to you the urgent necessity for immediate action to improve the situation relative to the acute need for young and vigorous replacements for the Army and Navy and to provide the necessary manpower to increase the production of critical items of munitions, accelerate ship construction, and effect the rapid repair of damaged vessels.

You are intimately familiar, Mr. President, with the great importance of regaining the offensive on the western front and pressing it, together with operations against the Japanese, with constantly increasing intensity in the months to come. To this end, therefore, we feel that the United States should make every conceivable effort to enable the armed forces to carry out your instructions.

This, I hope, will plainly show that General Marshall is concerned only with the necessity for adequate authorization for meeting manpower shortages wherever they exist and that he makes no attempt to express to the Congress any preference on the wording of the needed authorization.

Now I would like to discuss the legislation which is before us.

I think it is within reason to say that war—if war must be waged—should be total war. All of the Nation's resources should be engaged. If one man can be called upon to risk his life, to accept the harshness and the misery of life at the front, to undergo the hazards and the terrors of battle, there can be but small compunction about asking another man to give his work where it will be most effective, or asking another to lend his wealth or his factory for like purposes. Deliberately I say we should have had total mobilization immediately after Pearl Harbor. Had we done so, I believe the war might already have been won, that those who are to die henceforth might have been spared.

At this late day it is more difficult—much more difficult—to adjust ourselves to the requirements for manpower draft. It is doubly difficult for me to accept the need for manpower draft as an actual and compelling one until I have seen the Government take the lead in eliminating waste of manpower. I have not seen that. I would like to see this Government undertake a coordinated drive to eliminate waste of manpower in its own agencies. I believe that such a drive based on patriotic principles could be highly effective. No reasonable person will deny that there is waste of manpower wherever the hand of the Government reaches. There is manpower waste in the Government-financed war industries. There is manpower waste in Government offices. There is manpower waste in every military and naval post. I deplore it. It is inexcusable. But it exists, and I realize that we shall continue to have it. That in itself is a powerful argument for a manpower bill because a manpower bill will provide the direct authority and the responsibility for coordination and correlation of manpower needs, for more equitable distribution of manpower, for a central authority which can order an end to practices which now contribute to manpower waste.

We cannot base our consideration of this measure on what might have been or what should have been. Regardless of all the objections which can be raised, there remains one fact which outweighs all of them. The Commander in Chief and the Chiefs of Staff have stated that the United States must have a manpower draft—now—if we are to insure sufficient matériel for the proper prosecution of the war. They know the needs of the armed forces. We do not. We, today, are not concerned with pointing out the mistakes of yesterday. The men in uniform are not concerned with dissertations on the mistakes of yesterday. However regrettable they may have been, we cannot supply tomorrow's needs of the matériel of war by pointing out yesterday's mistakes of policy or strategy. There are always mistakes in war. Today we are

concerned with the supply of guns and ammunition which are needed now and in the months to come. Without a manpower draft there may not be shells enough on the western front to insure the success of the drive which is shaping up. There may not be enough gasoline for the planes and tanks which are so essential to present-day military operations.

There were not enough in 1944. We have actual figures on the shortages in many items. Those figures are contained in the hearings which have been presented to you in support of this measure. I would like to point out that there was a shortage of 6.2 percent in artillery ammunition, of 11.5 percent in mortar ammunition, of 7.8 percent in 105-millimeter howitzer ammunition, of 9.2 percent in bombs and grenades, of 6 percent in trucks. These are but a few items. Shortages have a way of showing up at the worst possible time. It is not sufficient to have ample supplies through 11 months of the year. A shortage during the crucial twelfth month may undo all that was accomplished before.

More shells and gasoline at critical periods last autumn might have kept the Germans off balance, might have prevented the winter stalemate, might have brought a quick end to the war. They might have prevented the Rundstedt counter-offensive, with its heavy casualty lists and its destruction of supplies.

Always when there is a shortage of vital war material or of the machines of war, human hands and human bodies must fill the gaps. There are stalemates. The casualty lists lengthen. We at home do not pay for mistakes or shortages. The men at the front pay for them. For us at home it may not make much difference whether or not we pass a manpower bill. The war would drag on a few months longer, and some people would like that. They are getting rich on war prosperity. But to the men in uniform it would make a difference. To the people they left back home it would make a difference.

The general purport of this bill is to say that the Government will apply compulsion if necessary to get citizens to produce the arms required by other citizens it has drafted to stand on the battle fronts. It is a modified, half-way national service act, for men between the ages of 18 and 45.

In its new form the bill is not strictly a work-or-fight law, but a work-or-get-fined law. Most of the 18,000,000 covered by it are men whom the Army does not want, so there is no point to drafting them for combat or labor battalions. The need for them is in certain vital war industries. In September 7.5 percent of the workers in such industries quit. It is to keep them on the job and to enlist others that the May bill would provide fines, backed up by jail sentences.

The need for it has been stated emphatically by the Commander in Chief, the War Department and the Navy Department. They are the ones who should know. They are charged with responsibility for the conduct of the war.

It would not be good politics to support the measure. Every one of us who does so will lose votes by it. There are ele-

ments within labor and capital which are bitterly opposed to it. Some of them already are making their threats. Obviously both groups are sufficiently well financed to sponsor opposition for any of us who refuse to bow to them. The people who will appreciate our action are a silent group. Many of them are far from home. They are overseas in uniform. They cannot do much to show their appreciation. But, appreciation is not important when a measure of this consequence is involved. The real question is one of right or wrong. It is a question of the lives of men. It is a question of keeping the faith. No argument can change these fundamental facts. It is right to support this measure.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, whatever action is taken by Congress on a national service law at this time will go down in history as one of the most important actions taken by Congress during our entire national history. The action taken on H. R. 1752 will be looked to as a precedent from this point forward in all matters pertaining to the exercise of congressional power in wartime. For that reason it is especially important that we keep clearly before us the real purpose of the bill and that we do not undertake to incorporate in this bill legislation regarding controversial but very closely related subjects on which there has been no adequate preparation.

Briefly stated, the purpose of this bill is to freeze, so far as reasonably possible, employees engaged in essential industry or agriculture and to direct men to leave nonessential occupations and enter war work. Those two objectives are certainly in the national interest and if carried out successfully will go far toward making our war program more efficient and more satisfying to each and everyone of us. Probably even more important than that, such a program will assure our men now serving on the battle fronts that we on the home front are backing them to the limit.

Our needs for increased war production are very great. The bill, H. R. 1752, should induce men to enter employment in essential war industries voluntarily and to stay on the job. This bill is not a cure-all but it will be a help. The number of cases of violation of such a law should be extremely few.

Those of you who think there is greater need for reduction in feather-bedding by industry and for antistrike laws and for elimination of waste of manpower already employed in war production are not really proving a case against the true purposes of this bill. Even though Congress acts on all these other matters, there is still need for some law directing our energies to essential war production and to put an end to idleness of those who can and should be working in war production. We must increase our production of war materials beyond anything heretofore attained by our workers on the home front and this will tax our entire Nation to the

utmost if we are to win this war as quickly and efficiently and effectively as possible.

Our people will not approve militarism within our industrial and agricultural structure and they will not approve extreme measures of regimentation by the executive and administrative branch of Government. I have done everything within my power to help develop the bill before us today with proper safeguards against militarism and regimentation in industry and agriculture.

Following the First World War, I joined actively with the various veterans' organizations, and especially with the American Legion, in advocating some form of universal draft for any future war in which we might become involved. Practically every veteran of the First World War returned to civil life thoroughly convinced that any future war should be waged by the entire able-bodied manpower of our Nation. This belief of the veterans of World War No. 1 culminated in the proposal by the American Legion in 1922 that would authorize the President in time of war to draft labor, control capital and industry, and stabilize prices, and this proposal was the outgrowth of a sincere determination to equalize the burdens of war.

Both major parties adopted planks in their platforms in 1924 supporting the universal draft, and such a plank was retained in the Republican platform of 1928. In 1930 the War Policies Commission of Congress investigated and studied methods of equalizing the burdens of war and removing the profits of war. During and following that investigation, discussion on the House floor indicated a fear that any universal draft would include the drafting of labor, capital, and industry, and that capital and industry could not be drafted without compliance with the fifth amendment requiring the Government to pay just compensation for property taken for public use. This discussion resulted in the adoption of an amendment to the resolution providing that the War Policies Commission "shall not consider and shall not report upon the conscription of labor."

Having carefully observed these developments, I watched with great interest the reaction to proposed manpower legislation such as the Austin-Wadsworth bill, H. R. 1742, in the Seventy-eighth Congress. When it came before the Committee on Military Affairs 1 year ago, extensive hearings were held, but no bill of this kind was reported to Congress by the committee prior to this bill. During the summer and fall of 1944 the general feeling throughout the Nation was that the war was so nearly won that it would be unnecessary to enact further legislation governing the use of our manpower in this war. About the middle of November, however, the record of shortages of certain items of war materials began to show up for various reasons. It is not my purpose here to place the blame for these shortages on any man or group of men because no human being could possibly have estimated in advance the exact proportion of our war materials that would be needed on all of

our fighting fronts. The volume of supplies needed was bound to vary tremendously with the extent of military operations and in the matter of ammunition particularly the volume consumed exceeded that of any military operation in the world's history. We suddenly faced the need of increasing our war production quickly. The first warnings were issued by the War Department officials in November that we needed to step up our production, but these appeals were not immediately effective because of the general opinion throughout the Nation that the war was practically over. Untold numbers of workers drifted away from war production and into jobs that appeared likely to be more permanent. Industry was ready to start reconversion to civilian production.

It is true that our production record for this war has been magnificent, in spite of the concern of both industry and labor regarding reconversion and permanent jobs. No one is condemning either industry or labor in any way. But, when our own great record of production must be still further increased because of the tremendous stepping-up of the war tempo, ways must be provided for immediate results if this new production is to be most effective and most helpful to our war effort.

The reconversion of industry to civilian production can be delayed rather effectively under existing laws and regulation. But there is need for labor legislation along the lines proposed in the bill now under consideration. There is no such law on our statute books, and until the German advance in the Ardennes in December, public thought during the past year would not have supported enactment of such a law, although such a measure would have had wholehearted public support at the time of Pearl Harbor.

I look upon the bill now under consideration as a necessary insurance policy against any future unbalance in our war program. The extent of its enforcement will be small compared with the extent of its influence in causing people to enter and to remain in essential war work.

Legislation of this type might impose a degree of militarism and arbitrary regimentation if not carefully developed with adequate safeguards.

The Army and Navy officials expressed their opposition to any type of work corps under direct military jurisdiction, and certainly industry and labor do not favor such a system as was provided in the bill H. R. 1119, the predecessor of this bill. Early in the hearings, I expressed my vigorous opposition to any provision that would make the drafting of an individual into the armed forces a penalty for his violation of this or any other law. The Military Affairs Committee is strongly opposed to such practice and the penalty section of this bill was changed to one calling for civilian penalties of fine or imprisonment with jurisdiction in civilian courts.

The possibility of growth of arbitrary regimentation under such legislation was well illustrated during the course of the hearings when I questioned Judge Patterson and Judge Hay and other witnesses, only to find that in their opinion

the powers granted in the bill, H. R. 1119, as then written, were construed by them to be broad enough to enable the administrative agencies to compel a qualified registrant to work for a specified private employer for private profit. From the hearings you will note that I questioned the constitutionality of any legislation granting that power. I need not enlarge upon the possible extreme abuses of such arbitrary power. Most Americans would object to an arbitrary order for them to start to work for a certain private employer or go to jail. The objective of this legislation is to require qualified registrants to go to work in essential war production and not to authorize any such arbitrary regimentation.

Except for the fact that we are at war, this bill contravenes the thirteenth amendment of our Constitution. The power given to Congress in section I of the Constitution to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy, is so far-reaching in wartime as to uphold many laws that would be considered unconstitutional under the thirteenth amendment in peacetime. You will note in the committee report that the Federal, district, and circuit courts have held that service by an individual can be required on "work of national importance under civilian direction in time of war." There has been no ruling as yet, however, on the extension of war powers to include the forcing of an individual to work for a designated private employer for the employer's private profit, but in my opinion any statutory grant of such power would be held unconstitutional.

The war powers of Congress and the need for the exercise of those powers are sufficient to support legislation requiring men to work in essential war production if they come within specified classifications. There is also a good argument for the constitutionality of a law freezing men already employed in essential war production because of the great national interest in maintaining efficient war production throughout the war. Certainly any high rate of turnover of manpower in our war-production industries can cause a most serious curtailment of war production when increased production is most needed. I cannot support any legislation that gives the power to force a man to work for a designated private employer for private profit. In my opinion, there is no justification for the grant of such a power and it would be contra even in wartime to the provision of the thirteenth amendment prohibiting involuntary servitude.

In order to assure the bill's constitutionality, I offered in committee the limitation set out at the end of paragraph (4) (C) which appears at lines 3 to 5, on page 5 of the bill, making the entire sentence read:

It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith, provided the order gives him a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work.

In my opinion, the adoption of this amendment helps to make the bill constitutional, and insofar as this bill is not in conflict with the Constitution, I am

glad to support it to speed up our war-production program and our entire war effort to the limit of our national power.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman has given a lot of thought to the expression "reasonable choice of employers for whom to work." The gentleman comes from an agricultural area. How would the gentleman interpret that provision?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I should like to have the bill so administered that the agencies ordering the registrant to go to work would give him the choice of at least a reasonable number of employers, and then I would leave it to an interpretation of the court as to what a reasonable number might be. I can readily see how the number of opportunities should be extended more in some branches of work than in others. It would be extremely difficult to predict what number of agricultural employers would be a reasonable number.

Mr. BROOKS. Also the area, as to the number of war plants and the number of opportunities, might affect the number of certifications.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Absolutely.

Mr. BROOKS. So that in one area a reasonable number might be a limited number and in another area it might be unlimited.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Absolutely. I gave a great deal of thought to that in trying to arrive at what would be the proper number, and decided that the best thing to do would be to have the amendment call for a reasonable number and let the number vary with the different situations that might arise.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss a national service bill that will affect all Americans alike, or as nearly so as is practicable. We have here a bill that proposes to deal with the ages of 18 to 45. We have made little discrimination regardless of whether the men are IV-F's or soldiers returned from the battlefronts with an honorable discharge. I want us first to bear that in mind.

I make no controversy on the recommendation of the President with regard to a national service law. I would not argue as to General Marshall's and Admiral King's recommendations to the Congress. But there are a few things which I do want to discuss with you in detail. There was introduced in the beginning a work-or-fight bill. We struck out the fighting feature and went back to the penalties of the Selective Service laws. This bill according to the newspapers was amended on various occasions, and I am sure you have kept up with the daily press. We have executive sessions, the secrecy of which I shall not violate here in my remarks. But I think I am free to discuss matters that have been printed in the press with regard to the deliberations on this measure in executive session. We find that this bill was amended to where the War Manpower Commission would not be utilized but juked and scuttled. But we find again

in reading the bill before us for consideration that the Selective Service Board has been set up for this function. So we know that is true, because most news stories that come to our attention unrepudiated are accepted as true. That is the bill as we find it before us today. We further find that the Tydings amendment was being given the test, that the Selective Service Director had sent out an order on the day we convened here in Congress to the State Selective Service directors. The order was, reading that part which affects those coming under the Tydings amendment:

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 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interests of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men. The President feels in view of the existing conditions agriculture like our other war industries can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older age groups.

The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25.

Then we find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23 a directive by General Hershey which was inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], which states as follows:

The directive of January 3, 1945, State Directive Advice 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment.

The opinions and findings contained in State directive advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local board in determining the classification of registrants in the age groups 18 to 25. Section 5-K of the Selective Training and Service Act known as the Tydings amendment places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal in the case of the individual registrant, whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Now, you can appreciate, along with me, the state of confusion that existed for the young farmers of America, 300,000 in round numbers, who have been classified as essential to agriculture when this was published on the morning of January 4 in the newspapers.

Many of them were liquidated immediately. Many of them since that date have joined the armed forces. Among the group, according to the statistics of the Selective Service Board, 40 percent were or will be rejected for not being physically able. That 40 percent, in all probability, will never return to the farm, and agriculture suffers the more.

I am sure you are familiar with the Tydings amendment, but in order to refresh your memory I will read from the Selective Service Act as amended. This is section K:

Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), 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.

Now, the order that went to the Selective Service Board did not take into account the obtaining of someone to take the place of one of the 300,000 farmers that fell within that age group. Farming with most of these 300,000 is a very skilled occupation. In the handling of heavy equipment, particularly in the breadbasket of America, it is necessary to have skilled operation of the equipment and machinery which we have, even though most of it is old.

We found further on reading the newspapers that we amended the bill where no person would be obliged to join any labor union or organization unless he really chose to do so. We found, also, from reading the papers that every person volunteering for employment under section 4 shall have the right to join any union or organization, but no such person shall be obliged to join any such union or organization if he should not freely choose to do so. But as the House has received the bill, we find this amendment has been deleted from the original bill.

At this time I want to take off my hat and bow to the Representatives from the grand old State of Arkansas, where I was born, and the Representatives from the State of Florida for having nerve enough to submit to the people of their States a constitutional amendment, which was adopted in both instances, where you cannot operate a closed shop in those States. And such would be the case in Oklahoma, if such an amendment were submitted to the people of that great State.

We have dealt severely, as is necessary, in raising an Army. The Congress of the United States has been considerate of the soldiers in the passage of the G. I. bill and many other good laws. But we are now taking into account 7,000,000 American citizens and we are saying to them that we are going to utilize their services in the Army and war plants until this war is over.

But we leave the union organizations untouched. The closed-shop unions can and will demand dues and fees from a man who is drafted by his government to work. Before he can seize a tool, he must pay that supergovernment which our courts have upheld. He must pay tribute before he is permitted work; yet he will receive a most severe penalty should he refuse to work.

I propose to offer amendments to take care of this labor situation. I propose to offer an amendment to safeguard the Tydings amendment. I propose to offer an amendment to require utilization of the War Manpower Commission instead of junking it and scrapping it and spending a billion dollars setting up a new organization to handle the manpower of the country. One would think that the original bill was good but it has been entirely rewritten and even given a new number. The old bill was 1119. This bill is 1752. The provisions of the original bill have been changed to such ex-

tent that any Member of Congress in my opinion is justified in offering any amendment designed to temper the bill with justice to the man it affects. We are protecting labor; we are protecting industry, we are guaranteeing reasonable returns on investment up to 6 percent; we are tolerating cost-plus con-

tracts, where a lot of manpower is lost and not utilized in production today. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] who spoke of the visit of a Senate committee to some of these activities and finding at first hand what was going on in the way manpower is being wasted.

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, since this law affects the entire Nation, let us try to make it just, let us not give in to the labor leaders and their organizations as against the 85 percent of the unorganized people of America; let us not give in to industry as against 85 percent of the population of America. One of these days our boys will be marching home. On this very day, this very morning I received a letter from one of my constituents who has served overseas. I have it here should anyone care to see it. It comes from my home town. The postmark is there. It was written on the 27th, just the day before yesterday. This man is writing about this bill, and I will read an excerpt to you from this letter. It is an excellent letter, a good letter:

You can tell those Congressmen that argue for the C. I. O. and closed shops that it will be a sad day when this war is won and they have to stand and look millions of veterans in the face and explain why they have to pay to get a job after they have fought to keep the country free. Are we going to let them down?

Now, don't get me wrong. We all love the U. S. A. and what it stands for. But we sure don't approve of the way Congress has let the labor racketeers pull the wool over their eyes.

The labor racket is worse than Al Capone's gang. He didn't force people to become members. This is not just my opinion. Thousands feel the same way. I have listened to them all over this country.

They just don't have the guts to say so. But you can tell the world the veterans will say so when they come home. And if something isn't done about it before they get home, they will not only talk but will show action as well. We don't want them to come home to find their own country in a mess.

I'm for the working people 100 percent. But I am getting tired of being told to go to see the business agent. And he tells the working class just how much to kick in or not work. And if those union stool pigeons don't think the soldier feels that way just ask any one of them they meet on the street that has a battle ribbon on his blouse.

I could read on. That reflects the views of an ex-serviceman. I have several letters here, but in the limited time allotted me I cannot read them to you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, this subject is so large it is impossible to tackle it and to say much about it in the course of 10 minutes. However, the basic facts are that 900,000 men will be needed for military service by June 30, 1945, while we are told by the Army and the Navy that 700,000 workers will be needed for essential industry within

that time. So far as the 900,000 for military service are concerned, no question can be raised. They will be secured by 150,000 volunteering for the Navy while they are still 17 years of age. A large part of the remainder will come through the Selective Service boards, about 420,000, and the balance will be coming from the occupational-deferred groups. As to these persons who are in the occupational-deferred groups, there are some interesting figures. Of physically fit men under 26 years of age, only 40,000 are in industry today, and of those 40,000 said to be in industry, many are doctors, chemists, and other persons with peculiar assets who certainly are not going to be called forward to serve in the Army. Sixty thousand are in the merchant marine. The balance, about 360,000, are on the farms.

We are told by those who came before us that they do not expect to get any men out of industry under 26 years of age for the military services. If they get any it will be very few, because they have combed that class very closely. Any man under 26 in industry today is a key man and cannot be spared. Of the men in the merchant marine probably some can be replaced by older men. Out of the 360,000 on farms, they say that 180,000 can pass the draft requirements. That is where 180,000 are coming from. Whether or not there will be replacements for them is another thing.

If I can judge from the farmers who came in to see me in the last few days while I was home, they expect their boys to leave the farms and they are pretty certain they are not going to get replacements. The balance of the men needed for the services will come from men in the age-group from 26 to 29, more from industry perhaps than from farms. However, I was told by a man who is chairman of a selective-service board and a very able citizen that they combed that class pretty thoroughly. Any man who is between the ages of 26 and 29 today in a big industrial plant is a man who by experience has become a toolmaker, a diesinker, or holder of some other important job for which no other person can be trained in less than 6 months and for some jobs in not less than 18 months. Certainly that group is not going to be hauled out of industry merely by the passage of this bill. Selective Service will not take them.

How do the people back home feel about this bill? I have been wondering, as you have, while we have been here in Washington. I was interested in picking up the Worcester Telegram, a paper with a circulation of 130,000, the biggest circulation of any newspaper in Massachusetts outside of Boston. Reading from its editorial dated Thursday, January 25, 1945, I find this statement:

On one point, there can be no question. War production must be kept up, whatever the inconveniences or the hardship to civilians. Here at home, where many of us are getting high pay, and most of us are living in comfort, we cannot fail to do the little that is required of us to maintain the fighting men who are making the real sacrifice at the front.

Any fair service act can be accepted, and the public will support it, if the need for it can be demonstrated. But the two groups most directly concerned with the practical

business of war production, the leaders of organized labor and the leaders of industrial management, are agreed that the situation can be better met without compulsory war work.

The sensible thing would be to let those men demonstrate that they can get together and solve this manpower problem. If they can't, and the emergency continues, Congress can act. But, as matters stand today, the arguments for a service act are not wholly convincing.

Back home in Springfield I personally took the time out to call upon labor leaders and upon heads of important industries employing thousands of men. Their position was about the same as the position given in the Worcester Telegram. Let us wait 30 or 60 days before passing any bill like this. Let us permit the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., and the heads of industry to get together after the War Department and the Navy Department have told us what they need, because they have not told us up to date. "We think we can do it without this legislation. We are sure we can do it without this legislation, and we know that we can do it better without this legislation as it is now written than we can with the legislation." That seems to be their position.

I was interested in the Springfield papers, both the Republican paper, the Union, and the Democratic paper, the Springfield Daily News—the Daily News being the largest Democratic paper outside of Boston in Massachusetts. In the Springfield Daily News editorial of January 22, 1945, they indicate their opinion, and I will use the closing words:

Assuming there is a shortage of 4,000,000 workers in key industries (and that figure may be large) Congress should hesitate to place 40,000,000 Americans under a workers' draft to meet the deficiency. That would be giving Government bureaucrats too much power over far too many people to cope with the problem. Moreover the so-called crisis will ease off immediately if the Russian-Allied offensives succeed in smashing the German war machine by spring.

The position of the Union is expressed in an excerpt from their editorial of January 22, 1945. The editorial speaks for itself:

Is it not possible that the present manpower crisis stems, at least in part, from the incompetence of the manpower administration? That question is inevitable, in view of the failure at the top in so many other divisions of war-program administration: the deplorable mismanagement of our food production and supplies, for instance. If the manpower shortage is remediable without legislation creating what amounts to the labor battalions mustered by Hitler and his Tokyo opposite number, if a change of administration can lead to a sufficiently effective use of civilian workers to do the job without passing oppressive laws, then a change is mandatory.

At least there is room for argument about current proposals. And Congressmen who insist on argument and who oppose the labor draft are performing a signal service for the country, for they are determined not to abandon the Government of free-men until every means of preserving it, even in a war crisis, has been exhausted. Let us not look upon them as obstructionists or politically inspired critics. The necessity for breaking down the traditional barriers containing democratic practice has not yet been proved beyond doubt.

I feel that certain amendments ought to be offered to this bill before anyone would vote for it. One of them is to limit the time within which it is to be operative. As the bill comes before us today, it is going to operate until we get through with the Japanese war. It does not seem to me that we need any such period of time to keep 53,000,000 persons, who are our workers, covered by legislation of this kind. I think that we should make it 6 months or make it a year. Make it the year 1945. Close it out as of December 31, 1945, if the German war is over at that time. If the war is still on, or if the need can be shown at that time to be great enough to require such legislation, then we will have proper opportunity in which to renew it.

Another amendment which I think should be adopted is on page 2 of the bill. I believe that a man who is given the power of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion should not be given the right to delegate it as provided in line 5. Congress does not know today and it will never know to whom he will delegate the power. Thereafter he will not be responsible. There will always be some agency, some other person, to hide behind. If Mr. Byrnes is going to be the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion let him sign whatever documents have to be signed so that the Congress can always go to him and say, "You are the person responsible; it is not Mr. McNutt, Mr. Jones, or whoever else happens to be holding office as head of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, or some other agency." Let us not have that division of authority which these bureaucrats love to have down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Let us put the responsibility in one man and then we will know where we stand.

Another amendment which I think might well go in is brought to my attention by the fact that the papers in Springfield recently were telling us that they are bringing in Jamaicans, colored people, to take up employment in my city. By the way, you would be interested in the Friday Evening Union of last week, which says that Smith & Wesson—I think everybody in this room knows who Smith & Wesson are, great revolver manufacturers—have a cut-back coming, that 200 employees will be dropped in 2 weeks. Cut-backs are coming all along the line today in the production of what we would think to be the most needed weapons of war. People are going out of Smith & Wesson. There are going to be jobs for them, to be sure, in other industries.

So, in the Springfield area, we have at one and the same time the picture of American workmen being dropped from the pay rolls of industry while alien workers are coming in large numbers to work in other plants. Nothing portrays more clearly the type of manpower shortage which we have today in our country. It is a shortage of common laborers, men who are of an age and physique which will permit them to perform the hardest kind of manual task. They are needed in the heavy tire industry and in the foundries. Their pay is in

the lower brackets and not commensurate with the abilities of skilled workmen. According to the testimony on pages 281, 349, and 350 of the hearings, there are experienced American workmen who are Negroes who are not able to get work in plants because of discrimination against them. Both major parties at their conventions last year wrote planks into their platforms, pledging support for legislation which would eliminate such unfair practices. I believe that a provision in this bill would both redeem those pledges and be helpful in overcoming such manpower shortage as now exists.

Mr. ARENDs. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot stop a football game at the end of the third quarter and conclude you have the game in the bag because you are ahead and again have the ball on the enemy's 1-foot line.

After Pearl Harbor, America started on an all-out effort to win this war.

Immediately our military leaders to whom is assigned the duty of carrying out the problems and battles of war unleashed their best efforts in a terrific movement to get our fighting forces under way and well equipped to do the job wherever called upon. Month after month our tasks have multiplied, and today we face as momentous and important war problems as of any time since the outbreak of this war.

Before I go any further, let me state that I well realize that, both as to the military and home front, mistakes have been made. Mistakes were bound to happen. Others might well have been avoided. And I want it emphatically understood that I am of the opinion and belief that the dilemma in which we find ourselves at the moment certainly is not the blame of our fighting boys at the front, of Congress, the rank and file of labor, or industry. Somebody last fall just failed to see the true picture of the war and, if it was known, failed to acquaint the American people with the truths and facts connected therewith. There is no use crying over spilt milk. Mistakes, costly and regrettable as they may be, cannot be retrieved. One thing certain is, that they must not be repeated.

Therefore, today we have this drastic bill before us which permits the freezing of men in jobs and the drafting of men not now employed in essential labor, into war work. I repeat, it is drastic and something on which I had hoped we might not be called upon to act. The whole idea of involuntary service in private employment is rather repugnant to good Americans. That simply has not been our way of doing things in this country. It is not our style. Our American standards and patterns have always been cut out of better cloth.

As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I listened to all the testimony of the various witnesses who came before our committee. It was both interesting and informative. Never before, however, have I seen such directly opposite views expressed as that voiced by the proponents and opponents of the bill. There were good arguments on both sides, and I believe it would prove of benefit to all of you to read the complete hearings.

Our committee worked diligently day after day to bring forth the best possible bill. It has its shortcomings and may be improved through amendments from the floor. I hope so, for I know of one or more amendments, defeated in committee, that I feel should be in the final draft. One such amendment is the so-called Andrews amendment, which is in the Austin-Wadsworth bill, whereby any individual drafted to work in any plant is given the privilege and right to either join or not join a union of his choice. This amendment certainly is not anti-union, but it simply retains to the individual a right which he as an American citizen is entitled to. I have never been able to understand by what reasoning any United States citizen could be forced to join a union when working on a Government contract. To me that is un-American.

The details of this bill have been explained by our chairman and also set forth in full in the report which accompanies the bill. I am not going to repeat such details. I do want to call your attention, however, to section B, page 4, which emphasizes the voluntary participation made possible to any individual who is capable of filling a wartime job. Only, and I repeat, only in case he refuses to accept such employment will he be subjected to the penalties of the bill. Somehow I want to believe that when the public is made fully aware of the seriousness of the situation we face, ample hands will be found available to voluntarily fill all labor requirements. That, I say, is my hope.

Everyone in this House knows that war is waste and destruction. Everyone does or should know that there is a waste of manpower in our factories and plants today. Each Member must have received, as I have, untold numbers of letters telling of instance after instance where individuals complain that they do not have enough work to do, are not permitted to work long enough hours or are not permitted to turn out as much work as they are able and willing to do. Both Phil Murray, C. I. O. head, and Mr. Crawford, chairman, National Association of Manufacturers Executive Committee, testified that there is now available enough manpower to do the job requested of labor and industry. Frankly, I don't believe I am far off in saying that there now exists, as an over-all picture, three men doing the work that two men could well do. That is a most regrettable statement of what I believe to be a fact. I do not think Congress can cure such an ill through legislation.

But, Mr. Chairman, and this is the crux of the whole matter as I view it. Under Secretary of War Patterson and Under Secretary of Navy Bard, in speaking for our armed services, emphatically stated that we need some legislation of this type now. Secretary Patterson stated:

As we see it, the manpower needs of the armed forces, and of the war industries that support the armed forces, for the first half year of 1945, will aggregate 1,600,000 additional persons. That is made up of 900,000 for induction into the armed forces, Army and Navy, for military service, and 700,000 additional persons in war production, in war-supporting industries.

I seriously doubt that any Member of this House has the vaguest idea as to what our military requirements will be for the next 6 or 12 months. Neither do we know when the war will end. All plans, policies, and determinations must be left to our military leaders under the head of our outstanding Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall. I have often said that if it is possible to derive any blessing from any war, then the greatest blessing to come to America out of this war has been that great soldier, General Marshall. All of us here realize that he knows his business. Somehow I like to depend and rest my case on his decisions. Approximately 20,000,000 fathers and mothers of today have placed the fate of their loved ones in this man's hands. They trust him; so do I. Who am I to loudly voice my opinions from a military angle against those of General Marshall?

It seems to me that we today are up against a situation that calls for action. If we are to win this war, men and materials must be made available. We must keep loading the guns our boys are shooting. God forbid the day when any of our boys might be defeated or killed through a lack of sufficient weapons or ammunition to carry the fight to our enemies.

If in this still great and glorious country of ours we can place our fingers on the shoulders of the young men of this land and send them out to fight and die, then how in the name of all that is just, can we ever possibly deny them the things to fight with in order that victory will be ours. I was one of those who, before the war, did everything I could in an effort to keep this country out of war. But it was not to be. Now we are in it and have been for over 3 years. The day of victory is going to be ours. We cannot backtrack now. Let us get every American into this fight up to the limit of his or her abilities. And right there let me pause to say that it is regrettable that the McSwain bill calling for taking the profit out of war was never put into law. You may recall that bill passed the House in 1935 by an overwhelming vote, 368 ayes to 15 nays. Had that bill passed, all the Nation's manpower, industry, and resources would have immediately been drawn into the war effort before declaration of this war. I still would like to see such a law on our statute books. It might help avert any repetition of this vicious conflict in which we now play so big a part.

Members of Congress, it may be that with the help of every good and loyal American, our armed forces cooperating with our allies can finish off our two world enemies during 1945 and 1946. In the meantime, let us throw everything at them that we have, in a grand push to terminate the loss of life, waste, and devastation that we encounter every day.

No, this bill is not perfect. This isn't the type legislation we like to vote for. Maybe it won't work out as smoothly as it is expected. There is a legal question as to its constitutionality but, regardless, I somehow feel deeply the need to do something about the matter right now. We have this bill here because of the one

objective that is being sought, and that objective is solely to meet an emergency manpower problem. I do not like the bill, for it takes us off on a tangent or foreign road from good, sound American doctrine, privileges, and rights. But, regardless of how bad the taste of the medicine this bill offers, I believe we have to take it. I can see no other alternative. The issue is clear—are we to throw our every resource into this battle, or not? We cannot take chances. We face the real question of whether we are now going to completely throw ourselves into this war effort when so badly needed. Just remember, the boys who are fighting and dying are not stopping to ask questions at this moment. They will ask such questions and speak their pieces when they get home. Now they want action from us—more men, more materials. General Marshall and Admiral King say we need this legislation. Under such conditions I can do nothing else but support it, unless the bill is drastically amended when up for consideration under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am going to direct my remarks at a part of this bill which has not been discussed this afternoon.

I intend to vote for this measure. I do so not because I believe it is the best manpower bill which could be brought forward, but because it is the most likely to pass. I endorse the intent of the bill. But its administration, I predict, will be hopelessly confused and entangled.

When this bill was before the committee for final action, it contained provisions for sensible, economical, and experienced administration of the job freeze and job transfer procedures. These provisions did no violence to the intent of the bill. They simply authorized, for the purpose of legally controlling the employment of men 18 to 45, the continued functioning of the vast employment exchange, manpower control, and management-labor committee machinery which this Congress—year after year, by appropriation—has recognized, approved, and supported.

If I had read this bill as it is now written, without knowledge of the tremendous mobilization of men and women into war plants and supporting activities by the War Manpower Commission—and into agriculture by the War Food Administration—I would have never guessed that a labor allocation machinery, providing for management and labor participation, was already in existence. I would have thought that this bill intended to create in these war years a manpower mobilization machinery for the first time.

What the bill, in fact, will do, unless amended, is to create additional machinery, duplicating machinery, machinery that can only confuse and disrupt the extensive system of recruitment, referral, and transfer, bulwarked by management and labor sponsorship, that already exists.

In 1933, the Congress created a Nation-wide system of public employment offices under Federal-State control. Prior to

Pearl Harbor, the employment service system was gearing itself to meet the labor demands arising out of defense production. On December 19, 1941, 12 days following Pearl Harbor, this system was temporarily placed on a Federal basis, so that Nation-wide mobilization of workers for expanding war industries could be expedited. In April 1942, by Executive Order, this system became the operating structure of the War Manpower Commission. During 1942, '43, '44, and up to the present minute, the War Manpower Commission has applied itself to the job of recruiting and transferring millions of workers to war production, with the help of management and labor committees. It has operated a tremendous interarea clearance system to move needed workers out of surplus areas. It has held millions of workers on essential jobs by its stabilization program, worked out cooperatively with management and labor. It has become the only agency with up-to-date and relatively accurate information on labor utilization and the rapidly changing labor requirements of different war programs and plants. It has undertaken, with management and labor support, an area-by-area program for moving less-essential workers into urgent jobs by employment ceilings and priority referral.

The War Manpower Commission has done and is doing these tasks with no law except the self imposed, informal law of workers and unions, employers and trade associations, voluntarily agreeing to abide by hiring controls they themselves helped to formulate.

This system of Nation-wide manpower control, founded on the voluntary cooperation of labor and management, has had to create many techniques and procedures. No manpower control system could operate without them. The manpower control system which Selective Service under the present bill must create also will not operate unless comparable duplicating procedures are created.

There is one way to avoid this duplication. There is one way to strengthen and to utilize the tremendous manpower machinery that already exists and that will continue to exist after this bill is enacted. That one way is to restore to the bill the intent of the committee's earlier amendments which would have authorized the Director of War Mobilization to designate the War Manpower Commission—and for agriculture, the War Food Administration—as the agency to which male workers 18 to 45 would be referred for placement and the agency which would determine, with the assistance of its management-labor committees, whether a worker's present job or future job was in the interest of the war effort. If there is some doubt as to the agencies which the Director of War Mobilization actually would designate, this doubt could be removed by writing into the bill the requirement that the Director of War Mobilization designate referral and placement agencies.

Let us look at the realities of the situation. The Selective Service System has 6,500 local boards. They are part-time

voluntary boards. They are already overworked. They know how to select and induct men into the armed forces. They have done and are doing this job magnificently. But they have not done active recruitment and placement of war workers.

The War Manpower Commission, on the other hand, has 1,507 full-time local offices and other part-time or itinerant offices, staffed with 2,000 people whose full-time business is manpower recruitment, referral, and stabilization. The Commission has 177 area offices and about 336 area management-labor committees. The local offices carry on placement, recruitment, transfer, and manpower control, under employment stabilization plans. Management and labor have worked with the area offices in developing these plans and are actively participating in carrying out these plans. It is the management-labor committees of the Commission which hear and decide worker and employer appeals under the plans.

The area and local offices together have recruiting specialists, utilization consultants, labor-market economists, and so on. They are, as I say, in the manpower business.

All these local and area offices throughout the country are tied together by State and regional offices and a Washington headquarters office. In each area, State, and region, and in Washington, there is an actively cooperating management-labor committee. By means of this extensive organization, the employment trends and labor needs of urgent production for plants and areas throughout the country are determined. This method of keeping track of our war manpower situation is working so well that Justice Byrnes recently designated the War Manpower Commission as the sole agency responsible for the coordination and issuance of manpower information. By this means, also, all male workers without regard to age—except World War II veterans—and in some areas women workers as well—must be hired with the consent of the employment service and must take jobs that have a high priority rating unless there is some good cause for refusing. And I would like to say here that when you have a voluntary manpower control system which cannot remedy substandard wage situations, which cannot pay transportation costs, nor promise adequate housing, you are bound to have many perfectly justifiable reasons for not taking a priority job.

I know that the War Manpower Commission has not operated perfectly. I know that there are some people who have chosen not to comply with the rules, and since the rules were essentially voluntary, very little could be done about it. Important employers have kept War Manpower Commission utilization consultants out of their plants so that no question could be raised on the labor needs they reported. Less essential employers have tried to buck the employment ceiling program so they would not have to give up workers to war industry. Many essential employers have given written releases to workers indiscriminately and then complained that the War Manpower Commission was not stopping

turnover. Some individual workers have found ways and means of getting jobs without a release. Some individual workers have managed to turn down priority after priority job in order to take a less important job of their liking.

In spite of all this, the war mobilization job done by the Commission without the power of compulsory assignment has been amazing. Up until last month, the manpower demands of our war effort, by and large, had been successfully met. Almost without exception, the shortages which face us now are not the result of failures to meet manpower demands in the past. They are the result of changed schedules dictated by changed battle conditions.

I think it would be foolhardy to throw aside the machinery, the procedures, the management-labor cooperation, the technical experience that has done this job. I think it would be eminently reasonable to recognize this machinery and to rely upon it for referring and placing workers, for determining when and where workers are needed, for deciding which workers should be transferred to urgent jobs, and for certifying that it is or is not in the best interest of the war effort for a particular worker to leave the particular job he is in.

I can think of nothing more wasteful of public funds or confusing and disheartening to the workers and employers of this country than to have a new agency—new in the sense that it has not handled civilian manpower problems—setting up a new and competing system to allocate workers of a particular sex and age while the responsible manpower agency, responsible for mobilizing all the other millions of workers, is tossed aside to continue its operations as best it can.

When I vote for this bill, it will be with the greatest misgivings as to its administrative effectiveness. I hope it will be possible now or later to rectify what I believe is a most serious error in the bill as written. I can see no good reason, no public interest, against correlating the appropriate Selective Service authority in this bill with the placement, referral, stabilization, and appeal authorities of the War Manpower Commission. As Judge Hay told our committee, there has been built up, through the cooperation of industry, labor, the procurement agencies, and the War Manpower Commission in their local areas, an intelligent system of selecting urgent war activities and assigning priorities with respect to jobs in relation to their importance to the war. The system includes an appeals machinery of joint management and labor panels, locally and up the line. I urge that we build upon this machinery and that we incorporate our intention so to do in H. R. 1752.

May I read into the RECORD at this time a brief description of the War Manpower Commission machinery through which existing manpower controls operate:

EXISTING MANPOWER MACHINERY

I. WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION ORGANIZATION

For administration of the manpower programs, War Manpower Commission organization consists of (1) a headquarters organization in Washington; (2) 12 regional manpower organizations covering all States in the United States, and Hawaii and Alaska; (3)

State manpower offices in each State; (4) area manpower organizations covering local labor market areas; and (5) a network of local employment offices. Organizational units in the field are headed by regional, State, and area manpower directors.

II. LABOR MARKET AREAS

The entire country is divided into labor market areas each of which represents that geographic area within which resident workers normally find their employment and local employers normally find their labor supply.

III. MANAGEMENT-LABOR COMMITTEE

Management-labor committees have been set up at national, regional, and area levels of War Manpower Commission administration. These committees are made up of representatives of management, labor, and where necessary agricultural, at the various levels. The manpower director at each level is the chairman of the management-labor committee at that level.

The management-labor committee functions (1) to advise the manpower director regarding formulation and operation of the applicable employment stabilization plan; (2) to assist in securing voluntary compliance with provisions of the plan by acquainting employers, workers, and the public with the need for and applicability of the plan; and (3) to hear appeals from actions of the War Manpower Commission under the plan and to recommend to the Manpower Director decisions on appeals.

IV. MANPOWER PRIORITIES COMMITTEES

Manpower priorities committees are set up in each administrative area of the War Manpower Commission to assist the manpower director in setting ceilings for individual establishments and in determining the relative priority of manpower needs of employers.

The manpower priorities committees are comprised of representatives of (1) the War Manpower Commission; (2) the War Production Board; (3) the Selective Service System; (4) the Navy Department; (5) the War Department; and (6) where advisable, representatives of other important claimants for manpower, such as the Civil Service Commission, the War Food Administration, the Maritime Commission, and others. The manpower director is chairman of the manpower priorities committee.

The manpower priorities committee is to make recommendation to the manpower director on the basis of production urgencies determined by the production urgency committees of the War Production Board and pertinent manpower factors in individual establishments.

V. APPEALS PROCEDURE

Any employer or worker who claims that any action of the War Manpower Commission under the employment stabilization program is unfair or unreasonable as applied to him, or is inconsistent with regulations under the program, may appeal such action to the area management-labor committee.

He may appeal beyond the area management-labor committee to the regional management-labor committee, and finally to the chairman of the War Manpower Commission. Hearings on appeals are not subject to rules of evidence, but are conducted informally.

Each party to the appeal may present his own case, or he may be represented by a member of his labor or trade organization or by any other person freely chosen by him.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill before the House today is the result of unfinished business. It is here because the executive department failed to lay down a sound business and labor policy which should have been enunci-

ated immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

This has not been done, and 3 years later with the fanfare of trumpets and hysteria and a hurricane of propaganda the buck has been passed to the Congress and extreme pressure for the passing of a National Service Act.

The result has been that cost-plus-fixed-fee contractors have been allowed to hoard labor and establish prices which have added billions to the cost of building our military machine. It has placed a premium on idleness of employees in many of the war plants; has set an example that has slowed down production and increased the waste of manpower for the past 3 years. It has wasted tremendous sums of the people's money who have given it in a most patriotic manner with the hope that every dollar they have invested in bonds would be so spent that it would bring victory to American arms at the earliest possible date. It is a gross injustice to the people, dangerous to the financial solvency of our Government and at this late date places this responsibility upon the Congress which has been neglected by other departments of the Government. It is a responsibility that I believe the Congress can meet and certainly should meet and solve at this time. If it is not solved the most profligate waste in the history of this Nation will continue to lower the morale of our people.

With all deference to the chairman and the Members of the Military Affairs Committee, I do not believe the National Service Act which they have recommended offers a genuine solution to this most vexing problem. It does not go to the core of the problem. It seeks to acquire 900,000 more men for military service within the next 6 months and 700,000 more men for essential war industries within the same period. Its purpose is to get this great number of men from the young men coming 18 years of age and from the very lean manpower now engaged in the civilian economy of the Nation, from the farms which are already short of manpower, from those employed in small businesses and from distribution of services to the civilian people of our country.

Is this course necessary? The Director of War Mobilization, representing the executive department, does not and cannot know under existing conditions. This problem cannot be properly approached until it is determined whether or not the manpower we now have in the war plants of the Nation is sufficient; if it is properly distributed and fully employed in production. This National Service Act should not be passed until that is determined.

Practically every Member of Congress continues to receive mail pointing out that there is a tremendous hoarding of manpower, particularly in the cost-plus-fixed-fee war plants, and that there is a wastage of manpower in most of the plants of the Nation. Thousands of patriotic men throughout the Nation have quit work in war plants after waiting days, weeks, and months for work because they were too patriotic to draw their checks in these critical times without being allowed to work in the plants

where they were supposed to be employed. Many men who are and have been employed in war plants have told me this story, have told it to you, and to the press of the Nation. This story has been told to the citizens all over the land where their friends and neighbors have been employed in these plants. This condition not only has lowered the morale of many of the laboring men but to a certain extent lowered the morale of the American people. This bill does not provide that a thorough investigation of this matter be made in the solution of this problem. This bill proposes to herd more men into these already congested areas, which will add greater confusion in these plants and will not increase production.

The Barrett bill—H. R. 1803—which will later be offered as a substitute goes to the very core of this manpower problem offering a real solution. It provides first that the draft boards of this country, in cooperation and conjunction with the manpower committees located in these industrial centers make an investigation of the hoarding and wastage of labor in these plants. It arms them with the power of subpena to take testimony under oath, to determine how much labor is being hoarded and wasted and provides the machinery whereby at the close of an investigation of a plant the number of men found unnecessary for production in such plant can be transferred to the plants where there is a real shortage of manpower. It also provides that the draft boards shall begin an immediate reclassification of all the manpower between the ages of 18 and 45 with the exception of those in I-A which will give all of those including the over 4,000,000 IV-F's an opportunity to volunteer their services for essential war work under their signature. There are one and a half million other than IV-F's in this pool which pushes this total to be given an opportunity to volunteer their services to 5,500,000 men.

When this bill is placed in operation, instead of driving more men into the war plants of the Nation under threat of fines up to \$10,000 and jail penalties, the Barrett bill provides for opening the gates of these overstaffed war plants and taking out of these plants surplus labor which is on the payroll and unemployed and which will give those a chance to exert greater efficiency in the plants and provide for this surplus labor of skilled mechanics to be transferred to plants where they are really needed.

I feel certain that when the draft boards offer these five and one-half million men a chance to volunteer for war work that at least 10 percent of them will sign up; yes, in my opinion, a great majority of them will. But if only a minimum of 10 percent volunteer for such service that would amount to 550,000 men. They say they only need 700,000 men and they do not need them all the first month but this is the number they estimate they will need by the end of 6 months. Is this Congress ready to say that the patriotism of our people on the home front is so low that if given a call to serve by the draft boards that 10 men out of 100 would not respond? I have more faith in our people. I want to

approach and solve this problem in the American way. We will fail if we attempt to solve it in the totalitarian way by force and the threat of heavy fines and jail penalties.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that there are over 16,000,000 men now in essential war work. It is further estimated by some of the best industrial engineers of the Nation that some 20 percent of the effort of this manpower is not being utilized due to the hoarding and wastage of labor. If this investigation by the selective service boards and the War Manpower Commission finds that only 10 percent of it is not being fully utilized that would amount to 1,600,000 men. This means 1,600,000 men added to the 550,000 men previously referred to will give us a manpower pool of 2,100,000 men.

The Director of War Mobilization, Mr. Byrnes, and the leaders of our military forces say that we only need a million six hundred thousand men.

I think the Barrett substitute offers a sound, sensible approach to this problem. These thousands of draft boards, in cooperation with the various manpower committees already set up in the industrial centers, can make a quick and effective survey, reporting it back to Selective Service, War Manpower Commission, and to the Congress of the United States.

It will decentralize the problem and will bring the power of public opinion, with all of its force, back of these boards in the various localities in the United States. It will put the cost-plus-fixed-fee contractors, the Army and the Navy, the Federal bureaus, and the Government on notice that there is a real movement on at last to stop the hoarding and wastage of manpower anywhere and everywhere it can be found in the Nation. If this bill is passed the hoarders of labor in the war plants of this Nation will begin at once to set their houses in order to avoid the fierce condemnation of the people and the Congress of the United States.

It is my opinion that if we can approach this matter through the Barrett substitute that you will find so much skilled labor hoarded in the war plants now, so much wastage of labor that very few of the great numbers of men who will sign up who are now in civilian service—that very few of them will be taken from this very thin reservoir of labor into the war plants of the Nation. I believe the Barrett substitute offers a great opportunity for the Congress to solve this manpower problem and solve it in a way that will strengthen the entire economy of the Nation and stop the continuance of unnecessary waste in billions of dollars which under the present arrangements has helped to push the national debt to a dangerous height.

Mr. Chairman, I am against this National Service Act recommended by the committee, because I believe it to be unconstitutional. I believe it clearly violates the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution which provides against involuntary servitude.

Congress and the Constitution are, in my judgment, the two most sacred and the two most important pillars to sustain

the future liberty and democracy of this country, to which a confused people all over this land pin their dwindling hope and faith. I, for one, do not want to further shake their faith.

I am against this bill because I believe that free labor under patriotic leadership will bring about greater production than will forced labor.

I am against this bill, because in my judgment it is not necessary and because I believe it will not help solve our production problems.

Mr. Chairman, in summing up the matter it seems to me that the Congress must decide whether or not it is wise to substitute the Barrett bill, which will provide for the first time for a Government agency to investigate and offer some supervision as to how our billions of dollars will be spent in the war plants, some check and control over the cost-plus contractors, and the 16,000,000 men employed, or whether we shall continue to back away from this problem and in an effort to get greater production empower the Government with heavy fines and jail penalties, to draft and force maybe a million more men into the war plants of our country without knowing in what places they are needed and in many instances add to our confusion and add to the cost of producing our war equipment with billions of dollars of unnecessary waste in the expense of the people of our Nation.

I hope now that this problem has come to the Congress, that we can deal with it in a courageous and forthright manner, finding the proper solution.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 107, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by me to the Secretary of War, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, on the question of bread rationing for the Italian people.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by myself relative to the action of the Department of Justice in filing another antitrust suit today against a cartel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by

Mr. R. B. Caywood, president of the National American Wholesale Grocers' Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MOBILIZATION OF MANPOWER

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill which I have introduced today, H. R. 1803.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it is a trait of human nature not to blame yourself when things go wrong. In this respect governments are no different than individuals. Manpower is America's No. 1 problem today. Last summer Government officials and high-ranking military men were talking of the early defeat of Germany. Reconversion was one of the main topics of debate. The War Production Board was working out a plan of procedure which would permit new production of civilian goods. As early as last August men began to leave their jobs in war plants to get back to civilian work. There was great debate about what to do with the enormous surpluses of war materials that American industry and labor had produced. About a million and a half men and women left war industry and filtered back to civilian jobs with a post-war future. Many of them left because of a lack of war orders. There was a wholesale departure of war workers from their jobs, both voluntary and under compulsion. Now many of these individuals are confronted with the threat of work, fight, or be penalized.

About 364,000 young men from 18 to 25 have been deferred because they work on farms. Notwithstanding the fact that the production of food and fiber is such a vital part of the war effort the draft boards were instructed to reexamine these registrants with the idea of the strictest possible interpretation of the Tydings amendment.

Some people attempted to blame the IV-F's for a shortage of manpower. They were branded something akin to slackers. Yet no responsible agency has ever given the IV-F's the proper guidance and told them precisely what they should do. General Hershey made the statement that in his opinion 90 percent of the boys classified as IV-F's would voluntarily do anything they could in furtherance of the war effort. I venture to say that 99 percent of these boys would patriotically and voluntarily respond to a call from their Government and go anywhere or do anything.

Until recently officials said the 300,000 war workers would be sufficient to man the war plants. Now we are told that 700,000 men will be needed in the next 5 months, and at this moment 140,000 men are needed in the war-production plants of the Nation. The businessmen and the laboring men of America are bewildered and puzzled as to just what is the manpower situation today: 9,300,000 men and women are employed in munition production; 8,600,000 are engaged in agricultural activities; 34,300,000 are engaged or employed in other than nonagricultural and nonmunition activities.

We have a great reservoir of skilled mechanics and laboring men in the over 9,000,000 people presently employed in munition production. The woeful waste and hoarding of manpower in the cost-plus-fixed-fee plants of America is scandalous, to put it mildly.

Recently I received a letter from an inspector at Hill Field, Ogden, Utah, in which he stated:

No nation, America or any other, can sustain a program of waste such as I refer to.

I have witnessed thousands of man-hours wasted and millions of dollars.

I have witnessed B-24 airplanes, known as Liberators, bombers which could easily have been repaired, put under the saw and hauled out to the scrap heap. We reconditioned 26 B-24's at Hill Field so as to fly them to Florida to put them under the saw for scrap.

I saw gasoline dumped in the sand in lots ranging as high as 200 gallons at one time, no, not dirty gasoline, but gasoline which was put in an airplane and because the fuel cells leaked it was drained and not used in trucks or other equipment, but hauled out and dumped on the sand by men who could not obtain enough gasoline to get to work without lying to a ration board.

On January 1 we instituted a time-card system that had been tried here before and had proved a failure with the result that hundreds stood in line for 2 hours to get into the clockhouse, and although they were supposed to clock in by 7:30 a. m., many of them were still in line at 9:30, and a bulletin was put on the board to the effect that if they clocked in before 10 a. m., they would not be considered tardy.

I have seen times when it took 7 days to get a part from the warehouse that was located less than a quarter of a mile away because of the red tape involved. Yes, the part was there, and the mechanics needed it to repair our fighting machines, but we had to go through channels to get it, with this kind of a result.

We have now in Hangar No. 2 an airplane known as airplane No. 42-52288. It is a B-24, yes, a Liberator bomber, which cost about \$300,000; four engines and it will use about 250 gallons of gasoline per hour, and we have equipped this airplane with fine flooring, inlaid linoleum, chairs that cost \$111.16 each,

loud speaker for the radio, ice box, etc. We have put in a little over 4,500 hours of manpower and an estimated \$10,000 in equipment and this airplane is to be used by Gen. G. H. Beverley to fly around over the country with.

We have a fuel cell known as self-sealing so that when it is punctured it will seal itself from leaks. Now, some of these cells are equipped with a fitting which would no doubt cost about \$5, but we have been forced to condemn the entire cell which would cost about \$500, because they say they are unable to obtain that fitting from the fuel-cell manufacturers.

At Hill Field, I have never heard one person complain of working too hard, but I have seen them quit by the dozens because they could not work. Thousands of man-hours are wasted each and every month by some clean-up order because some general is coming through, and many times they don't even enter the hangars.

A few days ago I received a letter from a man formerly employed in the production-engineering department of a nationally known corporation which is building naval aircraft on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, in which he stated:

One morning our supervisor came hurrying through the department telling all of us to get the lofting tables uncovered and cleaned off and to have plenty of blue prints opened out to give the appearance of great activity for he had been notified that the local draft board was to pay us an inspection visit during the day. Sure enough, later in the day, our visitors arrived and they were shown prints and lay-outs and templates, etc., all of which made quite an impression on them, as to the importance of the department in contributing to the war effort. Little did they know that a great deal of what they were shown was old and obsolete material.

As a matter of fact, half of the men in the department of several hundred, had no real work to do and could have been dispensed with. The plane had long since been in full production and only a limited number of men were needed to take care of occasional and slight changes of design that were made from time to time. Yet the force is kept at full strength, even at the present time. Whenever a patriotic and conscientious loftsmen or engineer sickened of such loafing and hoarding of manpower and tried to get a release to seek more useful war work, he was blocked as much as possible by the department head.

Why? Because if the department had been reduced in size to actual need there wouldn't have been much left for the supervisor to be the head of, and, after all, Uncle Sam was, and is, paying the freight, so the company didn't care and always sided in with its supervisors in fighting releases. Multiply this by thousands of cases over the country of a similar nature, wherever cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts are in force, and you have the cause of most of the labor hoarding and shortage.

There would, no doubt, be a big howl from interests that now are riding along with the taxpayers paying billions.

Recently I received a letter from an engineer who inspects various private contractors making parts for Navy equipment, which reads as follows:

In my present work I am in daily contact with machine shops that are making parts for naval ordnance. The work involves making surveys of plants to see if they have the proper facilities, equipment, personnel, etc., to make various parts for the gun that my company is producing in the naval ordnance plant that it is operating. We have field men, such as myself, in various parts of the country, for we are thus enabled to utilize the

facilities of small plants in numerous communities in the war effort. This same pattern is followed in practically all war work. After orders are placed with these vendors for the component parts they are to make, I then follow up on the work to see that no delays occur in production. These delays can be caused by numerous reasons, technical questions, tooling questions, difficulty in obtaining special materials, etc., may arise, all of which I must iron out to assure the early start of operations. However, once the work is underway, in most cases it will run along smoothly until the parts are ready for naval inspection offices in all parts of the country and at each step a part is supposedly inspected. For instance, John Doe, the vendor, buys some S. A. E. 1020 steel to make a part. He buys it from a warehouse that in turn bought the metal from a steel mill. The Navy demands that it be inspected at the mill, then again at the warehouse. After John Doe has made the part it is again inspected before being shipped. If a special finish is required, such as Parkerizing, and the vendor sublets this to a finishing shop, it has to be inspected there. Now each time inspection takes place delay occurs. The warehouse, for instance, notifies the local naval inspection office that it has some steel to inspect. This may be at 10 o'clock in the morning. Maybe an inspector will show up by 5 o'clock the next afternoon. He may be an ex-drug or grocery clerk who has taken a course in reading a micrometer, but the chances are 100 to 1 that he's not a metallurgist and doesn't know any more about metal than my 8-year-old boy. Nevertheless, after he arrives he feels of the metal to make sure it isn't Swiss cheese. He then fills out numerous red-tape reports and the metal is officially pronounced to be steel. Now, if the inspector didn't sleep well the night before and he has a grouch on he can get contrary and order a piece of the metal shipped to a naval testing laboratory for a chemical and physical test. Believe me, these naval labs don't break any speed records in running their tests. They take (now get this, for it is a fact) from 2 to 4 weeks to make their tests, and all the time the metal is lying in the warehouse, and the vendor may have machines idle for want of the material.

Now this sort of foolish delay takes place at each step. If this same metal later on in manufacture has to be plated or parkerized, samples will again have to be submitted for laboratory tests with another delay of weeks. The other day I had several hundred parts with lugs welded on their sides. The local naval office was notified that they would be ready for inspection on January 13. The naval inspector showed up on January 19 to place his blessing and stamp on them as really being welded. All this time my company was needing these parts badly to avoid a hold-up of the assembly line. This is the sort of thing that makes a person boiling mad, especially when an admiral with all his gold braid, and no industrial experience, gets up before a congressional committee and fires a broadside that the solution to speed-up industrial production is to draft labor. He may be the best admiral in the world, but he should keep quiet on something he knows nothing about.

But the final pay-off on this naval inspection set-up being a complete farce, lies in the fact that after all the "horseplay" and make-believe inspection, when the parts are received at the assembly plant, they are really inspected by qualified men who have all necessary equipment, and so forth, to do the job right. The parts are either accepted or rejected. All the previous inspection doesn't mean a thing for if the final inspection rejects a part, it is rejected no matter how many former O. K.'s have been put on it. When you stop and realize that this same thing occurs all over the country every day,

the effect of millions of resultant lost man-hours is a catastrophe.

If civilian items followed the Navy type of inspection, an automobile would cost probably \$50,000 and a few hundred thousand would be a peak yearly production, instead of millions and the cars wouldn't be a bit better. It's demoralizing to a vendor and to the men in a plant to work excessive hours in rushing to get out parts that are badly needed, only to see them lay around for days awaiting inspection before being released for shipment.

Senator MEAD made the following statement, after his committee investigated the Norfolk Navy Yard:

Program after program on the "must" list is described as short of labor. One such "must" is the ship-repair program. Norfolk Navy Yard, which both builds and repairs ships, employs over 38,000 people. It is said to be short more than 4,000 workers for essential programs. But in this yard the subcommittee found excess manpower, wasted labor, hoarded labor, and enforced loafing.

We also went through several ships. Here is what we found: Each of the members of our subcommittee personally saw idleness and loafing on a big scale. Men stood and sat around in groups smoking and talking right on the decks of vital fighting ships. Their bosses were not to be seen. The men themselves think there are too many of them on the job. They say they are unable to do an honest day's work. They brought these complaints to us and brought them before our committee after they were sworn.

A mechanic who has worked in three Army airfields has the following to say:

I have worked at three Army airfields in the United States and at all of them I have found the same condition: About three men for every job—and personnel departments constantly advertising for more.

Highly trained mechanics—trained at Government expense—sit around twiddling their thumbs, or are given inconsequential tasks which any schoolboy could do after a half hour's instruction. To occupy their time some make gadgets for themselves, using Government-owned materials and tools.

Men who have sons at the front and whose one desire is to be allowed to work and work with all their might for their fighting sons over there come to empty benches morning after morning and are told to sit tight and look busy. At night they go home to read of their sons being short of shells in France because of workers' failure to produce. How about management's failure to produce. How about management's failure to coordinate the workers?

In the December 20 issue of a London magazine, there is a picture of Mr. Churchill's son-in-law and an Army officer, accompanied by a news item stating that they had paid a visit to some of the 3,000 men in our Engineer Corps who are working on the demolition and repair of London houses. Now, I know how much the people of London have suffered, but it seems to me that our men were not inducted into the Army to do such civilian jobs abroad.

Now these situations are not isolated cases, but on the contrary they are typical of conditions existing in many of the cost-plus-fixed-fee plants of America. Management can correct many of these abuses with little or no difficulty. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the American laboring men is honest and patriotic and anxious to do a full day's work to put the means of

warfare in the hands of our boys in the front lines. Their own boys are fighting and dying, and I am positive that they will wholeheartedly cooperate in a program to clean up this situation.

Officials state that while we need 148,000 men in critical industries at the present time, that we will need 700,000 industrial workers added to the force, working on munitions and supporting industries, in the next 5 months. Our greatest need at the present time is for ammunition, tanks, heavy trucks, tires, radar, ship construction and repair. It is estimated that we will need 300,000 men for critical industries; 200,000 for supporting industries; and 200,000 for arming the French forces. Now, over the last 5 months it is estimated that industry will lose 200,000 men to the armed forces and accordingly, it appears that between now and July 1, according to the military estimates, we will need 900,000 men to work in war activities. I am convinced that we can find a proper solution to our manpower problem without resorting to enforced labor, which will reduce the morale of the laboring men of America. If we will but tell the American people the exact conditions confronting them, I am convinced that we can get the wholehearted cooperation of management and labor and correct this situation on a voluntary basis and in an American manner.

We have four and a half million of our young men, who through no cause of their own, are classed as IV-F's. It is estimated that two and one-half million of them are already employed in essential war plants. It is estimated that 500,000 of them are maimed and physically disqualified from working in these plants. However, it is estimated that one and a half million are available for work in war activities or war-supporting activities, and I am convinced that if they are called on a voluntary basis that very few of them will refuse to go wherever they can be of service to their country. In the second place, the one and a half million people who left war work last fall should be called and requested to return to war activities. During the first 6 months of 1945, it is estimated that 360,000 men will receive noncasualty discharges from the armed forces and many of these will be available for civilian work. Some high officials of the War Manpower Commission estimate that some 500,000 to 800,000 men can be taken out of the war plants of America without lessening the efficiency of the plants.

An official of the War Manpower Commission recently made the following statement:

The amount of labor required for present and foreseeable war production is for the most part already on the employment rolls of the country. A 5 to 10 percent improvement in manpower utilization would be sufficient to provide all necessary labor. There is not a factory in this country which could not easily improve its utilization to this degree if management and labor become utilization conscious. Resulting action could add the equivalent of five hundred thousand to eight hundred thousand to the labor force. This potential must now become a national goal. In order to bring this about we must continue to expand and apply more vigorously the successful measures now in use, and in

addition there should be greatly renewed effort by management and labor. The national management-labor policy committee of the War Manpower Commission might very well be the spearhead of this expanded effort. Certainly this committee could readily devise ways and means for drawing upon so rich a source of manpower. It is looked to by management and labor for leadership on all matters affecting manpower. This committee has nation-wide contact with regional and area management-labor committees and is, therefore, in a unique position to provide constructive leadership and to enlist the support of local committees for any program designed to obtain the maximum utilization of manpower.

George B. Trundle, Jr., who is the owner of one of the large engineering companies of America, being the Trundle Engineering Co., during this month made the statement that with better planning and more hard work on the part of both management and labor, the productivity of the laboring people employed in our industrial plants could be increased from 10 to 20 percent. He made the following statement:

Let's go into that subject of manpower. Is there really a shortage? Frankly, I doubt it. I will agree that as the shifting fortunes of war place new emphasis upon various types of production, we find manpower supplies not properly located geographically with respect to requirements. This is a handicap, but not an insuperable one, if adjustments are made with intelligence and with full cooperation upon the part of both management and labor. The question is—is our supply of manpower sufficient to accomplish the renewed production job required and, in my opinion, the answer to that is definitely "yes."

You may well be inclined to challenge this statement. You may say, "With all the men and women who have gone to war, we have many less productive workers in the country than we had when the war started. How can we do a maximum production job with fewer workers?"

The primary responsibility for the solution of the problem lies, in my opinion, with management.

It is up to management to do better planning, to establish better controls, for more efficient and more economical utilization of materials, machines, and men.

A lot has been said, these days, about the failure of labor to produce what it should. But the fact remains, as I have said so many times, that labor is only as efficient as management plans for it and gives it the tools with which to work.

But, on the other hand, labor must cooperate completely with management if the job is to be done. Workers must produce more.

I'm not thinking about speed-ups. All I mean is that every worker should stay at his machine or his bench and do a fair job every hour of his workingday. It's simply a matter of making good use of time.

And this doesn't apply only to the men at the machines. It applies also to the sweepers, and the oilers, and the repairmen. It applies to the foremen and the superintendents.

The waste of manpower is a severe drain on our manpower supply. Absenteeism, turn-over, and maluse of labor are widespread. The list of causes which make for ineffectiveness are numerous and they vary with each establishment. The solution of this problem must go back to each locality in the country and depend upon the patriotism of the American people to get the job done as quickly

as possible. In the last analysis, it must be done on a plant-by-plant basis.

The War Manpower Commission has 25,860 employees. They have 550 local United States employment service offices scattered over the country. They have 500 expert utilization consultants. They have made over 5,000 utilization surveys and have accomplished splendid results. In one plant alone, the War Manpower Commission was able to reduce the labor requirements by 15,000 without impairing production. An outstanding example of this is the solution of the heavy rubber tire problem. The War Manpower Commission was convinced that better utilization was possible in Akron, where most of the heavy-duty tires are made. Twenty-four utilization consultants were assigned to survey the five major plants. These surveys were finished early in August, just at the time when public attention was directed to tire shortages. The surveys are good illustrations of the utilization methods. A variety of factors were impeding production and these could only be uncovered by a utilization study. As a result of findings, accepted and promoted by both management and labor leadership, immediate improvement in output occurred, so that 60 days later the increase in heavy-duty tire production was 35 percent over August 15, with several hundred less employees.

The seriousness of the situation cannot be denied, but I am convinced that we can appeal to the patriotism of labor and industry in America in such a way that public sentiment will demand the correction of these abuses on a voluntary basis. Because I feel that compulsory labor is a denial of the very thing for which our boys are fighting abroad, I have endeavored to formulate a plan whereby free labor and free industry can accomplish the purpose without regimentation. The workers can be drafted, but their will to work must come voluntarily.

I have introduced a bill which I believe will solve the problem in a true American way. My bill requires the Selective Service boards of the Nation to make an adequate occupational classification of every person between 18 and 45. Those who are available for work in war activities or war-supporting activities will be asked to agree in writing to voluntarily accept employment in those industries. I am convinced that a large reservoir of manpower will be found on a voluntary basis. Many of those who left war plants last fall and thousands of the IV-F's will be channeled into war plants through the War Manpower Commission. The War Manpower Commission is required to investigate the hoarding and wastage of labor in the cost-plus-fixed-fee plants in America. To my way of thinking, the War Manpower Commission will find in these plants the skilled labor that will be more than sufficient to furnish the requirements of critical plants in less than 60 days.

I commend my bill, H. R. 1803, to you for careful study. It is my proposed intention that this bill will be offered as a substitute for H. R. 1752, presently under consideration. The bill reads as follows:

H. R. 1803

A bill to provide for the total mobilization of the Nation's manpower in the present war with the aid of the Selective Service System

Be it enacted, etc. That the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended—

(1) By inserting before section 1 the title heading:

"TITLE I—TRAINING AND SERVICE IN LAND AND NAVAL FORCES"

(2) By striking out "this act" wherever appearing therein, except where it appears in sections 10 (a) (1), 10 (b), 10 (c), 15, and 16 and inserting in lieu thereof "this title"; and

(3) By inserting at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE II—UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER FOR CIVILIAN WAR AND WAR-SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES"

"DECLARATION OF POLICY AND INTENT OF CONGRESS"

SEC. 21. The Congress hereby declares that in order to effectuate, on a voluntary basis, the total mobilization and most effective use of the civilian manpower of the Nation in support of the war effort, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive investigation and reappraisal of the civilian manpower of the United States.

SEC. 22. The Director of Selective Service is hereby directed (a) to provide for the registration and adequate occupational classification of all registrants liable for training under title I of this act, except those serving on active duty in the armed forces and those exempted or deferred from training or service therein by 5 (c) (1) or (d) of title I. This registration and classification shall be conducted through the local boards of the Selective Service System in conjunction with the War Manpower Commission who shall furnish to such boards such expert, technical, and other assistance and personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(b) Upon request from the War Manpower Commission to require the local boards to furnish to the United States Employment Service a list of the names and addresses of registrants available for employment in war or war-supporting activities, including agriculture, for voluntary assignment of such registrants to civilian or Federal employment in furtherance of the war effort in accordance with the determination of essentiality and priority requirements made by the War Manpower Commission.

SEC. 23. The Director of Selective Service shall, as hereinafter provided, direct the local boards to conduct an investigation of the use of civilian manpower within their respective jurisdictions for the purpose of ascertaining whether the maximum and most effective use of such manpower is being made for the best interests of the war effort. The local boards shall use the services and facilities of the War Manpower Commission to conduct such investigation which shall include in-plant surveys whenever and wherever necessary to accomplish this purpose. For such purpose the War Manpower Commission may, wherever necessary, employ expert and technical personnel by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923. In the utilization of the services and facilities of the War Manpower Commission, the local boards shall operate under the supervision, direction, and control of the various area directors and management-labor committees of the War Manpower Commission where such are available. They shall report their findings forthwith to the Director of Selective

Service and to the War Manpower Commission, together with a statement of the number of persons in their respective jurisdictions available for service in war and war-supporting activities; and said agencies shall forthwith make a full report thereon to Congress. Wherever any board and/or War Manpower Commission area director and the management-labor committee, acting together or separately find indications of wastage or hoarding of labor or situations wherein labor is not being used to the best interests of the war effort in either Federal or private employment, the employers, the employees, and/or the employees' representatives shall be required to cooperate fully in such investigation, and in the selection of skilled and other employees to be released for other employment. After determination that such worker can be more effectively employed in war work and that either the worker does not have good cause for refusing to accept such employment or the employer fails to furnish adequate justification for the retention of said employee, the War Manpower Commission shall thereupon require his release. In order to aid the Selective Service local boards and the War Manpower Commission in the exercise of the additional duties required of them under this title, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may assign to such boards, in an advisory capacity, representatives of such other agencies of the Government as he may deem advisable.

"Sec. 24. The boards are hereby empowered to subpoena persons to appear before them and give evidence upon such matters as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and for such purpose the provisions of section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence) are hereby made applicable to the powers of such boards.

"Sec. 25. The Director of Selective Service shall prescribe regulations to provide the necessary traveling expenses and subsistence allowances during travel and until commencement of work, of persons volunteering under this title for civilian or Federal employment, or service in a locality other than that of their residence: *Provided*, That travel expense and subsistence shall be computed in the same manner and on the same basis as under the standard Government travel regulations. On or after the date of a determination that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in the war effort, or on or after the date of his being involuntarily separated from such employment, he shall receive similar travel and subsistence back to the place from which he was first allowed travel under this subsection (or, at his election, to his home if that is not farther distant), if application is made therefor within 30 days after such date.

"Sec. 26. Any person who volunteers for service under this title, or who is required to relinquish regular employment to undertake such service shall, upon application to his employer within 40 days after the termination of such service, if it is determined that his services are no longer necessary in war or war-supporting activities, be entitled to be restored to his former position, or to a position of like seniority, status, or pay, unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make such restoration impossible or unreasonable. This section shall not require the reemployment of any such person by any State or political subdivision thereof, but it is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that such person should be restored to his position with such State or political subdivision or to a position of like seniority, status, or pay. Nothing in this section shall supersede any of the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

"Sec. 27. Nothing in this title shall affect in any manner any of the provisions of section 5 (k), or any other provisions of title I,

"Sec. 28. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HITLER HOPES FOR SOFT PEACE TERMS AND PROPAGANDA TO ENABLE GERMANY TO REBUILD FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the German delegates to the Versailles peace conference wrote a book a few years ago entitled "Documents and Thoughts on Versailles." The author, Count Brock-Randzau, who later became the first Foreign Minister of the German Weimar Republic, told of a caucus that was held by the German delegation to Versailles in May of 1919, at which he quoted himself as having said at that time:

Our enemies had better watch out. They have won the war, but they may lose the peace.

Thus, even before the terms of the Treaty of Versailles had been agreed upon, leading Germans were conspiring to evade its terms and defeat its purposes. History records that conspiracy to have been a success.

Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt, who along with Cordell Hull has been a pioneer in the crusade for a world organization to make and enforce a durable peace following this war, in his recent message to the Congress stated:

Peace can be made and kept only by the united determination of free and peace-loving peoples who are willing to work together.

The President's statement carries a lot of meaning. We know that following the last war the peace that was made was not kept. We know it was not kept because the free and peace-loving peoples were not united and were not willing to work together in the enforcement of its terms. We know the statement of the German delegate was based on the reasoning that there would be lack of Allied unity, lack of Allied determination, lack of enforcement.

SOFT AND INEFFECTIVE PEACE TERMS WILL LEAD TO THIRD WORLD WAR

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, we know the Nazis will attempt to make that history repeat itself. In their plans to rebuild and rearm for another war, the Nazis will again undertake to bring about lack of Allied unity. Again they will depend on lack of a real and effective world organization of the United Nations that would be able to thwart their sinister military plans and ambitions. Therefore, the lessons of the past 25 years become of increasing importance in the making of the plans to prevent future wars.

There seems to be no delusion in the mind of anyone about the Japanese and how they must be dealt with in the post-war period. But in the case of Germany, various proposals have been advanced and various schemes put forward. In this regard many people seem to ignore the lessons of history. From what has happened during the past quarter century we know one thing with force and

certainty: That if soft and ineffective peace terms should be applied to Germany at the end of this struggle, the world will soon again be ablaze with another war far more horrible and destructive than anything that has ever gone before.

GERMAN CRAZE FOR CONQUEST MUST BE DESTROYED

Mr. Speaker, the pan-German creed that glorifies war and conquest, has been nurtured and sustained by the Junkers military caste and has been aided and abetted by the German people. That craze for conquest finds its embodiment in Adolf Hitler today. But the same psychosis that raised Hitler to power stood behind Bismarck and the Kaiser and many of their predecessors. And unless something is done to prevent it, the same forces will rally around another Hitler—another führer—in the not far distant future. It follows that any treatment of Germany after victory has been achieved, which does not include a program for the destruction of that will for war, will leave Germany a strong and dangerous nation.

It will be recalled that the Treaty of Versailles recognized that disease and that recurring danger. As a treatment applied to the disease, the treaty ordered the Junkers-dominated German general staff abolished. The German Army was limited to 100,000 men. But those provisions were evaded and were not kept. There was no effective enforcement.

VERSAILLES TREATY WAS NOT ENFORCED

The general staff in reality never ceased to operate, but continued under various disguises. The Weimar Republic that was set up as a supposedly peace-loving, antimilitaristic outfit, was really used from its very beginning as a smoke screen for the general staff.

What happened to the limitation of 100,000 men in the German Army, as provided in the treaty? It was evaded by means of a rapid turn-over in the German Army trainee program. It was not long until a million Germans had goose-stepped their way through a short period of intense military training under the admiring eyes of the Junkers.

The Versailles Treaty further provided that no export or import of war materials was allowed by Germany. A strict limitation was put on the manufacture of armaments. Germany was allowed to retain 6 battleships, 6 light cruisers and 12 torpedo boats. To bring about the enforcement of these and other provisions, Allied commissioners were appointed.

But time and again the treaty was violated and evaded, and little was done about it. Factories were camouflaged and began in secret to build guns and munitions, as some Germans have in recent years boastfully disclosed. A psychological war was begun under the direction of Dr. Alfred von Wegerer, a prominent member of the general staff. Propaganda against the Versailles Treaty was organized. They preached the false doctrine of nonresponsibility for the starting of the war. They claimed the treaty was too hard and was not workable. They implored world sympathy.

The Allies, war-weary and busy at home, failed to act. As a result by 1927 all Allied enforcement commissions had been abolished. Such conformity as there was to the disarmament clauses of the treaty was gone by the time of Locarno. By 1925 German rearmament was well along. From 1925 to 1929 the German budget for the army was almost double over the preceding 4 years. Loans and credits were secured, and the German militarists and industrialists quietly built an industrial base for all-out rearmament.

MUST ENFORCE EFFECTIVE PEACE TERMS OR FACE ANOTHER WAR

Mr. Speaker, some one wisely said that we must first kill the bear before we can skin it and tan the hide. A grim and bitter struggle yet lies ahead. But the leaders of the United Nations have recognized the imperative need for some preliminary planning. That was the reason for the Dumbarton Oaks conference, which prepared the groundwork for a permanent organization of the Allied Nations to make and enforce the terms of peace that are agreed upon. There is much assurance from the fact the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia have at various times made expressions which indicate they are in substantial agreement on many of the essentials of the peace program and what the terms of peace must include.

All these nations agree the war must end with total victory. That includes complete occupation of the Reich. In addition, we know that Germany must be totally and completely demilitarized. That must continue not for years, but for decades. It must be enforced by police power and the necessary force of arms. There must be no room for rearmament by subterfuge or evasion. The Junkers caste must be made a myth and the general staff forever abolished.

A United Nations Crime Commission to deal with war criminals has already been set up and is functioning now. The subhuman beasts of the Gestapo and all other German war criminals, from top to bottom, must be arrested and made to fully account for their crimes.

There will be the matter of accounting for Nazi barbaric practices with death chambers; their murders of some of our own captured troops, and of countless thousands of civilians; their many other acts of starvation and of despotism that have horrified the civilized world. The Germans must be made to rebuild and restore much of their ruin and destruction, and return and replace and compensate for their stolen gains.

We know there must be an abolition of German war industries; rigid post-war control of Germany's chemical and metallurgical industries; elimination of the German aviation industry, as suggested by our State Department. There must be sharp supervision over Germany's international trade and foreign financial investments, and the United Nations must institute a long-range program of reeducation of the German people. They must be made to know that when they use their power and might for evil ends "the massed angered

forces of common humanity" will rise up against them to strike them down.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, we know that any and all of the terms of peace will be meaningless unless they are enforced.

After victory has been achieved and as the United Nations go about the task of making and enforcing peace terms that will prevent another war upon human rights and Christian principles, there will always be the knowledge of the capacity of German scientists, if permitted, to invent new methods and means for the destruction of human lives. The V-1 bomb and the V-2 rocket have let loose visions of what may come next. The rocket bomb streaks through the stratosphere at 2,500 miles per hour. Methods of mass destruction of lives and property too horrible to contemplate are visualized by many scientists today. The next war, if there is one, will indeed be a V-10 war.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that unless the terms of that peace are made firm and unequivocal, unless the terms are sternly and relentlessly enforced throughout the foreseeable future, we will not have kept faith with the gallantry and sacrifices of our millions of fighting men. Our failure in this task would mean that hundreds of thousands among our bravest and best will have died in vain. Such a failure would go down as one of the greatest tragedies in history.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for January 29 and 30, on account of important official business.

To Mr. POWERS (at the request of Mr. TOWE), on account of serious illness in his family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 340. An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 30, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will hold hearings, Tuesday, January 30, 1945, at 10:30 a. m. on:

H. R. 685. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest.

H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while

in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

H. R. 689. A bill to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, January 31, 1945, to begin hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

There will be a meeting of bridge subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 o'clock p. m., Wednesday, January 31, 1945, begin public hearings on H. R. 541, a bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

138. A letter from the Acting Chairman, United States War Ballot Commission, transmitting the report of the United States War Ballot Commission, pursuant to Public Law No. 277, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Election of President and Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

139. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a copy of a letter addressed to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, certifying that the Post Office Department is within the quota set by that Bureau under date of September 30, 1944, for each of the appropriation units involved; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

140. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of reports to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relative to determining the number of employees required by the various units of the Department of Justice for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions for the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

141. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

142. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to make it a criminal offense for certain escaped convicts to travel from one State to another; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

143. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting tables of bankruptcy statistics, with reference to bankruptcy cases commenced and terminated in the United States district courts during the fiscal year, ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

145. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting the ninth report by the War Shipping Administration of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (Public Law No. 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 107. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1752, a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 97. Resolution providing expenses for continuing the investigation authorized by House Resolution 75; without amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 108. Resolution authorizing the expense of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 55 of the Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 109. Resolution providing for the employment of a clerk, assistant clerks, and janitor to the House Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 110. Resolution providing for the payment of the further expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 66 of the Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 111. Resolution providing for funds for expenses of conducting the study and investigation of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning authorized by House Resolution 60 of the Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 112. Resolution providing for the further expenses for conducting the study and investigation of the national defense program in relation to small business in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 113. Resolution providing additional funds for the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed the Scope of Their Power or Authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1646. A bill to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; without amendment

(Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1401) for the relief of Frank Franklin, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 1803. A bill to provide for the total mobilization of the Nation's manpower in the present war with the aid of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1804. A bill to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska," approved June 5, 1942; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1805. A bill to provide for procurements without advertising; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. R. 1806. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ERVIN:

H. R. 1807. A bill to authorize the admission of Alaska into the United States as a State; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1808. A bill to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 1809. A bill permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1810. A bill permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1811 (by request). A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1941, entitled "An act to strengthen the national defense by creating the grade of chief warrant officer in the Army, and for other purposes," so as to decrease by 4 years the length of active service required prior to permanent appointment in the grade of chief warrant officer in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1812. A bill to authorize an award of merit for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 1813. A bill providing that commissions on postal money orders be paid to postmasters of the first, second, and third classes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 1814. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to improve international collaboration with respect to meteorology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1815. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 1816. A bill to provide for promotion of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 1817. A bill to discontinue certain reports now required by law; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 1818. A bill relating to the acquisition of certain property within Mount Rainier National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 1819. A bill authorizing the payment of necessary expenses incurred by certain Indians allotted on the Quinaile Reservation, State of Washington, in securing their allotments; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1820. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable States to provide medical care for recipients of public assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 1821. A bill to name a dam on the Little Missouri River in Pike County, Ark., and the reservoir created by the same; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1822. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 62 years old; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1823. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1824. A bill to provide for the creation of conservation authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1825. A bill to provide that veterans needing prosthetic appliances will not thereby be deprived of opportunity to take civil-service examinations; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1826. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 so as to extend the time within which members of the armed forces may pay income taxes falling due prior to or during the period of military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1827. A bill to amend sections 4 and 313 of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended with respect to disposition and removal of housing; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1828. A bill to provide for the payment of accumulative or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States who enter or re-enter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or the District of Columbia before the expiration of such leave; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1829. A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1830. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish headstones or markers for graves of honorably discharged war veterans, notwithstanding discharge, other than honorable, from any prior or subsequent

service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 1831. A bill to equalize State old-age assistance payments and to provide burial allowances under title I of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 1832. A bill to provide pension, compensation, or retirement pay of not exceeding \$20 per month to all veterans without dependents while being furnished hospitalization by the United States or any political subdivision thereof; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 1833. A bill to provide for the burial in the national cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 1834. A bill to prescribe the procedures of legislative investigating committees and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution authorizing the broadcasting of the proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. Res. 114. Resolution providing for studies and investigations with respect to the disposition of surplus property and with respect to the administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RYTER:

H. Res. 115. Resolution declaratory of the aims and purposes of the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 116. Resolution authorizing an investigation with respect to fisheries on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a seamen's bill of rights; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Viola Theriaque; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 1837. A bill for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 1838. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of A. G. Bailey against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1839. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Eugene Wesley Gayle, personally and as administrator of the estate of Jennie Gayle,

deceased, against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1840. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Herbert R. W. Lauterbach and others for compensation for overtime labor performed at the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., in excess of the legal day of 8 hours; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1841. A bill for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 1842. A bill for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1843. A bill for the relief of Nelson Bell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 1844. A bill for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1845. A bill for the relief of Domenico Strangio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1846. A bill for the relief of James M. Hiler; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1847. A bill for the relief of Francis X. Servautes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1848. A bill for the relief of Max Hirsch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1849. A bill for the relief of Mr. Ora R. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 1850. A bill for the relief of Louise Zerweck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1851. A bill for the relief of the widow and three children of Greenfield Payne; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1852. A bill for the relief of R. H. White Transfer & Storage Co., of Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1853. A bill for the relief of Col. J. M. McHugh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Thomas Sumner; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Ern Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Southwestern Drug Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1858. A bill for the relief of W. E. Cary; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. Res. 117. Resolution for the relief of William A. Pixley; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

40. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Florence Mowers and 28 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

41. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Janesville, Wis.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Thou who makest men to be of one mind, hear our prayer. As the world is choking through the most inhuman chapter in its long, tragic history, we pray that the spirit of the Christ may move among all its staggering wickedness and be led to the real glory of truth with its security; O do Thou match against the world's hard sin the salvation of Thine only begotten Son. May the enslaved peoples turn from their fears and suspicions and forge freedom and cooperation on the anvils of faith. Give them life where weakness abounds; life where blunders are fatal and disunion fails. Dear Lord, wherever there are heartbreaks, sorrows, and deep losses, lay Thy tender hand upon them and make them to know that in the Man of Galilee is the power to save to the uttermost. Heavenly Father, hear Thou the prayer of Thy children of other years who toiled unto weariness in sun and dark:

"Grant us, O God, Thy protection;
And in protection, strength;
And in strength, knowledge;
And in knowledge, knowledge of the right;
And in knowledge of the right, the love of it,
And of God, and of all existence."

In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatlin, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 35. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes;

S. 338. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat; and

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution providing for a study of certain phases of old-age and survivors insurance under the Social Security Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 64):

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and shall examine all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the