

buildings, community centers, and recreational centers, rehabilitated old school buildings, established playgrounds and athletic fields, and improved the sanitary and health conditions of countless communities. It also added immeasurably to industrial school facilities. All those contributions were made to the health and well-being of the people of my State. I am proud of them. My State is proud of the work done by the N. Y. A. We regretted very much the necessity of its discontinuance.

Mr. President, I feel, and have felt from the outset, that the success of an organization is based upon the ability of the administrator at its head. It is not based on his ability as a banker, or his ability as an electrical engineer, but is based upon his ability to choose a staff, ably direct them, and formulate necessary plans, programs, and regulations under which the staff shall work. I believe that any person who has studied the operations of the N. Y. A. will find that the N. Y. A. was well administered. In my opinion that is the measure of an administrator.

For the reasons which I have stated I feel impelled to support and vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams, who so ably administered the N. Y. A. during the 8 years in which it was in operation in my State.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair) 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.)

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the nominations on the Executive Calendar following that of Mr. Williams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will state the nominations on the calendar following that of Mr. Williams.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the nominations to which there is no objection.

RECESS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 22, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 21 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Fletcher Warren, of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nicaragua.

Frederick B. Lyon, of Michigan, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 21 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

KANSAS

Lorraine C. Mills, Bunkerhill.

KENTUCKY

Violette G. Thomas, Owingsville.

Katheryn E. Short, Van Lear.

RHODE ISLAND

Alexander P. Bates, Oak Lawn.

TEXAS

Hubert John Risinger, Bandera.

Granville M. Knox, Bertram.

WISCONSIN

George W. Rickeman, Helenville.

Gene F. Guay, Peshtigo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 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:

Our Father in Heaven, who hast given us life and the promise of spring, holy, holy is Thy name. Today we see Thy love in the beauty and prospect of nature, in the budding tree and flowering field, and in the numberless delights of Thy providence. Open our hearts to this inflow of divine order, for everything breathes the promise of new life. Thy prevailing goodness lays its hand upon us and calls us to manifold service. Our cup is so full that we know not where to begin to praise Thy holy name. May life be so sacred with us that we may bear a conscience void of offense and be earnest to every call of duty. O Voice of God, bless every silent advance, every defense of the truth, every combat with sin, and every triumph over wrong. Stimulate us with that faith that always greets the dawn rather than the setting sun—faith in Thee as our Father and in our fellowmen as our brothers and in the ultimate triumph of all things right. We ask it in our Saviour's name. Amen.

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

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1946

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2126) "making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and agree to the same.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
JOE HENDRICKS,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1, 3, 5, and 7, provides that "used" automobiles shall be purchased from funds provided in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2, inserts the word "affected" instead of the word "affected".

Amendment No. 4, appropriates "\$44,508,000", as proposed by the Senate, instead of "\$41,358,000", as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6, appropriates "\$24,172,000", as proposed by the Senate, instead of "\$14,037,000", as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8, inserts the word "be" as proposed by the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
JOE HENDRICKS,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

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

ANTILYNCHING BILL

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy the House has unanimously adopted the conference report of the civil functions War Department appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I place on the desk discharge petition No. 3 to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of H. R. 1698, a bill to assure persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching. This measure is popularly known as the antilynching bill. In our legislative program for the post-war period, the antilynching bill deserves high priority.

At this time I, therefore, wish to outline some of the more cogent reasons why the Seventy-ninth Congress should outlaw this heinous crime as speedily as possible. Five thousand one hundred and forty-four persons in the United States met death at the hands of the lynch mobs from 1889 through 1944. I do not need to point out that under mob law an individual needs only to be suspected or accused of an offense, not necessarily punishable by law, and without anything remotely resembling an opportunity to defend himself, is snatched up and put to death. Nor do I feel that it is necessary to go into all of the gory details of flogging, hanging, shooting, burning, and the other fiendish tortures by which the lynch sentence is executed. It is sufficient to say that these acts of unrestrained barbarism are committed in the greatest democracy in the world and, in the overwhelming majority of cases, by native white Americans.

Three thousand six hundred and eighty-eight victims of lynch mobs in the United States have been Negroes. Today every person who has made anything like a careful study of this problem agrees that as the yearly number of lynchings decline, more and more of its victims tend to be confined to members of the colored race. I, therefore, feel that it is incumbent to examine some of the facts known about lynching.

Mob violence is inconsistent with our laws of government and is indefensible regardless of the nature and gravity of the offense. It should be said that, however, that relatively few of the lynchings of Negroes resulted from accusations, well founded or not, that the lynched committed a felony like murder, robbery, rape, or arson.

My mind goes back to our experience with lynching immediately following World War No. 1. In 1917, according to the best available figures, 52 Negroes were murdered by the lynch mob; in 1918, the number increased to 63; and in 1919, lynching spiraled to 79. Ten of the lynchings in 1918 were soldiers or ex-soldiers and there is little question but that these men were slain simply because they had tasted a little freedom, a little travel, and had a little pride in the part they played in the Army that fought for democracy.

If 10 Negro soldiers or ex-soldiers were lynched in the first year they returned to this country after World War

No. 1, what can we expect will be the fate of almost a million Negro soldiers and sailors who have had several years of service and have seen duty in many foreign countries after World War No. 2? Hundreds of thousands of these Negroes are from the South and will return there after the war.

We have some experience to guide us here. On April 3, 1941, Pvt. Felix Hall, a volunteer, was found hanging from a tree at Fort Benning, Ga. He was clad in the uniform of the United States Army. I have here a clipping from the Plaindealer, published in Kansas City, Kans., dated March 16, 1945, which states that on Tuesday, March 13, a group of civilian police in Jackson, Miss., severely beat with blackjacks a group of Negro overseas veterans because they were fraternizing with some white soldiers whom they met in the railroad station at Jackson. These men had fought together overseas and had congregated in the lobby of the station between the Negro and white waiting room. "The police, seeking to preserve southern custom," the article stated, "informed the men that they could not mingle together in Mississippi." When they did not immediately break up the conversation, the story continued, civilian police, armed with sawed-off shotguns and tommy guns, beat the Negro soldiers about the head with blackjacks and forced them to immediately board their train en route to Camp Shelby. I do not wish to be pessimistic, but if this sort of thing can happen here in the midst of a war, it is only reasonable to assume that this is but a foretaste of what will come afterward. In connection with this general problem of civilian brutality against Negro members of the armed forces during the war, I think that it is significant that the War Department has been so moved by the gravity of the situation that, at its request, a bill, H. R. 1523, was introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress to make unlawful an assault by a civilian on a member of the armed forces a Federal offense.

I am concerned about the violence that has been, and is being, perpetrated upon the Negro soldier and the Negro veteran. I am equally concerned about the wide-scale violence that we may reasonably expect after cessation of hostilities. There is no room in America for lynchings; there is no room in America for race riots. This must apply particularly to the post-war period. We, as a Nation, are preparing to take our rightful place of leadership in world democracy. That democracy for which men fought and died is not, and must not be a democracy labeled "for white Europeans and white North Americans—only." It must be a democracy for all of the nations and all of the peoples of the world. We will assume world leadership in the post-war era because we have won it. I ask this House then to make this democracy a real and meaningful thing to the millions of Negro servicemen and their families who have helped to make victory and leadership possible. I ask that this House take immediate steps to outlaw lynching by adopting H. R. 1698 so that when these boys come home, black and

white alike, they will know that they have truly fought for—and won—a better America and a better world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter.

Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech by the Honorable James B. Perkins, of Maine, on the work-or-jail bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include excerpts from an article by Leonard Lyons.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, and to include in one an editorial from the Manchester Union entitled "Less Coal," and in the other an article written by Ernest Lindley on Dumbarton Oaks.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address by Clarence Budington Kelland.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the services of Mr. Joseph F. Kelly, of the War Shipping Administration.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on page A1317 of the Appendix of the Record appears a table showing the exports of farm machinery from the United States, which I think all the Members would find very interesting. You will note that 21,349 farm tractors were exported to Canada last year, that a total of 41,037 farm tractors needed for domestic production were exported last year from the United States, and that many of these tractors were sent to South American countries, which, as far as I know, have had no direct effect on the winning of this war.

REJECTIONS FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REES of Kansas. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REES of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file such rules as it may report today.

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

There was no objection.

LITHUANIA

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KELLY of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Assistant Secretary of State William L. Clayton, recently made before the Women's National Press Club in Washington.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and to include an address by Hon. Charles P. Taft.

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein the membership rolls of the Democratic steering committee from its inauguration and a list of the chairmen of the Democratic caucus.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me under special order for this afternoon may be put over until Friday and that the time be extended from 20 minutes to 40 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

MIDNIGHT CURFEW

Mr. BRYSON. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, War Mobilizer Byrnes displayed both wisdom and courage in the issuance of the order closing night clubs, bars, and like places at midnight.

There can be no doubt but that great pressure was used to stay the issuance of the curfew order. No act could be more timely in view of the acknowledged scarcity of food, manpower, and other essentials of war.

We of the Fourth South Carolina Congressional District, the home of Mr. Byrnes, are proud of his unwavering determination to do only that which will further the causes of this global war and hasten the coming of a victorious and permanent peace.

It will be observed that the objectors to the enforcement of the midnight closing order are not from the millions of homes whose sons and daughters so courageously and unrelentingly are now forcing our enemies to terms of unconditional surrender.

The good people of this country would do well to let Mr. Justice Byrnes know that they stand shoulder to shoulder with him during these trying hours.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances—one, on the coming San Francisco Conference; two, on war criminals; and, three, on the East India Exclusion Act.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, to include therein a speech he made before the Polish Relief Committee in the city of Lawrence, and secondly, to include a very fine editorial which appeared on St. Patrick's Day in the Lynn Telegram News of Lynn, Mass.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include therein an overseas broadcast made by him.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein a resolution concerning the free press.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a radio address made by Mr. Herbert Bratter.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. RICH. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that we are now \$235,000,000 in the red, according to the Treasury Department, and in order to save some money we must do something here in the Congress in order to economize. I call your attention to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget has 576 employees, and it costs them \$2,189,800 a year to maintain that Budget. The Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate have 23 employees, and the salaries and wages paid are \$98,480.

The Bureau of the Budget is recommending too many things for us to appropriate money for. Whenever the House says, "We are within the Budget," then you think that is all right. I say it is not right. What you have got to do is to get below the Budget estimates. We must budge the Budget. Budge it downward. The House should take from the Budget Bureau the thought that they can recommend any amount to be spent and that you will give the money from a Treasury that is empty. More than empty. It is bare. It is like Old Mother Hubbard's cupboard. So I say to you, go below the Budget or you will bust. Bust the financial stability of our Government.

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

STATISTICAL SUMMARY, BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statistical summary for March, issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXEMPTING ANNUITY PAYMENTS FROM TAXATION

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 577, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation, be recommitted to the Committee on the Civil Service.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1946

Mr. TARVER. 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. 2689, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may proceed for not to exceed 5 hours, to be concluded today, and the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] and myself. I have conferred with the gentleman with reference to this request and have been advised it meets with his approval.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not understand the time allowed.

Mr. TARVER. Not to exceed 5 hours.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would not reserve that objection for the moment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin reserve the right to object or withdraw his objection?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I withdraw the objection for the time being.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am wondering if 5 hours will not take care of all the demands for time?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I have requests now for only 1½ hours.

Mr. TABER. How much time does the gentleman from Wisconsin want?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not care for more than 15 minutes, but I do not want to be cut off with 2 minutes like I had on the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I will give the gentleman 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

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. 2699, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations which brings this bill to you today has acted with more unanimity in the preparation of this bill than has been the case in connection with any agricultural appropriation bill during the period of my service as chairman of this subcommittee. There has been very little difference of opinion, and such difference of opinion as has come about has related to minor matters contained in the bill and not to any of the major items of appropriation. I feel that that situation has been brought about by the fact that in the preparation of the bill there has been an entire absence of any spirit of partisanship and the 7 men who have worked on the subcommittee have sought to keep in mind only the interests of agriculture as they might best be promoted by the provisions contained in this bill with justice to the citizenry of the United States as a whole as to the amounts of the appropriations which should be provided.

We have had, of course, the continued and able service of the Members who have during the previous congresses served on this subcommittee: the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from California, [Mr. SHEPARD], the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], in addition we have had three exceedingly able Representatives recently assigned to this subcommittee, men deeply interested in agriculture, men who have found it possible to attend the hearings almost continuously for a period of several weeks with the remainder of the subcommittee, and who studied them in detail. I refer, of course, to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITEN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]. On account of his absence on a mission of public importance we have not been able to avail ourselves this time of the able assistance of our colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who has formerly aided in the preparation of the Agriculture appropriation bill.

We have had as always the able counsel and assistance of our genial and capable executive secretary, Arthur Orr.

We have brought to you a bill which, if you have examined the report of the committee, you will find is approximately \$141,500,000 below Budget estimates when appropriations, reappropriations, transfers, and loan authorizations are all taken into account. The total of these items in the bill is approximately \$833,000,000. The total of the Budget estimates was something slightly in excess of \$975,000,000. In addition to pointing out that fact I wish to call your attention

to this situation, that in the fiscal year 1942 there was made available for agriculture through the medium of this bill in excess of \$1,400,000,000, whereas, as I have stated, the total amounts made available in the pending bill aggregate only slightly in excess of \$833,000,000, a reduction in this brief period of time of approximately 36 percent. I think I am correct when I say that no other department of the Government has sustained a similar percentage of reduction in the amount of funds made available for its use during that period of time.

I do not wish to discuss in detail all of the items contained in the bill. I do wish to address myself to those which I think are of outstanding interest to the membership of the Committee of the Whole and of outstanding importance, and if after I have concluded this discussion, which I hope to have reasonably brief in character, there are other items in the bill not mentioned by me about which Members desire information, I shall do the best I can to supply the information which may be requested. I wish to point out first that we have taken the same action with regard to penalty mail that has been taken by other subcommittees, following the leadership of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations in appropriation bills which have heretofore been presented to the House since the passage of Public Law 364, Seventy-eighth Congress, dealing with that subject matter. In other words, we have reduced the Budget estimate for penalty mail by 10 percent. Personally, I do not feel that that is a wise or logical way in which to deal with this particular problem, but in view of the fact that the precedent has been established and has on several occasions been approved by the House in the passage of other bills making this blanket reduction, our subcommittee has felt bound to follow that precedent in the case of the pending bill. The natural result of that sort of procedure, however, will ultimately be, in my opinion, if it has not already been, to have the department estimate at least 10 percent in excess of what it reasonably anticipates will be required, in the expectation that the subcommittee handling the bill will reduce it by 10 percent and it will then have the amount which it actually requires.

We have a substantial reduction in the appropriation for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. In the matter of economic investigations we have cut the Budget figures \$100,000 because of our feeling that the information developed by the pending farm census will render unnecessary the collection of many types of statistics which have heretofore been collected by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in its economics-investigation work and that the work of the Bureau in this particular field will not suffer by reason of the proposed reduction in the amount.

We have proposed a reduction in the estimates for the Crop and Livestock Division of this Bureau. We have disallowed a supplemental Budget estimate of \$150,000 for the study of farm wages. The original budget as submitted to the Congress contained an item of \$119,000 for this purpose and that item is carried

in the bill. The \$150,000 which we have disallowed was requested of the Budget by the Department at the time that it passed upon the item in the original budget, but was disallowed at that time by the Budget, and if you will examine the hearings you will find that it was developed therein that no additional evidence was submitted to the Budget between the time of its original disallowance of the item and the time when for some unknown reason it approved the extra \$150,000 and transmitted the supplemental estimate to the Congress. We have, for these and other reasons which will be apparent from an examination of the hearings, disallowed the supplemental estimate of \$150,000.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

The estimates for this office have been approved without change, as recommended by the Budget. In the present state of disturbed international relations and of uncertainty as to world commerce in agricultural products after the war, this office is, in the judgment of the committee, performing exceedingly useful service to American agriculture, and it has provided the full amount of funds thought necessary to continue its activities unimpaired.

EXTENSION SERVICE

The duties of your subcommittee in connection with appropriations for the Extension Service are more or less routine. The amount of payments to the States being fixed by law, the full estimate for administrative expenses has also been approved. There have been frequent complaints from administrative personnel, particularly field personnel, concerning the level of salaries paid such employees when compared with the salaries paid to employees of other organizations of the Government of similar grade. While we have taken some evidence on this subject, it is, of course, one which cannot be dealt with in an appropriation bill, especially since the work carried on in the field is done in cooperation with State governments.

The items in the estimate for the Agricultural Research Administration and the Special Research Fund have been approved as submitted.

In connection with the Office of Experiment Stations we have made one very substantial reduction below the Budget estimate, and that is in the fund proposed for availability for allocation to States for the State experiment stations under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act. We carried last year for this item \$2,463,708. However, the Bureau of the Budget proposed that we increase that item to the full limit of the authorization contained in the Bankhead-Jones Act, \$3,000,000. While the committee realizes the importance of the work which is being done with these funds, we do not feel under war conditions existing at the present time, with the financial resources of the Government being strained in an effort to meet our war needs, that there is justification for largely increasing this particular item of appropriation which has no direct connection with the war effort. We have therefore disallowed the amount of \$536,000-plus, the increase proposed by the

Bureau of the Budget, and have provided in the bill for the appropriation of the identical sum carried in the bill for the present fiscal year.

In the matter of the Federal experiment station in Puerto Rico, we have disallowed the Budget increase of \$60,000-plus, intended principally for use in the reconstruction of buildings at that project which, from the evidence adduced before us, we feel can be properly postponed until after the war; certainly until after the expiration of the next fiscal year.

No substantial change has been made in the estimate for the Bureau of Animal Industry, nor in the estimates for the Bureau of Dairy Industry. These are carried in the bill in substantially the same figures proposed by the Budget, with one or two minor exceptions.

In the estimates submitted for the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering, there was included \$170,000 in addition to some \$47,000 which has heretofore been carried in the bill for designing farm structures, a work which has been carried on by the Bureau for many, many years. Additional money was sought to be appropriated upon the idea that the farmers of the country need a great many more buildings, that there will be a great farm building program after the war, and that it is essential that designs for farm buildings be improved and perfected for use in connection with that anticipated building program. It is the opinion of our subcommittee that while a great deal of building on farms in the country is justified at this time, or is needed at this time, it is impossible for the farmers to carry out the building projects which are desired by them, because they are unable to obtain the necessary materials. What they need now is not to be furnished with additional plans for farm structures but to be accorded the materials that are necessary for use in building farm structures which they desire and which, in many thousands of cases, are so badly needed. We could conceive of no particular reason for appropriating \$170,000 additional for that type of study.

We also eliminated a Budget proposal to add \$25,000 for funds to be used in the study of electrical appliances for use on the farm. The Rural Electrification Administration is doing and is presently capable of continuing to do all work of that character which may be desired by the farmers of the United States.

There have been no material changes in the estimates for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. The item for the control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases is carried in the bill as proposed by the Budget. Of course, it cannot be definitely predicted now how much money will be needed for that purpose during the next fiscal year.

The appropriations for the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry have been provided as proposed in the budget, with one slight addition of \$15,000.

No change has been made in the estimates for the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics.

An appropriation of \$850,000 for this important Bureau has been approved as recommended by the Budget, representing an increase over the amount available for the present fiscal year of \$43,370. Last year the committee provided \$200,000 in excess of Budget estimates for this Bureau, which is sufficient evidence of the fact that we regard its work as being of very great value and importance. An appeal has been made to us this year to again add funds above Budget recommendations, but, notwithstanding the desirability of the work to finance which this request has been made, the committee does not feel that under present financial conditions it is justified in further increasing this appropriation above Budget estimates.

In the white pine blister rust control item the committee has made a very substantial reduction below Budget estimates but at the same time it has provided for the use of \$1,000,000 more in this work than was available during the present fiscal year. We realize fully the importance of the white pine blister rust control work. At the same time, we know that with the shortage of manpower existing in this country and the necessity for the utilization of additional manpower in our war industries, it is not going to be possible for the work of white pine blister rust control to attract new workers to the extent proposed by the Budget without seriously interfering with the manpower needs both of war industries and of agriculture.

The work had for its use this year \$1,923,000. The Budget proposed \$4,250,000, more than double the amount available for the present fiscal year. We thought that that increase is not justified under existing conditions and, while we have allowed it to the extent of \$1,000,000, we have disallowed \$1,326,000 of the Budget estimate for this work.

We have made three substantial changes in the items of estimates submitted for the Forest Service. The first of these and the most important is the disallowance of the \$1,000,000 item proposed for the aerial mapping of forests. We realize the desirability of this work, but we feel that it has not direct connection with our war effort and that it is something which might well be postponed until a post-war period. We have therefore disallowed the \$1,000,000 in the Budget which was proposed for the purpose of carrying out that particular work.

We were impressed by the statements made to us by some of our colleagues who appeared before our subcommittee and by the statements made by members of our subcommittee from the Northwest—the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]—as to the importance of the work in the study of the reseeding of depleted forest ranges. We felt that the Budget did not adequately provide for that work, so we have added the amount of \$75,000 for the purpose of making adequate provision for it—a sum which we think upon read-

ing the hearings you will find is amply justified.

We have reduced the amount proposed for the forest-products laboratory at Madison, Wis., to the amount which was made available for the present fiscal year. In doing that we have not intended to discount the importance of that work, but we wish to point out that the Army and Navy during the present year are transferring to that laboratory approximately \$1,500,000 for the study of problems in woods that are of particular interest to the armed services.

It is anticipated that similar transfers will be made in the future. So that apparently there is no lack of sufficient funds to carry on all reasonable investigations that could be projected.

In that same connection, I wish to point out that some 40 or 50 of our colleagues appeared before us urging the establishment of 20 experimental forests or additions to existing forest stations in the South. Some of our colleagues urged the establishment of an experimental forest in Pennsylvania, and others, too, urged the establishment of a similar activity in the State of Ohio. We were also advised that similar research work in forestry is desired in the northwestern part of the United States and in New England.

I believe our subcommittee is fully and deeply impressed with the wisdom of decentralizing to some extent this work at Madison, Wis., and having studies made in the different areas of the country where different types of forestry problems exist, of the particular problems in those areas. We think it might be wise to set up a Nation-wide system of these experimental forests and laboratories for the purpose of carrying on that work. But it was proposed to have us exceed the budget by providing for such stations according to particular plans which were called to our attention. We did not feel that it would be fair to other sections of the country to set up the projected system of experimental forests in the South at a cost of \$927,000 above the budget, and at the same time we could not allow similar items for Pennsylvania and Ohio for the same reason, that is, that these are problems which interest all portions of the country almost alike, problems which ought to have the attention of Congress, but which ought to have that attention on the basis of consideration of Nation-wide needs and not consideration of the needs of any particular section or area in the United States.

So, we have suggested in our report that the Department accord study to this problem and, if possible, submit to us next year a Nation-wide plan for experimentation in forestry along the lines which have been advocated by our colleagues who have appeared before our subcommittee. If that is done, it is possible that the Budget will approve the plan which may be suggested.

Now, we have also made a substantial reduction in the appropriation for forest roads and trails as proposed by the Budget. The Budget proposed a program for the construction of new forest highways at a cost of about \$45,000 per mile,

amounting to \$4,200,000. You know, of course, that the Congress has provided a road program for the country which does not become effective until after the war. It is to be carried out in the 3 post-war years. We have not felt that the construction of new highways in national forests is a matter of any more importance than the construction of new highways throughout the country generally. Therefore, we have eliminated that part of the Budget estimate, but we have approved that part \$500,000, which was proposed for the purpose of providing for the repair of existing national-forest highways.

Many of our colleagues have been interested in what is known as the emergency rubber project, the guayule project in California. I trust the members will read the hearings before the committee. This subcommittee last year recommended the elimination of the emergency rubber project, feeling that the benefits which might reasonably be anticipated from the operations of that project were not sufficient to justify the large expenditure of funds which had been had and was being proposed. We therefore provided for the liquidation of the project. However, the House in its good judgment, by an overwhelming majority, disagreed with the conclusions of our subcommittee and eliminated the proposal for the liquidation of the project. Notwithstanding that fact, the Budget, in its estimates submitted this year, provided for gradual liquidation, providing for the destruction of 10,000 acres of the guayule shrub during the coming fiscal year, although the destruction and reconditioning of the land for return to the owners would cost \$183,000 more than it would cost to retain that 10,000 acres of the guayule shrub. We felt the Budget was disregarding the expressed will of Congress. It was in accord with the expressed views of our committee, but not with those which you expressed upon consideration of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill last year. So we have reduced the appropriation by \$183,000 and have directed in the report that the 10,000 acres of guayule proposed for plowing up be not destroyed, but that the project be continued upon the basis which was last year approved by the Congress.

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

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is simply my intention to call to the attention of the House the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee who is now addressing the House, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, was very scrupulous with respect to the rights of the House relative to the guayule project. As the gentleman has mentioned, in spite of the fact that he himself opposed it, yet he saw to it in the subcommittee that the wishes of Congress as expressed last year by a direct vote, were upheld. I wish to sincerely compliment the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, on that fine demonstration of upholding what the House really wishes done in this particular instance.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman.

The War Food Administration appropriation for the present fiscal year was \$30,000,000, or \$28,000,000 plus, leaving out the overtime which was carried in the appropriation. The estimate submitted by the War Food Administration for its administrative expenses for the next fiscal year was submitted in three forms, as is customary with all of the departments, I understand, the minimum form carrying something in excess of \$22,000,000. The Budget cut these administrative expenses to \$10,000,000, the most drastic cut made in connection with any organization coming under the jurisdiction of this committee. When the War Food Administrator and his assistants were before our committee we sought to elicit facts which would justify us in approving that proposed cut, but we were unable to do so. All the witnesses who were in a position to have knowledge of the program and its needs insisted that the program would be substantially wrecked if funds in excess of \$10,000,000 were not provided for administrative expenses. So we sent down to the Budget and we asked that they send up the officials of the Budget who had passed on this subject matter, thinking that perhaps they had sources of information that we did not have, which would indicate the possibility of this organization being able to function during the next fiscal year on \$10,000,000 when it wanted \$22,000,000. After examining the representatives of the Budget, we came to the conclusion that some of their cuts were justified, but that some of them were entirely without justification, and we took steps in the pending bill to restore cuts to the amount of \$3,636,000, giving the War Food Administration \$13,636,000 for the next fiscal year as against over \$28,000,000 which it had for the present fiscal year. I may say that \$2,708,000 of that increase is for transfer to the Extension Service to afford aid to the county agents in assisting farmers in connection with their problems which have grown out of this war. The Farm Bureau recommended that the amount of \$4,000,000 should be appropriated for this purpose. Since the War Food Administration itself has only asked for \$2,708,000 we provided only that amount in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I desire to take this opportunity, if I may, to compliment the committee on the new form of setting up the committee's action on Budget increases and decreases. This is a most helpful thing and I hope it will be carried out by the other subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman. Perhaps the most important item in the bill, or at least one of those of outstanding importance, is that having to do with the conservation and use of agricultural land resources. The Budget, as you know, submitted to us a proposal by which it undertook to do several things. One was to decrease by \$10,000,000 the amount of \$300,000,000 which

you had fixed last year as the over-all figure for the regular land use program. The departmental authorities had projected a program on the basis of \$300,000,000, as you had directed and publicity had gone out to the farmers over the country relative to the apportionment of funds aggregating an amount of \$300,000,000; and the Budget, as far as we know, without any justification therefor arbitrarily cut \$10,000,000 from the amount. That we have restored in this bill. There was also the seed program, the program of \$12,500,000 for stimulating the production of clover and other legume and grass seeds, a program which, although not carried out in my section of the country, according to the evidence before us has been very effective and has been of vast benefit to agriculture. All of the evidence we have indicates that the continuance of this program for the next fiscal year is more necessary than it has been for the present fiscal year; so we restored that program.

The major change proposed by the Budget, however, was that we should appropriate section 32 moneys in the amount of \$133,000,000, \$100,700,000 of which should be from unexpended balances of 1943-44 section 32 moneys; and \$32,300,000 of which should be taken from section 32 moneys for the next fiscal year and divert it to this program. To begin with, that is not legislatively authorized, and while we have three or four major legislative items in the bill they are items which have been heretofore approved by the Congress.

This is a direct legislative item which has never received the approval of Congress, which had provided by section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act that 30 percent of the tariff receipts should be segregated and set aside for certain designated uses, including the disposition of surplus agricultural commodities. So our committee did not feel justified in including the legislation, irrespective of whether we felt that section 32 moneys ought to be so diverted or not. So far as the 1943-44 moneys are concerned they have already reverted to the Treasury and there is not anything involved in appropriating the unexpended balance of section 32 funds for those years except the matter of language. The money is in the Treasury; it is not available for use for section 32 purposes; and to appropriate it directly or refer to it as a reappropriation of section 32 moneys is a distinction without a difference. So we have undertaken to write this appropriation in accordance with the law. We are not undertaking to change the law. We have made the appropriation as projected from the general funds of the Treasury of the United States as authorized by law, and we have also eliminated from the proposed language of the bill the limitation of \$200,000,000 on the program that might be carried on in the calendar year 1946. That sort of provision is a limitation not on funds carried in this bill but on funds which are expected to be carried in a bill for the 1947 fiscal year. It is therefore legislative. The Congress has authorized \$500,000,000 by statute and we have been asked to provide in an appropriation bill a legislative limitation changing the

fundamental statute, so that the limit will be \$200,000,000. Besides that, the evidence before our subcommittee does not justify the decrease of this very important and useful program at this time in the manner which was proposed by the Budget, even if we had the authority in an Appropriations Committee bill to legislate.

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

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

Mr. VURSELL. I must admit that I do not know what the items of expenditure are in connection with this \$300,000,000 for soil conservation. What does it go for? Probably some other Members of the House would like to have that information too.

Mr. TARVER. Each State through its State committee of farmers works out a program for itself of those soil-conserving practices which are felt by the farmers of that State to be most important for that State. That program when worked out by the States is approved by the authorities in Washington. Each State, having its own particular problems, works out its own necessary program.

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

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

Mr. PACE. I merely want to state my great satisfaction at the action of the gentleman's committee in refusing to reduce the soil-conservation fund and in refusing to permit this diversion of section 32 money which is so important for new uses and the removal of surpluses.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman. I may point out in this connection that the Farm Bureau in appearing before our committee urged the carrying on of this program for the next fiscal year in the same volume and to the same extent and in the same amount of money as that made available for the present fiscal year which would be, according to the departmental authorities \$368,000,000 or approximately that amount, although the Farm Bureau in testifying before us asked for an appropriation of \$350,000,000. We have not gone to that limit, but we have provided in the bill altogether for \$342,250,000, which is \$22,500,000 above the Budget proposal, and we have provided for changing the language of the bill as indicated.

We have also refused to approve another change suggested by the Budget and that is the language which proposes to bar the so-called seed-lime-fertilizer operations after the calendar year 1946. The basic law enacted by the Congress authorized that program. We felt it has been one of very great usefulness to agriculture and we know of no reason why we in an appropriation bill should undertake to limit the authority heretofore provided by statute enacted by the Congress.

Mr. PACE. Did the hearings before the gentleman's committee disclose what influences are at work in the Budget to cause it to submit recommendations of this character on a program so important to the farmers of this Nation?

Mr. TARVER. No. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that the reason-

ing of the Budget in arriving at these conclusions was not disclosed to our committee.

We have provided for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation in the amount recommended by the Budget, \$7,984,900. You know, of course, that our subcommittee has in past years recommended the elimination of this program and the Congress agreed with us a couple of times. We thought the program was on the way out. We felt that it has been conducted without substantial benefit to the farmers of the United States and that the expense to the Government is so tremendous that its further operation would not be justified.

As I have said we have provided in preceding bills for its liquidation, but the Congress in December passed a bill proposing to reinstate the program for a period of 5 years, not only to reinstate but to expand it to include flax and certain crops where the work should be conducted experimentally. I hope that the program will be successful. I think there will be nothing more interesting to the farmers of this country than to have a sound crop-insurance program worked out. I wish I were able to think it will be successful. I do not. I think that we are simply going to waste a great deal more of the people's money in undertaking to find a solution for this particular problem in the way in which we have tackled it. But the Congress has made it mandatory upon us by the enactment of this law passed in December to provide the funds necessary to administer the program, and we have provided them in this bill in the exact amount recommended by the Budget.

Soil Conservation Service: We have made no increase over the Budget estimate, but we have made a substantial increase as recommended by the Budget of \$4,261,500 for soil-conservation operations, that being the item under which technical assistance is furnished to soil-conservation districts. That increase is occasioned by the great increase in the number of soil-conservation districts from 1,114 on June 15, 1944, to an expected number of 1,492 on June 15, 1946. That increase in the number of districts requires an increase in money for the furnishing of adequate technical services to those districts. And, of course, the Government cannot afford to discriminate between the districts and afford that type of service to some and not to others, so we have approved the Budget estimate in that particular.

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

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

Mr. THOM. In reference to the aid furnished the districts, does that consist solely in sending experts to assist them?

Mr. TARVER. Not solely that, but that is the main item of expense; that is, the technical service to aid them in mapping plans for their districts, the methods which should be used in endeavoring to restore the fertility of the eroded land, to conserve the fertility of land not eroded, the working out of sound farm practices, are all subject matters concerning which advice is furnished by

the technical experts provided under the provisions of this appropriation.

Mr. THOM. Does the district contribute any money?

Mr. TARVER. The district contributes far more than the Government. I cannot yield any further. I am taking more time than I should, and there are other important items that I would like to refer to.

The school-lunch program is carried in the bill in the same amount as that provided for the present fiscal year, \$50,000,000.

The Sugar Act administration expense fund has been approved without change.

In the Market News Service there is no change in the Budget estimate of a material nature, except in a reduction by \$100,000 of the funds estimated for the enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act. Dealing in agricultural commodities on exchanges has diminished to such an extent that additional money for the administration of the Commodity Exchange Act is not, in the opinion of our subcommittee, justified.

Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation under the Farm Security Administration: The committee, I think I may say for all of them, has been very greatly impressed with the type of work which has been done by our former colleague, Frank Hancock, of North Carolina, now Administrator of the Farm Security Administration. He is really putting into effect things which Congress has been directing the Administrator to do over a period of years.

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

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

He is liquidating these large cooperative projects concerning which Congress has complained. He is eliminating these experimentations involving the construction of hosiery mills and other activities of that type. He has sold already more than 700,000 acres of the 1,800,000-plus acres which have been acquired by the Government in the course of this program, and he has assured us that he is proceeding to dispose of the remainder of that acreage as rapidly as it can be done.

We think that he is doing a good job, yet we find upon examination of the estimates that the number of beneficiaries of this program has decreased from July 1, 1944, to December 31 by approximately 50,000. The evidence in the hearings showed that there were 475,000 beneficiaries as of July 1, 1944, and only about 425,000 as of December 31 of the same year. That is evidence of the fact that there is a decreasing need for the type of assistance carried on in this program.

The condition of agriculture in this country, while of course not by any means satisfactory to those of us who represent agricultural areas, has yet improved over the conditions which existed several years ago, and the necessity for the extension of this type of loans to low-income farmers has diminished rather than increased. Notwithstanding that, the Budget proposed to set

aside \$125,000,000 for this program instead of \$87,500,000, which was the amount that was authorized for the present fiscal year. We could not understand why such an increase is justified. It was sought to be justified in part by saying that our returning soldiers are going to become beneficiaries of this program. We do not believe that ought to be true. We do not think the American soldier returning from the battlefield ought to be required to enter into a rehabilitation program conducted by the Farm Security Administration in order to get the type of assistance he needs. We think he ought to have that assistance, but he ought to have it under the provisions of the G. I. bill of rights. If that act is not sufficiently broad to provide adequately for his needs, it ought to be amplified by Congress, but we ought not to seek to incorporate him into this rehabilitation program which we have carried on for several years for the benefit of low-income farmers. So we have reduced the amount proposed for loans to the amount available for the present fiscal year and have reduced the administrative expenses of the agency accordingly.

We have also reduced the budget estimate for the farm tenancy program. That is a program with which I am very deeply concerned, as I think every Member of Congress representing areas where a large percentage of the farmers are tenant farmers should be. However, the \$15,000,000 which they have had for the regular program for the present fiscal year has been enough. They are not able to buy farms at normal values for use in this program except in certain restricted areas of the country. Of course, I do not believe any of us want to buy lands at highly inflated values and saddle these tenants with a 40-year loan upon the basis of those inflated values, loans which it is probable that in the years after the war the tenants would be unable to pay, so that the granting of that type of loan to them would be an injury to them rather than a help. We cut down the budget estimate of \$25,000,000 for the regular program to \$15,000,000, the amount available for the present fiscal year.

The Budget, however, proposed \$25,000,000 for use in this program for returning veterans of the present war. They did that under the provisions of the G. I. bill of rights, which has a clause expressly authorizing the utilization of this program for the benefit of these returning veterans. While we do not think the amount of \$25,000,000 provided for that purpose will be a drop-in the bucket compared to the need which will exist, because it will provide for only about 5,000 loans, yet in view of the action of Congress in authorizing veterans' eligibility for this program we did not feel justified in reducing that estimate of the Budget by any amount whatsoever, so that the amount carried in the bill is \$40,000,000 instead of \$50,000,000 for the over-all program, a reduction of \$10,000,000 below the figures suggested by the Budget.

WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

The estimate of \$1,000,000 for this purpose has been approved without change.

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECT

This appropriation has not heretofore been carried in this bill. We have approved the budget estimate except that portion of it which provides \$307,824 for the construction of farm buildings on these projects, and \$27,110 for the construction of roads thereon. These proposed expenditures we do not think are authorized by law, and we have eliminated from the bill the funds estimated therefor, leaving in the bill for all purposes under this heading, \$1,165,066.

In the Rural Electrification Administration item, we have made a substantial reduction which will probably attract adverse criticism by some supporters of the R. E. A. program. I am one of those supporters. I believe in the Rural Electrification program, and I think that it has accomplished a great deal of good and that those who have been in charge of it and who are now in charge of it are doing a jam-up job. They have electrified about 40 percent of the farms in the United States. They have loaned over \$400,000,000. Delinquencies amount to approximately one-half of 1 percent of the amounts that have become due. They have had repayments above maturities of 4½ percent of the funds loaned.

I want to see that program enlarged until it will finally reach all of rural America. But we ought not to neglect to examine other facts. They are not able to expend even the amount of money which we have been heretofore providing for this program under present conditions. Under W. P. B. regulations relative to the use of materials for extensions of existing lines, in most areas of the country it is impossible to obtain extensions. That is evidenced by the fact that they have \$111,000,000 that has been allocated from authorizations made during this and previous years which they have been unable to expend. This year they will have made by the end of the year allocations covering the \$26,000,000 which they have available, but they have only been able to expend slightly in excess of \$2,000,000 of that amount. They had \$25,000,000 for this year plus an unexpended balance of approximately \$1,000,000. The budget proposed \$150,000,000. Any Member who will read the hearings on the subject will know that they could not possibly expend that amount. We have provided in the bill \$60,000,000 instead of \$150,000,000, which is more than twice as much as they had for the present fiscal year, and which is more money than they can use. It is our judgment that those who vote for more money than that are really doing an injustice to the Rural Electrification program rather than helping it, because they are creating the impression in the minds of the people of the country that the farmers are getting \$150,000,000 for the R. E. A. program, when, as a matter of fact, they will not be able to use more than a fraction of it.

We have also reduced the administrative expenses of the Rural Electrification Administration in conformity with the reduction in the amount of funds available for it.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Estimates for F. C. A. including farmers' crop-production and harvesting and provisions for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation have been approved as submitted.

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Committee, I have used more time than I should have used in my effort to explain the important provisions of this bill. Let me say in conclusion that this subcommittee has no pride of personal opinion with regard to the subject matters provided for in this bill. If, in your judgment, there ought to be amendments made, if you want to reduce the amounts of appropriations which we have provided, or increase the amounts of others, you will certainly not be offending any member of the subcommittee if you offer and urge your amendments; and, if, in the judgment of the House, changes should be made, that, of course, is perfectly satisfactory with us because we are merely the servants of the House; we are merely trying to do a good job for American agriculture, keeping in mind the financial condition of the Government at the present time. If we have not done the kind of a job that you want, we invite your efforts to have our mistakes corrected.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has so comprehensively and with such particularity discussed the bill that there is not much I can add to the information he has given you.

As you have learned the bill undertakes to appropriate \$833,801,932, which is \$141,499,350 less than the Budget recommended.

If we had not been obliged to include some sixty millions to cover the G. I. bill we would have brought in a bill somewhat smaller in amount than that for fiscal '45. Incidentally, we realize that with farm values boosted from 25 to 63 percent it is no time for any veteran to purchase a farm without and unless he has the most careful advice of those able to advise him.

In my opinion as expressed in committee hearings, the total amount might well have been still further reduced to the advantage of the taxpayer, and to nobody's disadvantage for the duration. Some things which might well be done in normal times cannot and should not be attempted while we are at war.

The bill was carefully scrutinized and considered item by item by my colleagues in the committee, and all of us had a chance to say our say, and finally the bill was reported unanimously, as is, and I am for it.

I am sure that there can be no justification for seeking to increase the total amount covered for appropriation, as well as that there also can be but little tenable ground for controversy or amendment, if the real purpose and intent of the bill, which is to implement the war effort, be allowed to prevail.

Under the diplomatic and very able direction of the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, the members of the subcommittee have worked long and hard and harmoniously and as a unit for

weeks, without the slightest evidence of partisanship or sectionalism, each and all of us determined to appropriate every cent of money for agriculture essential to the winning of the war, equally as determined not to spend a cent of the taxpayers' money in support of any project at this time which cannot be justified and the war-winning necessity for which cannot be established as emergent or essential.

ARTHUR ORR

Right here I wish to pay my respects and a tribute to Arthur Orr, the experienced and extremely capable, long-time efficient executive secretary of the committee, who has rendered the committee such valuable service while the bill was under consideration by it. It is not to be overlooked that during and while the hearings were in progress he observed the twenty-fifth anniversary of his service with the Appropriations Committee. The committee and the Congress and the clerk are each and all to be congratulated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, nobody realizes any more or better than the subcommittee reporting the bill the responsibility which rests upon it as it undertakes to handle what is known as the farm problem from the standpoint of appropriations for the support of the farm and the farmer through the Department of Agriculture and directly for the agricultural population. This responsibility is heavier now than ever, for we are engaged in and at the critical stage of a war such as we have never experienced heretofore.

You have before you the very comprehensive report. The hearings have been available since Saturday last. I see no occasion for my discussing the bill at any length.

I do want to talk briefly about the farm problem in general.

THE FARM PROBLEM

It is true that no man can forecast the future of or for the American farmer. Despite the fact he has been made the victim of propaganda, false hopes, soaring prices, speculative land values, and covered with mortgages he does not recognize as existent, and always the goat, because as an aggregation he will not cooperate, nevertheless, what he is expected to do does not involve diverting his efforts from the supplying of peace needs to war needs. "Nothing," as someone has said, "that he learns to do now will come amiss when the world is again at peace." The defeat of Hitler—and the Japs—and the restoration of tolerable living in Europe will deliver the American farmer from the disastrous accumulation of staples produced by his past mistakes and place him in a position to create, for the first time in American history, and in due time, a healthy and permanent agriculture.

It is not easy to know what to do to make that dream come true. Appropriations and doles and subsidies will not accomplish it. We have an enormous national problem to solve. A problem of proteins and vitamins, which now coincides with our international problem. It involves not only land, but human beings

and about everything else under the sun.

Our attention has been drawn to the War Food Administration's discharge of its duties. Certain evidence which was presented to us made us suspicious that there were people in that outfit who were not an asset to it, to put it mildly. That is all I care to say with respect to that matter now.

WAR FOOD

The War Food Administration has supplied the nations of the world with a tremendous amount of food.

An indication of the magnitude of relief shipments may be seen in the fact that during the 18 months ended last November 30, 2,250,000,000 pounds of meat and 175,780,000 pounds of butter were exported for relief and other than military requirements.

I notice that James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion has named a new agency headed by Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, to determine how much food and other relief materials the United States can supply to the rest of the world without endangering the war effort and its own civilian economy. This move, intended to avert a serious clash between domestic and foreign demands for scarce American supplies, comes none too soon.

The War Food Administration has been trying since December to dispose of 400,000 cases, or 9,600,000 No. 2 cans, of string beans of the 1942 and 1943 pack, it was learned yesterday. So far 215,000 cases have been inspected for quality, and of these, 89,000 cases are in the process of being inspected.

The original processor, who has first option to buy the commodity back, and the processors in similar lines who get second choice, have turned the offer down, the procurement and price support division of W. F. A. said yesterday.

The 89,000 cases were sold on February 16; 126,638 cases were offered to wholesale dealers and institutional and State purchasing agents at a fixed ceiling price but with a 1½ percent discount if paid for in cash. This is the normal trade discount.

On March 12, 120,036 cases were offered to the latter two groups on a different basis. They were invited to submit their own bids, the W. F. A. reserving the right to reject the offer if it was not high enough. March 29 is the closing date for these bids, which will be passed on by the Procurement and Price Support Branch of the W. F. A. Office of Supply in Washington.

Meanwhile a No. 2 can of string beans is still rationed at 10 blue points a can.

We are told by the President that we must tighten our belts, and that we will do for our boys and girls over seas, but there are some things about the whole situation which deserve and will compel a most thorough investigation. There are some things which smell worse than spoiled tomatoes, rancid lard, and carloads of rotten potatoes.

We will take a 12-percent cut in our meat ration for the benefit of our military personnel and for our fighting Allies, but we have a right to know where all the stocks of food have gone, and where

they are, and that is and should be no military secret.

I think an editorial writer for the Washington Post hit the nail on the head when he wrote last Sunday respecting food sharing, as follows:

FOOD SHARING

The President was stating a simple truth when he pointed out that people who oppose cutting our food consumption for the sake of feeding the starving of other countries are not decent. We share the President's belief that the vast majority of Americans are the decent sort who are prepared to make sacrifices to alleviate the sufferings of others. However, the agitated debate over food shortages and export demands has taken an acrimonious turn that threatens to obscure and distort the real issues and to give a wrong impression of the temper of the civilian population.

Faced by the simple question whether we are willing to share our comparative abundance with the starving people of liberated areas the answer is unequivocally, "yes." Moreover, we could, and probably we shall be forced to, get along with less food than is now available without impairment of health and efficiency. Starting from that premise, the discussion of our food problem becomes motivated by a desire to utilize our resources to the best advantage and to give the most aid with the means at our disposal.

Attacks on the Administration for the loose, uncoordinated character of its food relief program are warranted, and constructive critics will not be turned aside by presidential rebukes addressed to a selfish minority.

SEES "HORN" RUNNING OUT

J. A. Krug, chairman of the War Production Board, warned the United States and her allies the other day that this Nation's "inexhaustible" horn of plenty is running out.

Chairman Krug stepped into the charged controversy over American food and resources and declared that "we must explore all the factors that will reduce to a minimum the net drain on American goods, including food, textiles, and such basic materials as steel and lead."

Agreeing in principle with President Roosevelt's admonition that we must do our best to help feed the starving peoples of Europe, Krug, nonetheless, bluntly warned the allies and the liberated areas of Europe and the Pacific that:

"We can stretch to the limit all our resources—and they are tremendous—and we will still fall short in our efforts to avoid desperate suffering abroad. We are not an inexhaustible arsenal of food and materials. This fact seems to be as much of a surprise to millions of Americans as it is to our allies.

"There has been too much talk the world around about the inexhaustible wealth and resources of America. There is a limit to everything and America is reaching that limit. I hope we can get this idea over to the other nations of the world. For we have scraped the bottom of the barrel in several respects."

This is taking the bull by the horns, an act long deferred, but one that should have salutary repercussions.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. Chairman, in this connection, I cannot omit to say a word or two on the question of farm machinery, the domestic scarcity of which is hampering the efforts of American agriculture to an extent which may have disastrous repercussions on the battle front. The Members are aware, of course, that a Member of the House, in a recent speech from the

floor, advised this body of the existence of extensive inventories of farm machinery and equipment in the reservoirs of many of the countries allied with us, and perhaps, some friendly neutrals as well. The committee, sharing the general concern on this question, went into the matter very fully at the hearings in an endeavor to obtain information concerning such foreign inventories for this House which is directly responsible to the people through whose industry and generosity these supplies are lend-leased to others.

I feel that it is my solemn obligation to advise the House and the country that the committee's efforts to obtain such information were not entirely successful. Although officials of the executive branch were in full possession of the information, it was given to them, they alleged, by foreign governments under the seal of confidence, and only under that seal transmitted to the committee. The reasons assigned, of course, are those of military security, but it is my understanding that the officials of this Government have no determining voice in deciding whether any such information does or does not affect military security. And so the committee found itself silenced in a matter important to this country by the unreviewed dictum of an official of a foreign government. I need not tell the House that I, for one, did not like it, and only after action of the Appropriations Committee as a whole so directing, was the subcommittee, through its chairman, authorized to publish the information which you will find before you in the record.

LEND-LEASE MEAT

I understand that there will be a substantial reduction in lend-lease shipment of meat. Britain will get only 25,000,000 pounds of lend-leased meat next quarter, or about 12½ percent of present shipments. This evidently was based on the theory that British reserves are large enough to sustain England without great American assistance.

If we can manage to produce to feed the world, we ought first to be able to feed ourselves. Is that not so? Charity begins at home. To live on American standards it is estimated that we need the product of a billion acres. When the war is over the American farmer on these acres will be in a position to establish a solid future for himself. As I see it, a starved world will eagerly carry off his grain stocks; a naked world will carry off the stocks of cotton and wool and other products. The law of supply and demand will once more operate normally to save the day and civilization.

Then the day will have arrived when we will no longer have to pay the farmer to stay out of production because, as sure as the sun rises and sets, with a proper distribution of farm production, with systematic development of markets at home and abroad, good farming will pay.

The need for subsidies for agriculture will cease to exist. The economic post-war future for the American farmer promises either a new and better day, or the end of economic stability the world around.

THE FARMER AND PEACE

The future welfare of the farmer is involved in the kind of peace we are able

to make and keep. He cannot disassociate himself from any single problem, for he is touched and touches the question at almost every angle as the feeder of the world.

William Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, was talking about agriculture as much as about any other economic issue when he said that the Bretton Woods pacts would stabilize the markets and maintain job levels. The international bank and monetary funds must be adopted to insure the stable post-war markets needed to maintain full production and employment in the United States.

In a Nation-wide broadcast Mr. Clayton warned that, without such international institutions to curb a return to the economic warfare of the last two decades, the most elaborate political and military arrangements for the preservation of physical peace will soon disintegrate in an atmosphere of bitterness.

He declared:

Our foreign economic policy revolves around an expansion in world economy—free and equal access for all nations to the trade and raw materials of the world, increased production, much greater exchange of goods and services between nations, and higher levels of living for all peoples everywhere.

Now, there is not one single element of the Santa Claus philosophy in this policy. On the contrary, quite aside from the question of future peace, the United States will be one of its principal beneficiaries.

FOREIGN MARKETS

Noting that there are almost unlimited foreign markets ready to absorb the expanding output of the United States, he asserted that the real problem will arise from difficulties in making payments. The International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development present a solution to this problem without superseding private lending or disrupting normal business practices, he explained.

The whole basis of the Bretton Woods proposals is the conception of an expanding economy and collective security through common action—

Mr. Clayton said, adding that unless this goal is achieved—

the solution of the vast problems before all nations may well be rendered impossible.

After the war, agricultural resources, human and soil—

Says Arthur Moore—

must be restored, preserved and expended all over the world, in new farming areas and old. The underfed must be fed. But, if the world is to obtain freedom from want, people must not be fed at the expense of food production or farm standards, nor of the farmer, as such.

The farm problem varies from region to region, from crop to crop, from farm to farm. The true problem is, as has been said, to grasp the wonderful range and diversity of American agriculture and the delicate, complex interrelationships that keep it dynamic.

SIX MILLION FARMS

We have a total of 6,000,000 farms. None is typical. One-third of them—the top 2,000,000—produce nearly four-fifths of all farm crops.

They include a few big "factory farms" and great ranches and plantations, but the vast majority are just good prosperous farms. The bottom 2,000,000 farmers account for only one-twentieth of total agricultural production—and consume most of that themselves. The middle third farm for profit, but most of them are short of capital or short of land. These groups produce the Nation's food and industrial crops; they produce a disproportionately high share of the Nation's children; and perhaps more importantly they are the Nation's greatest reservoir of independence and self-reliance. In that fundamental struggle of our times between the state and the individual, the farmer will never surrender.

TRAMPING OUT THE VINTAGE

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of all those interested in the farm problem, to a recent book written by Joseph A. Cocannoner, entitled "Tramping Out the Vintage," in which he defines a program for agriculture. Among other things which interested me, and evidently have interested others, he definitely makes and stresses three important points, viz:

Rural education must cease weaning able boys and girls from the farms; we need teachers who understand farm life; we must handle our greatest resource—soil—more intelligently.

He fails, however, to emphasize the fact that unless farm income is adequate, it is futile to expect ambitious youths to stay on the farms.

If this point were stressed—

Says Haydon S. Pearson in his review thereof—

the book would be better balanced. Economics being what they are, up and coming youths will always insist on a vocation that provides some of the good things of this modern age.

Mr. Cocannoner sees the dangers to American society unless our farm population overcomes its indifference to soil erosion, poor animal husbandry, and "cotton minds."

Without the vineyard to produce them—

He says—

there can be no grapes of wrath. Tending the vineyard properly is the task for America today.

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

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

MISSOURI RIVER FLOOD CONTROL WILL HELP AGRICULTURE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the committee on the comprehensive way in which they have approached the problems in the annual agriculture appropriation bill. On the whole, it is one of the best-balanced bills on the subject that has come before the House in my membership.

I rise at this time, however, Mr. Chairman, to mention the importance to the agricultural interests in the great basin of the Missouri River, and thereby to the Nation, of an action taken here earlier

today. That was the adoption by the House of the conference report on the appropriation bill for the civil functions of the War Department.

That action placed into law the initial appropriations for drawing the plans on the huge multiple-purpose dams authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944, passed by the House last May, and finally enacted into law last December.

This action has immense significance to agriculture. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, when those dams are constructed it means the end of the floods which in 2 successive years, 1943 and 1944, covered from two to three million acres of the Nation's best and richest farm lands between Sioux City, Iowa, and St. Louis, Mo., not only knocking them out of production in this important war period but damaging hundreds of thousands of acres for many years to come. Such ruin will stop when the dams are built for which the House today voted funds.

In the second place, Mr. Chairman, these dams will open a new era for agriculture upstream from Sioux City, in the Dakotas, Montana, and Wyoming. They will mean water for livestock and irrigation in dry years; they will mean an abundance of power for towns, cities, and country, and revolutionize the life on the farms and ranches of those States.

And these things can be done under the projects now authorized and for which initial design funds have now been voted. There is no need for any Missouri Valley Authority to do the job.

The funds voted today will start the Army engineers on their part of the work—the big structures on the main stem of the river. The Budget message sent up from the White House yesterday, if approved by the Congress, will provide similar funds for the Department of the Interior to plan its part of the authorized work.

The funds now approved by Congress for the Army engineers in 1945 and 1946 include these items for the work on the authorized Missouri River program:

Garrison Dam	\$700,000
Oahe Dam.....	450,000
Fort Randall Dam.....	200,000

The funds recommended in the special budget message for the Department of the Interior include:

Bureau of Reclamation.....	\$2,150,000
Geological Survey.....	1,400,000
Fish and Wildlife Service.....	375,000
Office of Indian Affairs.....	56,500
National Park Service.....	40,000
General Land Office.....	48,500
Grazing Service.....	10,000

In his message transmitting this estimate, the President said:

This estimate includes funds only for the work preliminary to actual construction and must be performed irrespective of whether construction of the projects in the basin is accomplished by a valley authority or other agencies.

He also said:

In my judgment, the proposed work will not interfere with the conduct of the war.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that the President did not send up a budget message on the Missouri program for the Army engi-

neers until after the civil-functions bill had passed the House of Representatives.

At the conclusion of our hearings on the civil-functions bill, I asked the Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, for tables showing the estimates they had made for funds to begin plans and designs on projects authorized by the 1944 Flood Control Act, and asked particularly about the Missouri River items. General Reybold gave us the tables, but the committee decided they should not be acted upon until the Budget Bureau had completed its consideration.

When the estimates later did come to the Congress, they were minus the amounts the engineers had requested for the Missouri River and the Central Valley of California. It was understood that they were deferred for consideration of the valley authority proposals. The other body, however, placed in the bill the full amount requested. That action, in which the distinguished Senator from my State, Senator GURNEY, was most helpful, the action of the House conferees yesterday in concurring, and the action of the House today in adopting the conference report, can only be interpreted as meaning that the Congress does not see any necessity for a Missouri Valley Authority.

The great program can be undertaken by the regularly established agencies of the Government—and, indeed, is now under way.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in the discussion of an appropriation bill it is in order to speak of taxation. I wish, if I may, to comment on the action of the legislature in my own State of Pennsylvania, and the legislatures of other States in connection with the memorialization of Congress to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of considering and adopting an amendment placing a 25-percent limitation on inheritance, gift, and income taxes.

The State Legislature of Pennsylvania last year, without any general knowledge on the part of the people of Pennsylvania, followed an action already taken in 17 other States and adopted a resolution petitioning Congress to call such a convention for that purpose. This resolution and its objective, I understand, has been sponsored primarily by Frank Gannett's notorious league for so-called constitutional government. It has for its purpose the lifting of the income-tax burden from those individuals who have huge incomes and are able to pay, and the saddling of that burden on the wage earners and those receiving small salaries who already find it difficult to meet tax obligations, and also upon industrial corporations, as it undoubtedly would occasion an increase in the corporate tax rate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman know of any other effect such

limitation would have other than the transfer of the tax burden from those with large incomes to those of small incomes?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. There are many other effects, but to me that is the most important one.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that is correct. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Seventeen States, without the citizens of those States knowing what was taking place, have already passed the resolution. If two-thirds of the States of the Union adopt such a resolution the Congress will have no recourse except to call a constitutional convention. If this amendment is finally adopted, we will lose, I am informed by the Treasury Department, \$6,000,000,000 worth of revenue instantly. In addition to this loss everyone knows that in the post-war period we are not going to have the benefit of all the revenue we now receive from excess-profits taxes. It is going to be difficult for the Government to meet its obligations without the loss, which would thus occur. Congress would be compelled to enact legislation providing for a sales tax and various excise taxes and practically all of this burden would fall upon individuals who today are paying taxes on incomes above \$500 if single and \$1,000 if married. These people will see their tax burdens doubled and trebled if this nefarious proposition is allowed to be consummated.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman know that out of the 17 States that have adopted it 3 of them, Arkansas, Iowa, and Wisconsin through their legislatures, have recently rescinded their action?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I understand that is so. When the people of those States became aware of what had taken place the legislatures immediately saw that they better rescind their actions. In the State of Pennsylvania, Representative James Lovett, from Westmoreland County, has introduced a resolution calling upon the Pennsylvania Legislature to rescind its previous action. I hope my colleagues from Pennsylvania, Republicans and Democrats alike, will direct the attention of their constituencies in Pennsylvania to the resolution of Representative Lovett and urge them to petition the members of the general assembly and the State senators to take favorable action upon his resolution before the rank and file of the people of this country are saddled with a tax burden that will be unbearable.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I call attention to the fact also that the Government expects to take in about \$42,000,000,000 in revenue in the coming year. If the 25-percent limitation were in effect we would probably not be able to take in one-half of that unless we at least

doubled or trebled the taxation on the lower income earning people.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. What the gentleman says confirms the information I have already received from the Treasury Department. In my own city of Philadelphia it is difficult enough at present to take care of tax obligations, because in addition to income tax we must all pay a city wage tax which was forced upon us. We do not wish to contemplate any new burdens.

I hope that every Member of this House will direct the attention of their constituencies to what is taking place, so that the people of the several States in the Union can watch the action of their legislatures.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand here a book compiled by the Committee on Agriculture showing a list of payments made to farmers who received \$1,000 or more under the 1943 agricultural conservation program and the 1942 crop-parity payment program. This book contains information showing that 26,578 farmers in this country are receiving over \$1,000 apiece under these programs, and that the amount of money we are handing out in gratuities now amounts to over 50,000,000 a year. You know, when we talk about the individual worker in the country today toiling hard and trying to earn and save a dollar, in order that he can buy food and clothing, that is one thing; but when you have a list here of thousands of people who are getting \$1,000 or more a year, and some of them very fabulous sums, it seems to me that the Congress ought to wake up, because if you do not, you will find the farmers of this country waking up and they are going to tell you what to do; and that, very shortly.

Let me read you a partial list of States. Alabama had 373 people who received \$698,539.86; Arkansas had 796 people who received \$1,709,708.58; California had 1,418 people who received \$3,571,368.95; Georgia had 595 people who received \$1,169,771.66; Illinois had 1,477 people who received \$2,432,630.77; Kansas had 2,948 people who received \$4,830,621.44; Louisiana had 264 people who received \$535,208.56; Mississippi had 1,231 people who received \$2,778,048.49; Nevada had 32 people who received \$68,292.05; North Carolina had 136 people who received \$275,275.56; Oregon had 974 people who received \$2,150,700.65; Pennsylvania had 59 people who received \$143,928.54; South Carolina had 172 people who received \$269,791.40; Texas had 2,668 people who received \$5,142,039.76; Washington had 2,385 people who received \$4,884,784.16; and Wyoming had 272 people who received \$514,591.26.

If any of you Members are interested in knowing the figures of other States, I will be glad to give them to you.

Now let us take some of the insurance companies. In Wisconsin, the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Milwaukee, received a check for \$48,086.67. The Old Life Insurance Co. of

America, also of Milwaukee, received \$7,244.69.

Let us take the State of New York. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 1 Madison Avenue, New York City, received \$95,756.95.

These are the hand-outs that I am talking about that this munificent Government of ours gives to these great corporations.

The New York Life Insurance Co. received \$8,485.45.

The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, of New York City, received \$73,908.31.

Let us take Massachusetts. The John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Boston, received \$65,242.24. Out of a total amount of \$72,570.42 for the entire State of Massachusetts, the John Hancock Life Insurance Co. received over \$65,000.

Missouri: The Kansas City Life Insurance Co., of Kansas City, received \$14,169.57. The National Fidelity Life Insurance Co., of Kansas City, received \$9,252.72. The Mutual Life Insurance Co., of St. Joseph, Mo., received \$10,379.67.

Now, let us step over to another State and take little Connecticut. The Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., of Hartford, received \$1,181.93.

The Aetna Life Insurance Co., of Hartford, received \$39,095.08.

I have a policy in the Aetna, and maybe they are making that policy good; I do not know.

Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., of Hartford, \$23,894.88. Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Hartford, \$16,550.29. Travelers Insurance Co., \$43,839.82.

Minnesota: Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, \$48,473.41. Northwestern Life Insurance Co. of Minnesota, \$6,837.45. Winona National & Savings Bank, of Winona, Minn., \$4,280.18.

And so it goes on down the line. What are the taxpayers of this country going to say after awhile when they learn what is in this book? I am going to show the people of this country just what the Congress has been doing in frittering away the money of the taxpayers—the people who have to work and pay taxes. I want them to see where this 20 percent goes that is taken out of their salaries for taxes, which money is used to pay these fabulous sums.

But I just want to say this: After you learn what is in this book and find out how munificent this New Deal has been to these great corporations and to these farmers who are getting over \$1,000, it will be time for the American people to wake up.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to read into the RECORD at this point a release from the War Food Administrator, Judge Marvin Jones. Overnight, so to speak, another wave of food-shortage hysteria seems to have immersed us in a sense of fear. Most of us have heard from time to time dire predictions as to our food situation. These predictions have been made for several years now, yet no one in

America so far has gone hungry, and I do not believe anyone is going hungry this year. I know we all have faith and confidence in our former colleague, Judge Marvin Jones. He is doing a good job in feeding our Army and Navy and civilian population and in supplying our allies with food. The worst criticism I have to offer against our war-food program is that Judge Jones has not been given more authority. It is reassuring to hear him state today that no one in this country is going hungry. He has just issued the following release:

I hope no one will be misled about the food situation. No one has gone hungry in this country. No one is going hungry. We have heard these things before. This storm will pass and certain facts will stand out:

1. In 1943 the American farmers produced 32 percent more food than this or any other nation ever produced before the war.

2. In 1944 they upped this 5 percent making a record increase of 37 percent above pre-war production.

3. This record was made in spite of the handicaps of war.

4. This year the farmers themselves set goals that call for an even greater crop acreage.

5. We have the best fed Army and Navy in the world. They have first call on our food.

6. Russian officials have told us that but for American food they could not have gone forward as they did in turning back the Germans. The same is true of England. All our allies are fighting in a common cause.

7. Our civilians during the war have eaten more food per capita than they did pre-war.

Our armed forces will continue to be well fed. We will continue to help our fighting allies. Our own people will continue to have plenty of good, wholesome food, and we will contribute our share to the relief of starving people, even if it means a new hitch in our belts. This is a practical matter and a part of the war itself.

The primary object of the War Food Administration is to aid in securing production of food. We are proud of the all-time production in each of the war years. Credit for this goes primarily to the American producer. Anyone who sells the American farmer short makes a mistake.

In addition we have been buying \$5,000,000 worth of food per day for lend-lease, and to supplement the needs of our armed forces. This food must be processed, stored, loaded, transported and delivered to shipside. Much of it is perishable.

The handling of this food is a gigantic task. It must be handled with speed. It must go forward every day. It must be kept flowing to the war fronts.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

FOOD SHORTAGES

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe we can all agree with the statement made by our chairman of the Committee on Agriculture as to the splendid job the American farmers have done in producing food. Their outstanding achievement in food production is a miracle when you consider the handicaps under which they have operated, the shortages of machinery, the shortages of labor, plus unnecessary and unwise restrictions placed upon their production by the O. P. A. and other administrative agencies. Food production by American agriculture for the past 3 years cannot be used by the adminis-

tration as an alibi for the food shortage which now threatens our country. The fault is not with the farmers nor with the processors. The fault, as I see it, lies in the unnecessary and unwise administrative orders from Washington and the lack of coordination on the part of those agencies in securing proper and adequate distribution of the food. There is no question but what we are going into a serious shortage of certain vital foods.

In the case of beef, that is one situation which can be remedied. If the administration would change its policy, we could have more beef. But as long as policies are in operation which will stop the farmers of this country from putting 300 or 400 pounds more meat on feeder cattle there will be that much less beef produced in the United States in 1945.

I introduced a resolution yesterday calling for an investigation of the food situation by the House Committee on Agriculture. I appeared before the Committee on Rules this morning and asked them to report a rule ordering our Committee on Agriculture to make the investigation. I felt that the Committee on Agriculture was charged with the responsibility to see that we had abundant and ample food for the American people, for the armed forces, and to keep our commitments. My colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], introduced another resolution which called for the creation of a special committee to investigate the entire food matter.

I do not know what the Committee on Rules will do, but it is my hope we can get to the bottom of this entire food problem to find out as to our supplies and what the commitments have been made by the administration and what the needs of the country are to maintain a decent civilian economy. Our first duty is to assure the men and women in the armed forces that they will have an abundance of all vital foods.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think the gentleman is right about that resolution. The Smith committee has authority to investigate that situation. I am one of the members of the Smith committee. But the members of that committee do not have any special knowledge of agriculture, and this question of food production, supply and transportation should come before your Committee on Agriculture, and be investigated by that committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. I definitely feel that the investigation should be made by a committee of the House, whether it be a standing committee or a special committee.

Let me refer for the moment to what the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], said. He quoted Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and I am satisfied he quoted him correctly. The proposition is not one of production, because the farmers have been doing a good job; but the question is one of distribution. The matter has become so serious that our War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, went to Mr. Byrnes and asked

him to set up a special committee to see that there would be a check on the commitments made by U. N. R. R. A., by the F. E. A., by Lend-Lease, and these other agencies. Mr. Jones feared that these agencies would promise away most of our food.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.
Mr. VORYS of Ohio. After the Hot Springs food conference I heard one of the American delegates say that he expected that in the next year while we would have enough food, we would not be able to have the luxury of having the grain after it had been transferred into beef and meat, but we would have to go on something like peasant diet, eating cereals ourselves, and forego what he called the luxury of eating meat. In the statement made by War Food Administrator Jones that we will have plenty of food, I wonder if the gentleman knows whether he means we will not starve, but we will get enough cereals, or whether he means that we will have the type of balanced diet to which we are accustomed?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman that we do have a certain school of thought in some of these agencies, which maintains that instead of feeding corn, hay, wheat, barley, and oats to livestock so that we can eat beef, poultry, and dairy products, that they should feed this corn, hay, wheat, and barley directly to the people, and in that way we will save a lot of money and a lot of time and work. It sounds fantastic.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is that the plan?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think that is the way some of them are planning, but with many others I prefer to eat my meat red, I prefer to eat butter, and I like to have fluid milk, instead of eating corn and hay.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If these so-called internationalists, these one-worlders who want to raise the standard of living of people all over the world, including those who eat rice and things like that and no meat, if they advocate giving our meat to people in other parts of the world, is there any reason why we should not send meat over there and eat a little rice ourselves? That will bring about the balance a little quicker.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Perhaps we would have to send the gentleman from Michigan over to teach them how to eat this red meat.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have not had any for a couple of years. It does not make any difference to me. I can eat fish.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will say this to the gentleman, that he will have less meat and less beef and less pork and less poultry in the next 5 months than he has ever had before.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How can that be if I have not had any? I am not complaining. I do not care for meat. I like rice and oats and oatmeal. Up at Battle Creek we make a fine grade of oatmeal, you know.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman does not complain.

But let me point out an additional reason why this situation will be more aggravated. In New York at the present time 90 percent of the beef goes into the black market and people are not getting it who want to live up to the laws and regulations.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. We talk about our G. I.'s. Is it not about time to think about the mothers and wives of our G. I.'s, who are forced to go into the black markets to get their meat and other foods at this time?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true and I am glad the gentleman called that to our attention.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would it not seem much better if the O. P. A. would issue one set of stamps for butter and another for meat? We hear about butter turning rancid because people do not have enough coupons to buy it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Even if you had one set of stamps for butter and another for meat, I doubt if in the next few months you will get very much of either one of them. You must have production first.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have worked closely with the gentleman from Minnesota in the last 6 years. I think the point the gentleman from Minnesota has always made is that ample food can only be attained by a maximum food program. I think a very good example is a product such as eggs which we have seen increased very materially. The increases could have happened in other things if there had been a maximum food production program.

I wish to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if that is not where he still stands?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman who is one of the outstanding agricultural leaders in the United States. I have not changed my views. If we produce an abundance we shall be amply able to take care of all the people to whom commitments are made and we would not need many O. P. A. regulations.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I have just been wondering whether the investigation contemplated by the gentleman would be broad enough to cover inquiries concerning the allocation of farm machinery or steel for the manufacture of farm machinery.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If my resolution is passed it will be broad enough, because I raise the question in it as to the reasons for the shortages.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that if the investigation is to be made it should be made by the gentleman's committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I hope the Committee on Agriculture will play

an important part in it. I do not know whether we are going to get it or not.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota in order that he may answer some questions of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I did not quite understand the gentleman's statement with reference to the percentage of meats in New York that went to the black market.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have it from official sources that more than 90 percent of the beef and poultry in New York City goes into the black market.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And what is being done to stop that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have provided ample funds for the O. P. A., and they have a large enforcement staff. Some cases have been begun against black-market operators, some of the small ones; but, by and large, the black market is flourishing and increasing in its operations and is getting worse and worse every day.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. One other question on the same point. The gentleman is a very able member of the Committee on Agriculture and I observe that he is familiar with the operations of agriculture and its products. What is the estimate as to what part of the beef and pork of the United States go into the black market? What percentage the country over?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is pretty hard to answer that question. It depends on whether one lives in an area where the supply is produced. There is less in the black market in those areas. But when it comes to the larger consuming areas like New York and Boston and some of these other places where they have to ship in most of the food, the gentleman will find that the black market is flourishing to a large extent, and very little is being done about it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is the black market growing?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The black market is growing by leaps and bounds. Right here in Washington about 30 percent of the beef is sold on the black market at from 10 to 12 cents above the ceiling price.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wish to compliment my colleague from Minnesota as the author of this resolution. It is high time we had a check-up on some of these rules which are depreciating our food supply, and also to control some of these agencies that are recklessly sending what we have all over the world. I wish to compliment the gentleman for introducing it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me say to my colleague from Minnesota—and I thank him for what he has said—his district is one of the finest in the country. I know that because I had the

honor of serving a large part of it for 8 years. In his district they produce dairy products, hogs, cattle, corn, and sugar beets. Sugar-beet production has been cut 50 percent in the last 2 years, from 1,200,000 acres down to about 600,000 acres. It is not too late for the administration to change its policy on sugar so we can secure a return of the old acreage which will permit us to get the sugar we need here in the United States and also to meet our commitments.

Here is the issue for Congress to promptly settle. Shall we encourage the production of an abundance of food with proper distribution to take care of the needs of our armed forces, civilian requirements, and other commitments, or shall we permit the continuation of policies that now threatens serious food shortages and a break down of both production and distribution machinery? I say, the time has come for a change in policies, and it is up to the House to investigate and take quick action to force needed changes in food policies as a part of our effort to win the war, maintain civilian economy, and meet our commitments.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill provides less money for agriculture than has been provided by any annual agricultural appropriation bill for many years. It is the ultimate in a continuous and progressive reduction in agricultural appropriations and expenditures in the United States. In 1940 we appropriated in round figures one and a fifth billion dollars in the annual bill. In this bill we provide for the coming fiscal year less than half of that amount.

From a reading of the report on this bill you may get the impression that a slightly larger amount is recommended for appropriation this year than last. But when you take into consideration the fact that there is included in this bill \$25,000,000 for G. I. loans, which is not strictly an agricultural expenditure but an expenditure for all American citizens, without regard to section or industry, it will be noted there is provided in this bill the lowest amount for agricultural purposes that has been provided by any annual bill for many years.

Likewise there is a marked decline in the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture during the last year. The total number of employees in the Department of Agriculture on June 30, 1943, was 108,000, while the number on January 31, 1945, was 72,000, a decline in the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture in time of war of approximately 36,000.

But as the expenditures of the Federal Government for the Department of Agriculture decreased, production on American farm steadily increased, with the result that we have broken each year the farm production record of the preceding year, and have produced in the year 1944, just tabulated, the greatest volume of food and fiber ever grown at any time in any land in the history of the world. For example, the following table indicates the progressive increase in volume of production since 1909:

Volume of agricultural production in the United States, 1909 to 1944

[Index 1935-39=100]

Year	Total food products	Total agricultural products ¹
1909.....	76	79
1910.....	75	79
1911.....	78	83
1912.....	80	85
1913.....	78	81
1914.....	81	86
1915.....	84	86
1916.....	81	83
1917.....	82	86
1918.....	90	90
1919.....	90	91
1920.....	87	92
1921.....	84	83
1922.....	92	91
1923.....	95	94
1924.....	97	98
1925.....	93	97
1926.....	97	100
1927.....	97	98
1928.....	100	102
1929.....	97	99
1930.....	98	98
1931.....	100	102
1932.....	96	95
1933.....	97	96
1934.....	100	93
1935.....	93	91
1936.....	97	94
1937.....	101	103
1938.....	103	103
1939.....	106	103
1940.....	111	110
1941.....	115	113
1942.....	125	124
1943.....	132	123
1944.....	137	133

¹ Includes in addition other feed grains, hay, cotton, tobacco, hops, soybeans, flaxseed, wool, and mohair.

² Preliminary.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, The National Food Situation, October 1942 and January 1945.

It will be observed that production increased from an index number of 79 in 1909 to 133 in 1944—the record farm production of all time.

We have not only exceeded our record in the production of all agricultural products and the production of food, but we have fed the American people better than they or any other people have ever been fed before—both in quantity and variety of diet.

And some people who have been feeling sorry for themselves when they could not get just what they wanted at the store or butcher shop may be surprised to learn that we have fed the American people more generously and adequately throughout every year of the war than in any year of peace and prosperity. Here is the table submitted by the Department of Agriculture and found on page 82 of the hearings:

Estimated per capita civilian supplies for the major food groups for specified periods

[Pounds per capita, by calendar year, retail weight]

	Calendar years				
	1935-39	1941	1942	1943	1944 ¹
Dairy products ²	437	468	491	516	522
Dry beans, peas, and nuts.....	14.1	14.4	16.7	17.6	17.9
Tomatoes and citrus fruit.....	84	97	98	101	103
Leafy green and yellow vegetables.....	90	92	104	105	109
Other vegetables and fruits.....	212	226	207	185	207
Eggs.....	36.1	37.7	37.7	41.2	41.7
Meat, poultry, and fish ³	132	147	146	150	151
Grains.....	200	197	202	207	209

¹ Preliminary.

² Milk-solids-non-fat equivalent basis; excludes butter.

³ Excludes bacon and salt pork.

Preliminary estimates for 1945, based on assumption that the war will continue, give: dairy products, 528; dry beans, peas, and nuts, 17.4; tomatoes and citrus fruits, 101; leafy, green, and yellow vegetables, 104; other vegetables and fruits, 211; eggs, 43; meat, poultry, and fish, 133; and grains, 205. Of course, if the German war ends during the year these estimates will be greatly increased. So it is evident that those who complain about the war diet of the American people are complaining about a diet vastly better in quantity and quality than any which the American people have ever enjoyed in time of peace.

For example, the highest average consumption of meat, widely discussed in the press this morning, the highest average consumption of meat by the American people in any year prior to the war was 132 pounds per person per year. In 1944 the amount was 151 pounds per person. Even if both wars continue through 1945, which no one anticipates, the yearly ration per person will still be higher than it was before the war. During the past year, when every other participating nation has been rationed to a substandard diet, the American farmer has been delivering to the people of the United States, through legitimate channels, not taking into consideration any additional amount which may have been channeled through black markets, 151 pounds of meat per capita, the greatest amount ever consumed by the American people in any year of their history.

As far as our soldiers are concerned, of course we provide the best and the most of everything for our fighting men. In time of peace he was consuming an average of 132 pounds of meat per year. He is now consuming in the American Army an average of 292 pounds of meat per year, the very best quality of meat that is to be obtained.

When the history of this war is written and the contribution by the farmers of America to victory is evaluated, they will have contributed, by any standard—hours of work per day, days on the job, volume of production per farm, per acre, or per man—as much as any other industry, either by class or by individuals, not only to win the war but throughout the war to preserve at home our normal standard of living. And he has sold the products of his toil to the consumer at the lowest comparable price. In that respect he has rendered a far greater service than the middleman. Here are some of the figures:

Hogs and pork products

	1918	1943
Market price for live hogs—	\$17.30	\$13.50
Retail prices:		
Pork roast.....	.22	.35
Pork tenderloin.....	.25	.45
Pork chops.....	.35	.41
Picnic hams.....	.25	.31
Sugar-cured hams.....	.30	.35

Sheep, veal calves, and lambs

Market price for live sheep, veal calves, and lambs (average at least 2 cents lower in 1943 than in 1918).

	1918	1943
Retail prices:		
Shoulder of mutton.....	\$0.18	\$0.30
Leg of lamb.....	.22	.38
Lamb chops.....	.20	.45
Breast of veal.....	.12½	.20

Sheep, veal calves, and lambs—Continued

Retail prices—Continued	1918	1943
Veal chops.....	\$0.20	\$0.40
Leg of veal.....	.22	.38
Veal cutlets.....	.15	.45

Wheat and bakery products

Market price for No. 1 dark northern wheat.....	1918	1943
	\$2.25	\$1.53¾
Retail prices:		
Bread (large loaf).....	.07	.12-.14
Raised doughnuts (dozen).....	.14	.25

The Government is now paying a subsidy on wheat in order to prevent the price of a loaf of bread from going up 1 cent per loaf. The extent of the imposition on the consumer and the United States Treasury which must take this subsidy out of the taxpayer, is evident when you remember that the total cost of the flour in a pound loaf of bread is only a little over 2 cents.

In view of the fact that the farmer has provided so bountifully for the table of the American people and their allies and so adequately for the diet of our armed forces, and at the lowest wage and lowest price of any worker or industry in the Nation, it would be presumed that his record-breaking achievements would meet with the warm appreciation of the people and the Nation he has so faithfully served. But too frequently the contrary has been true. Tables have been published to leave the impression that the farmer is reaping vast profits and in effect profiteering on his customers. Here is a typical excerpt:

A comparison of commodity prices

Wheat:		
December 1932.....per bushel..		\$0.42
December 1944.....do.....		1.63
Cotton:		
December 1932.....per pound..		.0572
December 1944.....do.....		.2138
Hogs:		
December 1932...per 100 pounds..		3.04
December 1944.....do.....		14.14

A more inequitable and unscientific system of comparison could not be devised. Rather than go back to the depth of the depression and pick out the lowest price the farmer ever received why not go back to 1919 when everybody was prosperous and everybody was receiving the highest wage for his labor and the highest price for his products ever paid up to that time. For the 1932 figures let us substitute the 1919 figures. And that is comparable because it was a year of peak industrial prices and wages as well as agricultural prices and wages.

In 1920, wheat was \$2.40 a bushel. Today it is \$1.63. The price of everything else has gone up 200 percent. Wheat has gone down.

In 1919, cotton was selling at 35 cents a pound. Today it is selling for 21 cents.

Hogs in 1919, sold as high as \$24.50. Today, they are selling at \$14.70.

In short, farm prices today are just about half what they were in 1919 while industrial wages and prices are more than twice what they were at that time. The year 1919 may have been an inflation year. But if it was, industrial wages and prices stayed at inflation and are today more than twice above. Only farm prices were deflated. And the farmer is today working longer hours and delivering at a higher rate of production

per capita without adequate machinery than any other businessman in America.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to complete my statement, and then I will be glad to yield.

But in this world conflict we have not had to wait until the close of the war to witness the decline of farm prices. Already agricultural products are dropping. The price of cattle has fallen. The price of hogs has dropped. The price of corn is lower. The total value of all livestock, including poultry, declined 27 percent in 1944 alone, while the price of every other commodity has increased.

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

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. While the price of every service and commodity in the United States has increased during this war, farm prices alone have declined during the war.

Now, the farmer is not complaining. He accepts with equanimity the disproportionate share of the national income remaining after the other industries have taken the lion's share. But he is confronted today by a situation which challenges the closest attention. Notwithstanding the scareheads in the morning newspapers on the scarcity of food, there is on hand today the greatest supply of foodstuffs in the history of the world. If we did not produce a single grain of wheat we have enough wheat on hand to last 2 years, and the report received just yesterday is to the effect that we have another huge crop of wheat coming on this season. Present indications that it will be a banner crop and we have no place to put it.

There is so much corn that the price in my home community has dropped from \$1.08 last fall to 87 cents this week. There are between eleven and twelve million bales of cotton hanging over the market right now, with the prospect of the keenest competition in the post-war market, with rayon, nylon, plastics, and other synthetic fabrics.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield a little later.

Mr. GRANGER. I just want to say there are 12,000,000 cattle that the gentleman should speak about.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On January 1, 1945, there were 81,760,000 cattle in the United States. That breaks every record for cattle on hand except for 2 years, 1942 and 1943, and it is only 2 percent behind 1942. We have cattle, and to spare. And, incidentally, there is on hand today in reserve six times the amount of wool normally in storage.

To complicate the situation, the armed forces have on hand enough staple foods to last them practically a year. And they are still buying today more feverishly than ever before. The morning paper reports that Canada is seeking a market for a huge supply of surplus meat. And its graneries are bulging with wheat for which transportation can not be secured. We have it from an

authoritative source that England has enough food stock-piled to last until January 1, 1946, even at the reduced lend-lease quotas now in contemplation. Every warehouse is filled. All pipe lines are loaded to capacity and all cars and ships are full. The corn stored by Joseph in Egypt pales into insignificance when compared to the amount of food-stuffs that are stored today ready for immediate consumption.

Now, the Army, of course, is justified in maintaining these huge stores because it is a fundamental axiom of military science that always you must proceed as if the war being waged would last indefinitely.

But we know, and everyone knows, that the end of the European war is rapidly approaching; that it cannot under any circumstances last longer than approximately 3 months. While we as good soldiers must continue to pile up these vast stores both on this side and on the other side with the view of the war's continuing through 1946 and 1947 we know that when the German war ends there will be an immediate drop in the purchase of agricultural products.

We are told that we must provide surplus food in order to feed not only our own armies and the armies of our allies, but also the destitute people in liberated countries. It now develops that the need for support of destitute peoples in Europe has been greatly overestimated. The Army, the Navy, the lend-lease authorities and U. N. R. R. A., all acting independently have submitted overlapping estimates. Russia has redeemed all of her agricultural lands. The Ukraine, the breadbasket of the Soviet Republic, with its great communal farms will be under cultivation this season and will be operated by labor forces supplemented by German prisoners of war now in Russian concentration camps.

France has suffered no great agricultural devastation; practically all French farms are intact. The Germans kept them so because they were consuming the major share of their products themselves. There is in many parts of France today actual surpluses of foods. The shortage in portions of France is due not to lack of food in France as a whole but to difficulties of transportation. In no country in Europe will it be necessary to provide food beyond the first crop year. That means that when this war is over we will have on hand such a surplus of food as never seen before.

Experience is a great teacher. After the last war when we had a small amount of surplus food on hand, but insignificant as compared with the amount of supplies which are now in reserve. We had no alternative than to throw it on the market. You will remember how depots were established in every city in which the Government sold food. Billy Sunday had just completed a series of meetings down here in a tabernacle built near Union Station. In that building the Government set up a retail store and sold food to everybody. The effect upon prices was catastrophic. When you have so much more on hand this time, what is going to be the effect when that vast

amount of food is turned loose upon the market?

Mr. Chairman, it must be remembered if we furnish food abroad, it is a case of giving it away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, never has there been such devastation as exists today in Europe. Hardly a city left standing, one out of every five houses in England destroyed; the destruction in Germany is even greater. All exchange is gone, all wealth has been burned up in the holocaust of war. They have nothing with which to pay for anything that we send them. Any exportation of food to Europe in the post-war period will be purely on a free, gratis basis. In other words, we are going to give it to them. So here is the proposition, Mr. Chairman: When we give our food and cotton to the destitute people of Europe, who is going to give it? Is the American farmer going to be forced to give it through curtailment of his prices, as after the last war, or is the Government to give it away and pay the producer a fair price? Is the laborer worthy of his hire?

That is a fallacy. In 1920 wages instead of going down went higher and agricultural products went to the bottom of the well. On the other hand, remember that the rest of this country is dependent upon the buying power of the farmer just as much as he is dependent upon the buying power of the rest of the country.

We made that mistake in 1920. Everybody stayed up except the farmer, and he went to perdition. Then in contravention of this idea that all you have to do is to keep up the rest of the country, the rest of country followed him to the very depths. They went along. So you really are not taking care of the farmer alone in this post-war period if you maintain his buying power; you are maintaining the prosperity of the entire country. We are all in the same boat. We have to sink or swim together.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as this committee came to the consideration of this bill making agricultural appropriations for the next fiscal year of necessity we had to have before us a twofold problem. First, in view of the financial condition of the Nation, with a national debt which will reach the staggering total of \$300,000,000,000 sometime soon, the vast expenditures to meet the necessities of war, it was incumbent on us as Members of Congress to keep conscious of the fact that reductions should be made where possible, but not where such reductions would jeopardize the operations of the Department and its program of production. We had the further duty of protecting so far as we could our great agricultural resources which have contributed so much toward the winning of this war and the maintenance of our high standard of living in peacetime.

While this bill does not reflect my own views in many particulars, one has only to read the hearings to realize that this committee has taken its duty seriously and has given many hours of study and work in an effort to report a bill which would have the support of all members of the committee and of the country. It is hard to realize the great contributions to the welfare of the Nation which have been made by the Department of Agriculture under programs initiated by this Congress. Frequently we accept the benefits of these programs without realizing that back of such benefits is the vision of men in the Department and Members of Congress who have put through legislation providing for such programs.

In the field of research the Department has released during the last year 43 new varieties of crop plants, bred for improved resistance to disease, heat, drought, or cold. Tests with DDT have shown wonderful possibilities in the control of injurious insects. The Cotton Ginning Laboratory at Stoneville, Miss., has designed a press for gin use that presses cotton to the same density as produced by the big compresses making it possible to load 130 bales in a freight car which formerly carried only 80, and are continuing their test of cotton fiber which in my judgment show it to be better than substitutes now being used in many fields. There have been tremendous improvements in corn hybrids, greatly increasing production. These are merely samples of the great advances made possible by research of the Department of Agriculture. In my own area of Mississippi through the last 10 or 15 years due to the use of improved cotton seed of an early maturing type we have been able to produce a crop early enough to largely miss the ravages of the boll weevil. Many of our farmers accept this as a natural occurrence and I am afraid without full appreciation of the fact that back of such development there was continuous experimentation on the part of the Department of Agriculture which has brought about this improvement and saved to my section alone many millions of dollars. This Department has done wonderful work in the control of diseases of animals and of plant life and in the prevention of diseases in those fields. Time does not permit me to go into the many phases of this program.

Most Members of Congress send out bulletin lists with many hundreds of bulletins which are available to farmers. These bulletins if studied and the information contained therein put to use will result in great benefit to our Nation. Back of each of these pamphlets is the experimentation, research, and practical experience of the Department of Agriculture which has proved the correctness of the information contained in such bulletin. I feel that these bulletins are not fully appreciated by the farmers of America and have urged the Department of Agriculture to devote further time and study in conveying to the people the knowledge that this source of information is available and if used will result in tremendous advances in agriculture. In my judgment it is better to have one development actually put to practice and

use than to have 10 discoveries, none of which are put into practice because of the failure to sell the farmers on such improvement. I realize this is a difficult problem. There may be those in the Department who think that when they make such information available to the farmers they have done their part and if the farmer does not make use of it that is his fault. This is the wrong attitude in my judgment because with the tremendous labor shortage, the number of hours which the average farmer must put into his work, he has little time to think along the lines of improvement and in trying out new practices during the present emergency. This is a great field for study on the part of the Department in an effort to see that the information which they have obtained and the new practices which they have proven to be of value are fully utilized by farmers.

The American farmers have certainly contributed their part to winning the war. They have been faced with a shortage of labor, a shortage of machinery, with greatly increased demands for production. Not only did the farmers of the Nation have these problems with which to contend but was forced to accept subsidies in order to meet production costs in many instances. They believed as I do, that they were entitled to a fair price in the market place for their products. Instead of this they have had price ceilings so low as to force them to accept subsidies.

The dairy industry particularly in my area has been tied down by price ceilings, based on prices established when this industry was a side line incident to farming. With a subsidy, they have found the going tough. I am hopeful that some relief may be obtained for these producers.

Not only have our farmers taken these problems and handicaps in stride but they have worked, without limit on hours put in to sustain this Nation in the time of its need. They have contributed untold quantities of foodstuff to our allies and thereby have made added contributions. In 1943 our farmers produced 32 percent more foodstuffs than ever before in history; in 1944 an additional 5 percent. Our farmers have answered the challenge. It is the attitude of this committee that much of this ability to show production is to a large extent a direct result of the soil-conservation practices and programs which have been in effect for a number of years. This gave us many thousands of acres of rich soil in the beginning of the war. With wartime demands so great much of this soil has been used to a greater extent than is consistent with good and long-time conservation practices. It is my personal belief that wartime demands have resulted in "cashing in" much of our great natural resources of this kind. Of course that is true also in other fields. We have greatly depleted our oil supply. This is irreplaceable. At the same time we have greatly depleted our rich soils and our forests. These last two can be replaced under a sympathetic and constructive program. We have made an effort in this bill to carry on the soil conservation service and program, be-

lieving that by so doing we are keeping at a minimum the depletion of this great natural resource under wartime needs. This is the capital of our farmers and of our Nation. If the war forces the liquidation of a part of this, we should restore such fertility in fairness both to the farmers and to the Nation.

This committee has given much attention to forestry and the urgent need of our Nation to conserve our great forests. This natural resource has suffered greatly during this emergency. Many of us in the committee believe, in line with many of our colleagues who appeared before the committee, that this resource should be restored, and that much attention should be given to the growth of new trees and of new forests so as to fully utilize many lands in the Nation which have not heretofore been fully productive. In my own section there are many thousands of acres which could easily be turned to the growth of trees. I believe that the expansion of the experimental forests and further experimentation with forest products is a step that should be taken by this Nation. Private landowners and companies handling forest products recognizing that timber is becoming scarce, are spending millions of dollars in this field. Most of the States of our Nation are now on a sound financial basis and they, too, are vitally interested in forestry, in the conservation of our present forests, and in the further expansion of work in that field so as to restore this great natural resource, the depletion of which has been so necessary during the war. Unfortunately the request on the part of the persons interested in the expansion of this program in the Southeastern States came too late to have such request considered by the Department and was not presented on a national basis.

It is my belief that it would have been wise to have gone ahead with such experimentation in those areas prior to the setting up of a program on a national basis. I certainly know that in those areas we have the urgent need for such expansion. While this committee did not take appropriate action to expand this work in that area we have requested the Department of Agriculture to make a study of this problem on a national basis so as to include the problems of the various sections of the country and to have it ready for presentation at the next meeting of this committee. I feel that members of this committee who could not see the propriety of this expansion in view of its limited scope and the method of preparation are sold on the necessity for such enlarged program on a Nation-wide basis and I believe the Members of Congress will fully appreciate the need to restore so far as we can these millions of acres of forest lands to full production, appreciating fully the contributions which forestry has made to the great advancement of our Nation. In so doing we are contributing to the whole Nation. In my own section there are many, many acres of thin land which cannot be operated successfully in the usual farm crops. They are ideal, however, for timber growing. Here again the farmer has not realized that the best way for him to be successful is to realize from every

acre of his ground such production as it will produce. In some sections of my State the farmers are having to buy coal because they do not have trees and firewood. Most of such farms have numbers of acres which could be adapted to the growing of trees and at least make such farm self-supporting with regard to timber needs. Experimental forests in that area so that the farmers of the section could see what could be done by planting and harvesting trees as a crop would mean much on selling the people, and once they were sold they would carry this program on for their own benefit and for the benefit of the whole country.

This committee has recognized the needs of other agencies connected with the welfare, well-being, and progress of our farm population. With regard to the Rural Electrification Administration, which has meant much toward keeping our farmers satisfied to stay on the farm, which has resulted in greater conveniences, and has enabled them to keep up the great production in wartime with less labor than heretofore, the committee did not see fit to grant all the increase requested by this agency because it was advised that material and equipment were not available for such expansion. I know it is the attitude of the committee, however, that at any time the R. E. A. can fully utilize the funds which are here appropriated, that upon another request being made the committee will certainly be sympathetic with such request, having full confidence in the value of such expansion and great hopes that it will reach the vast majority of the farmers of the country.

In this bill we have appropriated many dollars toward agriculture and toward this agency which has done so much to improve agriculture and those engaged therein. In so doing we have tried to keep conscious of the demands on the Federal Treasury and of the financial condition of the Nation. We do believe, however, that the high standard of living which this Nation has enjoyed can be largely attributed to the great natural resources with which we have been blessed. We feel that the demands of war, however, have seriously depleted these resources and that the Nation owes it to itself to do everything within reason to keep such drain on our natural resources at a minimum, and insofar as possible to restore and maintain for future generations rich soil, fine forests as well as excellent livestock, and a contented and happy farming population, believing that by so doing we are better enabling the Nation to continue to enjoy the high standard of living with which it has been blessed throughout its history. By leaving these great resources intact for coming generations we aid them in meeting the great financial problems which must follow from our huge expenditures in fighting this war on all the fronts of the world.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the chairman of our committee has covered the matters contained in this bill item by item, I have not attempted to do so. I have tried to relate the needs for supporting this Department together with the benefits which flow to our people and Nation from its programs.

Mr. FLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that it was certainly a pleasure to work on this particular subcommittee under the chairmanship of such a fine chairman as we have in the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, and in collaboration with the other five gentlemen of that committee. I believe, everything considered, that we have done as good a job as the average subcommittee could do. The ramifications of the structure of our Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration are immense. But there are certain points that I would like to bring out and discuss rather frankly, and with that in view I intend to take about 15 minutes of your time. Before doing so, may I commend the work of Mr. Arthur Orr, our subcommittee clerk, who was a very helpful assistant in the big job of preparing this bill for action here today.

It was my thought in demanding of certain officials of the Government that they release to us figures concerning the exportation of farm machinery—it was my thought, I repeat, that Congress should be entitled to such information, in view of the fact that we hear on every hand that there is a food shortage. The particular gentleman who appeared before us from the Foreign Economics Administration was a little hesitant about giving us this information but the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, told him, and rightly so, that it would be up to the subcommittee, and eventually up to the full Committee on Appropriations, to say whether or not the release of this information should be considered confidential and whether or not the Congress should make available unto itself that particular information concerning the exportation of farm machinery. The full committee yesterday morning decided that it could not harm the war effort in any possible way by making this information public and agreed to my motion that such should be done. As a result of this decision of the Appropriations Committee you will find that particular information in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A1317.

May I speak more or less from the viewpoint of a man who has farmed practically his entire life? It is from the viewpoint of a man who urged a liberal appropriation for A. A. A. in this bill. The records of the subcommittee will show that I personally moved to raise the appropriation for A. A. A. up to \$300,000,000 and that I moved to reinstate the seed program in this bill. The record will show my approval of \$60,000,000 in loaning power for R. E. A. and my support of the great number of useful bureaus in our Department of Agriculture, especially the great fundamental research divisions.

From the viewpoint of one of the few Members of the Congress who have come direct from the farm to Congress, I am searching this exportation of farm machinery report, trying to determine just why our Uncle Sam should give to neighboring nations, not engaged in war,

tractors and farm implements by the thousands, when our own farmers need them so badly. From that viewpoint, I want to look into this problem of the exportation of farm machinery, not as it affects our fighting allies, the Russians and the British and others, but I cannot understand when examining this report just why Congress should countenance the sending out of this country, when we need farm machinery as badly as we do, farm machinery to the South American republics and Mexico. I perhaps can stretch my point of view when it comes to Brazil. Brazil actually has men fighting over there in Italy alongside the Thirty-fourth Division, many of whom are men from my own district and who have been on that front line for over 400 days without intermission. But let us look into this report and may I quote from it to you Members of Congress?

We find, for instance, that out of the 41,037 farm tractors exported to other countries of the world in 1944, and that represents quite a tidy little chunk of our production, 16.6 percent in fact, 1,840 went to Mexico, 193 to Chile, 265 to Colombia, 363 to Venezuela, 169 to Peru, 111 to Uruguay, and so on.

Personally, from the viewpoint of a man representing what is perhaps the most exclusively agricultural district in America, I protest against sending any of those precious farm tractors out of this Nation at a time like this to non-combatant nations of which it certainly cannot be said that this must be done because of furthering the war effort; and I shall continue to protest as long as this procedure is followed. Might I inquire why should Canada, whose food situation is not grave, receive 21,349 farm tractors in 1944?

For the last 2 years I have been trying to get a disk-harrow for my farm, just an ordinary tractor disk. When I went to my dealer again this last fall and asked him what was the possibility of getting that particular disk for this coming spring, that implement I needed this past 2 years and could not get, he said to me, "Well, Carl, I do not know how many requests for disks I have had this year, something like 35. I got 1 last year, and you are still fifth on the list."

In other words, at the rate my home dealer was able to obtain that particular type of farm machinery that I need so badly to farm that land, it will be 5 years before my turn comes to secure that particular disk. Now, let us quote again from this report as to the number of these machines sent to some of our neighboring countries.

When I see in this report that our kind and beneficent Government through the bureaucrats operating certain divisions has seen fit to send 1,299 harrows, for instance, to Brazil, 662 to the Dominican Republic, 5,510 to Mexico, 294 to Chile, 309 to Venezuela, 250 to Colombia, and ad infinitum, I begin to see why my dealer does not have that piece of machinery available for sale to farmers here in the old United States of America. Also, I begin to wonder if we are not far too generous with our substance in that line and many others. When I think of the farmers back home

who are working long hours today to try to produce as much food as they possibly can produce; when I see these farmers writing me as they have protesting against the taking away from them of the only help they have on the farm; when I see a man 79 years of age on a farm in my particular congressional district from whom the draft has threatened to take his only help on his nearly 400 acres of land; when I see the necessary farm labor stripped from our farms in violation of the expressed law of the land which we had just this week to re-express for the benefit of selective-service officials, I think it is time for Congress to get up on its hind legs and assert itself and really find out whether our laws are to be made by Congress or whether the bureaucrats in this teeming bureaucracy shall supersede us in that duty.

Seven thousand eight hundred and sixty-five grain drills were exported last year, 17,520 cultivators, 4,112 combines, 2,254 binders, 13,543 harrows, and 39,041 plows. This will perhaps explain to a good many farmers just why they cannot secure the implements they need. Why should not the farmers in the United States obtain much of this farm machinery instead of the South American nations being the recipients? The only answer that can be made to this question now is that irresponsible persons in our Government are too lavish with our substance and know not what they do.

We hear much talk about a food shortage. On September 23, 1943, I spoke to this House and predicted a coming food shortage if the labor was drained from our farms and if farm machinery was not made more plentiful. This food shortage is a fact today simply because the men and machinery are not there to work the farms and simply because there are not enough men of practical experience in agriculture, who actually know agriculture, taking part in this great Government of ours and making decisions which affect food production throughout America.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], one of the best-versed men in agriculture in the House.

Mr. JENKINS. In the study made by the gentleman, has he discovered, or has any evidence been brought to his attention, as to whether or not there is favoritism in the distribution of farm implements in this country? I will cite an instance in my own district. I have never been able to run it down. I do not want to accuse anybody unjustly. But that was to me a very glaring instance of favoritism if I have the facts right. I would like to know if the gentleman is acquainted with any such facts.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Frankly, none such have come to my knowledge, I am glad to say. I have much confidence in these boards, but they simply have not been able to allocate machinery when such was not available to the dealers.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESSESS of Indiana. I would like to say to the gentleman from Minnesota, as well as to the gentleman from Ohio, that last year it was necessary for this House to vote in an amendment to the agriculture appropriation bill deducting the per diem allowance for certain Agriculture employees who are denying to the farmers their necessary equipment because they refused to join in a certain program of the Agriculture Department.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to close this part of my address by simply reiterating, that while I am perfectly willing to see the exportation of anything we have to any of our allies where our products will do some good in winning the war, I object to sending our substance, by lend-lease, U. N. R. A., or in any manner to those non-combatant countries that really have done nothing definite to aid us in winning this war. I refer to the bulk of South American countries. I object to sending farm machinery down there that could far better be utilized in your district and my district for the further production of food which we know we must have to win this war and secure a lasting peace. Uncle Sam's resources are not unlimited, as some star-gazers would have us believe.

Now, let me go into another subject, please. There came to my attention during the hearings that \$25,000,000 was placed in this particular bill in the farm tenancy section for the purpose of giving G. I. veterans the opportunity to make loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act. Here we have the curious situation where, under our basic G. I. bill as you all know we have authorized loans which are to be made to veterans for 20 years at 4 percent. I believe we are doing something here, however, that will mess up the whole works by putting into this appropriation bill an entirely different provision, which is available to only a limited number of veterans, those who can be covered by this \$25,000,000, 40-year money at 3 percent. I do not believe Congress had in mind that that should be done. I fear there will be a lot of hard feeling. In line with that thinking, I agreed to have my name included as one of the sponsors of the Cunningham bill which was dropped into the House hopper the other day, which simply amends the G. I. bill so that each and every one of these veterans shall have the right to have this 40-year money at 3 percent rather than just giving a few of them under this particular appropriation bill that right.

I have investigated certain farms over which the Farm Security has had administrative supervision and which they have aided farmers in reestablishing themselves. I know that five out of those six particular farms that were personally investigated were coming along fine and making wonderful progress for their owners. The other was a failure. But to me this is a very good percentage and very worth while.

Under the new Farm Security Administration there is a very evident improvement in this great help to farmers who

have been forced to seek this aid, as their credit was no good at the local banks.

With that part of the work of Farm Security I am in wholehearted sympathy. Let us keep Farm Security in that field, and recognize that the problems in that field are in no way similar to the problems facing the G. I. veteran who wants his own home and farm. Let us divide these and not mix them up by forcing the G. I.'s to accept the necessarily strict provisions of the farm-tenancy program. Congress did not intend that the G. I. loans and the farm-tenancy program should become intermingled. Today it has, and I fear that both programs—both worthy—will become unmanageable as a result. Frankly, I think the Farm Security today is doing a good in their particular field of helping farmers who cannot get commercial credit elsewhere. But, Mr. Chairman, I am fearful of what is being done today. I do not like it. I expressed myself openly in the committee. I do not like to see the veterans of this Nation put in the same category as Farm Security clients, and under the same regulations as Farm Security clients, in order to get these farm loans that you and I in Congress decreed the veterans should have the right to get. When we think about Farm Security and farm tenancy we think about farmers who have been unable, perhaps from no fault of their own, to carry their own financial burden. Personally, I am glad to vote for the money necessary to help them, and their record of repayment the past few years has been a splendid one. When, however, I think of the G. I. veterans—these boys coming home—I am afraid that the psychology of those whose job it is to select and supervise the farmers under the Jones-Bankhead Act and the farms they purchase is not the sort of psychology that you and I want applied to the G. I. veterans coming home. Remember that perhaps \$10,000,000,000 in loans and 2,000,000 borrowers for homes and farms may be the size of the veteran loan business before this law is fully utilized. I call your particular attention to the fact that the \$25,000,000 here is allocated specifically for veterans. This is the opening wedge for great sums to follow, and I cannot, in justice to either the Farm Security, farm tenancy, or our veterans, see the wisdom of this course of action. When we come to that portion of the bill I intend to move to strike it out of the bill, with the viewpoint in mind that we must pass better legislation for the veterans—with the viewpoint in mind that we cannot permit the handling of these loans by people who are not trained for that work and by people who do not have the proper perspective to which our veterans are entitled. Clearly, the Veterans' Administration should place the control of this great farm-buying program in the hands of elected, not appointive, officials in every county in our land. Veterans' organizations should give their counsel to these nonpartisan boards.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my neighbor from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has had to say about the operation of the Farm Security Administration in connection with the veterans. In South Dakota the Farm Security Administration has done a rather commendable job in its work. As a Republican, I can say they have been free from the political criticisms which I have heard in some of the other States. They have attempted to do a good, business-like piece of work in a public spirited manner; but I agree with the gentleman that when it comes to making this money available to the veterans, that might more properly fall within the purview of the Veterans' Administration than the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Of course the gentleman knows that the Veterans' Administration does have the right to allocate the Farm Security and the Farm Tenancy this particular provision of the G. I. bill. The thing is entirely according to law but I feel that Congress should at once see to it that the proper organization is in charge of it. The Veterans' Administration has dodged its responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. I think everything is perfectly legal, but I agree with the gentleman about the psychology of the Farm Security Administration, which is to deal with a relief program, in connection with farmers who need the helping hand of Government to set them on their feet.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am glad to hear that the gentleman agrees with me as to just how far we should permit Farm Security and Farm Tenancy to proceed. I am friendly to both.

Mr. MUNDT. That is the reason I joined with the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], in sponsoring this new bill to treat the veteran as he should be, under the G. I. bill of rights, to give him equity rather than relief.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Give him the right to have 40-year money, if he needs it, at 3-percent interest, the same right accorded others under the Bankhead-Jones bill. That is the least we can do for these men who are fighting for this Nation.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. And he should be a mighty good risk because he is at the proper age to assume a long-term indebtedness.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has consumed 16 minutes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to talk about our national forests. I realize that this subject is something like the weather and the national debt—everyone talks about them but few really try to do anything about them.

There is no question but what our national forests are being depleted at a dangerous rate. This fact is definitely of national interest.

Of the total landed area of this great Nation of ours, one-third is said to be best suited for the growing of trees; 49 percent is best suited for farming and livestock; while the remaining 18 percent consists of mountains and deserts.

In the bill before you this afternoon we feel that adequate provisions have been made for the current year and that our remaining forests will be protected to the limit of presently available men and materials. They will be protected from the ravages of fire. The pest invasions will be controlled and the part that research in forest products has been playing in our military efforts will be continued.

However, many on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations felt that the time was here to take a full and factual look at the entire situation as it affects our national forests and to present some of our reactions.

We feel that a complete and adequate program can no longer be avoided, and many of us hope that next year will see the beginning of a Nation-wide program that will meet the true seriousness of the situation as it affects our national forests.

To anyone who has seen recent pictures of our invasions on either front must come the realization of the tremendous part that American forests are playing in this global war.

Practically every piece of supply that goes to the front is boxed, crated, or cased in wood. In this modern warfare it does indeed take lumber also to win.

We are now arriving at a national awakening of what this inroad on our existing forests means in terms of our national economy and our future security. Within this Union there are 32 forest States and the lumber which is helping to win this war is drawn from each of these 32 States.

Something of an appreciation of what we are taking from our forests can be gathered from the following record of the total lumber produced from our forests in the last 7 years. In 1938 we produced 21,600,000,000 board feet of lumber; in 1939, 24,900,000,000 board feet; in 1940, 38,900,000,000 board feet; in 1941, 33,400,000,000 board feet; in 1942 our production rose to 36,300,000,000 board feet; in 1943 we produced 34,300,000,000 board feet; and for the year just passed, 1944, it is estimated that our production was approximately 32,000,000,000 board feet.

This is for lumber only. Other products, such as pulpwood, cordwood, poles, piles, and so forth, taken from the forests of this Nation amounted to better than 40,000,000,000 board feet. It is, I think, most important to call attention to this factor, for lumber is not the only draining upon the forest resources of this Nation.

I think it would be informative if we were to consider 1 year's production—say, that of 1943—in terms of building a board fence around the 17,936 miles of the circumference of this Nation of ours. The lumber produced in 1943, if used to build a solid board wall around this Nation, would have given us a board fence 362 feet high, running along the 3,072 miles that compose the Mexican border,

up the Pacific coast, in and out of peninsulas and isthmuses, for a distance of 2,730 miles, across the northern boundary for a distance of 3,987 miles, down the Atlantic coast for 5,565 miles, and around the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of 3,641 miles. The 40,000,000,000 board feet of poles, piles, and pulpwood would supply plenty of posts to nail the boards to.

It is the war, of course, that has brought us face to face with the fact that we are nearing the end of our virgin stands of timber. We are also nearing an end of an era when we permitted, even encouraged, prodigal cuttings of the Nation's forests.

A nation's resources consist of two types: Those which are exhaustible, which when once exploited cannot be replaced. Our oils and our minerals are prominent in this type. When we utilize such resources, we say we are "mining" them. The forest industry itself admits that for 300 years we have "mined" our forests. By that the industry means that they have depleted the land of all trees and have given all too little thought to the fact that wood is part of plant life and that it is a natural resource that can be renewed. This is the second type of resource.

It grows and takes from the soil only 2 percent of the volume of the wood produced, and that 2 percent can, by wise management, be replaced.

Today our Forest Service and our lumber industry are thinking in terms of this great natural resource in terms of "cropping." For years now, more foresight in the Forest Service and in the lumber industry has been used, and this complex problem given much thought. They realize that it takes from 40 to 200 years to renew this national asset. They realize that the problem of growing a 40- to 200-year "crop" involves long-range financing of a special type, and they realize also that old and obsolete methods of forest-land taxation will have to be modified and modernized if a workable program of reforestation is brought about.

Roughly speaking, the forest lands of the Nation are about 600,000,000 acres. Of this number, 178,000,000 acres—about 10 percent of our total landed area—is given over to the national forests, and these national forests contain one-third of the Nation's remaining timber.

But the war has seen a progressive inroad even into this reserve. In 1939 we cut 1,290,000,000 board feet from the national forests, while in 1944 this figure had more than doubled until we cut three and one-third billion board feet from the national forests.

To put it another way: In 1938 it was estimated that we had 519,000,000,000 cubic feet of standing timber. It has also been estimated that we should have had 653,000,000,000 cubic feet to sustain the cut that occurred in 1941, but that for the long-range view if we are to maintain the national resources of this Nation's forests, the standing timber on one-third of our landed area should never be allowed to drop below 788,000,000,000 cubic feet of standing timber.

Briefly, the problem before the Nation is to develop a program that will progressively, through the years to come, re-

store approximately 300,000,000,000 cubic feet of standing timber. This program should include everyone who can make a contribution.

This problem and this challenge is generally recognized. Already this Congress has taken steps. In 1941 Congress appointed a Joint Committee on Forestry made up of five members of the Senate and House to study and make investigations of the present and prospective situation with respect to the forest land of the United States, its condition, ownership, and management, as it affects a balanced timber budget, watershed protection, flood control, and other commodities and social economic benefits which may be derived from such land.

It should be said, however, that our position has altered in the 3 years since this study was made. Today, perhaps we can profit by another look. During the hearings on this bill which we have before us today, individuals and delegations came to us from all parts of the Nation and were given complete hearings. Without exception they made good presentations.

Your subcommittee realizes the gravity of the present situation and feels the need for a sound and nationally comprehensive program of restoration of an asset that belongs to and concerns every individual of this great Nation.

Briefly, the Forest Service suggests a program along four broad lines:

First. They ask for a further public cooperation aid to the industry and aid to private owners. This public cooperation includes (a) research, (b) forest management and fire and pest control, and (c) greater utilization of the wood from the Nation's forests. At this point, it should be noted that for years only 20 percent to 25 percent of the standing tree was put to useful purposes. Today through research and better management, we are using up to as high as 33 1/3 percent; in the hearings instances were mentioned as high as 40 percent of the standing tree. This in itself is a great saving to the Nation.

Second. The Forest Service suggests that all submarginal forest lands too poor for profitable private ownership be included in Federal reserves.

Third. They suggest the establishment of definite standards for all forest management, cutting, logging, reforestation, and other proper uses of the Nation's forest lands. This is the most troublesome of all of the problems involved in the rebuilding of our forests, since it entails the changes in financing, in taxes, and to some extent—even yet—changes in attitudes on the part of those who hold stewardship over portions of the Nation's timber. However, great progress has been made in this phase in the last 10 to 20 years. Timber owners no longer defend the "mining" of our declining forest stands. Increasingly they realize that wood is a crop.

The fourth broad phase, itself a type of research suggested by the Federal Forest Service, entails the development of methods of salvage for large burns and the slashings which are a part of every lumbering operation. In this regard, one of the most interesting experiments now being conducted by the For-

est Service is that on the Tillamook burn area in Oregon. In this burn there are estimated to be 8,000,000,000 board feet of lumber, and ways and means of avoiding this huge waste are at present being studied.

But, of course, in the broader sense, while the outline of the program may come from the Federal Forest Service, the dismal business of making both ends meet in this country must be the responsibility of you and me. Some way must be found to get the very maximum of return, in the shape of more and better timber, for every dollar appropriated.

A couple of weeks ago this House by its action raised the Federal debt to the world-record dimensions of \$300,000,000,000. It is not my purpose in this discussion to argue as to just who owes whom what, but rather to quote from an editorial in the Evening Star of a week ago in which they said:

For a national liability of \$300,000,000,000, whether we owe it to ourselves or not, is bound to have a profoundly important effect on the economic future of all of us.

Debt tends to weaken credit. The credit of the Federal Government is especially important since only the Federal Government can coin money. The States cannot coin money. Therefore, the national debt affects us as individuals, our local and county governments; it will affect us in our State governments; it will affect our Federal union.

Anything that we do to weaken the financial stability of the Federal Government must necessarily affect those who depend upon a stable medium of currency with which to do business any place in the United States, and inferentially today apparently any place in the world.

And so the members of your Appropriations Committee have somewhat of a conflict of duty here. One is to assist in every way we can to develop and provide for the maximum of Federal participation in a program that will rebuild one of our greatest national assets—the forests of this Nation; and secondly, do all in our power to see that this Nation once again lives within its means, which in the long run is the only way possible for us to maintain our national stability.

There was a time when the bulk of our individuals, the bulk of our county and municipal governments, and practically every one of our State governments was deeply in debt. Today even as we raise the Federal debt limit to \$300,000,000,000, this situation has changed. Just what the proportionate responsibilities are do not concern us. Today practically all individuals, all institutions, all corporations, municipalities, county governments, and State governments, are close to or completely out of debt. Many have surpluses. At this point I insert recent comments on the condition of States' finances, mostly from governors' messages to State legislatures in 1945:

RECENT COMMENTS ON THE CONDITION OF STATE FINANCES—MOSTLY FROM GOVERNORS' MESSAGES TO STATE LEGISLATURES 1945

CALIFORNIA

"During these war years, State revenues have soared to unprecedented amounts.

We have frozen many millions for post-war construction to take care of a 10-year backlog of building needs and to cushion employment conditions during the period of reconversion. There will be millions left in our treasury after these sums have been set apart." (Source: Biennial message of Earl Warren, Governor of the State of California, January 8, 1945, p. 14.)

CONNECTICUT

"During these past 2 years we have followed a policy of wise and careful spending. We have lived well within our means, paid off or laid aside enough money to retire the general fund debt and accumulated a substantial surplus." (Source: Inaugural address of His Excellency Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor of the State of Connecticut, to the General Assembly, January 3, 1945, p. 11.)

DELAWARE

"The financial condition of our State Government is presently strong, with a favorable cash balance in reserve to meet contingencies which may be expected in our post-war readjustments. This strength can be maintained only by continuing to conserve and economize." (Source: Message of Hon. Walter W. Bacon, Governor of Delaware, to the One Hundred and Tenth General Assembly of the State of Delaware, January 2, 1945, p. 4.)

GEORGIA

"Two years ago, when I took office, the State owed \$35,961,630.38. On January 1, 1945, the State's net indebtedness stood at \$6,924,000. The floating debt that existed on January 1, 1943, has been entirely paid. * * * If we are permitted to continue our present fiscal policies, we shall be able to fulfill the pledge made 2 years ago that, when my term of office ends in January 1947, the State of Georgia not only will not owe a single dollar that is not covered by money in its treasury, but it is hoped that the State will have a comfortable reserve to assist in financing the transition from war to peace. Then Georgia, for the first time in its history, will be free of debt." (Source: Message of Gov. Ellis Arnall to the General Assembly of Georgia upon the condition of the Commonwealth and the State budget, January 9, 1945, p. 11.)

ILLINOIS

"The fact that Illinois has been able to build up a substantial reserve in the general revenue fund of the State treasury during the last two bienniums, has raised the question of whether taxes can be reduced. We all agree that State income should not permanently exceed expenditures. It is always difficult to forecast accurately our total State revenues because of the fluctuations, resulting from general business conditions, in the receipts from the retailers occupational tax, which is the source of such a large share of our general revenue.

"The best estimates are that total general revenue receipts for the next 2 years will be approximately the same as in the biennium which will end June 30 next, and now estimated at \$320,000,000. Appropriations from these funds amounted to approximately \$284,000,000. It is now indicated, however, that not more than \$260,000,000 of these appropriations will be expended. Thus, approximately \$60,000,000 will have been added during the biennium to the reserve in the general revenue fund." (Source: Inaugural address of Dwight H. Green, Governor of Illinois, January 8, 1945, p. 7.)

"By 'surplus' is meant the excess of collections over disbursements during the fiscal year. This excess in the general and reserved funds totaled \$38,450,152 for the 1944 fiscal year, being 14.54 percent of the total revenue. For the preceding fiscal year the year's surplus was \$30,876,580. It must be emphasized that neither surplus mentioned represents the total accumulated State surplus, the ac-

cumulated surplus, or balance available in the general revenue fund alone was \$115,798,756.80 on December 31, 1944." (Source: The Illinois Taxpayer, January 1945, p. 1.)

IOWA

"A great deal has been said during the last few months about the balances in our State treasury. Fortunately the State of Iowa as a unit of government is in a sound, prosperous condition. This is the result of careful budgeting by legislatures, economical administration of funds by officials, and increased receipts in certain funds as a result of the war. This has given rise in some instances to an unwarranted feeling of great wealth. Iowa is not a wealthy State. Before the war our per capita income was neither the greatest nor the smallest. Iowa financially is a middle-class State.

"A substantial part of the funds accumulated is pledged under our constitution and laws to specific purposes. * * * Part of the surplus must be used to replace worn-out equipment which cannot now be replaced because of the war. * * *

"The surpluses now on hand, together with revenues in funds increased by the war, should be sufficient to meet all of the needs of Iowa government during the next biennium." (Source: Inaugural address of Robert D. Blue, Governor of Iowa, to the fifty-first general assembly in joint session, January 11, 1945, pp. 12-13.)

KANSAS

"Our State, generally speaking, is in excellent financial condition. For the past 2 years there has been no State levy on general property except to pay the principal and interest on soldiers' bonus bonds for World War No. 1, and the one-fourth mill levy for a building fund for institutions under the control of the board of regents. It is my hope to eliminate any general State levy during the fiscal years of 1946 and 1947.

"On December 30, 1944, there was a cash balance in the State general revenue fund of \$9,592,479.88. In addition there were general fund taxes covering the year 1943 in the amount of \$230,268.60. As of December 30, 1944, these taxes had not yet been drawn from the counties by the auditor of state. Thus we have available cash in the amount of \$9,822,748.48. Against this balance there are appropriations available for expenditure in the amount of \$7,819,555.71. We have available in the State general fund at this time a net cash balance of \$2,003,192.77, even if all appropriation commitments were liquidated.

"This net cash balance will be augmented during the next 6 months by such collections as income tax, and which, I am reliably informed, will total slightly in excess of \$7,000,000." (Source: Message of Gov. Andrew F. Schoepel to the Kansas Legislature, January 10, 1945, p. 4.)

MAINE

"When the laws passed by this legislature take effect, there will be a substantial surplus in the State treasury. In the eyes of many groups of people this surplus represents the solution of their particular problem. No matter how large this surplus may turn out to be it cannot solve all these problems and this legislature, through appropriation measures, will judge which problems it will attempt to solve by recourse to this surplus. Meanwhile I suggest that we all bear in mind how this surplus came about.

"State revenues increased 12.2 percent in 1942 over 1941 and have since continued to climb. The per-capita income of individuals in Maine went from \$600 in 1941 to over \$1,000 in 1943. This was a 68 percent increase and the highest increase in per-capita income of any New England State. At the same time there was a corresponding drop in our relief loads. Thus you can see how this surplus came into existence. It is not a normal operating surplus at all. It is the result of a war-inflated economy on the one

hand and abnormally restricted government functions on the other hand. The same situation exists in all State governments." (Source: Inaugural address of Horace Hildreth, Governor of Maine, to the Ninety-second Legislature, January 4, 1945, pp. 4-5.)

MICHIGAN

"The sixty-second regular session of the legislature created a post-war reserve fund for the purpose of liquidating Michigan's obligations after the termination of the war, to its returning servicemen, their widows and dependents, and any other post-war obligation of Michigan.

"The latest transfer to this post-war reserve fund was made on December 19, 1944, bringing the amount up to the statutory limit of \$50,000,000. The funds in this reserve are, or will be, invested in short-term United States Government securities, and the earnings thereon when received will be added to the balance in the fund. * * *

"The State is entirely out of debt. On November 15, 1944, there was retired \$2,433,000 in highway improvement bonds which was part of fifty million issued between 1921 and 1925.

"For the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, it is estimated that revenues will amount to approximately \$158,000,000 as against appropriations of \$138,000,000. This latter figure includes the \$132,800,000 actually appropriated by the legislature from current revenues plus \$2,500,000 for school aid, which was appropriated from the previous year's surplus, and approximately \$3,000,000 in carry-over balances this year, most of which were in the welfare items for old-age assistance and aid to dependent children. There will be unexpended balances as of June 30, 1945, and the best estimates now point toward a surplus of approximately \$25,000,000." (Source: Message of Harry F. Kelly, Governor of Michigan, the sixty-third Michigan Legislature, January 4, 1945, p. 10.)

MARYLAND

"It is highly gratifying to report to you that as a result of the combined efforts and cooperation of the general assembly and the State's fiscal officers with this administration, the State's financial condition was never more sound than at present. Maryland's credit today ranks with the highest among the States of the country. * * *

"Total expenditures have been less than the amount appropriated, and total revenues received have exceeded all reasonable expectations, with the result that on June 30, 1944, we had a general-fund surplus of \$8,961,000, and it has been estimated that at the close of the present fiscal year we will have on hand a general-fund surplus of \$9,272,531." (Source: Address of Gov. Herbert D. O'Connor to the General Assembly of Maryland, January 3, 1945, pp. 8-9.)

MINNESOTA

"Our State debt has been reduced \$11,048,106 in the last 12 months. This is a reduction of fully \$50,493,266 since January 1939.

"I am glad to report that at the opening of the present fiscal year on July 1 we had a free balance of \$3,100,000 in the general revenue fund, \$15,700,000 in the trunk-highway fund, and \$21,700,000 in the income-tax school fund. This makes a total of almost \$41,000,000 in these major funds. By the end of the present year on June 30, the general revenue fund should have a free balance of \$5,500,000; the income-tax school fund fully \$25,000,000, and the trunk-highway fund probably around \$18,000,000. We thus should be able to enter the post-war period with some good reserves to help meet the demands that may be expected." (Source: Inaugural message of Gov. Edward J. Thye to the Legislature of Minnesota, January 3, 1945, p. 5.)

MISSOURI

"It is estimated that a surplus of approximately \$18,000,000 will remain in the general

revenue fund after all current obligations of the past biennium have been paid. I recommend that this surplus and any accumulated surplus as the result of economical spending be safeguarded as a backlog for post-war projects and post-war employment. Since the war and business incident thereto have been responsible for this surplus, it would seem not only the part of good business but a moral obligation that it be set aside to take care of some of the damage this war will inflict on Missouri. It is going to require hard-headed resistance to pressure groups by both the general assembly and the Governor in order that this surplus be judiciously spent, and I earnestly recommend to you that you regard this surplus as a sacred fund." (Source: Inaugural address of Gov. Phil M. Donnelly to the Sixty-third General Assembly of Missouri, January 8, 1945, p. 4.)

MONTANA

"The State government is in the best financial condition in its history. Our general fund balance is around \$5,000,000. The University millage fund has a balance of about \$1,000,000. We are well ahead on all our bond principal and interest requirements. Our surpluses are more or less typical of the States generally at this time.

"We should, however, keep in mind that these are not normal times. We cannot safely assume that the State government's income will remain at the current figure, nor can local units of government safely assume that their financial condition will continue as prosperous as it is now." (Source: Message of Gov. Sam C. Ford to the Twenty-ninth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, 1945, p. 13.)

NEVADA

"The records of the State treasurer show the cash balance of State funds in the State treasury as of December 31, 1944, to be \$3,447,955.34. There is no outstanding bonded indebtedness.

"On June 30, 1944, the bank value of bonds owned by the State was \$4,713,620. On December 31, 1944, the bank value of bonds owned by the State was \$5,564,915.37. Income from interest on bonds from July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1944, was \$223,556.14. On December 31, 1944, the sum of \$31,927.60 was available for investment." (Source: Message of Gov. E. P. Carville to the Nevada Legislature of 1945, p. 7.)

NEW YORK

"The financial position of the State continues to be most fortunate. To avoid the slightest interference with the national war effort in the use of manpower and materials the State has deferred many normal purchases, repairs, replacements, and new undertakings. At the same time revenues have continued at a high rate, while the careful management of State funds has been intensively maintained. As a result, I am happy to advise you that our surplus this year will approximate \$150,000,000.

"Last year, upon my recommendation, your honorable bodies created the post-war reconstruction fund. The purpose of this fund was to husband the war time savings of the State in order that they might be available at the proper time to meet the State's deferred reconstruction needs and to aid in the stimulation of job opportunities after the war for the men returning from our armed forces and for our war workers.

"This fund now amounts to more than \$160,000,000. I recommend that this year's surplus be transferred to the reconstruction fund, thereby increasing that fund to approximately \$310,000,000." (Source: Message of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey to the legislature, January 3, 1945, p. 4.)

OHIO

"Our aim should be to operate the Government in the ensuing 2 years out of the current revenues and to leave untouched, ex-

cept for the moneys that can be used for new capital investments, the \$92,000,000 unexpended at the end of 1944.

"This surplus should be used for emergency purposes and capital investments only. We must not forget that many things that should have been but were not done during the war will require finances for performance after the war." (Source: Address of Gov. Frank J. Lausche before the ninety-sixth general assembly on January 15, 1945, pp. 1-2.)

OKLAHOMA

"The income to the general revenue fund from the present tax structure, according to the estimate heretofore made by the State Equalization Board, is approximately \$11,000,000 (aside from the amount required for debt service, which will no longer be required) in excess of the amount appropriated from the general revenue fund for the current fiscal year." (Source: Message of Gov. Robert S. Kerr, January 2, 1945, pp. 2-3.)

OREGON

"I am happy and proud to report that the State of Oregon is in the best financial position in which it has been in a long, long number of years. * * *

"The total bonded indebtedness from original issues of over \$87,000,000 has been reduced to around \$20,000,000. * * *

"The State has invested in War bonds, notes, certificates, and Treasury bills a total of \$37,000,000." (Source: Legislative message of Earl Snell, Governor of Oregon, to the forty-third biennial legislative assembly, January 8, 1945, pp. 2-3.)

PENNSYLVANIA

"Budget—It shows a surplus of \$110,735,000 in the general fund and estimated revenue of \$369,000,000." (Source: Message to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania by Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, January 2, 1945, p. 5.)

SOUTH CAROLINA

"Our financial condition is one of prosperity unequaled in the history of our State * * *. Even though a big surplus is in our State treasury, we are living in abnormal times. Our income tax has increased over 350 percent, but at the close of the war, this will necessarily fall off: We must, in our legislative program, keep before us the post-war days when our income will not be near as great as it is today." (Source: Annual message of Ransome J. Williams, Governor, to the General Assembly of South Carolina, January 10, 1945, p. 3.)

SOUTH DAKOTA

"In general, it may be stated conservatively that South Dakota's financial condition today is good." (Source: Message of Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, to the Legislature of South Dakota, at commencement of the twenty-ninth regular session, 1945, p. 14.)

TEXAS

"This program will require approximately \$36,250,000 in State highway funds to match the Federal grants. We have made a careful study of our financial position and find that with our \$30,000,000 nest egg we will be able to start this program promptly at the expiration of the emergency, and over a 3-year period with a normal return from our gasoline tax and license fee revenues, we should be able to raise the remaining \$56,250,000 in the 3-year period, although it will be necessary that we hold pure State fund construction to the minimum. A careful analysis indicates that if this is done we should execute our 3-year program with funds that will be available to us, leaving a balance at the end of the third year of only \$400,000, which is a rather close margin on which we must attempt to operate but we feel that by careful administration this can be accomplished." (Source: Message of Gov. Coke

R. Stevenson, to the members of the forty-ninth legislature, 1945, p. 3-4.)

VERMONT

"The State's finances are in excellent condition.

"According to the present program of debt reduction our bonded debt at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, will have been reduced to \$393,000, excluding the perpetual debt which consists of certificates of indebtedness, held by the permanent school fund, and the agricultural college bonds, which total \$568,031.90.

"On July 1, 1944, the unappropriated surplus in the treasury was \$1,006,626.44 and this will probably be increased by the end of the present fiscal year, June 30, 1945." (Source: Inaugural message of Mortimer R. Proctor, Governor of the State of Vermont, to the general assembly, January 4, 1945, p. 24.)

WASHINGTON

"Our own State has a surplus of more than \$60,000,000. We must conserve this surplus and use it wisely." (Source: Inaugural message of Mon C. Wallgren, Governor of Washington, to the twenty-ninth legislature, January 10, 1945, p. 10.)

WEST VIRGINIA

"Every citizen is proud of the financial stability of our State. Such can be matched by only a few and exceeded by none of the States of the Union. Since 1933 West Virginia has steadily climbed to its present high position of sound fiscal policy and management." (Source: Inaugural address by Clarence W. Meadows, Governor, January 15, 1945, p. 4.)

WISCONSIN

"The State is in an enviable position financially. The prosperity which has come to it, largely because of war activities and enterprises during the last 4 years, places it in the best financial status in its history." (Source: Governor Goodland's message to the 1945 legislature, January 6, 1945, p. 5.)

WYOMING

"The financial condition of your State is excellent, and, likewise, the financial condition of political subdivisions has improved. State bonded indebtedness stands at \$3,464,000, slightly over two and one-half million of which are outstanding highway bonds which the attorney general rules cannot be paid until due date. Your State treasurer is charged in all the various funds with approximately \$41,000,000, three and one-quarter million of which is in the general fund." (Source: Legislative message of Gov. Lester C. Hunt to the Twenty-eighth session, Wyoming Legislature, January 11, 1945, p. 8.)

I am sorry that this is not complete, but it is of sufficient breadth to give us some appreciation of the fiscal status of our States. It seems apparent to me that if we are to rebuild our forests that we must utilize every facility which experience and the fortunes of the times make available to us. I say that with no feeling whatever that the Federal Government can withdraw from its position of dominance in this program. I merely say that the program needed is so important that every factor should be considered.

Let me repeat. I have the feeling that the Federal responsibility in this matter of rebuilding our forests cannot be dodged. I have a suspicion that if we set up an adequate program that will achieve those things which are broadly recognized as necessary to restore and preserve this great national asset, we may have to consider even an increase in Federal expenditures. However, I do

feel that some consideration to what is being done by the individuals in the industry, the States, and our schools of forestry and silviculture could be profitably reviewed by us at this time.

We should explore them fully. Those which have promise should be recognized and fitted into a national program. I believe that every step should be taken to coordinate and to achieve not only full public cooperation in this business of rebuilding our forests by giving aid to industry and private ownership. I believe that every step should be taken to make the fullest possible advantage of the work being done in State institutions and in private industry. Even if we do this the Federal participation must remain dominant.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, under consent received in the House, I include a list of forest schools known to have conducted research in forest management:

FOREST SCHOOLS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST MANAGEMENT

Pennsylvania State College, Duke University, University of California, Iowa State College, Purdue University, University of Idaho, Utah State Agricultural College, Michigan State College, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, Cornell University, Harvard University, New York State College, University of New Hampshire, University of Vermont, Yale University, University of Montana, Oregon State College, University of Wyoming, Louisiana State University, University of Georgia, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Mississippi State College, University of Arkansas, University of Florida.

Most of the research done by forest schools is an adjunct of teaching. Research in forest management by its very nature is a long-time process. Few of the schools are equipped with personnel adequate to follow through on such long-time experimentation. On the other hand, the field of forest management is broad enough to include a variety of studies in different forest types, varieties of climate, soils, and tree species. Simple but well planned cultural operations if painstakingly done, followed even with student assistants for a long period of years, may produce valuable results. Actually most of the research underway is largely of an empirical character including planting, thinning, pruning, weeding, and improvement cuttings. Well-planned long-time projects are exceptions. Sound basic research in forest management cannot be made a part-time job.

STATES, OTHER THAN UNIVERSITIES, KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST MANAGEMENT

New Jersey Department of Conservation, Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station, Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, Connecticut State Forest and Park Commission, New Hampshire Forestry and Recreation Department, New York State Conservation Department, Florida Forest Service.

PRIVATE OWNERS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST MANAGEMENT

Great Northern Paper Co.

However this list is obviously incomplete, for many firms and owners are doing some work in this direction today.

Another phase dealing with this business of rebuilding our forests is that connected with experimental forests. Many members of the subcommittee feel that every one of the 32 forest States should have from 1 to 4 experimental forests. Just how extensive these individual forests should be in area and just what the element of State and Federal responsibility should be in such a 32-State program, should be clearly defined.

Personally, I feel that this phase of the business of rebuilding our forests should be fully explored and at this point, Mr. Chairman, I include a list of States known to have experimental forests and also a list of States known to have operated State forest nurseries.

EXPERIMENTAL FORESTS

As indicated by the research conducted by forest schools, the experimental forests are used as tools or as demonstration and practice areas in connection with teaching. The main objective is teaching. These forests vary in size from minor plantations and wood lots to larger demonstration and practice forests in which students are given the opportunity to become acquainted with actual forest conditions.

STATES KNOWN TO HAVE EXPERIMENTAL FORESTS USUALLY AVAILABLE TO FORESTRY SCHOOLS ESPECIALLY FOR TEACHING BUT FOR SOME RESEARCH

New Jersey, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Connecticut, New Hampshire, New York, Florida, Texas, Pennsylvania, California, Iowa, Indiana, Idaho, Utah, Minnesota, Vermont, Montana, Oregon, Wyoming, Louisiana, Georgia, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Alabama.

STATES KNOWN TO HAVE OPERATED STATE FOREST NURSERIES

Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Now we come to the field of research. This is one of the most encouraging phases of the conservation of our national forests. If you will turn to the record, you will find on pages 710 through 714 the story of the conquest of wood waste beginning with 1915 to date. Much headway has been made. Much yet remains to be done. In addition to using more of the wood of the standing tree, in addition to finding new uses for what used to be scrap lumber or the wasteful byproducts of logging and milling, in addition to conducting research to overcome the two ancient enemies of wood—rot and fire—research

has also been successful in speeding up the growth of trees, and, in addition, the same experiments have enabled researchers to produce clearer lumber.

But the over-all and outstanding work of research has been in the utilization of a higher percentage of the wood in the standing tree.

When one saw a tree in the forest 30 years ago he would have seen one of nature's products from which only some 20 percent was put to useful purpose. Today, in many operations, this same tree would yield up to 33 percent, in specific instances, perhaps even as high as 40 percent. Much work is being done in this regard, and because of the very nature of this work much of it must be done by Federal laboratories.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include a list of the States, schools, associations, and firms doing research in forest products.

I would like to call attention to the comments included with this insertion, for they will serve to bring out, I believe, the difference between individual and even State interests in the whole field of research.

This, I believe, has been particularly true in the military work which the Madison Laboratory has so ably contributed to the war effort during the last several years.

While this might have come from private and local laboratories, the facilities are readily available to the Federal needs and have responded with great credit to our national wood-products laboratory at Madison, Wis.

STATES, SCHOOLS, ASSOCIATIONS, AND FIRMS DOING RESEARCH IN FOREST PRODUCTS

It must be borne in mind that of the attached lists some do relatively little work in this field. The amount of money spent by the schools, for example, varies widely—some may have but one research worker engaged only part time on forest products research to fill in between teaching. Other schools may have two or three workers engaged full time.

Industrial research is mostly confined to lowering costs of the products manufactured or improving them and what work is done on new products generally starts where the Forest Products Laboratory leaves off. The break-down of industrial research, speaking of American industry as a whole, according to Barron's Financial Weekly, is about as follows:

Thirty-one percent reducing production costs.

Thirty-four percent improving the quality of the product manufactured.

Twenty percent developing new fields of application for the product normally manufactured.

Fifteen percent developing new products.

It will be observed that on the whole industrial research only spends about 15 percent of its total research money to develop new products out of the raw material they customarily work with.

Speaking specifically of State institutions, it will not, as a general rule, be profitable for small State laboratories or school laboratories to go deeply into basic forest products research. There

may be exceptions to this where members of the staff are especially suited by experience and personal interest and have the physical and financial facilities and freedom for such work. In contrast, problems at the Forest Products Laboratory have been approached by groups of workers each with his own specialized training in the solution of problems requiring very professional skills. In most cases the full time of the available staff at State or endowed institutions will be needed to meet the pressure for quick results of a so-called practical nature.

On the other hand, comprehensive research is necessary at the Forest Products Laboratory on a large scale to establish the facts about the fundamental properties and reactions of wood and wood products to provide a stable foundation for applied research and development. State forest products research should assist on this where possible but will generally have to depend upon the basic work done elsewhere. Their programs will generally be developed on the basis of experience and contact with local needs and the appreciation of local industries for the services rendered.

There are no figures available as to number of workers or sums provided for research by State institutions and private concerns listed.

STATE FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORIES

Division of Forest Products Research, Texas Forest Service, Lufkin, Tex.

Forest Products Laboratory, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

Forest Products Laboratory, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oreg.

Forest Products Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.—proposed.

UNIVERSITIES, COLLEGES, AND EXPERIMENT STATIONS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST PRODUCTS

Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.

Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.

New York State College of Forestry, Syracuse, N. Y.

Purdue University, LaFayette, Ind.

Yale University, School of Forestry, New Haven, Conn.

University of Michigan, Forest School, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Duke University, Durham, N. C.

University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.

George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.

Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.

Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson College, S. C.

Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.

Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Kingston, R. I.

University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

North Carolina State College, Raleigh, N. C.

University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H.

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.

Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.

Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.

University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.

Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven, Conn.

FOREST PRODUCTS PRODUCING INDUSTRIES AND BUSINESS FIRMS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST PRODUCTS

American Cellulose Co.; Blandin Paper Co.; Brown Co.; Weyerhaeuser Sales Co.; Brunswick Pulp & Paper Co.; Bryant Paper Co.; Champion Paper & Fiber Co.; Combined Locks Paper Co.; Crown Zellerbach Corporation; Crystal Tissue Co.; J. Neils Lumber Co.; Detroit Sulphite Pulp & Paper Co.; Eureka Fibre Co.; Hammermill Paper Co.; Diamond Match Co.; Fitchburg Paper Co.; Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.; Minnesota and Ontario Paper Co.; Flambeau Paper Co.; Fraser Paper, Ltd.; Gardner-Richardson Co.; Gaylord Container Corporation; Great Northern Paper Co.; Hammond Redwood Co.; Hawley Pulp & Paper Co.; Hinde & Dauch Paper Co.; Hoberg Paper Mills, Inc.; Hollingsworth & Vose Co.; Industrial Rayon Corporation; International Paper Co.; Kimberly-Clark Corporation; John A. Manning Paper Co., Inc.; Marathon Paper Mills Co.; Masonite Corporation; Brooks-Scanlon Corporation; Mohawk Paper Mills, Inc.; Mosinee Paper Mills Co.; Neenah Paper Co.; Nekoosa-Edwards Paper Co.; Northern Paper Mills; Northwest Paper Co.; Oxford Paper Co.; Port Huron Sulphite & Paper Co.; J. & J. Rogers Co.; Rogers Paper Manufacturing Co.; Scott Paper Co.; Soundview Pulp Co.; Southern Kraft Corporation, York Haven Division; Stimson Lumber Co.; Strathmore Paper Co.; Tennessee Eastman Corporation; Tomahawk Kraft Paper Co.; Union Bag & Paper Corporation; Union Mills Paper Manufacturing Co.; Whiting Paper Co.; Whiting-Plover Paper Co.; Woonsocket Rayon Co.; Burgess Cellulose Co.; American Viscose Corporation; Wood Conversion Co.; Burton Swartz; Red River Lumber Co.; May Bros.; Wood-Mosaic Co., Inc.; W. M. Ritter Lumber Co.; Crossett Lumber Co.; Gamble Bros., Inc.; The Mengel Co.; Bradley Lumber Co. of Arkansas; Hillyer-Deutsch-Edwards, Inc.; E. L. Bruce Co.; Chicago Mill & Lumber Co.; Frost Lumber Industries; Hardwood Lumber Co. of Louisiana, Inc.; Holly Hill Lumber Co.; George D. Emery Co.; C. H. Pearson & Son Hardwood Co., Inc.; Ichabod T. Williams & Sons; Pacific Lumber Co.; Green Lumber Co.; Wisconsin Land & Lumber Co.; Anchor Lumber Co.; Pardee & Curtin Lumber Co.; Bringardner Lumber Co.; Griffith Lumber Co., Inc.; Roddis Lumber & Veneer Co.; Louisiana Central Lumber Co.; Temple Lumber Co.; Crosby Lumber & Manufacturing Co.; Fordyce-Crossett Sales Co.; Con-

solidated Water Power & Paper Co.; Riegel Paper Co.; McPherson Lumber Co.; Pope & Talbot, Inc., Oregon; Tye Lumber & Manufacturing Co.; Twin Harbors Lumber Co.; Wauna Lumber Co.; West Coast Wood Preserving Co.; Westfir Lumber Co.; White River Lumber Co.; Snellstrom Lumber Co.; Atlanta Oak Flooring Co.; Bristol Door & Lumber Co.; Meadow River Lumber Co.; Morgan Manufacturing Co.; Jerome H. Sheip Co.; Pekin Wood Products Co.; Poinsett Lumber & Manufacturing Co.; Temple Lumber Co.; Denkmann Lumber Co.; DeSoto Hardwood Flooring Co.; Delphos Bending Co.; Hillerich & Bradsby Co.; Kahler Co.; Anderson-Tully Co.; Chickasaw Wood Products Co.; American Fork & Hoe Co.; Nickey Bros., Inc.; C. F. Works & Sons; National Casket Co., Inc.; Fisher Body, General Motors Corporation; Pope & Talbot, Inc., California.

FOREST PRODUCTS CONSUMING OR PROCESSING INDUSTRIES AND BUSINESS FIRMS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST PRODUCTS

Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Cos.; Bakelite Corporation; Resinous Products & Chemical Co., Inc.; Casein Co. of America; Catalin Corporation of America; I. F. Laucks, Inc.; E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.; Dow Chemical Co.; Timm Aircraft Corporation; Plaskon Glue Co.; Perkins Glue Co.; Engineering Research Corporation; Ault & Wiborg Corporation; Boston Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of Boston; Riverbank Laboratories; Elmen-dorf Corporation; General Finishes, Inc.; Industrial Laboratories, Inc.; Oshkosh Industrial Laboratory; Reilly Tar & Chemical Corporation; Sealright Co., Inc.; Southwestern Laboratories; Valcan Corporation; Western Cartridge Co.; Western Union Telegraph Co.; Netherlands Indies Laboratory; Sutherland Refinery Corporation; General Electric X-Ray Corporation; Arthur D. Little, Inc.; Timber Engineering Co.; Aircraft Veneer Committee; Wood Preserving Corporation; Protexol Corporation; Vidal Research Corporation; Girdler Corporation; Northwest Syndicate, Inc.; Structural Specialties, Inc.; American Lumber & Treating Co.; Curtis Cos. Inc.; International Creosoting & Construction Co.; Southern Wood Preserving Co.; American Wood Sugar Co.; Central States Aircraft Veneer Committee; Taylor-Colquitt Co.; American Box Board Co.; American Dyewood Co.; American Gum Importers Association, Inc.; American Seating Co.; Bartlett Tree Export Co., F. A.; Becker, Moore & Co., Inc.; Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc.; Berry Bros., Inc.; Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co.; Congoleum-Nairn, Inc.; Albert L. Clapp Laboratories; Container Testing Laboratories, Inc.; Crocker-McElwain Co.; Cliffs Dow Chemical Co.; Dietzgen Co., Eugene; Armstrong Cork Co.; Thred-Dit; Fibre Conduit Co.; Forest Products Chemical Co.; Formica Insulation Co.; Robert Gair Co., Inc.; Marvil Package Co.; General Box Co.; Glidden Co.; Columbia Naval Stores Co.; Globe-Wernicke Co.; Grand Rapids Wood Finishing Co.; Haskelite Manufacturing Corporation; Hercules Powder Co.; Herty Foundation Laboratory;

Homasote Co.; Hutchinson & Son, Inc., W. H.; American Cyanamid & Chemical Corporation; Joseph E. Seagram Co.; Western Electric Co.; James Gibbons Co.; Johns-Manville Corporation; S. Karpen & Bros.; Kobbe Laboratories, Inc.; Harold A. Levey; J. P. Lewis & Co.; Lord & Burnham Co.; Mead Corporation; Motor Wheel Corporation; National Folding Box Co.; New England Box Co.; North American Aviation, Inc.; North American Rayon Corporation; Thomas Keery Co., Inc.; Package Research Laboratory; Rafton Laboratories, Inc.; Scoville Manufacturing Co.; Miner Laboratories; Singer Manufacturing Co.; Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; A. G. Spalding & Bros., Inc.; Standard Tank & Seat Co.; Stanley Works; Upson Co.; Gebhart Laboratory; Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corporation; Anderson Corporation; Unit Structures, Inc.; Klomprens Lock Joint Manufacturing Co.; E. R. Reed & Co.; Armco Drainage Products Association; United States Plywood Corporation; Van Stee Corporation; Heywood Wakefield Co.; Beachley-Reichard Furniture Co., Inc.; Wellswood Spring Co.; Shearman Bros.; Parlor Furniture Co.; Strand Ski Co.; Seng. Co.; Northwood Chemical Co.; Jennison Wright Co.; Certified Builders, Inc.; Carbozite Corporation; Southern Ry Co.; Osmose Wood Preserving Co.; United States Stoneware Co.; Parkwood Corporation; Koppers Co.; Atlas Mineral Products Co.; Moore Dry Kiln Co.; S. Di Giorgio; Franklin Glue Co.; Plymold Corporation; A. D. Chapman & Co., Inc.; Monsanto Chemical Co.; W. & J. Sloane Co.; Inner-Ease Co.; Holgate Bros. Co.; Timber Structures, Inc.; Weaver Piano Co., Inc.; R. C. A. Laboratory; Simpson's Walker Woods, Inc.; Pluswood, Inc.; Louis de Ladurantaye; American Pipe & Construction Co.; Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co.; Sensenich Bros.; Higgins Industries; Henry J. Kaiser Co.; F. W. Megow; Nissen Wagon Co., Inc.; Harry R. Powell; Lignum-Vitae Products Corporation; G. B. Lewis Co., Inc.; Covered Wagon Co.; Taylor Lowenstein & Co.; Fluor Corporation; Marley Co.; Lillie-Hoffman Cooling Towers, Inc.; Foster Wheeler Corporation; C. H. Wheeler Manufacturing Co.; Hauser-Stander Tank Co.

TRADE ASSOCIATIONS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST PRODUCTS

National Lumber Manufacturers Association; American Society for Testing Materials; American Society of Heating and Ventilating Engineers; National Board of Fire Underwriters; Institute of Paper Chemistry; Highway Research Board; Mellon Institute; American Society of Civil Engineers; Seismological Society of America; Pacific Boast Building Officials Conference; American Society of Agricultural Engineers; American Chemical Society; Institute of Aeronautical Sciences; John B. Pierce Foundation; American Institute of Architects; American Institute of Chemical Engineers; American Institute of Chemists; American Institute of Electrical Engineers; American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers; American Institute of Science; American Society of

Arborists; Battelle Memorial Institute; Charles Lathrop Pack Forestry Foundation; Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research; Carnegie Institution of Washington; Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania; New England Botanical Club, Inc.; Society of American Foresters; Torrey Botanical Club; American Institute of Electrical Engineers; U. S. Testing Co., Inc.; New York Botanical Garden; Field Museum; Los Angeles Testing Laboratory; Chicago School of Design; American Joint Committee on Horticultural Nomenclature.

I trust that all those interested in our national forests will study this material when it appears in the RECORD tomorrow. In no sense am I trying to have the Federal Government avoid its full responsibility in leading this Nation to a safe position with regard to our national forests. My whole intent in placing this material before the Committee of the Whole House is to point out, first, the gravity of the situation of our forests today; second, the need for getting a complete program started at the earliest opportunity; and, third, the necessity for enlisting in this effort all those who have some contribution to make in this direction, every individual, every firm, every local and State facility, and, of course, the Federal Forest Service. Many of us hope that technological advance and the use of airplanes in the expensive business of fighting forest fires in the future will enable us to use for research and reforestation funds now expended for preventive measures.

Since our national forests cover portions of 32 of our States, and since one-third of our total landed area is best suited to the production of trees, it must be apparent to all of us that in addition to the great work in soil conservation that is going on at this time, we must give adequate and intelligent attention to the development of a program that will restore our national forests. This done, this Nation of ours will not need to want for anything that Nature can grow through all of the centuries to come.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to follow the distinguished gentleman from Washington who has just left the well of the House. Evidently he has found his place, to fit into this great body. He speaks the voice and the convictions of a true conservationist. I am sure he is going to add a great deal to the prestige of the committee, in calling to the attention of the country the necessity of preserving the soil and forests of our country. I might say I am thoroughly in accord with the provisions of this bill, although many of us thought that we made a pretty good record for appropriations which we considered were necessary for the Forest Service. Yet, I might say we are grateful that some consideration was given to our efforts before the committee. At this point I should like to call to the attention of the Members who are interested

in veterans' legislation the great necessity of having an overhauling of all the lending agencies under the Farm Credit Administration. Our Committee on Agriculture will probably report a bill which provides that the veteran will pay 4 percent interest for Federal farm loans. He will probably pay 4 percent interest for farm Land Bank Commissioner loans; under the provisions of this appropriation bill he will pay 3 percent on a farm tenancy loan; another rate of interest for a production credit association loan; and other rates of interest for farm security loans.

I might say in this connection that our Committee on Agriculture is making a study of this whole program with a view of building up a sound system of credit for the farmers of this country.

I especially want to call attention to a paragraph in the committee report on page 13. It has to do with grazing fees on national-forest lands. I want to quote the last paragraph, after the committee had discussed appropriations for the Forest Service:

One of the matters falling within the province of the work under this appropriation is the regulation of grazing on national-forest ranges and the fixing of grazing fees therefor. The committee, from evidence presented, was impressed with the need for revising grazing fees upward in view of the increased value to stock raisers of the grazing privilege. Such an upward revision would be more in keeping with the present price levels of livestock and livestock products.

Of course, the committee is restating a position that I think is sound and is the present practice of the Forest Service in fixing grazing fees, in that they are raised and kept in line with the price of livestock. I did not want the record to be incomplete and leave the thought that it is in order to raise the grazing fees. It is true, on the surface, it looks as if the livestock prices are reasonably high. I shall insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a study made by the Tariff Commission, at my direction as chairman of a Subcommittee on Agriculture.

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

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GRANGER. This report, prepared by the Tariff Commission, will actually show that, rather than a profit being made in the operation of the sheep industry, there has actually been a loss of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1.22 per head during the year 1944. So if that yardstick were used this time, rather than increasing grazing fees, it would mean there should be a reduction.

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

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, in this bill today we are appropriating something over \$800,000,000 for the advancement of agriculture, and to increase agricultural products.

I was interested in listening to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. He gave a wonderful, voluminous lot of statistics showing just how much meat every one of us was to get. Everything was prepared, the farmer was told how

much to produce, and he overproduced; the O. P. A. set the price; the meat is supposed to be in the butcher's box. About the only thing that did not click in the program and something that we are up against now, is that they have not been able to connect the purchaser with the meat. The purchaser cannot catch up with the meat unless he sneaks into the black market at inflation prices. There is an abundance of New Deal statistical meat being furnished the people, but real meat is hard for the housewife or the restaurant owner to obtain. There should be more real meat and fewer statistics. The people cannot eat ration stamps.

Canada seems to be thriving. People are going across to Canada from the United States in droves to buy meat. Food is not rationed in Canada. It is plentiful. Through lend-lease or otherwise Canada has been furnished some 4,000 or more plows, and something like 39,000 plows have been exported through lend-lease, and also some 20,000 tractors. I should like to know when I am going to get my plow. I have been trying to operate a pretty big farm and have been on the list for over a year but I have not yet got it. At the same time, however, we can export 4,000 plows a year to Canada. There is something wrong with the distribution of this meat supply to the country. There is no question but that the farmers produced it. While the farmer has been cut short on agricultural implements, instead of working 8 hours a day he has doubled his day; if he needed 2 tractors but had only 1, he operated the one 16 hours rather than 8 hours. Yes, the farmer has been fairly prosperous during the past 2 years. I do not believe it has all been because of New Deal planning; it has been because of Government buying to support the military effort. Unfortunately, the prosperity that has been brought to the farmers through his own efforts, for which we give him credit, is based fundamentally upon the maiming and killing of men in the military service—American soldiers all over the world. Yes, the farmer has been fairly prosperous. He has done a remarkable job because he has not been afraid to work day and night to produce the food for victory and in order to feed the civilian people of the country and incidentally make a few dimes to put down in his jeans or to credit to his bank account which has not been any too fat during the past number of years.

I think after we pass this bill for something like \$800,000,000 in order to encourage agriculture the committee of the House should go over to the O. P. A., that is helping to wreck agriculture in this country, call upon Chester Bowles, Marvin Jones, and others to cooperate with the Congress in order to carry out the law as written by the Congress. Then we would do agriculture and the people of the Nation a real service. The foolish, unsound policies they are forcing on meat processors and stock raisers is wrecking the meat supply of this country.

We who have not had the opportunity of meeting some of these gentlemen who formerly served in the House listen with considerable awe to the great compli-

ments that are paid these leaders in Government today. I have heard and you have heard on the floor of this House the virtues of the great Jesse Jones extolled day after day, we have heard the Commander in Chief extolled from one day to the other, and now for a steady diet we hear the great Marvin Jones, head of the War Food Administration, extolled day after day. It seems to me it is almost a fetish building certain individuals up in the minds of the general public and following the idea of personal government. We have had too much personal government. I would like to see the Congress extolled for having the courage to go to the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration and stop them from wrecking the farmers' livestock market in this country.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] pays great tribute to the farmers and to the administration. I happened to sit last night with some of the leading businessmen in the packing business of the State of Missouri and if ever I listened to men who know something about meat production and the processing of meat it was the gentlemen that I listened to last night. They told us that they were losing 85 cents on every hog killed since last August, that they had been losing on every beef killed for over a year and being purchased by the Federal Government. They said that the slaughtering of hogs on the market today is from 28 to 58 percent in decline from the same time last year. They claim that the market for these farmers whose virtues we seek to extol is going to ultimately vanish, that they cannot indefinitely keep this market open to them and continue to process meat at a loss. They have the figures to prove a constant loss to the packers and have furnished these figures to the O. P. A. They spent 43,000 man-hours getting the figures. They say that unless something is done to correct this situation the farmer will lose his market because the packers will be forced out of business.

The O. P. A. and those who are managing agriculture and regimenting agriculture in this country have forced more men into the bootlegging of meat than was ever known in a given area in the United States or probably in the world. It is far worse than the old bootleg days of the eighteenth amendment. There is more meat processed through the local slaughterers and through the black market than there is federally inspected meat that is processed through the big legitimate markets. Look at the tremendous loss. Twenty-two thousand little slaughterers have been licensed in the past year.

The merchant has the restaurant man, the hotel operator at his mercy. He can favor them with meat or he can withhold a part of it and break them. He can, and I am told does, in many instances demand tribute from them. In turn the merchant who is cheating is shook down for graft by some Federal inspectors. Businessmen are corrupted, morale is lowered, the black market flourishes, and the honest legitimate meat packers are being penalized and driven out of business. Bad policies enforced by the O. P.

A. are largely responsible for this vicious cycle that gains momentum every day.

Look at the waste there is. It has been said that the packers save everything but the squeal. Yes; not half of the meat, for the first time in the history of this Government, is being processed through the regular channels where they have the facilities to work up and save everything incident to the slaughtering of the animal. We have bootlegging of meat in the black markets throughout the land. That is the result of the O. P. A. as well as other Government officials refusing to allow the regular, legitimate, and efficient packers of this country to have a sufficient price in order that the meat may be federally processed and inspected, and in order that they may send it through the regular channels. This is the first time in the history of this Nation that one of the great industries of this country has been forced not only to process the meat, but forced to sell it at a loss month after month until losses are running into millions of dollars, which will ultimately, in my judgment, destroy the market for the farmers of this country.

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

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it not a fact that the fixing of a price to the extent that the processor of meat cannot make a profit is in direct violation of law, in that the law prescribes that a reasonable profit be provided for?

Mr. VURSELL. Absolutely. The law that we passed prescribes that a reasonable profit shall be provided, and that the price of living shall be controlled. They have not done either one. The black markets are robbing the people of this country, and the Government, by edict, has brought that about by grinding down private industry, the packers, of this Nation.

To show you how federally inspected slaughtering has fallen off, may I quote these figures? Whereas they were killing 10 a year ago, in February 1944, they only killed 4 this February 1945. What I am trying to explain is that of the millions of hogs killed last year compared with this year so far it is a ratio showing a drop from 10 to 4 or 40 percent less than last year. There has never been a time in the past 20 years when there has been such a decline in hogs, such decline in beef, such a decline in mutton, in poultry, and all of those things that the farmer produces, as there has been in the last year.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The records in the Department of Agriculture also show that the weight of the federally inspected cattle that have been slaughtered since the controls went into effect has fallen 44 pounds per animal. Last year they butchered about 20,000,000 head of cattle. That means that about 80,000,000 pounds of meat have been lost to this country; that is, good meat that should have been available to our people if the feeder of livestock had been permitted to feed in the normal course of his operations.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman is quite right. The trouble lies with the policies which have been put into effect by Chester Bowles of the O. P. A. and the War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones. It is personal government in action in defiance of the letter and spirit of the Price Control Act written by the Congress. It is the by-pass again of representative government. If the Congress will exert its independence, stand together and demand these policies be changed it can and will do a great service to the Nation. It should be done without delay.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND THE FARMER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, today I should like to emphasize the very great importance to farmers of H. R. 2202, which I introduced on February 16, known as the full-employment bill. This is the measure which would make it a responsibility of the Congress to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans to exercise the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment. Senator MURRAY of Montana introduced a similar measure in the Senate.

It is my belief that if we pass such legislation, we can in an orderly fashion shift from war- to peace-time levels of productivity and national income even higher than they are now. Within such a framework for directing and coordinating Federal activities, we can achieve an economy of continuously expanding markets and employment opportunities for all who are able and willing to work.

To the farmers this would mean that they would not again experience the shrinking markets and disastrous declines of price and land values which bankrupted so many of their fathers after the last war. They would, on the contrary, continue to earn the high net incomes of recent years—which, by the way, were more than twice the record peacetime farm net incomes of 1925.

I hardly need to point out to you that the demand for post-war full employment is not a partisan issue. Not one but both candidates in the last Presidential campaign explicitly recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government in this connection. Mr. Dewey in his San Francisco speech, for example, stated:

If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, then Government can and must create additional job opportunities. There must be jobs for all.

Leaders of industry, leaders of organized labor, and representatives of various consumer and welfare groups have likewise taken a clear stand in favor of governmental measures to assure full employment. This consensus as to the chief objective of Government economic policy is not surprising, since full employment, and the high level of production associated with it, is the one and only pathway to the maximum welfare of all groups in society. On this broad issue there can be no conflict of interests.

What I am particularly interested in today is the fundamental agreement

among the major farm groups of the Nation as to the importance of this full employment objective.

Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, has this to say:

No group has a greater interest in seeing full employment maintained after the war than agriculture. Without it, our whole economy breaks down.

Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, points out that:

The type of economic security we all want is jobs and opportunity for all those who are willing to produce.

The president of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Homer L. Brinkley, says:

What about measures to assure full employment and attendant requirements for optimum quantities of farm products? We are vitally interested in measures affecting full business operations of all kinds.

The stand of the Farmers Union is well known, and was reiterated by James G. Patton when he wrote in a recent article:

In our highly industrialized economy, full employment is the farm-relief measure of our time * * * nearly all our problems start with the possibility of mass unemployment; nearly all our solutions must start with full employment as the premise. Hence, a full-employment bill, while it will not in and of itself insure Utopia, is an indispensable preliminary to the organization of a truly good society.

The position of Secretary Wickard and the Department of Agriculture has been stated in these words:

First and most important is full industrial production and employment. American farmers sell, and will continue to sell, most of what they produce on the domestic market; they need plenty of customers able to pay fair prices.

The attitude of the land-grant colleges, presented in a statement of the Committee on Post-war Agricultural Policy of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, is that:

High-level employment in nonagricultural industry means very much more to farmers than any farm program the Government may attempt. Manipulations of agricultural production and prices are no substitute for good consumer markets.

Individual farmers, too, through Nation-wide polls, have expressed their overwhelming appreciation of the extent to which farm prosperity depends on national prosperity.

After hostilities cease, and when temporary demands for relief feeding have tapered off, farmers will again depend on domestic consumers for their markets.

Few realize what a huge farm market we can have right here at home if we maintain full employment and the national income that goes along with it. War experience has shown that with increased incomes consumers eat much better—better quality food and more of it. Careful estimates made by the Department of Agriculture indicate that, if we had full employment, our domestic consumption of most farm products would be 15 percent to 50 percent higher than before the war. I have here a supporting table entitled "Table 1, United

States Per Capita Consumption of Selected Farm Products, Pre-war and at Full Employment Post-war" that I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point. This, and the other tables I shall use, are derived from United States Department of Agriculture data.

TABLE 1.—United States per capita consumption of selected farm products, pre-war and at full employment post-war

Item	Pre-war	1943, civilian only	Post-war	Percentage increase over pre-war
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Percent
Foods:				
Beef and veal, dressed weight.....	62.8	57.7	71.0	13
Pork and lard, dressed weight.....	67.1	57.1	96.0	43
Chickens, dressed weight.....	17.9	28.1	25.0	40
Eggs.....	37.3	42.9	43.5	17
Dairy products (fluid milk equivalent).....	801.3	767.2	895.0	12
Citrus fruit.....	48.8	59.7	75.0	54
Other fresh fruit.....	89.4	61.3	90.0	1
Commercial truck.....	95.0	88.7	109.0	15
Canned vegetables (processed weight).....	31.1	36.1	43.0	38
Wheat.....	221.4	225.9	212.0	-4
Sugar.....	96.5	80.3	115.0	19
Peanuts.....	4.3	7.5	6.0	40
Nonfoods:				
Wool.....	4.5	7.7	6.0	107
Cotton.....	25.3	39.8	30.0	19
Tobacco products.....	6.5	8.6	10.0	59

And these are per capita figures. To them must be added the further increase from a probable 7-percent growth in population from 1940 to 1950. The net result would be a materially larger civilian consumption for most products than we have had even during the war.

But we need not rely for a farm market solely on domestic demands. Full employment and high levels of produc-

tion at home generate economic activity in other countries, and this automatically increases the demand for our exports. Hence we could and should count upon an export demand for agricultural products substantially above the post-war level. I have here a table estimating such increases for selected products—Table 2, "Past and prospective farm prices at full employment"—which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 2.—Past and prospective exports, at full employment

Product	Pre-war, 1935-39	1950, at full employment
Wheat, million bushels.....	54	About 100.
Lard, million pounds.....	192	About 600.
Pork products, million pounds, dressed weight.....	143	About 340.
Dairy products (in equivalent million pounds of fluid milk).....	352	About 500.
Canned vegetables (million pounds of fresh vegetables equivalent).....	93	About 250.
Citrus fruits (million pounds, fresh).....	662	About 800.
Other fruits (million pounds, fresh).....	2,550	About 3,000.
Cotton (million bales).....	5.6	4.5.
Tobacco (million pounds farm weight).....	457	525.

With these domestic and export demands, there would be markets for nearly as much as our farmers are now producing. The numbers of livestock and acreages of crops needed at full employment post-war are compared with present and prospective levels in table 3.

The demand for some products like potatoes, wheat, and peanuts might decrease below war levels, since they have been pushed to abnormal amounts to offset war shortages. But, when added together, these full-employment domestic and foreign demands for farm products as a whole would require even larger acreage than farmers are now

growing under greatly inflated war requirements. Of course, if farm efficiency continues to increase; that is, if we keep on improving stocks, hybrid seeds, fertilization, and machinery, it is probable that this increased demand could be met with no more acreage than is now under cultivation. This would mean increased value and income per acre and per farmer.

Consumption and production figures tell the full employment story even more forcefully when applied to specific commodities. What would full employment mean to cattlemen, for example, or to cotton and tobacco growers, to cattle growers, to hog producers, or to the dairying industry?

BEEF CATTLE

Everyone knows today that when people have good jobs they want to eat more steak and roasts. The market for beef is almost a barometer of prosperity and depression.

If we maintain post-war full employment, cattlemen could market nearly 30,000,000 cattle and calves a year, at good prices. This would mean they would take in about two and one-third billions of dollars a year—not much less than today, and just about double their average pre-war sales.

But if we allow severe depression to develop, beef producers will be really hard hit. Production would decline to about 27,000,000 head, beef prices to about \$4, and farm income would be down to two-thirds below present levels and one-third below the pre-war average. I have here illustrative figures—Table 3, beef cattle, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects, under various conditions—to be included in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 3.—Beef cattle, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects, under various conditions

Item	Unit	Pre-war, 1935-39	War, 1943	Post-war ¹		
				Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
Cattle and calves slaughtered.....	Million head.....	24.8	27.6	29.6	28.4	26.7
United States beef production.....	Million pounds, dressed weight.....	7,974	9,670	9,975	9,600	9,000
Farm prices, beef cattle.....	Dollars per hundredweight.....	6.51	11.80	10.50	8.00	4.00
Farm prices, veal calves.....	Dollars per hundredweight.....	7.75	13.50	12.25	9.75	5.00
Farm income from cattle marketings.....	Million dollars.....	1,173	2,560	2,322	1,717	810

¹Data for full employment and moderate depression from U. S. Department of Agriculture estimates; severe depression, rough estimates by the author.

COTTON

The cotton farmer has a double stake in full employment—both his domestic and his very important foreign market depend upon domestic prosperity; the former for obvious reasons, the latter because foreign nations can be prosperous only if the United States is prosperous.

The chief problem facing cotton growers after the war is that of competition—from synthetics and from foreign growers. Despite this threat, full employment would permit cotton to hold its own. It would create a market for about 14,000,000 bales and an approximate 40 percent increase of cash income over

pre-war years, provided prices were kept at a level low enough to meet competition. I should like to have a supporting table—Table 4, "Cotton, pre-war, and war, and prospects under various post-war conditions"—inserted in the RECORD at this point.

TABLE 4.—Cotton pre-war and war, and prospects under various post-war conditions

Item	Unit	Pre-war, 1935-39	War, 1943	Post-war ¹		
				Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
Cotton consumption, American cotton; ²						
United States.....	Million bales.....	6.8	9.8	9.0	8.0	6.0
Foreign countries.....	Million bales.....	5.3	1.3	4.5	3.3	2.0
Total consumption.....	Million bales.....	12.1	11.1	13.5	11.3	8.0
United States production.....	Million bales.....	12.9	11.1			
Cotton acreage.....	Million acres.....	28.5	21.9	25.9	21.7	15.3
Cotton farm price.....	Cents per pound.....	0.10	0.20	0.13	0.12	0.09
Cash income from cotton lint.....	Million dollars.....	645	1,110	900	702	360

¹ Estimates for full employment and moderate depression by U. S. Department of Agriculture; for severe depressions rough estimates by the speaker.

² Data for cotton years, beginning Aug. 1 of year stated.

If a serious depression is allowed to develop, on the other hand, prices and production would plunge downward, and acreage might have to be cut to less than 60 percent of the full employment market, and farm income from cotton would fall to half its pre-war level.

The heavily populated cotton South has problems enough even at best. One of the most difficult of these is the rapid introduction of mechanical cotton pickers, tractor plowing, cultivators, etc. Under depression conditions, this mechanization would only add to the already large number of sub-marginal farmers.

But with a full employment market and with the removal of discriminatory freight rates, the industrialization of the South can go swiftly forward, and open up good-paying jobs for farm people who may wish to leave the farm, as well as new markets for truck, dairy and other diversified farm products.

TOBACCO

Tobacco farmers, too, have a fundamental interest in full employment. Nobody today has to be told that increased incomes have a heavy impact upon the demand for cigarettes.

With full employment, farmers could grow one-third more tobacco than they grow today and sell it at prices nearly as high. The value of these crops would be nearly two and one-half times the pre-war level.

Severe depression, on the contrary, would cut consumption sharply, and prices would fall from 40 cents a pound to 18 cents or less. Farm income would be less than half what it is at present. I should like to have a supporting table—table 5, "Tobacco, pre-war, war, and prospects under various post-war conditions"—included in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 5.—Tobacco, pre-war, war, and prospects under various post-war conditions

Item	Unit	Pre-war, 1935-39	War, 1943	Post-war		
				Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
Domestic consumption.....	Million pounds, farm weight.....	899	943	1,360	1,240	1,000
Exports.....	Million pounds, farm weight.....	601	457	525	400	250
Total disappearance.....	Million pounds, farm weight.....	1,500	1,400	1,885	1,640	1,250
Total production.....	Million pounds, farm weight.....	1,500	1,400	1,885	1,640	1,250
Acreage.....	1,000 acres.....	1,647	1,449	1,935	1,685	1,285
Farm price.....	Dollars per pound.....	0.19	0.40	0.35	0.26	0.18
Farm income from sales.....	Million dollars.....	279	560	660	426	225

HOGS

Hog producers, because of their great wartime expansion for overseas markets, are even more dependent than cattlemen on high levels of domestic activity in the post-war. If we can maintain full employment, expanding domestic consumption will offset much of the shrinkage in

export shipments, and maintain high incomes for hog producers.

But severe depression would be catastrophic for hog farmers. If production were cut only one-third—from present marketings of 95,000,000 head a year to 61,000,000—prices would fall to \$7 or lower, and cash income from hogs to

under \$600,000,000—or less than a third of what hog producers' income would run at full employment. I should like to have table 6, "Hogs, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects under various conditions," inserted in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 6.—Hogs, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects under various conditions

Item	Unit	Pre-war, 1935-39	War, 1943	Post-war		
				Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
Hogs slaughtered.....	Millions.....	56.8	95.3	92.6	78.2	61.0
Pork production, dressed weight.....	Million pounds.....	7,337	13,371	12,135	10,250	8,000
Farm prices.....	Dollars per hundredweight.....	8.30	13.70	11.75	9.10	7.00
Farm cash income from hogs marketed.....	Million dollars.....	838	2,953	2,139	1,456	560

DAIRYING

With full employment after the war, the market would take over a fifth more than all the dairy products now being sold from farms. As a result, farm income from dairy products, which is al-

ready running twice pre-war, would be further increased to one-sixth more than it now is. Under severe depression, however, both marketings and prices would fall drastically, and farm income from

dairying would be near the low prewar levels. I should like to have table 7, "Dairy products, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects under various conditions," inserted in the RECORD at this point.

TABLE 7.—Dairy products, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects under various conditions

Item	Unit	Pre-war, 1935-39	War, 1943	Post-war		
				Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
United States production (fluid milk equivalent).....	Billion pounds.....	103.7	117.7	128.4	121.3	110
Farm sales of milk and dairy products (fluid milk equivalent).....	Billion pounds.....	80.8	90.8	110.7	105	100
Milk cows.....	Million head.....	23.5	25.7	27.9	26.4	23.9
Average farm receipts from sales of milk, butterfat, and butter (fluid milk equivalent).....	Dollars per hundredweight.....	1.81	3.12	2.90	2.25	1.60
Farm cash income from dairy products.....	Million dollars.....	1,409	2,804	3,222	2,363	1,600

Cotton, tobacco, beef cattle, hogs, dairy products, all show a close and consistent relation between the level of national prosperity and farm prices and income. Sales of these five products account for over half of all farm cash income. And there are many other farm products—poultry products, fruits and vegetables, flaxseed, wool and lambs—that are equally sensitive to changes in domestic and foreign buying power.

Putting these separate farm pictures together, we find that if we can maintain full employment after the war, as H. R. 2202 is intended to make possible, farmers can enjoy markets and incomes almost as large as the record highs reached during the war.

Under full employment and a national income continuing at a \$150,000,000,000 level, per capita consumption of all food would rise to a new level about 18 percent above pre-war. Assuming that

farm prices decline to parity level, net income of farm operators would remain more than twice as high as pre-war. Cash income from farm marketings per person engaged in agriculture would be about \$2,125, or two and one-half times as large as before the war. I should like to have table 8, "Employment, prices, and income in the United States, farm and total, pre-war, war, and post-war, under full employment," inserted in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 8.—Employment, prices, and income in the United States, farm and total, pre-war, war, and post-war under full employment

Item	Unit or base	Pre-war (1935-39)	War (1943)	Post-war (estimated at full employment)
ALL UNITED STATES ACTIVITY				
Employed (civilian plus military)	Millions	43.6	61.5	68.0
Unemployed	Millions	10.2	1.1	2.0
Gross national product	Billion dollars	81.9	186.5	188.0
National income	Billion dollars	66.4	147.9	150.0
Food consumption per capita, index	1935-39=100	100.0	106.0	118.0
AGRICULTURE				
Workers in agriculture	Millions	9.3	8.8	8.0
Volume of agricultural output, index	1935-39=100	100.0	129.0	135.0
Cash income from farm marketings	Billion dollars	8.0	19.2	17.0
Net income of farm operators	Billion dollars	4.2	11.4	9.3
Prices received by farmers, index	1910-14=100	107.0	193.0	166.0
Parity ratio	1910-14=100	64.0	119.0	100.0
Cash income from marketings, per person employed in agriculture	Dollars	860	2,182	2,125

¹ Production consumers would buy at the estimated prices and incomes.

But suppose we experience severe depression such as that we suffered in the early 1930's, with 17,000,000 unemployed and national income falling below \$60,000,000,000? Such a catastrophe for the industries of the Nation would be a double catastrophe for farmers. Sons and daughters would flock back home from the cities, while farm products would go begging. Farm prices would drop to less than half of present levels. Prices of

things farmers buy would decline, but less rapidly, so that the farm price ratio would fall to two-thirds of parity or less. These estimates are shown in table 9, "Post-war employment, prices, and income in the United States, farm and total, with full employment, moderate depression, and severe depression," which I should like to have included in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 9.—Post-war employment, prices, and income in the United States, farm and total, with full employment, moderate depression, and severe depression

Item	Unit or base	Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
ALL UNITED STATES ACTIVITY				
Employed (civilian plus military)	Millions	58.0	53.0	43.0
Unemployed	Millions	2.0	7.0	17.0
Gross national product	Billion dollars	188.0	130.0	76.5
National income	Billion dollars	150.0	105.0	57.5
Food consumption per capita, index	1935-39=100	118.0	110.0	100.0
AGRICULTURE				
Workers in agriculture	Millions	8.0	8.5	9.0
Volume of agricultural output, index	1935-39=100	135.0	125.0	115.0
Cash income from farm marketings	Billion dollars	17.0	12.5	6.5
Net income of farm operators	Billion dollars	9.3	6.5	3.0
Prices received by farmers, index	1910-14=100	165.0	125.0	75.0
Parity ratio	1910-14=100	100.0	89.0	62.0
Cash income from marketings per person employed in agriculture	Dollars	2,125	1,471	722

¹ Production consumers would buy at the estimated prices and incomes.

Net income of farm operators would decline to one-third of the levels that would prevail with full employment. Even with low depression prices, the markets would take one-sixth less than they would with full employment, and great unsalable surpluses would pile up in many farm products. The Government would have to undertake expensive measures to support prices and markets for farm products; but despite these efforts, farmers and city people alike would suffer great hardships. Meanwhile, banks and insurance companies would be closing their doors, and farmers who bought land at recent higher prices would be forced into bankruptcy by the thousands.

These facts all emphasize one basic relation; farmers cannot prosper unless the Nation prospers.

National prosperity, in turn, is what the full employment bill is designed to accomplish. Its enactment would constitute a congressional promise to co-

operate with the economic groups of the Nation in making sure that there is sufficient spending in the economy to take off the market all the products—from farm and factory—that the people of this country can produce.

Congress has influenced the spending of various groups with almost every measure that it has passed. Tax laws, social security, public works, tariffs, wage legislation, banking and currency programs—all have affected the expenditure decisions of business, consumers, States, and cities as well as the Federal Government.

But we have not always been able to appraise the over-all picture in our debates on particular measures. Under the full-employment bill, however, congressional proposals would no longer be debated as isolated items. A joint committee composed of members of standing committees in both Houses would be charged with the responsibility of co-

ordinating all proposals within the framework of a national full-employment budget.

H. R. 2202 does not prescribe what this National Budget should contain. Specific proposals would continue to be thrashed out in Congress as they now are. The only commitment of the legislation is that the effects of all the actions we take should add up to a full employment level of demand—demand for goods and services, and demand for labor to produce these goods and services.

If business, labor, farmers, consumers, and State and local governments cooperate with the Federal Government in shaping an expansionary program, full employment can be achieved, and private enterprise and initiative will hold full sway. Without such cooperation, employment and national income will fall, business will contract, and economic insecurity will breed a new crop of Federal regulatory and support programs.

For these many reasons I strongly urge that serious study and consideration be given to H. R. 2202 by all who are concerned with the future of American agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, my attention has been called to an item in one of the gossip columns that appeared in a Washington paper yesterday morning, purporting to report one of the weekly off-the-record meetings held by the new Republican Members of the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. Mr. Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., talked to us on that occasion and we asked him a good many questions. I do not know how or where the column got this garbled report of some of the discussion in the meeting. I called Mr. Murray's office and was assured promptly that he had not talked with the columnist or any of his agents, that he did not do business that way, and I am glad to say I believe him completely. But, however it happened, the story puts me in the position of saying things I did not say and I cannot let it pass unchallenged. I should like to read this paragraph:

Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, asked why it is that labor doesn't bring its own bills to Congress on important issues affecting labor.

"We Congressmen are really put on the spot whenever there is a need for legislation," Judd explained, "and when you people, instead of bringing in your own bill, wait for labor-baiters like HOWARD SMITH to introduce legislation. If legislation is needed, we've got to do something about it—even if it means voting for something proposed by a labor-hater."

Mr. Chairman, I dislike taking notice of this sort of misrepresentation to which we are all constantly being subjected. If you do not deny it, your silence is interpreted as meaning it is true, and if you do deny it you merely draw attention to and in some degree dignify a scurrilous attack upon one of our colleagues. In this case, however, I feel under obligation out of fairness to both the dis-

tinguished gentleman from Virginia and to myself to deny categorically that I made any such statement or accusation regarding him or any other of our colleagues, and I invite any of the 75 Members who were present to state so publicly if they heard me make the alleged statement or mention the name of any of our colleagues.

What I did say was this, and I can quote it verbatim because on a good many occasions during the last 2 years I have asked exactly the same question of friends in the labor movement in my own district in Minneapolis. What I said was this: "Almost always in our country's history whenever one group in our population developed a great deal of power it tended to abuse that power. The railroads at one time thought they were stronger than the country but they were not, and they had to be regulated. The banks and Wall Street at one time thought they were stronger than the country and abused their power, and they had to be regulated. Now, labor has great power in this country and there are some of its leaders who, it seems to me, are tending to abuse that power. If they continue, it will inevitably lead to regulation. Therefore, Mr. Murray," I asked, "why don't you leaders of labor work out and propose legislation—and I will help sponsor it—that will merely bring the practices of all the unions up to the level of the practices that the best-managed unions long ago voluntarily adopted? Then labor will not need to worry for a moment about any of the people that it calls labor-baiters introducing or voting for legislation which would be restrictive of labor's legitimate rights."

That is almost word for word the language of the question I asked. I submit it is very different from that reported in the column, and I resent intensely any attempt to put into my mouth words or accusations or insinuations which were not there. There is no need to discuss the matter any further. It is enough to be responsible for the things I do say without gratuitously being made responsible for a lot of things I did not say or think.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would not take this time, but evidently the committee has been engaged in the consideration of rather important matters, and it might be well by way of diversion to make some comment about the gentleman to whom the last speaker referred. I did not all hear the remarks, but I gathered that the substance of it was that the gentleman to whom reference was made does not always tell the truth. That probably is not news to Members of this House. It is reprehensible for Pearson to so distort his comments about Congressman, but it is outrageous for him to place the gentleman who just left the floor in so false a position for no one is more kindly, more considerate of his colleagues than our fellow Member, the gentleman from

Minnesota, Dr. Judd. As well might Pearson throw mud at the flag for our colleague gives offense to no one.

In the March 20 Washington Post, referring to debate on the floor, the gentleman, Mr. Drew Pearson, among other things said this:

Although the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows a vicious speech by HOFFMAN, it does not show one statement by HOFFMAN that, although most judges stay out of politics, "if Justice Frankfurter wants to descend into the political arena that is a matter between him and his God." This statement is not shown because before HOFFMAN could say another word Representative WILBUR MILLS of Arkansas, presiding over the House at the time, ordered it expunged from the RECORD."

Now, you would think that even so notorious a liar as Pearson would use a little discretion in his lying. Why the man should put into the Washington Post, which at least a few Members of the House read, a statement which every Member of the House who knows anything at all about House procedure knows is false, is beyond me. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] was in the chair all right, but he did not strike anything I said from the RECORD. He did not have any authority to strike anything from the RECORD. Not only that, but no objection was made to what I said. Pearson had to tell two lies in one sentence, both of which those who were present here and who are familiar with the procedure of the House, know are false. They know his statements are falsehoods.

Moreover had the statement attributed to me been made it did not violate the House rules nor would it have been improper. Some say this gentleman, Mr. Pearson, is a smart man; that he is a good reporter. He may be smart, low, and cunning but he is a disgrace to the profession which numbers so many honest and conscientious reporters and columnists.

Why this House permits him or his stooge the privilege of the Press Gallery when he is not a reporter—just an ordinary falsifier—why the House permits him the privilege of the House Press Gallery is beyond me. The gentlemen here in the Press Gallery are gentlemen of integrity. They know how to narrate the facts. While they make a few mistakes now and then, by and large we can depend on what we find in the papers from the Press Gallery reporters. But here is this bird who comes along and day after day tells the most barefaced lies that anyone could think of. And he is not even skillful. Some folks have admiration for a skillful, cunning liar, but for a liar who is also foolish I just cannot understand why the House permits him to use its hospitality to attack its Members.

Now, I am not afraid of being charged with suppressing free speech in suggesting that he be segregated from decent, conscientious reporters. That is not the issue involved. We furnish special facilities at the taxpayers' expense for those in the Press Gallery and these reporters come in here because the public is interested in what transpires on the floor and we talk freely in their presence never

regarding them as eavesdroppers—tittle-tattle talebearers, keyhole peepers, or scandalmongers—but Pearson is all that. I would send him over into the gallery and while that might be a hardship for decent people to associate with him, I would put him in a special pen as you would do with an unruly or a fence-jumping critter. He does not abide by any of the rules which apply to decent people, to the ordinary, average citizen. He just goes off and writes that rot because he knows somebody will be looking to see what new lie he has thought up since his last appearance. Why do we not just say to the gentlemen upstairs, "If you are controlling the Press Gallery, why do not you get that skunk out of there? If you do not, we will have to do it for you and set him apart"; because if they associate with him, so help me John Rogers, their clothes must stink when they go home at night and their wives will want to know where they have been.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, on page 13 of the committee's report on H. R. 2689 appears this statement:

One of the matters falling within the province of the work under this appropriation is the regulation of grazing on national-forest ranges and the fixing of grazing fees therefor. The committee, from evidence presented, was impressed with the need for revising grazing fees upward in view of the increased value to stock raisers of the grazing privilege. Such an upward revision would be more in keeping with the present price levels of livestock and livestock products.

I wish to direct my remarks to the suggestion that the national forest should raise their grazing fees upward. It may be that there should be some adjustment of the grazing fees on the national forest, but certainly not upward.

I also note the testimony given by Mr. Granger and others of the Forest Service, on pages 686 to 693 of the committee hearings. Among other things, it was shown that the rates now charged on the national forest for grazing, are three times what they were in 1918. Also I find from the records of the Forest Service that grazing fees as the result of the Rachford appraisal and formula were increased from 7.5 cents per head in 1934 to 26 cents per month per head in 1944. There were 3,750,000 head of cattle on the national forest in 1918, and only 2,000,000 in 1943. This cut in numbers was made necessary because of overgrazing during and following the last World War.

There was much better feed on the ranges in those days than there is today. Just cutting in half the amount of stock to be grazed is not sufficient. There must go with it a program of re-seeding and poison and weed eradication. The amount this will cost will be repaid to the United States Treasury many times over in the way of increased revenues, without increasing the cost per head to the user. Right now the Forest Service is working along the line of charging more

for a much poorer quality of range forage.

Mr. Loveridge, before the Agricultural Committee, stated that if there had been the same number of stock on the Forest Ranges in 1944 that there was in 1918, the grazing fees would have amounted to \$5,700,000 instead of the \$2,400,000 that were collected, as a result of the present decreased cattle and sheep populations.

Putting it another way, in 1918, the Stockmen paid into the United States Treasury for grazing fees, \$1,725,821.91 for 3,750,000 animals. In 1943, the stockmen paid \$2,400,000 in grazing fees for just about half that number of stock on the ranges—or 2,000,000,000 head.

It seems to me that the Forest Grazing Service and the Agricultural Appropriations Committee could well look into the matter of re-seeding and otherwise increasing the feed value of these ranges, so they would care for more cattle and sheep, rather than to carry out their past and present policy of cutting down the number of stock permitted on these ranges to the decreased forage and increasing the fees.

Even from an investment standpoint, it would seem logical to spend a few hundred thousand dollars for re-seeding and eradication of poisons and weeds, when we know that the returned income in the way of grass and feed would repay it in a very few years, as well as helping out the economy of the West.

In most of the Western States, the industry that ranks first in economic importance is livestock. In my district of western Colorado, where 65 percent of the area is owned by the Federal Government and lies within the national forest or the Taylor Grazing Act, this is most important.

The forest reserves were created by the act of March 3, 1891, section 24, which reads:

The President of the United States may, from time to time, set apart and reserve, in any State or Territory having public land bearing forests, in any part of the public lands wholly or in part covered with timber or undergrowth, whether of commercial value or not, as national forests, and the President shall, by public proclamation, declare the establishment of such forests and the limits thereof.

On February 1, 1905, the forest reserves were transferred from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. The first recognition of the use of the old forest reserves for grazing dates back to April 12, 1902, when the Secretary of the Interior issued a manual, part of which was devoted to the subject of grazing on the forest reserves. Then on July 1, 1905, 5 months after the old reserves were transferred to the Department of Agriculture, a regulation was issued which read:

The Secretary of Agriculture has authority to permit, regulate, or prohibit grazing on the forest reserves. Under his direction the Forest Service will allow the use of the forage crop of the reserves as fully as proper care and protection of the forests and the water supply permits.

Neither Congress nor any responsible executive officer has ever formally de-

clared that national-forest grazing fees should return to the Treasury the full commercial value of the pasturage furnished. The general plan of the Forest Administration has always contemplated that users of the forage, like users of the timber, are to pay into the Treasury the reasonable value of the products used, due consideration being given to supply and demand, quality, accessibility, regulations, market conditions, and other factors.

In 1906 grazing fees were established at 1 cent per head per month. This was gradually increased until in 1922, C. E. Rachford, Assistant Chief under W. C. Barnes, then Chief of Grazing, made a study covering a period of about 2 years. Mr. Rachford made an appraisal and recommendations which were completed in 1924, and the report was turned over to Secretary Wallace. Afterward, Dan Casement was selected to review this report.

In 1927, the Secretary, after meeting with representatives of the National Livestock Association, reached an announced settlement of the grazing fee issue as follows:

First. That no increases in fees be made during 1927.

Second. That the schedule of fees determined through the Casement study be approved, subject to further reductions as found equitable to adjust fees fairly between forests and regions.

Third. That the increases in fees arising from the new schedule be applied in installments of 25 percent each during 1928, 1929, 1930, and 1931, the full measure to be applied during 1931 to 1934, inclusive.

Fourth. That in view of the social and economic purposes of the Forest Service and the general public benefits derived from the national forests, this schedule of fees be accepted as representing fair compensation for grazing on the forests under present conditions.

Fifth. That no changes in this schedule of fees be made during the 10-year permit period beginning in 1935 unless material change occurred in conditions which enter into an equitable determination of fair compensation.

To carry out the Casement recommendation for further reductions under No. 2 foregoing, the Forest Service further critically examined the individual forest fees, and the final average fees established were:

	<i>Cents</i>
	<i>per</i>
	<i>month</i>
Cattle and horses.....	14.5
Sheep and goats.....	4.5

The spring of 1933 found the livestock industry in the throes of the worst depression in history, and a demand again arose for lower grazing fees. After consideration, the Secretary of Agriculture approved the following plan:

First. That the average national forest grazing fees of 14.5 cents per head per month for cattle and horses and 4.5 cents per head per month for sheep and goats, in effect during 1931, be used as the basic fees, subject to adjustment each year in accord with fluctuations in livestock prices.

Second. That the adjusted fees each year shall have the same ratio to the basic fees that the average price received by producers in the 11 Western States during the immediately preceding year had to the corresponding average price during the period 1921-30, inclusive, in the case of cattle, and during the period 1920-32, inclusive, in the case of sheep.

Third. That the cattle prices used in adjusting the fees shall be the prices received for beef cattle as compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the sheep prices shall be the prices received for lambs as likewise compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

This plan was made effective in 1933. It is still operative.

As a result of the Rachford and Casement studies a formula was worked up for grazing fees on the basis of the market price of all cattle and sheep sold on the central markets from the 11 Western States. This formula has been followed ever since with the following results:

	Average national forest grazing fee (cents per head per month)		Average price per 100 pounds received by farmers in 11 Western States	
	Cattle	Sheep	Beef cattle	Lambs
1933.....	9.05	2.05	\$4.13	\$4.18
1934.....	7.51	2.385	3.43	4.85
1935.....	8.04	2.71	3.67	5.51
1936.....	13.05	3.36	5.96	6.84
1937.....	12.55	3.66	5.73	7.45
1938.....	14.98	4.24	6.84	8.62
1939.....	13.4	3.3	6.11	6.74
1940.....	14.89	3.68	6.80	7.49
1941.....	15.97	3.85	7.29	7.82
1942.....	18.9	4.6	8.64	9.39
1943.....	23	5.5	10.50	11.30
1944.....	26	6.25	11.70	12.60
1945.....	26	6	11.30	12.30

When the new fees were put into effect in 1931 the charge for cattle was 14½ cents and for sheep 4½ cents.

May I recall to you that the original grazing fee that was established when the ranges were comparatively new and in much better condition than now was 1 cent? We are today paying for grazing cattle 25 times what we did in those early days.

I wish I had time to review with you the differences between grazing livestock on the national forests and in privately controlled pastures. For 38 years I have operated a stock ranch close to one of the national forests and have used the privileges of the range. These areas are generally high and very mountainous, often extending in elevation to well over 10,000 feet. The terrain is very rough and rugged and the grazing is in mountain peaks surrounded by timber. Many different permittees use the same range and the stock is all run together under the watchful eye of the cowboys in charge. Because of the deep canyons, high mountains, and rough terrain as well as the poison and predatory animals the losses average from 5 percent to 20 percent a year.

When the Forest Service first started to regulate and control grazing in 1905 they stated that the charges to users of the range would not exceed the costs of administration. There is no written evidence of this fact, but many men have

told me that that was the promise that was given them for their cooperation in the establishment of the act. Let me give you the figures as given me by Mr. Dutton, of the Forest Service, this morning:

Grazing fees—receipts 1944	\$2, 458, 945. 77
Expenses for salaries of foresters, rangers, guards, supervisors, travel, etc.	1, 213, 941. 00
Incidental expenses, experiments, reseeding, special meetings, etc.	469, 000. 00
Total	1, 682, 941. 00
Net balance of	770, 004. 77

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

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. A net of how much?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Seven hundred and seventy thousand dollars.

Mr. HORAN. What became of that?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That goes into the Treasury.

Mr. HORAN. None of it was used for improving the range?

Mr. ROCKWELL. There is no record to show what happened to that. As I understand it, the research work done by this organization comes under the head of "incidental expenses" and includes reseeding, experiments, and that sort of work.

Mr. HORAN. The reason I asked the question is because it is apparent that our range has become less efficient during the years. I was interested in seeing the figure quoted by the gentleman from Colorado because I feel that it might be a good place for us to inquire as to whether or not we could not use more of those funds, which apparently are covered into the Treasury, for the purpose of rebuilding the range, which would enable us to graze more stock and thereby increase the Government's income.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

In conclusion may I summarize what I am trying to say to you. The stockmen of the 11 Western States believe that the present fees charged by the National Forest are sufficiently high to more than care for the necessary administration of grazing on the forest. They have no objection to a study and revision of these fees for the purpose of equality but not with the idea of an increase in these fees. In 1943, the total income from these fees per animal unit was 1.09 and the total expenditure amounted to 75 cents per animal unit, including \$277,500 for range improvement. Surely this is a sufficient margin. This agency was never set up as a revenue producer for the Treasury but to safeguard and protect our great national resources such as water, minerals, and timber stored in our great mountains of the West.

I, therefore, feel compelled to object to the request of the Agricultural Appropriations Committee that any study be made for the purpose of increasing the grazing fees on the national forests. These fees are based on the prices received by the stockman for his stock at the central markets and last year they were at their highest point which is three

times what was charged in the early 1930's and more than enough to care for necessary administration and incidental expenses. Also, we recommend that a study be made of a program of reseeding of the range and the elimination of poisonous weeds. This in turn will vastly increase the revenues by allowing increasing numbers of livestock on the forest-grazing land.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER].

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to the story of the marvels of farm production as told by the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations of the House and truly they are marvelous, but I want to remind all of you it has been done in an 8-hour day on the farm—8 hours before dinner and 8 hours after dinner.

I have also listened on several occasions to the venerable Member from Chicago when he referred to the days of the 95-cent milk. I want to take you on a little journey of imagination.

I want you to picture Adolph with a lantern on his left arm and five big pails nested on his right arm, making his way before breakfast down to the barn to milk the cows for his 95-cent milk. We will make no reference to what it costs to feed the animals or to produce the milk. After breakfast, after he has had a good big slice of ham and four or five buckwheat cakes, we see Adolph in gum boots standing half-boot deep in the lot beginning to load up the spreader with the winter's accumulation of fertilizer that makes the corn grow. Such an easy way to make 95 cents. Then we will have the gentleman decide after one morning's experience like that whether 95 cents a hundred is any price for milk or not. I would say to this distinguished Member, the patriarch of the House, that if he were to be given liquid milk in his city of Chicago, he still would not have cheap milk when it was delivered to the people of Chicago, because there are some milk drivers in that city who make almost as much money as a Congressman makes. I hope the committee of which I am a member will make a study and once and for all show us the spread in the cost of distribution and production of these raw materials until they reach the breakfast and dinner tables of America.

There are some other thoughts coming to me, something immediate, and a little later I shall speak of a subsequent problem that is facing agriculture in this country. In my district in northwestern Ohio is a small town called Archbold. It has 1,200 population. Last year it purchased almost \$11,000,000 of livestock. But in every letter coming to my desk from that district and the surrounding counties they say, "Where are the tractors? Why can we not get tractors?" I have attended meetings, and so have you, when we have heard of allocations and promises made of production of farm implements, and I say to you that sooner or later this Congress, which has voted without question every Army and Navy bill that has come along, must scrutinize the appropriations for

some of these great warships that are being laid down for delivery 3 years from now, when our Navy at the present time is destroying the remnants of the Japanese Navy, and decide which is most essential, the production of the No. 1 munitions—food—or the building of ships long after the emergency or the enemy navy exists. That does not mean that I want to let up one little bit on hammering Japan, and Japan will be destroyed with the ships already in existence. I think before 90 days the Japanese fishing smack will have to go out at night, if it wants fish around the Japanese islands.

I was intrigued also by the story of the fine cuts of meat that my friend from Missouri pictured the Army and the Navy eating. On this letter I made a few notes from a paratrooper soldier, a Wisconsin boy from Mr. MURRAY's district, who is somewhere in New Guinea.

He writes:

We are in the land where the sun shines hot and the soldiers eat bully beef and dehydrated potatoes.

But I want to show you how it affects his morale. On the next page he writes:

We are a high-spirited bunch, and I like it.

They are not getting rare roast beef over there. They are fighting on their canned bully beef and their dehydrated eggs and their dehydrated potatoes, and the boy says they are not bad if the cook knows how to prepare them.

I am wondering now whether we are going to have this supply of meat coming along when I see farm after farm depleted of labor, with the last operator taken away. There was one farm in my district consisting of 615 acres, and they took the last able-bodied man last week. There are other farms of two and three hundred acres, and one after another they are going out of production. I am wondering whether these boys are going to have all the bully beef they need. Yes, they can throw stones at the Japs; they can kill the Japs with their bare hands and carve them up with a trench knife, but you cannot go far without something under your belt, and I propose, for one, to see that he gets it if I can.

I have been one of those who has in the past criticized the farm administration of the New Deal, and I did so remembering a trip that I made as a member of the committee down into the Southeast in 1940. We were in the city of Charlotte, N. C., where witness after witness came into that room and testified that 6 cents an hour, 60 cents a day, was the prevailing rate of wages in that area. I remember one farmer from Florida who came into that room to listen to the committee of the Congress. He came down there to see if there was not something we could really do to make him an economic, independent, upstanding producer of agriculture. About 2 o'clock in the afternoon he said, "Will the gentlemen of the committee please rise?" Every man in that room rose to his feet. The sincerity of this man was moving. You could not resist coming to your feet. Down on his knees in that ballroom in the Charlotte Hotel that farmer knelt and gave thanks to Almighty God that a

committee of Congressmen had seen fit to come down into his area, the first one he had ever seen in his life that was interested in him, so he said. He had thought Republicans had cloven hoofs and spiked tails and horns, and here was a committee of Republican Congressmen coming to see what we could do to help him.

We came back to Washington, and a Member from Mr. TARVER's own State, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], before my committee told us that peanuts were \$40 a ton. He said, "If we could get \$80, we might have a new crop to grow there instead of cotton." Well, we have 1,000,000 tons of peanuts this year at \$160 a ton. I did not think that was too much. Sixty dollars was like 90-cent milk: it just kept you from starving to death.

I wish there were more of you here, because in 2 or 3 weeks you are going to vote like a bunch of sheep for the extension of the reciprocal-trade treaties that are going to take that million tons of peanuts from Mr. TARVER's State, with its oil now worth about 14 cents, and put it into direct competition with coconut and palm oil that was brought into this country in the spring of 1940 for \$4.40 a hundred f. o. b. Cincinnati, and 2 cents a pound duty was paid on it. That duty is now off.

It is true that Mr. Rainey, of Illinois, when asked, "Why not repeal this infamous tariff act you have heard so much about," said, "The Republicans will not do it and we do not dare." But you have cut it 50 percent, and now you come with a bill from the Committee on Ways and Means to permit another 50-percent cut, that would cut it to 25 percent, yet on your oils there is none there.

I say to you, if you want the American people to eat, if you want the American people to have a standard of diet higher than any others in the world, if you want a farmer something different than a clod or a serf, you have to stand up here and be counted when these men floating around on a pink cloud come in here in this House to put the American farmer, who is compelled by law to wear clothing and overalls, in competition with a native skinning up a palm tree with a G-string around his middle. That will be the acid test of whether you are the farmer's friend or not.

I want to tell you one of the reasons why I am not in favor of going back to this economic situation we had here prior to 1940. No one here has given the Lord God Almighty credit for the wonderful growing years and bountiful crops. I think they come as a direct reward for America because she is great, because she aims to be honest and solid and charitable to all in the world. I think it is just a benediction of the Almighty that these crops have been bestowed upon us during these war years when we have had to gather them with short labor. But if somebody challenges the remark I made, I want to give you the hottest one of all of them, the little pigs. You have heard a lot of them. I want to tell you something, that on March 3, 1940, 7 years after the lights of civilization went out, little pigs, 75 pounds to 130 pounds in weight, sold in the Chicago market for \$1 a hundred less than

they did when the fourth-term President was inaugurated for the first term—March 4, 1923.

If you think your proposition will preserve agriculture, a rude awakening is coming, because the thing that the chairman hinted at, this debacle, this collapse, this sliding of agricultural prices will take down agriculture first, then the country towns, then transportation, then the cities and the manufacturing, all tied together. This country cannot live on a free-trade basis with all the world. It will raise each one just a little and it will bring us down to the level of the world.

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

Mr. CLEVINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is talking about this little-pig business. Does the gentleman recall that last week over in the other body a gentleman who represents the State of Mississippi rose there and said that his farmers were not going to be able to work because they could not get salt pork, and they could not get salt pork because of the manipulations of the fellows down at the other end of the Avenue?

Mr. CLEVINGER. They cannot get salt pork because he has taken all of the farmers out of the Corn Belt where they put fat back on the pork.

You cannot feed them on blue sky and get good thick fatback.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about their working on orders, directives, and regulations? How about that keeping up their strength?

Mr. CLEVINGER. Well, I will say something about the black market. For 45 years I have been a constant visitor to the city of New York. It amuses me sometimes to hear them talk about the black market. I have never been there when there was a first-run at the theater but sooner or later somebody would come to me and say, "Mr. CLEVINGER, have you seen the latest so-and-so sensation at such-and-such a theater?" And I would say, "Why, yes. I saw it last night." I will say to the gentleman sitting before me that he is going to enjoy this as he has been there with me many times. And then they would ask, "How did you get the tickets to that show?" And I said, "I got them at the box office." That is the last place they thought of to go for a theater ticket. I am wondering if they know where to go to get steaks.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

OFF ON HIGH—ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN PROPAGANDA SHEET—LINING UP THE VOTES FOR BRETTON WOODS WITH FEDERAL MONEY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, dated March 17, 1945, from the Treasury Department of the United States came the following letter:

Secretary Morgenthau recently addressed the Detroit Economic Club on the Bretton Woods agreements for an international monetary fund and an international bank for reconstruction and development.

The Secretary thought you might be interested in the enclosed material from the Detroit papers and some selected clippings from other newspapers throughout the

country dealing with the Detroit meeting and the Bretton Woods agreements.

I am also taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of the text of the Secretary's address for your reference.

EDWIN B. FUSSELL,
Assistant to the Secretary.

With it were five full-page electroplates of Detroit newspapers and two of equal size containing assorted propaganda from Detroit and other papers.

Doubtless similar material went to the desk of every other Congressman.

The propaganda is in line with this administration's idea that, come low or high water, the interests, the welfare and the well-being of other people, other nations, should be considered first—before the interests of our own people of America.

The one great, vital question which confronts us here in the United States of America is the early winning of this war with a minimum of loss of life.

American youth throughout the world are dying by the thousands and the principal beneficiaries from the sacrifices which they have made, which they will be required to make, are the people of other lands.

If that is to be the fate of American youth, then the least that we here at home can do is to devote our every thought, our every word, our every act, to giving them the greatest possible support in every field.

The future welfare of other nations might well wait until the victory has been won; until the enemy has ceased shooting, bombing, killing, America's young men. The one thing which should concern every administration official is the giving of every possible aid to those who have either enlisted or who have been drafted to fight this war.

The administration here in Washington has at last discovered that there is a possible shortage of food. Yesterday, the President stated that he was going to give the matter some consideration. Perhaps General Hershey and those who have been "shanghaiing" agricultural labor at last realize that possibly some of their political friends will not be able to get all the butter, the meat, and the other things which they enjoy.

It is also possible that the White House—even the Executive Mansion—although the First Lady announces that she has not noticed any shortage of food—may in time discover that milk does not originate in a can; that the materials which go into the bread has a prior existence, and that, somewhere in the United States, someone has sweated and toiled to produce.

Krug, head of the War Production Board, according to the press, a few days ago made the momentous discovery that there was a limit to America's capacity to produce and to feed the world.

Perhaps it is too bad that some of the higher-ups in the administration either never heard of or failed to remember the old nursery jingle, which goes something like this:

Humpty-Dumpty sat on a wall;
Humpty-Dumpty had a great fall—
And all the king's horses and all the king's men
Could not put Humpty-Dumpty together again.

Perhaps they have forgotten that the answer to the riddle was that Humpty-Dumpty was an egg; that an egg once broken, the milk once spilled, cannot be conjured back into its original form by an administrative directive.

So up into Detroit, where there has been a slow-down of production, where the Army and the Navy officials have warned that men on the fighting lines will die because of slow-downs, work stoppages, and strikes; because of a lack of material, goes the great Henry Morgenthau, who announced, in substance, that the German nation should be deindustrialized, that its people should become agriculturalists, and attempts to line up the industrialists and the workers of Detroit in support of Bretton Woods, a program which will require American taxpayers to contribute, at its inception, more than five and one-half billion dollars.

The principal purpose of Bretton Woods is to make the American taxpayer pay for benefits which will be enjoyed by foreign nations and the people of foreign nations.

To corral the votes of the Detroit industrialists and of hundreds of thousands of workers in Detroit, Henry baits his hook with the juicy promise that Detroit, if Bretton Woods is adopted, will get an order for a million automobiles in the immediate post-war period and that hundreds of thousands of jobs will be created. All this on the theory that if we give or loan now five and one-half billion—later, more if necessary—to foreign nations, the people of those nations will, in turn, spend that money buying automobiles, and, naturally, someone must build them.

For myself, I prefer to have the American tax dollar spent here in America with the American people and that they—not someone across the sea—buy the automobile. The automobile will be sold, but it will be sold to an American. It will be paid for by American dollars, no part of which has been shaved off by some intermediary for administrative expenses. The automobile will be built by American labor and the American worker will have a job.

The theory of giving foreigners American dollars so that they, in turn, can spend those dollars with us and so create prosperity, savors too much of lifting ourselves by our own bootstraps.

Henry, instead of advocating the adoption of Bretton Woods, might far better have been appealing for a return to work, for the production of war materials. But his mind apparently was not on the main, the vital issue; he was thinking of the future welfare of those who are not Americans.

Bretton Woods should stand or fall on its merits, and there is no excuse for a member of the President's Cabinet traveling around the country spending tax money in propaganda.

There is no excuse for a Cabinet officer attempting to buy the support of automobile manufacturers, of automobile workers, by offering them post-war sales, post-war jobs.

One thing the automobile manufacturers, and the automobile workers should

remember is this: That if this administration continues to increase the tax burden of the American citizen, of the American farmer who has been the motor manufacturers' best customer, he will not have the money to buy on the home market, and the worker will not have the food to eat which the farmer would otherwise produce if properly equipped with motor transportation and farm machinery.

Henry should learn what Krug and some other high administrative officials are learning and today acknowledge, that it is necessary to keep a sound, secure foundation under the American people, under American industry, and that cannot be done if the material for that foundation is shipped abroad, given away.

Excerpts from these Detroit papers, which show Henry's bait, are attached hereto and marked exhibit A.

EXHIBIT A

Detroit Times of February 26, 1945: A picture of Secretary Morgenthau and Walter McLucas, chairman of the board of the National Bank of Detroit, with the information that Mr. Morgenthau addressed the Economic Club on the Bretton Woods conference.

Same page—first—headline, two-thirds across the page, "Strike May Hit 100,000 Jobs," and at the right, the headline on the news article reads, "Dodge fight seen halting B-29 output," and, down below, the statement:

The Army and Navy today flatly told representatives of 13,000 striking U. A. W.-C. I. O. Dodge main plant employees that they are impeding the war effort and jeopardizing recent United States gains.

Appearing at a W. L. B. hearing after the strikers refused to heed a W. L. B. order to return to work, the service officers said unless the strike is called off immediately production of certain B-29 bomber parts will be stopped completely.

In addition, production of trucks, tanks, robot bombs, and Bofors guns has been affected seriously.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND MAY BE IDLE.

A company spokesman estimated that, if the strike continued, more than 100,000 workers from 13 other Detroit and Chicago Chrysler Corporation plants may be made idle by the end of the week.

Detroit News, February 26, 1945, headline across top of page, "Strike perils jobs of 100,000."

Then, in the news column, is reprinted Morgenthau's address under the caption, "Million-car export due for Detroit—Morgenthau looks to Bretton Woods."

On another full-page reproduction, there is an article captioned, "In terms of jobs in Detroit factories."

Then the news story begins with the paragraph:

Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, speaking here in behalf of the Bretton Woods agreement, made a persuasive case for it by relating its purpose to Detroit's needs as an exporting center.

The substance of his argument was that, if we would finance other peoples and other nations, they would buy some automobiles and the workers of Detroit would have jobs.

Detroit Free Press, February 27, 1945, headline running across first page, "Dodge strikers get new W. L. B. ultimatum."

Down below, the subheading, "15,800 idle as unit still defies order—14 more plants may be forced to close."

Over at the left of the same page, "Strike at Dodge snowballs into national crisis."

Then, down in the middle of the page, Morgenthau's plug for Bretton Woods, captioned, "World auto trade boom predicted by Morgenthau economic pact would open market, Detroit business leaders told."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, many Members of the House are receiving complaints from all over the United States on the unworkability of title 3 of the G. I. bill of rights, namely, the title dealing with loans to veterans. I am receiving complaints from all over the country that this portion of the G. I. bill is not functioning in the best interests of the veterans. I believe that to be true primarily because the Veterans' Administration has surrounded title 3 with so many regulations, rules, and interpretations, that it is impossible to make a loan under it to the best interests of the veterans. I have information from bankers that they are only considering the making of loans to veterans because of the patriotic desire on their part to help them; otherwise, they would not be interested in these loans or interested in making them because the Veterans' Administration has surrounded title 3 with such unworkable regulations and interpretations that they cannot figure it out and make the loan and know what they are doing. I am perfectly aware also in the drafting of the G. I. bill of rights we placed therein a provision that if the veteran could not get a guaranteed loan under the provisions of the bill, the Veterans' Administration may permit him to get a loan from any other agency of the Government. In the bill before you, which is now under discussion. I find a provision authorizing \$25,000,000 to make loans to veterans under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act. That is well and good. But that, again, will only add confusion to the chaotic condition that already exists in the interpretation and administration of title 3 of the G. I. bill of rights. I am for the veterans getting those loans under the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Act, but not to have them administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and subject the veterans to the detriments of the Bankhead-Jones Act. If we could make it so that the veteran would get the benefit of the Bankhead-Jones Act without the detriments and make it as an amendment to the G. I. bill of rights instead of placing the veteran under the Department of Agriculture, then in my opinion we would be doing something for the veterans. In connection with that, I quote from the Bankhead-Jones Act the following as to the powers and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture, which he would have over the veteran if this

\$25,000,000 provision is retained in the present bill:

And that such proper farm practices as the Secretary shall prescribe will be carried out.

In other words, under this provision in this bill the Secretary of Agriculture would be able to tell the veteran who secures one of those loans what to farm, where to farm, how to farm, what to plant, what not to plant, and have complete control over him. That is not what the veteran is fighting for. That is not what the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House was endeavoring to do in enacting the G. I. bill of rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, we want the veteran to have the benefit of the loan without a lot of red tape and control over him. Let him be a freeman in the free country he is fighting for. Following out this thought, some 20 Members of the House, including myself, on Saturday of last week, met and discussed the possibility of an amendment to title 3 of the G. I. bill.

On Monday of this week I introduced such a measure, which is known as H. R. 2671, which will give the veterans all of the benefits of the Bankhead-Jones Act, without any of its detriments. In other words, he will be a free farmer or a freeman; will be able to come under the provisions of this bill, H. R. 2671, which is offered as an amendment to the G. I. bill of rights, and get everything that he can get under the Bankhead-Jones Act, with the same rate of interest, the same length of time to pay it off. I have no pride of authorship in the bill I have introduced, known as H. R. 2671, but I do say if we want to aid the veteran we should not do it in the manner proposed by the bill under consideration, but rather it should be by direct amendment in a separate bill to title III of the G. I. bill of rights, and prevent adding more confusion to the present chaotic condition.

Therefore, I submit to you the proper way to aid the veteran is to consider H. R. 2671.

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

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I was deeply interested in the address of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] wherein he discussed the great amounts of food on hand in this country. Among other things he called attention to the 82,000,000 head of cattle in this country as well as the number of hogs and other livestock. I come from a cattle-feeding section of the country where thousands of cattle are grazed and fed every year. The gentleman from Missouri says 82,000,000 is more cattle than we have ever had before, and that we have a surplus of livestock.

On the other hand, Government agencies tell us of the great scarcity of

meat, including beef. The War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, says there may be some doubt about it. Some Government agencies say the meat supply is fast fading away and very soon there will be little left for anyone. Officials in high places even tell us we may be short of meat for our armed forces. Even the British Government is concerned about a meat supply they expect from this country. Housewives say they cannot buy meat in the butcher shops and the butchers say they cannot buy it from the wholesalers.

What I am trying to bring out is this—the whole problem ought to be unscrambled. It appears to be a matter of maldistribution, bad handling and bungling. There are too many agencies dealing with the problem, many at cross-purposes.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I submitted a resolution that the Committee on Agriculture look into the food supply problem, especially meat. We should find out about our supply, what the demands are on the part of the armed forces, about our promises to the Allies, how much we are to give to U. N. R. R. A. and other foreign groups, and how much for ourselves. A policy should be formulated with respect to the distribution of food for the present and in the post-war era. The authority for the handling and distribution should be placed in one agency and not a half dozen as is being done now. It looks as though the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing in dealing with the meat question.

I know the problem can be worked out if we have experienced men to deal with it and who are given authority to do it. One thing that would give the country more meat is to offer inducement to the feeder by paying a little higher price for the finished product. Because livestock are slaughtered before finished we have a poorer quality of meat at a higher cost, and we have a less supply of good meat. It is estimated about 20,000,000 cattle were slaughtered last year at an average of 50 pounds less weight than the year before. This is a decrease of 10,000,000 pounds. We should have had an increase of two or three hundred pounds on each animal.

In any event we have confusion with respect to producing, processing and distribution that could be straightened out if we put it in the hands of one agency with authority to act. We have lots of statistics about meat. People cannot eat statistics—they want meat.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I agree fully with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Kansas. The testimony presented this afternoon on the floor of the House on the food situation in the United States has been most confusing. More than anything else, it emphasizes one thing, the need now of a prompt and searching investigation on the part of the people's Representatives.

I have gathered at random some statements made by Members of the House during the debate today. Let me repeat them to you:

First. Farm production in the United States is getting worse and worse.

Second. We have more food today than at any time in our history.

Third. We must be ready to take another hitch in our belts.

Fourth. Liberated lands will be able to produce record crops.

Fifth. We must export great quantities of food.

Obviously, we are in great disagreement. On one proposition, however, we do agree and that is the American black market flourishes and little is being done about it. It is not a healthy picture for morale on the home front, and most certainly it is not a healthy picture for our G. I.'s on the battle front.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there is something of more importance involved than this agriculture bill that we have up for consideration today—period. Little did I think 6 years ago, when I became a member of the Committee on Agriculture, that I would gradually see it washed out as far as being a committee of any great importance. In 1939 and 1940, the Agriculture Committee considered only the legislation O. K.'d by the Department. Now we see the committee's functions turned over to the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, evidently with the support of the chairman. These are facts no one can dispute. Little did I realize that the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of this House would ever have the temerity to take over the functions of a legislative committee of the House of Representative like the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations has done. This Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has set itself up above the law; rules, I will say instead of law, because I am not a lawyer, and I do not want to get into any legal argument. It distresses me to see the great Rules Committee become a partner to such a program. I do know when groups play fair, I know when they bite in the clinches, and I know when they hit below the belt, because I come from a country that is not too far removed from the lumberjack days.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Do I understand that the Committee on Appropriations is bringing in legislation on this appropriation bill not authorized by the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Kansas. Yes; I regret to say that the Rules Committee is going to bring in a rule that provides that no points of order can be made. The Appropriations Committee voted to ask for this kind of a rule. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations has taken upon itself to write the legislation that ought to go through the Committee on Agriculture. I am not irritated or jealous about it as far as it affects the Agriculture Committee. I do resent the attitude,

however, and I do question a program whereby the chairman of the Agriculture Committee gives it his blessing by appearing for a rule wherein points of order cannot be made without authorization from the Agriculture Committee.

It saddens me to see our country gradually going down the road to totalitarianism. Oh, it is the power certain people like to grab for some reason or other. I do not care who the Member is, he cannot help from being irritated, he should be depressed to see these things happen. I am not jealous about anything that the Agricultural Committee might have up for consideration, but in this bill the way it is brought in you will find legislation that could and should have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Let me give you one example. In the Agricultural Committee that is supposed to have charge of farm loans, they here vote out the Flannagan farm credit bill. I voted against it. After July 1 a person who is able to make a 50-percent down payment on his farm gets a mortgage for 4 percent for the remaining 50 percent. If he is fairly thrifty and he has 25 percent to pay down on the farm, the Flannagan bill requires the borrower to pay 5-percent interest. But, lo and behold, if he can go to the Appropriations Committee and get in good with that Bankhead-Jones committee, he can buy a farm without a red cent. He can sign a statement that he cannot get the money from anyone and he can get the loan for 3 percent for 40 years. In addition, he can get the Bankhead-Jones committee to provide a loan wherein they spend \$300 to go out and find a farm, or 5 percent on the average farm they will buy. The fellow who is the worse off has to go to the Bankhead-Jones committee. The fellow who is fairly well off and tries to get started has to get a loan from legislation that passes the Agricultural Committee and pay as much as 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent more interest than he would if he could get a loan through the Bankhead-Jones committee set-up.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It appears then it is about time that the Appropriations Committee of the House handling these appropriations for the Department of Agriculture get together with the House Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to make a personal matter out of this.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was not being personal.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN, a member of this subcommittee, went before the Rules Committee yesterday and protested. My colleague on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin the Honorable FRANK B. KEEFE, protested also. These gentlemen realize that this committee is in a field which it did not have any business to be in. I want it to appear in the RECORD at this point that as a Member of Congress I will not support nor will I vote to provide one group of people 100-percent loans at 3 percent and provide another group 75-percent loans for 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ more interest, or 5-percent interest.

We are going down the road to totalitarianism because when they get those loans they will be under the domination of the administration that provides the soft loan at 3 percent. The average or common man's loan will pay 5 percent and the hard-loan borrower will pay 4-percent interest. I wish someone sometime would explain this kind of legislation.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may have permission to revise and extend his remarks and to insert certain tables and other extraneous matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is given permission to revise and extend his remarks, but he will have to get permission to include extraneous matters in the House.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me when we are considering an appropriation bill for agriculture it is important to bring up the matter of the leather shortage and to make a suggestion as to how we can secure more leather.

Just a few days ago, on March 15, the War Production Board announced "a deep slash in the supply of leather for civilian shoes in April, May, and June." I am reliably informed that only 10 or 15 percent of the leather recently available for upper leather for shoes would be available for those 3 months. In practical effect this means that only fabric shoes will be made during this period. Much of the material now going into shoe construction is not worth the effort and energy required for the manufacture of the shoes produced. The quality of much of this fabric material is so low that, as many housewives tell me, shoes, particularly those for children, will not stand up and frequently fall apart shortly after they are put into use. As a result of the continued reduction in quality due to the lack of leather, the number of shoes produced in this country has continued to decline so that, in spite of a fairly strict rationing system, O. P. A. authorities now admit that the number of shoes available is fewer than the total number of tickets outstanding. In 1942 this country produced approximately 450,000,000 pairs of shoes. In 1944, 314,000,000 pairs of shoes were produced for civilians in this country. The cut announced this last week will probably result in a drop in production, even of the fabric shoes, to less than 300,000,000 pairs for the year 1945.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, there is increasing realization of the need for American production of footwear to provide for at least the minimum needs of the liberated countries. Some estimates set this requirement to a figure of 200,000,000 pairs. Present supplies cannot possibly fill even the minimum requirements for our needs here at home, much less the decent and humane thing of supplying some footwear to the peoples just freed from the Nazi yoke.

This need requires the resourcefulness of the American people. This problem, I am convinced, has a comparatively sim-

ple solution. This solution is so simple and so obvious that I am sure many will ask, Why did not I think of that one? And yet I am convinced that only inertia and lethargy and failure to realize the importance of increasing the supply of leather have brought about the failure to use the potential supply of leather that is available through the skinning and tanning of the large number of hogs that are slaughtered in this country. According to the Department of Agriculture, 46,520,000 hogs were slaughtered in federally inspected wholesale slaughterhouses in 1941. Yet in that year, approximately 200,000 skins were tanned to make valuable pigskin which is used to manufacture many beautiful articles that are sold in this country. According to the Department of Agriculture, this morning 74,804,827 hogs were slaughtered in federally inspected slaughterhouses last year. Yet only 550,000 skins were tanned to make pigskin. If only one-half of the hogs slaughtered in these slaughterhouses were skinned and the skins were tanned, the leather supply available in this country would be doubled. It might be possible then to produce a good quality leather shoe whose durability would be such that the present rationing program would fulfill the footwear needs of the people of this country; a new product will have been developed and we may be in position then, as good neighbors, to aid in filling the footwear needs of our allies abroad.

I was interested last evening while glancing through one of the better texts on shoe manufacturing, a volume entitled "Boot and Shoe Manufacture," by Frank Plucknett, to read that a British delegation visiting Russia in 1929 reported in regard to pigskin:

Care is being taken in that country in regard to the collection of raw materials, especially pigskins, of which it is hoped to export considerable quantities in the near future.

Apparently our Russian allies have learned to gather pigskin. According to one of the British trade journals of the leather industry, the Leather Trades Review, September 15, 1943, the Germans have also learned to use pigskin. R. E. Muirhead, in a letter to the editor in the issue of September 15, 1943, states that—

In districts of Germany where before the war pigs were not skinned, on the outbreak of the war the government made it compulsory to skin pigs and even took the trouble to have men trained to do the skinning in order to use the skin for leather production.

It seems to me that much leather that should be used in shoe manufacturing is going into the production of leather novelties. This is a comparative waste and all available leather should be kept for more desirable use in shoe production. On April 20 of last year, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], called the attention of this House to the serious shortage of leather resulting in the curtailment of shoe manufacturing. He stated:

I take the floor today to point out a situation in my district which presents a most deplorable condition which bids fair to threaten the very future of the community in which I live.

I refer to the fact that there are available no hides from which to make shoes.

He later stated:

You may be interested to know, from my observations taken on the tour I made in the Endicott-Johnson plants last summer, that the tanneries have not enough hides so they can operate and produce the leather to fill the full quota they have been called upon by the Government to manufacture. I speak of military and civilian needs they have been ordered to fill.

At that time the question was raised as to whether the problem was not really one of a labor shortage in the tanneries and the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] replied:

I will ask the gentleman to join me, if it is at all possible for him to do so, to take a tour through the Endicott-Johnson tanneries and shoe factories. He will change his mind after he has gone through the shoe factories and will conclude that there is enough labor, particularly in the tanneries, to tan and cure a great many more times the number of hides than have been made available. I assure the gentleman that sufficient labor is available. The only problem is to get the hides.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the O. W. I. announced on June 19, 1943, the formation of a test group "to investigate the possibility of increasing supplies through greater utilization of domestic pigskins." The full statement by the O. W. I. reads as follows:

A task group has been appointed to investigate the possibility of increasing leather supplies through greater utilization of domestic pigskins, Harold Connett, Chief of the Leather and Shoe Branch, W. P. B., announced today.

The slaughter of hogs averages approximately 80,000,000 head annually. However, only small amounts of leather are now produced from this kill, because the skin is usually left on the cuts of meat in the form of rind. It is hoped that substantial additions to the leather supply may result from this investigation, despite the fact that there are serious obstacles to be overcome.

The task group has been requested to investigate the suitability of pigskin leather for upper leather, sole leather, glove leather, and other uses, and the steps necessary to accomplish the maximum leather production from the hog slaughter.

The task group which consists of representatives of the various industries involved in utilizing pigskin leather, follows:

Packers: Henry McCaw, Swift & Co., Chicago, Ill.; Joseph P. Russell, Abrogast & Bastion, Allentown, Pa.

Hide and skin dealers and collectors: Thomas Trainer, Owatonna Hide & Fur Co., Owatonna, Minn.; Sig Adler, Sig Adler & Co., 3918-30 South Wallace Street, Chicago, Ill.

Tanners: E. E. Grayson, S. M. Gusdorf Co., 302 South Harding Street, Indianapolis, Ind.; Herman Roser, Herman Rose & Sons, Inc., Glastonbury, Conn.; F. Sturgis Stout, John R. Evans & Co., Camder, N. J.

Shoe manufacturer: Charles F. Johnson, Jr., Endicott-Johnson Corporation, Johnson City, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the transcript of a conference held on March 27, 1941, exactly 4 years ago. This conference was called by Harriet Eliot, attended by the leading figures of the shoe industry and all Government agencies involved, and met for the purpose of "talking with shoe manufacturers to get a more complete view of the situation running from the shoe manufacturers toward the consumer from the consumer

back to the leather supplies." It seems to me that someone has bungled this problem. On the one hand, we have the terrific need not only of our own population but also of our allies. On the other hand, we have the tremendous potential source available and apparently all that has been done about it is to have conferences, unending conferences, involved complicated regulations, but no one seems to have taken any action to resolve this problem.

Mr. Chairman, steps could be taken immediately to bring and end to the leather shortage. I hope this House will take steps to force some action in this field.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the membership of the House has had opportunity to reflect on the disastrous results from a departmental administrative standpoint of the deletions on points of order made in this body a couple of days ago during its consideration of appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary.

I have no quarrel with the rights of any Member of this body to raise points of order on the two or three definite legislative provisions that were carried in that bill. I refer specifically to the item of Cultural Relations with China and the Near East and the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London. I will state, however, in my opinion the provisions were warranted, first for the reason that the work being conducted by the Department of State, under these two items, has been considered of sufficient importance by the President during the past 2 or 3 years to justify their being financed out of the President's emergency fund. There is no question in my mind but that the elimination of these two items, if sustained by the Senate, will have considerable effect on the morale of the nations wherein this work is conducted, in addition to placing this country at certain disadvantages in its foreign relationship during this crucial period.

I do, however, resent and I believe that every fair-minded Member of this body will resent, the seemingly obstructionist tactics adopted with respect to the smaller and more insignificant legislative provisions that have been carried in this bill over a period of years, some of which came into being as a result of the need for more expedient action on the part of the departments in carrying on their war programs.

There has been considerable discussion in this House, and in the press, as well, about placing government on a business basis. Nearly all of the provisions eliminated on points of order were intended to do just this. The so-called red tape in our Government has been publicized for the past many years. Several of the provisions were intended to circumvent this red tape.

Take, for instance, the authority to transfer between appropriation items in amounts not to exceed 10 percent of any appropriation under the caption "Foreign Service"; the primary purpose of

which was to provide some flexibility in the administration of these appropriations. It is impossible for any agency of the Government to predict with any degree of accuracy its exact requirements under any one appropriation item for a period of approximately 1 year in advance. The real effect of this provision, as experience will show, has been to obviate the necessity of the department coming up for a deficiency appropriation in the event that it runs a few dollars short in one appropriation item, whereas it may have a considerable amount over in some other appropriation item. With an annual appropriation of approximately \$25,000,000 for the Foreign Service, only \$15,000 was so transferred during the fiscal year 1944.

With respect to the elimination of the entire item of foreign service buildings, it may be stated that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House was apprized of the legislative provision exempting this activity from the provisions of the act of March 25, 1938. This committee, however, realizing the importance of moving with dispatch in the acquisition of sites and buildings during this abnormal period, saw fit to allow the exemption to remain. If we wait until the war is over and then follow the usual procedure of requesting funds to purchase individual properties, there is no question but that the cost to the taxpayers of this Nation will be increased by many thousands of dollars.

The elimination of the wording, "Printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919" under the item International Conferences, will also result not only in inconveniencing the department in the carrying out of its work, but also in increased cost to the department. Many conferences are, of course, held outside of the District of Columbia and it is inconceivable how this statute could be made to apply to small amounts of printing and binding in other points of the United States and beyond the continental limits of the United States. Likewise, expenses of entertainment and representation allowances are considered a basic necessity in the conduct of any international conference. Similar allowances are made by other governments to their representatives, and this authority was included to place our representatives on an equal basis in order that they may avoid embarrassment and being placed in disadvantageous positions in their dealings.

Coming now to the Department of Justice, the membership will recall that there was eliminated from this department a provision authorizing the use of not to exceed 5 percent of the appropriations under Legal Activities and General Administration interchangeably. This provision as in the case with the Department of State, was inserted for greater flexibility in administering the various items of appropriation and obviating the necessity of coming to the Deficiency Committee for supplementals. To give you an idea of the extent to which this provision has been applied in the past years, it may be stated that in 1938 the amount of \$29,500 was so transferred. In 1940, \$3,928; in 1941, \$4,425; in 1942, \$2,400; in 1943, \$4,700; and in 1944, \$8,903.

It can be readily seen that the department has not taken advantage of this provision and that there has been no abuse of the authority heretofore allowed.

Under the item "Salaries and expenses of marshals" there was deleted a provision authorizing the payment of not to exceed 4 cents per mile for the use of privately owned automobiles when traveling on official business within the limits of their official station. The United States marshals and their deputies almost without exception use their privately owned automobiles in the discharge of their duties and in the transportation of prisoners. It is the responsibility of the Government to furnish transportation in these instances and obviously it is cheaper to authorize payment at the rate of 4 cents a mile than it is for the Government to purchase the necessary automobiles, principally because depreciation costs are not charged to the Government when privately owned automobiles are used.

In connection with the Federal prison system there was eliminated a proviso exempting an appropriation item from section 3709 of the Revised Statutes when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$500. Mr. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, has indicated to the committee on numerous occasions that, rather than an added cost to the Government, this provision has resulted in considerable savings to the Government. The procurement of supplies and material for the maintenance and operation of the institutions is exceedingly difficult under the present sellers' market created by the war. In many cases vendors do not desire to take on additional business and are unwilling to comply with the requirements of the provisions cited. The deletion of this provision from the bill will prohibit the Federal Prison System from making advantageous purchases on the open market and will greatly increase the procurement problems of this organization.

Coming to the Department of Commerce, there was eliminated a general provision authorizing the Secretary to delegate to an officer of the Department authority to sign minor routine official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretary of the Department. I do not believe that there is a business establishment in this country that has not in effect a working arrangement similar to the one provided for in this provision. It seems to me no more than just a matter of common sense.

As in the case of the marshals under the Department of Justice appropriation, there was eliminated from the Census Bureau an item authorizing reimbursement to employees for the use of their privately owned automobiles. The censuses that are taken by this Bureau under authorization of law are taken by temporary enumerators employed for this specific purpose. It is, of course, not economical to purchase automobiles for the execution of these responsibilities, and it certainly is unfair to the employees to impose upon them the use of

privately owned automobiles without just compensation for gasoline, tires, and so forth.

In the Civil Aeronautics Administration there was eliminated on a point of order the item "Of not to exceed the amount of \$5,000 for the entertainment of officials in the field of aviation in other countries when specifically authorized and approved by the Administrator." When one contemplates the future of this country in the aviation field and the many problems dealing with aviation that must still be solved it becomes exceedingly difficult to comprehend the reasonableness of eliminating this item. Our officials are entertained abroad and each country expects that their representatives will be extended similar courtesies on their visits to this country. Obviously the expenses of such entertainment cannot be defrayed by officials of the administration from their personal funds.

In two instances under the Commerce Department there were eliminated the words "without warrant action." I am just wondering if the term was thoroughly understood at the time the points of order were raised. The provision has no effect whatsoever on the continuation of previously appropriated funds during 1946. The provision was merely intended to eliminate the processing of many documents by the Treasury Department, the General Accounting Office, and the Department of Commerce.

Again under an appropriation item of the Civil Aeronautics Administration there was eliminated authority to reimburse employees for the use of their privately owned automobiles when traveling on official business. This item was needed in connection with the maintenance and operation of the air navigation facilities, many of which were located at otherwise inaccessible points.

In connection with the Civil Aeronautics Board under the Department of Commerce, there was eliminated the provision "without regard to section 3709 of the revised statutes." This provision, as the preceding text of the bill will indicate, was for the employment of consultants, experts, and guards on a contract fee basis. The purpose of the language was to permit the immediate employment of these types of employees for the investigation of aircraft accidents. The guards were necessary to prevent souvenir hunters and others from removing items which may be vital to the investigation and thus preserve evidence which may be of value in determining the cause of the accident. All of these employees were, of course, hired on a temporary basis only.

These are only a few of the 37 points of order conceded or sustained during the action on this bill. I could cite numerous others of a similar nature and equally insignificant and equally detrimental to the efficient operation of the departments involved. But time does not permit. I merely took advantage of what time was allotted me to call to the attention of the House the result of these points of order in the hope that the individual Members will more fully consider the import of their actions when

contemplating the raising of points of order against similar provisions in appropriation bills in the future.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time, 3 minutes, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct attention to the possible violation of existing law covering loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration, with the thought that consideration should be given to the reduction of the \$60,000,000 appropriation in the pending bill for loans from moneys borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Section 904 of chapter 31 of the United States Code—covering rural electrification—provides:

The Administrator is authorized and empowered from the sums herein authorized to make loans * * * for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central-station service.

Section 903 provides:

That no such loan (by R. E. A.) shall be in an amount exceeding 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor.

Information has just been received by me in a letter from a constituent indicating that regardless of these limitations, loans are being made by the R. E. A. for purposes not authorized by the act, and in excess of the amount prescribed.

To substantiate this charge and fact, I quote from my constituent's letter, as follows:

I have just received from the Western Pine Association a notice about the taking advantage by a Government bureau of a law of Congress in a manner which Congress quite obviously did not intend. I quote from the Western Pine Association Bulletin:

"A case in point is a recent certification to the W. P. B. by the R. E. A. of the Department of Agriculture. The Rural Electrification Act authorizes the Administrator to make loans that will be self-liquidating within a period of not to exceed 35 years at the rate of 2 percent per annum. Such low-interest-rate loans were restricted by Congress to the financing only of generating plants, transmission, and distribution lines or systems. The obvious intent of such restriction was recognition that otherwise banks and industry would be destroyed or severely curtailed.

"The present case involves R. E. A. authorization of a 100-percent loan for the purchase and rehabilitation of a creosoting plant and for working capital. The claim is made that a creosoting plant comes under the authority to promote rural electrification. If such assumption is established, these low-rate, long-time loans could apparently be made for the purchase and operation of timber and sawmills, copper mines, smelters, refineries, wire mills, as well as for the manufacture of electrical transformers and for purchase of raw materials."

I can only hope that Congress will amend the Rural Electrification Act so that there will be no possibility in the future of Government agency lawyers getting away with this sort of thing. Obviously, if you give these Government agencies an inch they will take a mile, and this sort of thing should be stopped, not only in this case, but in the future.

If the \$60,000,000 appropriation above referred to and provided for in H. R. 2689 is used ultra vires, and for the purpose of financing crocesting plants, and these at 100-percent loans, then it is probable that an amendment to make a very substantial cut in this appropriation is not only justified, but highly necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The Clerk read down to and including line 7 on page 1.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have addressed the Committee of the Whole today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. 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. WHITTINGTON, 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. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHELF (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), indefinitely, on account of death in the family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include certain tables and other extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include a copyrighted article by Maj. George Fielding Eliot entitled "Predischarge Leave Favored To Ease Return to Civilian Life."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a document by the Tariff Commission. The Public Printer estimates that it will cost \$130, as it exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable M. S. Szymczak, member,

Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, entitled "Monetary and Credit Agreements Entered Into at Bretton Woods," delivered before the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, at Chicago, Ill., on March 20, 1945.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks on four different subjects and to include therein newspaper clippings and a resolution.

Mr. NEELY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include with them two editorials from the Philadelphia Record.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain statements, excerpts, and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the tables referred to in my remarks this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1360. An act for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors.

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

S. 77. An act for the relief of Lindon A. Long;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 321. An act for the relief of James M. Hiler;

S. 515. An act for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes; and

S. 525. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 22, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Thursday, March 22, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection

for pensionable purposes for service rendered between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session at 10:30 a. m. on Thursday, March 22, 1945, in the committee room, room 356, House Office Building.

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 194. Resolution waiving points of order against the bill (H. R. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 1658. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the provisions of a contract for the purchase of a power plant for use in connection with the San Carlos irrigation project; without amendment (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 199. Resolution for the consideration of 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 355). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 195. Resolution to investigate supplies and shortages of food, particularly meat; without amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 52. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to study the basic problems affecting post-war immigration and naturalization; without amendment (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1074) for the relief of Mary G. Person, 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. ANGELL:
H. R. 2703. A bill to improve salary and wage administration in the Federal service; to provide pay for overtime and for night and holiday work; to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:
H. R. 2704. A bill to authorize municipalities and public-utility districts in the Terri-

tory of Alaska to issue revenue bonds for public-works purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2705. A bill granting travel pay and allowance for subsistence to certain soldiers of the Regular Army who served in the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 2706. A bill to make census data available without charge to applicants for benefits under the Social Security Act and to those seeking employment in defense industries; to the Committee on the Census.

H. R. 2707. A bill to terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2708. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the armed forces of the United States after the termination of hostilities in the present war and the beginning of demobilization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2709. A bill to amend the Criminal Code so as to punish anyone injuring a party, witness, or juror on account of his having acted as such; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2710. A bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2711. A bill to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2712. A bill to amend Public Law 36, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 2713. A bill to provide veterans' benefits based upon service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 2714. A bill to increase from 1 to 2 years the time within which to file claim for disability pension or death compensation or pension in order to receive benefits from date of discharge or release from active service or date of death; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2715. A bill amending title 11 of the Social Security Act to provide insurance benefits for any wife, irrespective of her age, who was married to and living with an insured individual for 10 years or more prior to the date he attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2716. A bill to provide for health programs for Government employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2717. A bill to eliminate the requirement of an oath in connection with applications for benefits under all laws and regulations administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2718. A bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to effect needed changes in the Navy ration," approved March 2, 1933 (Public, No. 411, 72d Cong.); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 2719. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1940 (Public Law No. 647, 76th Cong.), so as to make such act applicable in the case of highway bridges owned by municipalities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2720. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tide waters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution requesting the President to establish friendly diplomatic relations with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties, held before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of House Document No. 394, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War No. 2 and Their Dependents, Including Rights and Benefits of Veterans of World War No. 1 and Their Dependents," as a public document, and providing for additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the historical statement of the laws enacted and the regulations promulgated relating to veterans and their dependents, with a complete statement regarding expenditures for hospital and domiciliary construction, as a House document, and providing for additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. Res. 195. Resolution to investigate supplies and shortages of food, particularly meat; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 196. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the calling up of any bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations until its report has been on file and available to Members of the House for 10 days; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 197. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the exclusion of Members of the House from committee hearings; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 198. Resolution authorizing the printing of the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States No. 63, delivered during the October term, 1944, in the case of the *Northwestern Bands of Shoshone Indians, petitioners, v. The United States*, on writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2721. A bill for the relief of the Tobey Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2722. A bill for the relief of the Farmers Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Sumner County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2723. A bill for the relief of I. H. Beasley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Charlie Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2725. A bill for the relief of the estate of Joe Manier; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2726. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie D. Ford; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2727. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian Adams and Pleas Baker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of R. H. Sindle; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2729. A bill for the relief of Donald George; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 2730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane Strang; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 2731. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2732. A bill granting an increase of pension to Matthew Henson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2733. A bill for the relief of Charles Larkin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 2734. A bill for the relief of J. C. Decker, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2735. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Howard; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2736. A bill for the relief of Norman Abbott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2737. A bill for the relief of Clara Black; 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:

226. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Christian Frederick Danielsen, of New York, praying that the words "without revealing the nature or source of its evidence" be countermanded from the War and Navy Department's restrictive circular entitled "Discharge of Subversives From Private Plants and War Department Plants Privately Operated of Importance to Army Procurement," dated February 5, 1942, in that the clause results in an unconstitutional denial of a fair trial; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

227. By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Petition of the Seventeenth Legislature of New Mexico urging that the Congress consider such legislation as necessary to make the prevailing wage scales in New Mexico conform to those now being paid in the States of Arizona and Colorado; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

228. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress of the United States to consider favorably Senate Joint Resolution 8, proposing an amendment to the Federal Constitution providing that the President shall transmit to Congress his estimates of receipts of the Government during the ensuing fiscal year, together with his recommendations as to the purposes for which such receipts shall be expended, and, except in time of war or during the period ending on the date of the expiration of 1 full fiscal year after the termination thereof, the Congress shall not appropriate money for expenditure during such fiscal year in excess of such estimated receipts, except by a vote of three-fifths of each House, unless additional revenues have been previously provided therefor, or unless such appropriation be for expenses and contingencies of the Congress or the courts, or for payment of claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

229. Also, petition of the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the Peterson bill (H. R. 5477) known as the seamen's bill of rights; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

230. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of the New Moscow Woman's Christian Temperance Union, with 72 signers, requesting the President and the Congress in the interest of the war effort to cancel the April holiday for the manufacture of liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

231. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. E. D. Speer, president, Sunbeam Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Aledo, Ill., et al., urging the Congress to limit the activities of the alcoholic beverage industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

232. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Mrs. L. E. Austin, and other citizens of South China, Maine, deploring the shipping of malt beverages and other liquors with higher alcoholic content into our fighting areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

233. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 24 residents of Butler County, Pa., favoring the passage of the Lemke bill, an act prohibiting the vivisection of dogs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

234. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take official cognizance of the inherent right of the people of Poland, as well as the people of other small nations, to determine the form and kind of their own government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

235. By Mr. GEELAN: Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, memorializing Congress concerning representation at the peace table of members of the armed forces, by providing that the 12,000,000 men of the armed forces be represented at the peace conference; that there be selected one member from the personnel of the enlisted men of the Army, one from the Navy, one from the Air Forces, one from the Marine Corps, and one from the merchant marine, to have their part in the deliberations for the peace of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1945

(Legislative day of Friday, March 16, 1945)

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

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

God of all grace and beauty, we thank Thee for eyes to see and for hearts to thrill at every sacrament of loveliness as again earth clothes itself in the blooming garb of spring. We thank Thee for the purity of dawn which calls to holy dedication, for the zenith splendor of midday which summons us to challenging tasks, and for the peace of the evening which speaks of life everlasting. From dawn to dark give us courage in the midst of fear, faith amid the mists of doubt, love even in the strife of hatred, and hope like a beacon amid the encircling gloom of de-

spair. Build Thou our inner strength. Grant that we may be among those who stand in the evil day, and having done all still stand. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, March 21, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 77. An act for the relief of Lindon A. Long;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 321. An act for the relief of James M. Hiler;

S. 515. An act for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes; and

S. 525. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to ascertaining the sense of the people of the State on United States membership in a general system of international cooperation having police power to maintain the peace of the world

"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened, That the Governor, with the advice and consent of the council, is hereby authorized and directed to request selectmen of towns to insert an article in the warrant of the town meetings holden under date of March 13, 1945, to read as follows: 'To see if the town will vote to support United States membership in a general system of international cooperation, such as that proposed at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, having police power to maintain the peace of the world. Each town clerk is directed to forward to the secretary of the state the result of the vote, in his town, if any, on this question. The secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to canvass the vote on this article as returned to him and transmit his findings to the clerk of the United States Senate.'

"Approved February 14, 1945."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution relating to legislation affecting aeronautics now before the Congress of the United States

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has under consideration certain bills identified as S. 2, S. 34, S. 1, H. R. 4, H. R. 287, H. R. 674, and other similar bills affecting aviation, air commerce, and providing for certain Federal aids in the construction and development of airports; and

"Whereas it is the intent and import of these measures to vest in the Government of the United States full authority and power to regulate and supervise all air commerce and related activities, whether they be of an interstate or intrastate nature, and further to make substantial grants of Federal funds to municipalities for airport construction, without adequate planning and without giving full consideration to the economic responsibilities of the States and their political subdivisions; and

"Whereas it is the import of these measures to impose upon the States and their political subdivisions obligations, requirements, restrictions, and limitations of an indefinite nature, for an indeterminate period of time, without due regard to the extent to which the public interest may be served; and

"Whereas the effect of said measures would be to supersede and usurp the rights of the States to regulate and control air commerce within their borders and to infringe upon, jeopardize, and deny the constitutional rights of the States to exercise their police powers in the public interest; and

"Whereas the provisions of these acts would place municipalities in competition with each other and with the States for Federal airport aids in such a manner as to force the wasteful expenditure of public funds and to make impossible the orderly and well-planned development of aeronautics facilities into a system based on actual need and utility; and

"Whereas the several States are now engaged in preparing legislation which will create in an orderly manner aeronautics programs designed to provide such aviation facilities as may be needed, under the direction of State authorities familiar with local requirements and conditions; and, further, since these State programs provide for continuing financial assistance to be accomplished by means of taxes on aviation gasoline and aircraft, general taxation, and bond issues for the purpose of cooperating with the municipalities and with the Federal Government in developing an economically sound airport and air-commerce system which will best serve the Nation, the States, and the municipalities: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Minnesota records its opposition to any of the above-mentioned or similar bills which do not have deleted from them all language which is designed to deprive the States of their inherent and constitutional rights to govern themselves and which destroy the sound principle of intergovernmental cooperation between municipalities, States, and the Federal Government in such matters where each level of Government has a substantial interest; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the clerk of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, the clerk of the Commerce Committee of the Senate, and each of the Minnesota Senators and Representatives in Congress.

"Approved March 17, 1945.

"EDWARD J. THYE,

"Governor of the State of Minnesota."