

trict of Columbia the position of assistant health officer in charge of tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNUTSON (by request):

H. R. 2425. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2426. A bill to subject Indians and Indian reservations in the State of Minnesota to the laws of the State, with certain exceptions; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KEGGH:

H. Con Res. 33. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill (H. R. 2000) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," together with the accompanying report thereon; 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. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY:

H. R. 2428. A bill for the relief of Herman Paul; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2429. A bill for the relief of the alien Chu Shee (Chu Ng Sze); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GILLESPIE:

H. R. 2430. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2431. A bill for the relief of Monite Waterproof Glue Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 2432. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter E. Patton; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

117. Mr. BELL presented a memorial of the City Council of Kansas City, Mo., urging that a veterans' hospital be located in that city because of the natural advantages of transportation and because about 40,000 men and women residents of that city are now in the armed forces, which was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1945)

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

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

Almighty God, in the midst of this world of sight and sound, with all its squalor and splendor, make sensitive our spirits to the realities and glories of the world unseen and eternal which encircles us. Feeling the pulsing of that other world closer to us than breathing, may there be vouchsafed to us even in the waiting tasks of a common day an escape into eternity, bright shoots of

everlastingness edging with crimson and gold the work given us to do.

Unto our keeping Thou hast committed a national heritage luminous with freedom's glorious light. For all the glory which is America we bless Thy name, for borders without guns, for frontiers which are swinging gates, for unity in diversity, for peace which spans a continent, and for equality which beckons all to the summits.

Strengthen in us the steadfast faith that these healing trees of human good, grown in this land of the free, may blossom under all skies in all the earth. Facing decisions of destiny, unite our hearts and minds, we beseech Thee, in a mighty purpose that we fall not man nor Thee. 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, Thursday, March 1, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 1, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 76. An act for the relief of John T. Cooper; and

S. 335. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight.

DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES OF THE CUMBERLAND AND TENNESSEE RIVERS AND VALLEYS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a copy of a communication from the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority submitting a report entitled "A Report on the Physiographic, Economic, and Other Relationships Between the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers and Between Their Drainage Areas." This report was prepared at my request under the authority vested in the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority by section 22 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and Executive Order No. 6161 issued pursuant thereto.

The report points out the similarity and interrelationship between the problems of development of the resources of the Cumberland and Tennessee Valleys.

I have heretofore recommended to the Congress the enactment of legislation to bring the Cumberland River and its tributaries within the scope of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. I take this opportunity to urge again that the Congress give consideration to the enactment of such legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message is accompanied by a report from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the message and accompanying report be printed as a Senate document with illustrations.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 16)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1945, in the sum of \$3,000,000 for the Federal Security Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGE CLAIMS ON ACCOUNT OF DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY, PERSONAL INJURY, OR DEATH (S. Doc. No. 17)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, in the sum of \$103,052.96, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of law and require an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. Doc. No. 18)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent establishments to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of \$13,845.03, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of law and require an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE TO ROADS AND HIGHWAYS OF STATES (S. Doc. No. 19)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the sum of \$45,302.86, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of law and require an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY A DISTRICT COURT (S. Doc. No. 20)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation for the payment of a judgment rendered against the Government by a district court, amounting to \$5,808, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 21)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay claims for damages in the sum of \$62, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of

law and require an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY A DISTRICT COURT (S. Doc. No. 22)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a record of judgment rendered against the Government by a district court as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an appropriation of \$10,010, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, which has been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for payment, amounting to \$9,308.27 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. Doc. No. 24)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, estimates of appropriation amounting to \$317,236.03, to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for the services of the several departments and independent establishments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ADJUSTMENTS OF IRRIGATION CHARGES IN LAND EXCHANGES WITHIN INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize adjustments of irrigation charges in certain land exchanges within Indian irrigation projects (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SENATE,
Albany, February 20, 1945.

"Whereas the proper training of officers for the American merchant marine is of recognized importance to the State of New York; and

"Whereas the New York State Merchant Marine Academy, which was founded in 1875 by the New York City Board of Education and which became a State institution by chapter 322 of the laws of 1913, has over the years provided training and facilities for many hundreds of men who have served efficiently

and honorably in the American merchant marine; and

"Whereas said New York State Merchant Marine Academy is now located on lands known as Fort Schuyler Reservation, owned by the United States and leased under act of Congress, approved August 19, 1937 (Public, No. 316, 75th Cong.); and

"Whereas in order that the State of New York may fully utilize such land now owned by the United States by providing such new construction as appears necessary and securing the most modern equipment for training purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to accord to the State of New York title in fee to the land now owned by the United States and leased to the State of New York for the use of the New York State Merchant Marine Academy; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of New York."

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Memorial 1

"To the President of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska in the seventeenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the Government of the United States has expressed a deep concern for the need of developing and protecting Alaska's great natural resources; and

"Whereas the fishing industry estimates the presence of some 100,000 sea lions in the territorial waters of Alaska, and it is estimated that a sea lion, as a warm-blooded animal, consumes approximately 60 pounds of fish daily, thereby in the aggregate consuming annually 2,190,000,000 pounds of fish, or a loss to the industry of some \$219,000,000 annually; and

"Whereas the number of sea lions in Alaskan waters is steadily increasing:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully prays that appropriate action be taken by the Government of the United States to remedy this critical situation.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing Congress to enact legislation for the relief of counties whose taxable property has been taken over for national forests and parks; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented on the 1st instant by Mr. HOEY, p. 1599, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the mayor and board of aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., relating to the designation by the President of the United States of Brotherhood Week, and felicitating the President on his timely proclamation designating such week; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the one hundred and fourth annual meeting of the American Statistical Association, favoring and supporting the efforts of the Federal statistical agencies cooperating with the Bureau of the Budget in planning and making provision for an adequate statistical program for the benefit of business, labor, agriculture, and the Gov-

ernment, and endorsing the objective of establishing basic governmental statistics upon a level of completeness and adequacy; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Monocacy Lions Club, of Montgomery County, Md., favoring the prompt enactment of Senate bill 181, the so-called Federal aid for education bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by the treasurer, from the South-East Coal Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for full cooperation with the National Coal Association in support of an amendment to be offered to clarify the Office of Price Administration Act in eliminating the item of percentage depletion from the cost form which coal-producing companies are required to file with the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES—MEMORIAL OF THE MAINE LEGISLATURE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD under the rule a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, recently passed, voicing its opposition to what is generally called the work-or-fight bill.

There being no objection, the memorial of the Legislature of Maine was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-second legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress legislation purporting to authorize the drafting of men, now free, for labor in industrial plants to work for private employers, who would make a profit on their labor; and

Whereas such legislation is unconstitutional, being in violation of the direct and positive prohibition of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas the passage of such legislation would betray those who have died for the American way of life, because it would destroy the very thing for which they have died: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress to oppose said legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state, by registered mail, to the proper officers and committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the President of the United States, and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine in the United States Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was ordered to lie on the table.

COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMPS FOR CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE OF SWISS COLONIZATION OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, some days ago at the request of the Wisconsin Legislature and prominent Americans of

Swiss descent I introduced a bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Swiss colony at New Glarus, Wis., and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in Wisconsin.

Mr. President, after listening to the beautiful prayer of the Chaplain this morning, I am reminded it is the Swiss, a nation made up of Germans, Italians, French, and Austrians living together as we do under one flag and yet speaking their respective tongues, who have demonstrated to the other peoples of the earth the way to peace. A century ago an offshoot of that people came to Wisconsin and established at New Glarus, Wis., the nucleus of the beneficent influence that the Swiss people have contributed wherever they have gone all over this earth.

Recently, cognizant of the significance of this offshoot in their body politic; recognizing that the Swiss brought to our Commonwealth not only great constructive ideas, showing the way for people to live together, but brought also a great new industry, the cheese industry, the Wisconsin State Legislature adopted a resolution of which I read a part as follows:

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring). That the Wisconsin Legislature hereby makes official request on behalf of the State of Wisconsin to the Postmaster General of the United States for reconsideration of the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in recognition of the centennial observance of the Swiss colonization and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in Wisconsin—

And so forth. I will say that I made the request to the Postmaster General. He, thinking it was only a small local matter, rejected it. Then I asked him to reconsider. The Postmaster General has said that he will reconsider the matter. Meanwhile I have introduced my bill and meanwhile, recognizing that the President of the United States is one of the great collectors of stamps in the world, a philatelist of the first water and an authority on that subject, I wrote him a personal letter

My letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1945.

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor of presenting to you, on behalf of the citizens of my State, their petition for the issuance of a series of stamps to commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Swiss Colony at New Glarus, Wis., and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in the Badger State. The Postmaster General has already extended to me his willing assurance that this proposal will receive his own most immediate and thoughtful consideration.

The merit of this proposal will be readily apparent, particularly to a philatelist of the long experience and appreciation of yourself.

This proposal would be a fitting honor to the revered Swiss element of our population which has carried on the traditions of its former motherland of thrift, diligence, and harmony, which are in such faithful keeping to the traditions of its adopted land. This proposal, moreover, would be an inspiration to the dairy farmers of America who have made so resounding a contribution in peace

to the national health, and in war, to the Nation's well-being in its grave ordeal. Lastly, this proposal would be a token of fellowship and warmth to the splendid little democracy of Switzerland which has stood so high in the respect of our people and which has recently acted so forthrightly to block the economic subterfuge of the Nazi Government.

Knowing that, in the midst of your pressing duties of state, you will find a brief moment to send this commemorative stamp project on its victorious way, I am,

Respectfully,

ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator.

I sincerely hope that my request will be granted, and that it will not be necessary to ask the appropriate committee to act upon the bill which I have introduced; but, if the request should be again rejected, in view of the fact that in the past we have recognized other great national groups that have come to this country such as the Huguenots, the Walloons, and others, and have issued commemorative stamps, I think it is only fitting in this period of the world's history that we commemorate the significant fact of the settlement of this great strong Swiss people in America. They have contributed stability and strength and wealth to this Nation.

I ask that the resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature be printed in full in the RECORD following my remarks, and that it may be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 37

Joint resolution relating to an official request by the State of Wisconsin to the Postmaster General of the United States for reconsideration of the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp for the centennial observance of the Swiss colonization in Wisconsin

Whereas the year 1945 marks the one-hundredth anniversary of one of the most noteworthy events in the development of the Middle West, the carefully planned migration of 108 bold-hearted and liberty-loving Swiss colonists from the overcrowded canton of Glarus, Switzerland, to the fertile Sugar River Valley of Green County; and

Whereas, as that little band of Swiss pioneers by their hard work and perseverance shaped in a large measure the agricultural destiny of a Commonwealth, so have their descendants by their industry carried on and prospered to make Green County today one of the richest farming districts and Swiss cheese centers in the world; and

Whereas an organization is being created in the Green County area to promote a fitting centennial observance in 1945 of the settlement of Swiss colonists and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in Wisconsin; and is otherwise desirous of encouraging the constructive industry and forward-looking progress demonstrated by the Swiss colonists of Wisconsin and their succeeding generations, which is a solid foundation for an enduring civilized society; and

Whereas it is deemed advisable that a commemorative postage stamp be issued by the Postmaster General of the United States in recognition of this observance; and

Whereas such action and reconsideration can be taken by the Postmaster General only upon official request from the State of Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring). That the Wisconsin Legislature hereby makes official request on behalf of the State of Wisconsin to the Postmaster General of the United States for reconsideration of the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in recognition of the centennial observance of the Swiss colonization and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in Wisconsin, such stamp to be of such design as the Postmaster General may determine. The Governor of Wisconsin is respectfully requested and authorized to cooperate in securing the reconsideration thereof and to make any arrangements that may be necessary with the Postmaster General for the issuance of said stamp; be it further—

Resolved. That a properly attested copy of this resolution be sent to the Postmaster General of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, by unanimous consent, presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, identical with the foregoing resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF THE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

S. 58. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 76);

S. 397. A bill to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939-41; without amendment (Rept. No. 77);

S. 525. A bill 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 78);

S. 569. A bill to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 3, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 79);

S. 646. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of rear admiral; without amendment (Rept. No. 80);

H. R. 197. A bill to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 81); and

H. R. 1646. A bill to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 82).

By Mr. GERRY, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 647. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, a strip of land within the naval advance base depot at North Kingstown, R. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 83).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 670. A bill for the relief of Wilfred Dagnais; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 671. A bill for the relief of Horace G. Lawler; and

S. 672. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Weir Lillis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHANDLER (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON):

S. 673. A bill to prescribe the tenure of office of members of the President's Cabinet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BAILEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That 1,000 additional copies of part 25 and each subsequent part of the hearings held before the special committee of the Senate authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the operation of the national-defense program be printed for the use of said committee.

COMPENSATION OR PENSION TO VETERANS OR THEIR DEPENDENTS (S. DOC. NO. 15)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a Senate document an analysis of elements of entitlements to and rates of compensation or pension. It is an analysis of the laws granting compensation or pension to veterans of all the wars or to their dependents. It has been very carefully prepared by the Veterans' Administration, and has been checked for errors. I may say that there is a very great demand for this document. The sale of the document has been very great as it was heretofore printed, and now it has been brought down to date, with numerous corrections and additional citations.

All estimate of cost of printing the matter as a Senate document has been made, which I submit herewith. I ask unanimous consent that the document may be printed as a Senate document.

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

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by G. F. Geissler, director, western division, United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, relative to food production and food production goals in Utah, which appears in the Appendix.]

EMPLOYMENT OF RETURNING VETERANS—ARTICLE BY RICHARD B. COLE

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Returning Veterans Pose Vital Post-War Challenge and Opportunity," by Richard B. Cole, containing an interview with John J. Hagerty, the New England R. F. C. manager, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Se-

lective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment heretofore offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] as a substitute for the language proposed to be inserted in the bill by the amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have a few words to say about the pending bill, H. R. 1752. This bill is of vital importance to all America. Every Member of the Senate has been informed and is well aware of the appalling number of losses we are suffering today on the far-flung battle fronts of the world, where our brave and heroic boys are desperately fighting and dying at the hands of the beastly enemy. Every Member of the Senate is well aware of the urgent appeals which have been made by American generals and soldiers for more and more weapons of war with which to fight off and defeat those savage enemies. The victory must be won at the earliest possible moment. Every minute, every slight delay means the loss of many more of our fine American boys. Without plenty of the right types of war weapons and materials our fighting men are helplessly and mercilessly at the disposal of the savage enemy. This we all well know, and I am sure we all agree that something must be done, and done quickly, to correct this deplorable situation.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I refer to the committee substitute for the pending bill, H. R. 1752, and the two amendments I am offering. I feel that the committee substitute for H. R. 1752 has been subjected to so much compromise that it is now a very weak measure, but, regardless of whether it is weak or strong, I intend to support it as presented or as finally amended, because my policy on all war measures is to support our Commander in Chief in his requests for legislation which he states is necessary to further the war effort. That has been my policy heretofore and I do not intend to change it. Under our constitutional form of government, the responsibility for prosecution of the war rests exclusively on the shoulders of our Commander in Chief, and he should, therefore, be provided with everything he says is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, regardless of whether anybody else thinks he is right or thinks he is wrong.

The two amendments which I have proposed are intended to strengthen the bill. These amendments will abolish all restrictions on the number of hours a person may work per day, per week, or per any work period, and will also provide the same hourly rate of pay for each hour worked by each person.

The 40-hour week was established during peacetime, for the purpose of dividing the available work among more people and thus help solve the unemployment problem with which this Nation was faced at that time. This may have been a good policy at that time, but it is certainly a very bad policy at this time, when we are engaged in an all-out war, and when our very urgent war-pro-

duction problem has completely displaced our pre-war peacetime unemployment problem.

The penalty wage scale for work in excess of 40 hours per week was established simply as a penalty to help force compliance with the 40-hour-week law. This penalty wage scale also may have been a good policy during the period of unemployment during peacetime, but it also is certainly a very bad policy now, during a period of all-out war, when the problem of production of war weapons and materials has completely displaced the old problem of pre-war peacetime unemployment. My two amendments, Mr. President, are simply intended to nullify those two outmoded policies during this war emergency. If desired, those policies can be reinstated after the war is finally won.

It may be possible, Mr. President, for the Senate committee substitute for H. R. 1752 to bring about increased production to a very limited extent, but with my amendments added, production can be definitely and immediately increased any amount desired. If 25 percent increased production is desired, all that is necessary is for all workers who now work 40 hours a week to work 50 hours a week, and all others who work different periods to work 25 percent more hours. If 50 percent increased production is desired, all that is necessary is for all workers who now work 40 hours a week to work 60 hours a week, and all who work other periods to work 50 percent more hours. It is a very simple solution to a tremendously important problem. The adoption of my amendments would also be highly beneficial to the workers themselves, because their weekly income would increase from 25 percent to 50 percent or more, with practically no increase in their living expenses.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. What would the Senator think of the proposition, in order to keep workers on the job and having them work longer hours, which, I take it, is what the Senator is trying to accomplish, of making provision that after a corporation got the first 5 percent of profit the next 5 percent should go to the workers?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does the Senator mean a cooperative arrangement, that they would pay the workers an additional premium for additional work?

Mr. LANGER. After the corporation for which they were working got a profit of 5 percent, let us say, the next 5 percent should go to the workers, and above that they should split even?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is a wage problem which I shall touch on later in my remarks.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator's idea is to have the employees work longer hours?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; providing they want to and have the opportunity.

Mr. LANGER. And produce more goods?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes. In addition to what I have said, Mr. President, under my amendments the new materials produced would be not only greater in quantity but also better in quality, because they would be produced by the same experienced, willing, and patriotic hands who are now producing, instead of by the inexperienced and possibly unwilling hands of drafted or forced labor.

In eliminating the penalty pay for so-called overtime, thousands of good, experienced workers could be released for war work by establishments dealing exclusively in civilian goods and services. These institutions have the prices of their goods and services limited either by price ceilings or competition, and many of them would lose money and possibly be forced into bankruptcy if they had to pay penalty wages. Consequently they do not permit their employees to work overtime at penalty wages, but instead they employ more people at the regular base pay, which ties up from 25 percent to 50 percent more employees than they would need if my amendments were enacted.

Mr. President, my amendments do not deal in wages. The amount of wages paid is a matter which should be agreed to by employers and employees. Personally I do not consider this any time to reduce hourly wages of any of our patriotic workers on the production front, and with the demand for labor so urgent, there need be no fears of any wage reductions at this time. If my amendments are adopted the new base-wage rate in all cases could be established at the average hourly earnings being paid on the date the amendments became effective, and thus no employee would suffer any reduction in weekly earnings if he worked the same number of hours each week thereafter, and would enjoy increased weekly earnings to the extent that he worked an increased number of hours per week thereafter. Those who desired to work longer hours, and thus earn more money per week, could do so, if additional hours of employment were offered to them, and those who did not desire to work longer hours need not do so. Anybody who understands the thrift and patriotism of American laboring men and women knows that under this arrangement more additional man-hours will be volunteered than will be needed. Such a vast reservoir of additional man-hours would be created by the adoption of these two amendments that all necessary and urgently needed increased production of war weapons would be realized without further delay, and all this would be accomplished on a voluntary basis at increased remuneration to employees, and at no increased unit price to employers, or to the United States Government and its taxpayers, as the exclusive buyer of war weapons and materials.

In closing, Mr. President, permit me to say that I am one who has great faith in the patriotism of our American laboring men and women, and in their desire to work to the limit of their endurance to increase production and hasten the day of victory. I am not one who believes that any appreciable number of

the laboring people of this Nation lay down on their jobs when they heard the optimistic reports of some of our public officials last fall regarding the early ending of the war. I congratulate the working men and women of America on the almost miraculous job of production they have done in spite of the legislative and executive shackles which have been imposed upon them.

Remove those restrictions on the number of hours they are privileged to work, and repeal those archaic laws which were enacted during a wholly different era of our economic life, and the production of urgently needed war weapons will increase far beyond our requirements. That heart-rending plea of our fighting boys who must depend on us to back them up and keep them supplied with weapons and equipment while they are face to face with the ruthless and savage enemies, must be answered. We at home must not fail those brave boys who are shedding their precious blood and sacrificing their very lives to defeat the enemy. No sacrifice that we can make here on the home front is too great, if it will render even the smallest assistance to our fighting men.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of these two amendments. I sincerely hope they will be adopted and made part of whatever bill comes out of this Chamber, but regardless of whether they are adopted, and regardless of what kind of bill comes out for final vote, I will support it if it is what our Commander in Chief says is necessary to hasten the end of this bloody war.

I ask, Mr. President, that both the amendments which I am proposing be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this place.

There being no objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. O'DANIEL were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

"Sec. —. That the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 be amended as follows: 'At the end of the act, insert the following: "That during the wars in which the United States is engaged no employer shall enter into any contract or arrangement, or enforce or carry out the provisions of any contract or arrangement, which provides that with respect to employees engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for such commerce, or engaged in performing work under any contract with the United States, there shall be any discrimination against any person because he is or is not a member of a labor organization. No employer who violates the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall, for a period of 2 years after such violation occurs, be eligible to enter into any contract with the United States; and no officer or agency of the United States shall enter into a contract with any such employer during such 2-year period. The Secretary of Labor shall keep the various contracting officers and agencies of the United States informed as to the names of employers who are ineligible by reason of this section to enter into contracts with the United States."'"

At the end of the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

"Sec. —. That section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. Every employer shall pay to any of his employees who are engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for commerce, compensation at the same rate for all hours worked by such employee during any pay period.'

"Sec. 2. Until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, (a) no provision of Federal or State law which limits or restricts hours of employment shall be applicable with respect to employees of any contractor who are engaged in the performance of work directly or indirectly necessary for the fulfillment of any contract between such contractor and the United States, and (b) no provision in any contract heretofore or hereafter made with the United States restricting or limiting the hours of employment of employees employed under or in connection with such contract, and no penalty or forfeiture for violation of any such provision, shall be enforceable by any officer or agency of the United States.

"Sec. 3. The act entitled 'An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 30, 1936, is amended by adding at the end of the first section thereof the following new paragraph:

"(f) When the wage rates for regular hours of employment have been determined for the purposes of this act, the same hourly wage rates shall apply with respect to all hours worked during any day or workweek or other work period in employment with respect to which wages are determined under this section."

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

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. If the two amendments proposed by the Senator from Texas were adopted, by what percentage would production be increased, in the Senator's opinion?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think it can be increased any amount desired; at least 25 percent or 50 percent. It is such a little thing to work 50 hours instead of 40 hours a week, and I think that most every patriotic American worker would gladly work the additional hours if he were permitted to do so. If he is now working 40 hours a week and increases his working time to 60 hours a week there would be a 50 percent increase in production, because the worker would devote 50 percent more of his time to production. The experienced hands that are now working 40 hours and producing would simply continue and produce an additional 50 percent.

Mr. LANGER. What would the Senator say with respect to whether the work would be quite as efficient if a man works more than a certain number of hours a day?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I realize, of course, that there might be some difference. However the philosophy of penalty pay for overtime work which is now being practiced in this country is based on the theory that there is no decrease or let-down in the later hours of any work period. In fact, more pay is granted for later hours of work than is granted for work done in the earlier hours when the worker is fresh. I might also say that I do not agree with this philosophy and my amendments are intended to correct this policy and pay each employee the same hourly wage for each hour he works. If a man is worth \$1.50 an hour

for any hour he works, he should not be forced to accept \$1 an hour for the first 40 hours he works each week.

Mr. LANGER. But the penalty pay is for the purpose of discouraging overtime work, is it not?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; and it not only discourages overtime work but it prevents it in many cases. Legislation was originally enacted for the purpose of discouraging overtime work, but that was when we had an unemployment problem. We now have the opposite condition, and the penalty wage scale should be abolished. I think we can depend upon the employees of this country giving a full hour's work for a full hour's pay, whether it be the first hour they work or the last hour they work, and they should receive the same pay for each hour.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment I wish to propose to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, beginning with line 21, it is proposed to strike out all of page 21 and all of page 22 down to and including line 19, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

In carrying out the provisions of this subsection (except the proviso of the foregoing paragraph) the selective-service local board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained, without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation, service, or endeavor; and the foregoing provision of this sentence shall apply upon any appeal or review of a decision made thereunder by a selective-service local board. Such deferment shall be made by said board without consideration of any other circumstance or condition whatsoever; and during the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification shall be made by said board. It shall be the duty of any registrant who is now or hereafter deferred under this subsection and who has been found unacceptable to the land or naval forces for training and service, not to voluntarily leave or discontinue such agricultural occupation or endeavor unless his selective-service local board (subject to appeal in the same manner as is provided in section 10 (a) (2)) has determined that it is no longer necessary in the interest of the war effort for him to remain in such agricultural occupation or endeavor or that he has a justifiable reason for discontinuing such agricultural occupation or endeavor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield for that purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do, very gladly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hawkes	Overton
Balley	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Bilbo	Hoey	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	Johnson, S. C.	Saltonstall
Butler	Kilgore	Shipstead
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McMahon	Tobey
Downey	Magnuson	Tunnell
Eastland	Maybank	Tydings
Ellender	Mead	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Millikin	Wagner
Fulbright	Mitchell	Walsh
George	Moore	Wheeler
Gerry	Morse	Wherry
Green	Murdoch	White
Guffey	Murray	Wiley
Gurney	Myers	Willis
Hart	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hatch	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, beginning on page 21.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to take a few minutes to discuss the pending amendment and the general issue of manpower.

It must be obvious to all who have given consideration to this bill that there has been great reluctance in the minds of most Members of Congress to pass the type of bill which was considered and acted upon by the House, and which came over to this body. I think there can be no doubt that the bill which was passed by the House and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs would scarcely have been approved in the House if it had not been for the fact that every influence of leadership was exercised to make certain that the bill was adopted without substantial amendment. As a matter of fact, the appeal was made that no amendment should be offered upon the floor of the House. However,

an amendment was offered, in the nature of a substitute, which was based upon the theory that the selective-service boards throughout the country should make a survey of the utilization of manpower in their respective areas and districts. That amendment failed by only 10 votes.

What impresses me, Mr. President, is that Members of the Senate, as well as Members of the House, have realized that the proposal which is here made goes to the very foundation of democratic action, that is to say, to the very foundation of action in a free government by free citizens. The legislative body has hesitated to apply to individuals who are engaged in work on the home front the sanctions which are applied to those who are called for service in the armed forces. That contrast has been cited by some as a reason for the passage of the bill which came from the House. It has been suggested that failure to pass that bill would be an indication of an unwillingness to support the men who are fighting in the armed forces. It would be nothing of the sort, Mr. President. The reluctance of Congress to apply these drastic sanctions to civilian workers springs from the basic sentiment of America that individuals should not be subject to compulsion, and that to apply such sanctions to individuals working for other individuals or organizations which may profit from their labor, is altogether out of harmony with our system of government.

I think, Mr. President, that a much more significant phase of this debate is that Members of Congress seem to want to do what can be done to make the voluntary system of labor do the job which everyone acknowledges must be accomplished. The reason why there is so much hesitancy about adopting the compulsory labor principle is that the sentiment of this country realizes that if we take that step, we shall have taken the last step toward complete totalitarian and authoritarian government. It has been suggested upon this floor that if we should fail to pass the bill which came from the House we should be sending a message to Herr Hitler that the Congress of the United States was not supporting the soldiers upon the fighting fronts.

Mr. President, yesterday at the joint session of Congress I listened to the report of the President upon the Yalta Conference, and heard him say that unconditional surrender means the end of nazi-ism. It immediately occurred to me that here in the Senate we were being asked, at the very moment when the end of nazi-ism is in sight in Europe, to adopt the very principle of Nazi control of individual lives by applying to civilian workers the direct force of authoritarian rule.

I venture to say, Mr. President, that a much better message to Herr Hitler would be the message which we are already able to send, namely, that the people of the United States, by the method of voluntary cooperation, have accomplished the most stupendous task of military production in all history. A much better message to Herr Hitler, I think, and one much more understandable to him, is being delivered at this

moment along the River Rhine by the soldiers of the United States who are equipped with the munitions of war provided for them by civilian workers at home who have not yet been compelled to receive direct and complete orders from their Government.

I venture to say, Mr. President, that very few have had an opportunity to read the bill which we are asked to pass by those who are opposing the committee substitute. I recommend a reading of this measure if we desire to understand the tremendous step toward authoritarian government which we on the home front are being asked to take in the guise of supporting the morale of the soldiers. Since the beginning of this debate I have received, I am glad to say, several letters from men who are fighting with our troops overseas. In the letters they discuss this very bill. Not one of those soldiers has asked for the passage of the so-called work-or-fight bill. On the contrary, each one of the writers has expressed the hope that when he returns to his home he will return to a Nation in which civilian workers are still able to select their jobs.

I had the opportunity the other day to discuss briefly the record of production in the United States. I pointed out that the workers upon the home front have not only equipped and supplied our own Army and our own Navy, in which there are now enrolled more than 11,000,000 men, but they have supplied and equipped the armies and the navies of our allies in this war. Last night on the radio some of the Members of the Senate may have heard the report of a newspaperman who has just returned from a visit not only to Moscow but to Warsaw, to the areas in Europe which the Red Army has recently overrun. One of the questions the interviewer addressed to that newspaper correspondent was whether he had seen any evidences of the lend-lease materials of the United States on the Russian front. His answer was that his eye fell on such evidences everywhere. He mentioned jeeps and aircraft, and said that all the transportation of the Russian forces was done in American planes, and the Russian Army was equipped with untold numbers of jeeps, which the Russians called Willys, after the name of the original manufacturer of the jeep. This is the contribution of free labor to the war effort. But we are asked to abandon that system for one by which civilian workers will be frozen to their jobs and, having been frozen there, by which others may be compelled to go to other jobs, whatever they may be.

The breadth of the bill I hold in my hand, Mr. President, is not confined to service in the armed forces. This measure, which passed the House and which has been described here upon the floor as being much better than the committee bill, contains the following provision:

(n) (1) In addition to the liability for training and service in the land or naval forces, every registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not a member of such forces on active duty and is not exempted or deferred from training and service therein by section 5 (c) (1) or (d) shall be liable to perform work in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural oc-

cupation or endeavor essential to the war effort.

What is the duty which is to be imposed upon the citizens of America between the ages of 18 and 45 by this provision, which makes them liable to perform work in an activity in support of the national health, safety, or interest? Who has defined "interest"? Who has defined "safety"? Who has defined "health"? Under this bill it would be possible to write regulations combining those objectives of work; and, if the bill were passed, it would be possible for the administrator in charge to send persons to some unknown labor in some undefined area in support of an undefined activity in the national interest. There can scarcely be any doubt, Mr. President, it seems to me, that language of that kind conveys to the administering officials complete and unlimited power over the lives and labor of the citizens of the United States who are between the ages of 18 and 45. Is it any wonder that when the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate began to scrutinize the language of the bill which came to us from the House of Representatives, the committee hesitated?

Mr. President, I am moved to say at this juncture that I have observed a disposition upon the part of editorial writers throughout the United States to condemn the Congress as a rubber stamp whatever the Congress accepts, without amendment, a measure which may be sent to it from an executive department or bureau. But at the same time, when, as in this instance, a standing committee of the United States Senate undertakes in the performance of its duty to scrutinize the language it is asked to approve, then it is condemned for dilatory tactics. I venture to say that most of the editorial writers who have criticized the Senate Committee on Military Affairs for not having placed a rubber stamp upon the bill as it came from the House have not themselves read this bill. They do not know that we are asked to give to an administrative official a power to send citizens of the United States to any activity the administering official may choose for work in support of the national interest.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in the able argument of the Senator from Wyoming regarding the unlimited power granted by the May bill, which is one of the bills now pending before the Senate. I realize that the power of control over workers between 18 and 45 years of age falls alike on the willing worker and the one who is not willing to work. I agree that that is wrong. But I point out to the Senator that I have offered a substitute which would apply the rule only to those who are not working in some lawful occupation. It would apply the rule to the loafer and require that he be called up for military service when he refuses to work in some lawful occupation. He would be called up by his selective-service board, like any other young man of the country, and be offered to the armed

services. If he should be rejected he would be certified for work, and the War Manpower Commission would find a job for him. Certainly the Senator cannot object to such a measure being taken against those who are able to work but refuse to work at some lawful occupation. I call the situation to the Senator's attention because I am in full accord with him that the power provided in the May bill should not be exercised over the workers of the Nation, but I assert that the loafers in the various communities who will not work in any lawful occupation should be called to military service or compelled to work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia was one of the most diligent members of the committee in studying the bill. I have taken the position that any legislation which we enact should not be geared to the failure of recalcitrants, but should be geared to the willingness of the great majority of our people to do the right thing when the means is provided for doing it. In the course of my remarks I shall undertake to discuss briefly the substitute which the able Senator has presented.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The substitute which I have offered is geared to the thesis that we must protect the freedom of the worker. But the men within draft age who will not work—and there must be many of them, as evidenced by the letters which I have received—must be compelled to work. I think that we still can gear our legislation to the high plane of protection of the freedom of the willing worker. However, that is no reason why we should overlook those who will not work at any lawful occupation. I think we owe it to the country, and to the willing worker of the country, as well as to the men in the armed services, to see that those who will not work shall be compelled to work during this time of war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in my judgment, no legislation is necessary to accomplish the end to which the Senator refers. Under the selective-service law provision is made for drafting into the military service men between 18 and 45 years of age. The record presented before the Military Affairs Committee shows clearly that at this moment there are 750,000 individuals on limited service in the Army of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I agree with the statement that 750,000 men are on limited service, but the Senator will recall the testimony of the representatives of the War Department and the Navy Department. The Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Under Secretary of the Navy, and General Hershey, head of the Selective Service, all stated that they had been urged to take into the armed services men who had been classified as IV-F and were not working. We were told that the services were saturated with men of that type and that they could not take any more of them. Are we to provide a hiding place for men between 18 and 45 years of age, and allow them to

loaf? The Senator knows as well as I do that when once men are deferred the Army and Navy have no control over them. They could be called a dozen times, and neither the Army nor the Navy would take them. Some place in the war effort should be provided for such men so that they may be put to work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in my judgment, it would be necessary only for the War Department to accept 100 or 200 such persons as have been described by the Senator from West Virginia, and immediately there would be an end of all attempts on the part of such persons to escape service.

I may cite one or two cases which have come under my personal observation. I know of one young man who was a skilled mechanic at the woodworking trade. Unfortunately he had but one eye. Yet he was drafted and accepted for military service. His skill as a mechanic, which would have been of great value to the country in a war plant where such skill was required, was absolutely wasted in the Army because he was assigned to digging ditches in a camp. That is the reason why the Senator from West Virginia, as well as the committee, have recommended the enactment of legislation providing for a survey of the utilization of manpower in the Army, Navy, and civilian plants.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. As the Senator knows, I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee. What is the situation under the original bill with regard to a particular occupation such as that of lawyer? Could such a man who had devoted his life to legal work be taken out of his office by the local board and assigned to digging ditches?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; without question. Let me read to the Senator the language appearing in section 1 of the bill as passed by the House:

For the purposes of this subsection—

That refers to the "freeze" section—

the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or the agency designated by him, shall from time to time by regulations designate—

In passing allow me to invite attention to the fact that by those words the Congress is asked to delegate to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion the powers to legislate—

and certify to the Director of Selective Service, the plants and facilities, and the activities therein, in war production—

Now observe this language—

or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, and the farms and agricultural occupations and endeavors essential to the war effort.

Here is a power to the Director of War Mobilization to designate the particular plants and the types of activity. Then, the section goes on:

In making such designations, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may make classifications on the basis of geographical areas, types of activities, types of occupations within activities, and types of plants, facilities, and farms.

I submit, in response to the Senator from Delaware, that there is a power without limit to designate any occupation, any calling, in any manner for any work in a war factory or a farm or "in support of the national health safety or interest."

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, as I understand the Senator, a person may be taken from his law office or from a bank or from any of the various activities of life and placed in some other activity that might suit the particular board or person making the assignment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. TUNNELL. Is there the same protection as to physical examination? Of course, I am not in that category personally, but would those who are in it be protected by physical examination, I am wondering.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The object of this bill is to include in its application men who are not physically suited for the Army; so that what the Senator suggests would not be taken into consideration. If we were to pass this bill, I may say to the Senator from Delaware, we would be placing in the hands of a central officer in Washington the control over the activities of the men of the United States between the ages of 18 and 45 wherever they may be, and it would be, in my judgment, absolutely impossible for any group or any man in Washington to conceive and write regulations that could cause anything but injustice all over the United States.

Mr. TUNNELL. Would not that be a threat to all sorts of business and activities? Instead of aiding the Nation in preparation for war, would it not break up peace activities?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My judgment is that it would bring about chaos. It would destroy a system which is now working reasonably well and which the Committee on Military Affairs seeks to improve, and would substitute a new and untried system—untried, I say, except in Britain and in Russia. How it has worked in Russia I am not competent to say, but the record from Britain shows that it has not worked there.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand the Senator, the very purpose of these provisions is to place people in work in which they are not at the time working. The very purpose is to change the activities of men, no matter how well prepared they may be in the civil duties of life, to something with which probably they are not familiar.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator's interpretation.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from Delaware raised the question he did. I desire it clearly understood that I am not debating this subject with the Senator from Wyoming on the basis of the approval of the May bill. He and I are opposed to the May bill and its provision for moving workers in this country. The question I am discussing is not with regard to the workers, but with regard to those who are not working at any occupation.

A few moments ago the distinguished Senator made the statement that if a hundred or two hundred of these non-workers or loafers were taken into the service through the selective service boards the problem I have presented would be met. I do not follow the argument of the Senator, because, as the Senator himself has said, 750,000 of them have been taken already.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But they were not taken for that purpose, let me say to the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me read to the Senator from the hearings. This very question was raised in the discussions in the committee when the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, was there. This question was asked of Mr. Patterson:

Senator REVERCOMB. Can you not change your rules of accepting men in the Army and take some of these IV-F's and put them in places where they could serve?

The answer made by Mr. Patterson on behalf of the Army and War Department was—

This bill as originally introduced provided for that, but the Army has all of the limited-service men it can possibly use.

Then the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asked:

Senator HILL. You mean, as far as Army duties are concerned?

Secretary PATTERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator HILL. You do not need any more limited-service men as far as the military machine is concerned?

Secretary PATTERSON. Of the 900,000 men to be inducted in the first 6 months, both the Army and the Navy want those men to be fit for combat, for all-around service, and we have no use and no need for IV-F's or men who as soon as they get into the Army will have to be taken care of in a hospital. We are short of nurses already. We need them in civilian industry.

The statement of the Under Secretary of War is that they are not going to take any of these men for limited service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that an individual who would be sent to a hospital in the Army would be of no use in a war plant.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, he would not be, but there are many of them who would not have to be sent to a hospital.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Under Secretary of War was not talking about those because he did not want them. I wonder what the Senator from West Virginia expected the Under Secretary of War to say. He was arguing for the May bill, and, of course, he was not going to present evidence that would tear it down.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Under Secretary was stating the facts and stating his policy. He said the men they would take must be fit for combat, and they would not take any more IV-F's. Many men classified as IV-F's can still perform work, though they may not be fit for combat duty. The provision in my substitute is that they shall be called up for service in the Army and Navy, and, if they can be accepted, then let them be accepted into the service, but if they cannot be then those who have not worked at any occupation and refuse to work at any should be assigned some work.

That is all there is to the provision I have offered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can understand very well the theory upon which the Senator from West Virginia has been working upon this measure, and, while I realize that his motives are of the best and his desire is to bring about the most efficient use of manpower, I respectfully disagree with the proposal which he makes. I think the committee bill is a much better approach, as I shall undertake to try to demonstrate a little later.

For the present I wish to read one or two more paragraphs from the bill we are asked to support by those who are advocating the measure as it passed the House. I read now from page 3, beginning in line 11:

Upon receiving such a certification for a particular area—

This refers to the certification which the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion is authorized to make and which is described, let me say in response to the question of the Senator from Delaware—

the Director of Selective Service—

(A) shall designate the categories (by age and other status) of registrants who are liable to perform work under paragraph (1) and who are not deferred under subsection (k) or by reason of being engaged in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest—

Again we get that phrase, which recurs over and over again without any definition—

from which categories men capable of performing the work involved shall be called before calls are made from other categories. In designating such categories the Director shall first designate categories which include registrants who are, by reason of their age and other status, the type of men he deems can transfer to such work with the least disruption to the civilian economy and to themselves in comparison with men in other categories.

There, Mr. President, the complete power of discretion over the lives of all civilians between the ages of 18 and 45 is granted to one man.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Is the person who is being sent from his work to some other work consulted at all, so far as his preference or desire as to work is concerned? What is the provision as to that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is a very able lawyer. I call his attention to the provision which is made in the bill as passed by the House by which a registrant can defend himself. I refer the Senator to section 4 of the bill, on page 9, beginning in the paragraph which starts in line 16:

It shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to show (1) that he made application to his selective-service local board for a determination described in section 5 (n) (2), and (2) that the denial of such application was not based on a fair consideration of his application.

I ask the Senator from Delaware, how can any person anywhere prove a negative?

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, I gather from the answer of the Senator that what a

man has to do in order to be relieved is to convince the person to whom he is making the application that he did not give any consideration to the former application.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I venture to say that once a case is decided, it is decided.

Mr. TUNNELL. Undoubtedly. But I mean, he must convince the person with the power that the one who made the decision, that is, himself, was simply wrong, and did not give fair consideration to the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely. I was reading from the provisions in section 1 (4) on page 3. Now, so that there may be no misunderstanding of the power which the bill would give over veterans, as well as civilians, I wish to invite the attention of Senators to the language which appears on page 4, beginning in line 1. We are still discussing the power of the Director of Selective Service. I read:

And may exclude, or by regulations provide for the exclusion, from any category so designated, of those types of veterans (discharged or released from active duty in the land or naval forces under conditions not dishonorable) whose exclusion from such category the Director deems fair and equitable.

Congress is not asked in the bill to define the conditions which it deems fair and equitable for the exclusion of a man who has already been drafted for military service and discharged, or the conditions under which he shall be obligated to additional service, not working directly for his country, but to work for his country only indirectly, in some war plant.

Mr. President, here I wish to call attention to the difference between drafting a man for service in the Army and drafting a man for work in a factory or a mine, or on a farm. When a boy in the United States is taken from his home and his business and sent into a camp, or into a military installation, he serves under exactly the same conditions as all the other persons in his status; nay, more than that, officers and men live together in the camps and on the front under practically the same conditions, and a man who is drafted for military service may rise by showing his ability, his military capacity, and earn a commission; and many of them have done so. But who is there so naive as to believe that a man who may be drafted from his normal occupation and his normal skill and sent to work in the factory of another man, under compulsion, is likely to have an opportunity to rise? Such a person so drafted, so compelled to labor, would be in a class utterly and completely apart.

Mr. President, that is a condition which I am not willing to impose upon the male citizens of the United States between the ages of 18 and 45, particularly when some of them may be veterans who have already performed service on the fighting front.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to ask the Senator whether he believes there is any significance in the language on

page 5 of the original bill, in the fifth line, where the word "employers" is used instead of "employment." A worker could pick out the particular man who was to employ him, I understand, if the employer was among those listed, I suppose, by the board, but the bill does not provide that a man shall have any choice as to the kind of employment to which he may be sent. It is only as to who will be the boss.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right. I think it was intended that there should be no choice of employment, but the language reads:

It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith, provided the order gives him a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work.

But what is a reasonable choice? The choice is only of employers, and not of employment.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it would be possible to go through the original bill paragraph by paragraph and line by line to show the weaknesses of the measure. I shall not take the time of the Senate to do that, but I do want to call attention to another example of the negative proof which is being extended to the person to whom the compulsions of this bill would apply. This is to be found on page 10, beginning in line 4:

In case of an alleged violation of section 5 (n) (4) it shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to say (1) that he made timely application for revocation or modification of the order under section 5 (n) (4), and (2)—

Observe the word is not "or"; it is "and"—

and (2) that the denial of the revocation or modification requested was not based on a fair consideration of his application.

An utterly impossible condition to perform.

These, Mr. President, are some of the reasons why I characterize the original bill as a totalitarian measure which would subject the male citizens of the United States between the ages of 18 and 45 to compulsion the extent of which no man on this floor and no advocate of the bill can foretell. I feel very deeply that at this very moment, when the President of the United States tells us that unconditional surrender means the end of nazi-ism, the Congress of the United States should be the last body in which there should be advocated the adoption of these sanctions over the lives of free American citizens.

We know that free America has done this wonderful job. It has done it in the free way. It has done it, of course, by accepting many sacrifices. Most of those sacrifices, Mr. President, have been accepted willingly. Of course, there have been men in business, in labor, in the professions, in idle occupations, who have not done their part, but they are few and far between when considered in comparison with millions who have done their part in the great job that America has done.

I want to be able to say when the history of this war is written that we did not find it necessary to apply totalitarian

sanctions to the people of America. Although Herr Hitler said democracy was outmoded and could not fight because it was not subjected to compulsion; although he said that the colossus of the new hemisphere would fail because the democratic system was an outworn system, I want to be able to boast when this war is over as we can boast now, that the democratic system was capable of doing the job, and is doing the job, and will continue to do the job until the end.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not the distinguished Senator from Wyoming think that we are now telling Hitler in the only language that he could understand the very thing the Senator suggests?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely. We are telling him not only with the glorious and brave achievements of our soldiers and our sailors, but with the output of American industry and American labor, that the democratic system, the free system, is capable of protecting and maintaining freedom in all the world. Are we here, at the very end, to abandon these principles and adopt the method of Hitler, which has proven utterly ineffectual, to destroy democracy, though he had a start of many years in the organization of science and industry?

Mr. President, three proposals have been submitted to the Congress of the United States for the solution of the undoubtedly difficult problem of manpower which we confront. One of these is the draft bill, the compulsory labor bill, which I have just been discussing. Another is the suggestion that the objective should be achieved through the Selective Service System, and the third is the committee bill.

The second plan is that which is suggested in the substitute offered by the very able junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. That bill would depend for its effectiveness upon the work of the local selective-service boards. It has a fatal defect, in my opinion, although I utterly sympathize with the objective which is sought to be attained. At first blush it would seem to be the proper way to act, until we consider that the selective-service boards are voluntary boards. They have no staffs. For the most part such boards operate throughout the country by the voluntary activity of the members, with one or two clerks. Usually some competent and patriotic young woman in the area, the town or the district, acts as clerk for the board. The members of the board are businessmen and professional men and community leaders who are patriotically giving of their time. They cannot be expected to make the sort of in-plant surveys which must be made and ought to be made if we are to have an efficient utilization of our manpower. So I say, Mr. President, the proposal of the Senator from West Virginia contains a fatal defect.

It contains another which, in my judgment, would invite a veto, if it should pass, because in section 4 of the substitute offered by the distinguished Sen-

ator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and by my very able colleague from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], whose purpose it is to make a constructive solution, I well understand, it is provided:

The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall make or cause to be made in-plant surveys and other investigations of the use of manpower by the War Department and the Navy Department.

Mr. President, I feel confident that both the War and Navy Departments would object to extending authority and power to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to conduct such surveys in the installations of the Army and Navy.

This provision, like the provision with respect to selective service, would require a complete reorganization of the system which is now in effect. For that reason, Mr. President, it seems to me that it is not as effective as the committee bill. In the committee bill, cognizant of this difficulty, but in the realization that, as suggested by the Senator from West Virginia and my colleague from Wyoming, there should be and must be a survey of the utilization of manpower in the War and Navy Departments, we have provided that the task shall be performed under the general direction of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. This provision is to be found in section 3 (b). This is the language of the committee:

(b) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall make or cause to be made in-plant surveys and other investigations of the use of manpower by the War Department and the Navy Department, to determine the extent to which such departments are making the most effective use, in activities relating to production, procurement, or repairs, of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and shall take or cause to be taken, appropriate measures to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, and otherwise to promote the full utilization by such departments of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. President, that language was drawn in that way expressly for the purpose of providing the easiest and most effective way, without in any sense giving offense to the War and Navy Departments, for the survey of the utilization of manpower. It will be observed that this power is granted to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, to whom reference is frequently made in the press as the "Assistant President," the man who has been designated by the Commander in Chief to act upon the home front. It was the belief of the Military Affairs Committee that this direction could properly be given to the man whom the President, by Executive order, has already designated as his principal spokesman upon the home front in the war effort, to "make or cause to be made" certain surveys and investigations. That is the phrase that we use in the amendment reported by the committee. He would also be authorized to coordinate the operations and activities of production.

Mr. President, let me add an additional word. The committee substitute

is a very constructive and able effort, with the exception of the two or three criticisms which I have made, to bring together the bill which the committee has recommended and the Selective Service System. I am convinced, for the reason already mentioned, namely, the lack of staff in the local boards, that this authority must be given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, as is provided in the committee substitute. After full consideration, the committee was guided by the thought that the War Manpower Commission, having been established for the express purpose of dealing with manpower, and having agencies and branches all over the country, is ready now to do the work of channeling workers into the places where they are needed, provided we give them the support of statute law. What has been done in the past has been done largely under Executive order.

Mr. President, the committee substitute is an effort to perfect the system we now have. Each of the other two measures, the House bill and the substitute proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] would require a complete reorganization of our system. On the contrary, the committee substitute does not require a reorganization. It merely strengthens the arm of the agency already at work. It does things which should have been done long since.

Let me call attention particularly to the provisions of section 3 (a), to be found on page 14:

SEC. 3. (a) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall, subject to the direction of the President, provide for coordinating the activities of all departments and agencies of the Government responsible for production, procurement, or manpower in such manner as to carry out most effectively the purposes declared in the first section of this act. The Director shall provide, among other things, that manpower requirements and the availability of manpower shall be given due consideration in determining where production schedules shall be increased or decreased and where contracts shall be awarded, terminated, or permitted to expire, and that notice shall be given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission at the earliest practicable time of all changes or anticipated changes in war-production schedules, all awards or anticipated awards of war contracts, and all terminations or anticipated terminations of war contracts, which are likely to result in any substantial increase or decrease of the manpower requirements of any employer or any area. All departments and agencies of the Government shall comply with orders and regulations issued by the Director under authority of this section.

Here is a constructive attempt, we believe, to channel contracts into the area where the labor supply appears. Here is an attempt to make known in advance when a contract is expiring. Frequently when a contract is about to expire, the contractor knows that it is coming to an end. The workers know that it is coming to an end, but they have no knowledge as to whether or not a new contract is coming. The result, in all human nature, frequently has been a letting down of work. This would be obviated by the provisions of the committee amendment. Here we have the

effort to improve and make more efficient the plan which is already working.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that a conference prevented my hearing the entire speech of the Senator. Has the Senator commented on section 7, referred to as the Austin amendment?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. No; I have not commented on that.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to hear the Senator's views on it.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. My own view is that that amendment should not be in the bill, and I intend to support the amendment of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to eliminate the compulsion the amendment provides, because I think it is unnecessary. I feel that we should not run the risk that any authority would be granted to draft a regulation for the violation of which an individual might be liable to the punishment set forth in the language which the Austin amendment incorporates in the bill. I feel that it is unnecessary.

I feel also that, so far as I can read the bill, authority is not granted to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to draft such a regulation. I believe that by perfecting the voluntary system we can do much more to solve the manpower problem than by adopting any of the drastic methods which would provoke a feeling that the fundamental free choice of American workers was being denied.

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

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am sorry I did not hear the entire statement upon the point the Senator is making; but he did not indicate, did he, any compulsion or any punishment was to be placed upon an employee under the substitute I have offered?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Oh, no. I understand that.

Mr. President, I think that this in effect completes what I desire to say about the bill. I feel that the substitute should not be adopted and that the committee bill, with the change which is proposed by the amendment of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] merits the support of the Senate.

I can say that under the able and laudable chairmanship of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] the Committee on Military Affairs, in my judgment, has done an exceptionally hard-working, intelligent job upon this bill. It scrutinized with great care the measure which came from the House. It was not afraid to accept its responsibility. It did not hesitate to read the proposed bill, line by line. When it became clear, upon the first reading of the bill, that many amendments would have to be adopted, then members of the committee and Senators outside the committee, like the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who, as a member of the Mead committee, formerly the Tru-

man committee, has had opportunity to see how manpower has been wasted because we have not had legislation of this kind, gave their best thought and their diligent effort to drafting a bill which would meet the problem. Mr. President, I think it does meet the problem, and, as I said, it merits the support of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding is that the amendment which I have offered to House bill 1752 is now pending. Is it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. TYDINGS. That amendment is offered as an amendment to the committee substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Inasmuch as the amendment which is now pending, has, so far as I know, eliminated any objections raised by the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who, so far as I know, were the only opponents of it, the remainder of the Senate being a unit in support of reinforcing and restating the so-called Tydings agricultural amendment, I am very hopeful that it may be acted upon at this time, for the debate is not turning on what is pending before the Senate, but on the relative merits of the bill introduced by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from West Virginia, the committee substitute, and the House bill.

So, whichever one of the three of the Senate finally agrees to pass, I do not know that any Senator is opposed to this amendment. Thus, I am hopeful that it may be disposed of now, so that we may have before us what is actually the subject of the discussion.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland a question relative to the second part of his amendment, found on page 2, beginning in line 10, reading as follows:

It shall be the duty of any registrant who is now or hereafter deferred under this subsection and who has been found unacceptable to the land or naval forces for training and service, not to voluntarily leave or discontinue such agricultural occupation or endeavor unless his selective-service local board (subject to appeal in the same manner as is provided in section 10 (a) (2)) has determined that it is no longer necessary in the interest of the war effort.

And so forth. Will the Senator please interpret the last line I read—line 17?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. The man to whom this language refers was originally deferred because of his agricultural occupation. Subsequent to his deferment it might be found that he was physically unable to perform military service. Therefore, he would be excused from performing military service, not because of his agricultural occupation, but because of his physical disability. In such cases some men who have requested deferment because of agricultural occupation, finding that they no longer needed to work

on the farm, after they have been found to be physically disabled have left the farm and have engaged in some other occupation. I think that a man who asks to be deferred from military service because of agricultural occupation, and who subsequent to such deferment is found to be unable to serve in the Army because of physical incapacity, has the duty to remain on the farm.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us consider the case of a farmer who has been deferred and placed in either class IV-F or class II-C. Probably he works 8, 9, or 10 months of the year on the farm, producing wheat or corn, let us say. He does not need to work every day, but, of course, it is essential that when spring comes he cultivate the crops, and that when the fall harvest comes he be on the farm. Subsequently, at a time between seasons, when there is no particular need for him on the farm, he is granted permission by his selective-service board to work in a packing plant for 2 months—or, as in the South, to go into the woods to engage in lumbering operations. Would there be any difficulty about his returning to the farm the following season?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not a bit.

Mr. WHERRY. It is up to the draft board which classifies him, is it?

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the Senator speaking of a man who has been found physically unfit for service in the Army?

Mr. WHERRY. I am.

Mr. TYDINGS. He is always under the control of the draft board, even after he has been found to be physically unfit.

Mr. WHERRY. But would he have to go back to the draft board and offer himself again for service in the armed forces?

Mr. TYDINGS. I imagine the draft board would give him the right to transfer to such seasonal work for a limited number of months, and when that period expires he would automatically go back to the farm.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that provided for in the amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. So far as it can be provided, I would say "Yes."

Mr. WHERRY. So it will not be necessary for such a man to report back to his draft board; he will be allowed to return to the farm, and there will be no question of violation of the regulations or of imposition of the penalties provided in the measure, which are rather heavy.

Mr. TYDINGS. The penalties have been eliminated.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry I was not in the Chamber when that was done.

Mr. TYDINGS. But he would be left under the control of the draft board, which could put him into military service in a limited capacity. All the penalties have been eliminated.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I rose to my feet for two purposes. In the first place, Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has stated that the amendment

should be accepted by the Senate because it would appear in any one of the three bills.

Mr. TYDINGS. I offered it only to the bill of which the Senator from Utah is more or less the author.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. The reason I speak now is because of the Senator's statement in regard to penalties. On a rereading of the Senator's revised amendment beginning in line 10, and in the light of his statement that the penalties have been eliminated, I think it would be better, if he will not assume that I am giving him advice, to reconsider the matter, because I believe that the penalties have not been removed. I think that by use of the words "it shall be the duty," in line 10, all the penalties prescribed by section 11 of the Selective Service Act, as amended, will still be in force. They are extremely severe penalties. If the Senator does not object, and inasmuch as some Senators have urged the rejection of the last paragraph because of the severe penalties it provides, I suggest that action be delayed until we come to the question in one of the other bills—in case we do come to it—or, in case the Revercomb substitute is accepted, bring the matter up again after study and consideration.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding of the parliamentary situation is that unless the offer is made at this time it will not be in order should the Revercomb amendment be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true; but if the Revercomb amendment were adopted the Senator would have a chance to correct his amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I should be in the same position I am in now, because I am offering this amendment as an amendment to the committee amendment so that when we are given a choice between accepting the Revercomb amendment and the committee substitute we may know the final form of the committee substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Has the Senator studied section 11 of the Selective Service Act? If so, does he feel that the penalties have been removed?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Kentucky, and myself have discussed that matter. The Senator from West Virginia is of the opinion that from the wording of the language there would be no criminal penalty which would fall upon the registrant as a result of his draft board ruling. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; I think I understand what the Senator means.

Mr. TYDINGS. There would be no penalty. However, the draft board could certify the man for limited military service. To that extent, if he did not remain on the farm after he had used the farm to escape military service, the draft board could certify him for military service.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator will note that he has made everything which follows line 10 a duty.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The beginning of section 11 of the Selective Service and Training Act, as amended, starts with the words, "Any person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this act."

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So if the Senator is satisfied with having the last paragraph come under the penalty provided in section 11 to which I have referred, I, of course, am satisfied, because the bill which I am sponsoring carries a stronger penalty than the one to which reference has been made. The Senator himself has said that the penalties have been removed, but I am wondering if he is sure they have been removed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; the penalties have been removed. Of course, if a man had been given a deferment and then walked off the job, the board could recall him, reclassify him, and put him into some other service. I have no objection to the provision with reasonable penalties, and none without reasonable penalties. The main purpose of the amendment is to prevent draft boards from drafting men whom the law specifically states shall not be drafted under certain conditions. The other provision to which the Senator from Utah has referred was added at the request of certain organizations who asserted that in some cases men would be deferred because of being engaged in an agricultural occupation, and then after they had been found to be physically incapacitated for military service they would no longer use their agricultural deferment but would leave the farm and obtain a higher-paid job, knowing that they would not be drafted anyway because they were not physically fit.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the registrant should fail to perform a duty, is there any penalty provided in the Selective Service Act, and, if so, would not that penalty be imposed against him under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think it is of major importance at this juncture whether the word "duty" stays in or goes out of the amendment, because it is perfectly obvious that the amendment will have to go to conference. My suggestion is that all opinions expressed on the floor of the Senate must of necessity be opinions with regard to the legal phase of the subject. They have not been carefully considered and weighed as a result of a conference with representatives of the military service. Therefore, if the amendment is adopted, and there is any provision in it which has been subject to misinterpretation, the conference is the place where it can be refined so that it will be expressive of the will of the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any objection to deleting the word "duty" from the paragraph?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not so far as I am concerned. In my judgment that part of the amendment is only about 2 per-

cent of what we are trying to accomplish. I should not object to eliminating all the language after line 10 on page 2 of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us take it out.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, it is obvious that some men who go to a draft board and are excused from military service because of working on a farm, when they learn that they are physically incapacitated for military service, will cease to work on the farm, knowing that they will not be drafted because of certain physical disabilities. It is my opinion that as a question of specific morality, any man who is excused from military service because of doing some form of work essential to the war effort should not be allowed to leave the work when the situation changes in the way I have described.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I read this section, if we should delete the word "duty" in line 10, page 2, of the amendment the provision would still be in such form as to make it the duty of the registrant to do the necessary thing, and therefore the penalty would still be applicable.

Mr. TYDINGS. What would the Senator suggest?

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest that the language be stricken out. Under the law as it stands today, if a man is classified one day as IV-F the board may call him in the next day and put him into limited service.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator has caught the point which I am attempting to make. Let me cite a possible situation. John Brown is excused from military service because he is working on a farm in an essential endeavor and for him there is no replacement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that.

Mr. TYDINGS. He is exempt, although he could have been called up for military service and, to all intents and purposes, could now be fighting in the Army in France or in the Southwest Pacific. For 6 months or a year after he is deferred he is protected, so to speak, from military service and is called up again by the draft board and told, "Whether you are under the law of Congress or not, we will take you because we need you." While they get ready to take him they find that he is physically incapacitated for military service. In other words, to use the common parlance of the day, he is "IV-F'd." He says, "There is no use of my staying on the farm any longer. It is true that I got out of military service for a year under the guise of being a farmer during the war; but now that I find they will not take me because of physical inability, I am going to lease the farm and take the train tomorrow for Baltimore, Philadelphia, or New York, where I can get 8 or 10 dollars a day by working 8 hours a day and get time and a half for overtime, and so forth." So, I think that a man who has asked for military deferment because of agricultural occupation finds he can be

excused anyway on other grounds and then does not stand by what he asked for in the first place, is not entitled, in the eyes of the veterans who are dying on the battle front, to any further consideration, and I would advise that the penalty apply to a man who takes that position without the permission of the draft board.

Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. MURDOCK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia, and then I shall yield to the other Senators.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if the able Senator from Maryland will observe, I have taken the privilege of placing in the substitute which I have offered largely the language of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad to know that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In the proposed substitute it is directed to the local service boards, and requires that the boy be left on the farm; and if he is essential to farm work and cannot be replaced, no penalty is imposed upon him. Now, the case cited by the Senator from Maryland would be met under the substitute for this reason—

Mr. TYDINGS. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment to say that the provision which has just been read and to which the debate has been addressed has nothing to do at all with the deferment of an able-bodied man who has received agricultural deferment from military service.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no penalty, there is nothing of the sort that applies to an able-bodied man who has received agricultural deferment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And who stays on the farm?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. It deals only with the man who apparently thought he is able-bodied, gets a deferment, and escapes military service; then, finding he is not able-bodied, says, "I do not intend to work on the farm any more."

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is so. I should like to address myself to the substitute. Under the substitute measure, in the first place, one deferred by the Selective Service Board for farm work as a necessary worker has no penalty placed upon him whether he be able-bodied or IV-F. If the IV-F man goes back to the farm deferred and cannot be accepted into the Army because of his physical condition and he finds that out and leaves the farm, then under the bill of the committee there is nothing that can be done to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. But under my amendment there is.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the amendment as written with the penalties included in it. But let me state what would happen under the substitute amendment which has been offered. If that man left the farm he would have to go into some work whether he was a IV-F or able-bodied. Of course, if he is

able-bodied and leaves the farm, he is called up for military service; if he is not able-bodied but classified IV-F, under this bill he has got to take a job or become a loafer.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator means under his proposed substitute bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. If he becomes a loafer, he is called by the Selective Service and offered to the military service, and, if they will not accept him, the War Manpower Commission finds a job for him and he must take it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose he will not take the job?

Mr. REVERCOMB. If he is able to work, the same penalties would be imposed upon him as would be imposed on the man who refused to accept service when called by the draft board.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, if the Selective Service Board says to John Brown "Go into a plant and make shells," and he says, "I will not go," he is subject to 5 years' imprisonment and a \$10,000 fine under the substitute bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall state how I interpret it. There is no Member of the Senate, so far as I know, who opposes, in essence, the amendment I have proposed, and as a matter of fact no one is opposed to any of it except the last 10 lines, which may be subject to a questionable interpretation. I assume I have stated it correctly. I feel this way about this amendment: If a man has gotten deferment from military service upon his statement that he is going to work on the farm and no one can take his place, and he subsequently finds, even though there is no one to take his place, that he is physically incapacitated for military service and he uses that condition as a means of avoiding work, and goes some place else in violation of his first deferment, then whatever penalty is already in the law for evasion of the draft or any other part of the draft machinery ought to apply. That is my interpretation. While there is no specific penalty, the draft board can call back such a man and reclassify him for limited military service or anything they care to do, and the penalty would be in keeping control over him even though he had left the farm.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator from Maryland accept an amendment striking out all the language after the period following the word "board" in line 10?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will tell the Senator what I would suggest in the interest of good legislation. I do not know as yet whether we are going to have the House bill or the committee bill or the substitute bill. I think the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska is a good one, that for the time being there be eliminated all the remaining part from line 10 down to the end of the amendment. However, when this bill goes to conference there ought to be sufficient leeway in conference to take care of a man who

originally was deferred because he was working on a farm but who, finding himself unable to serve from a physical point, left the farm and went back on his original request.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking out on page 2, line 10, after the word "board", the remainder of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be so modified.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand the Senator's modified amendment and comparing it with the so-called committee bill, it relates to section 11 of the bill, pages 21 and 22?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore, what it would do to the bill that came from the committee would be to strike out on page 22, line 7, all the language beginning "It shall be the duty of any registrant who is now or hereafter deferred" to the end of the section?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. But it would leave in the first provision of section 11, and would add to it a new sentence, about which, I believe, there is no controversy, and which reads as follows:

Such deferment shall be made by said board without consideration of any other circumstance or condition whatsoever; and during the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification shall be made by said board.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's description of the present situation is completely accurate.

Mr. BURTON. The part that would remain in the Senator's proposal would seem to me, from the history of the case, to be without controversy. The Senator is striking out a sentence as to which there has been some controversy because of its penalty implications, but he would be definitely amending the bill as it came from the committee by striking out the important paragraph as to which the Senator has made some reference, indicating how valuable it may be.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. I promised to yield to the junior Senator from Utah, and for the moment it had slipped my mind.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I have listened to the Senator with much interest, and, as I understand him now, his amendment, by way of modification, takes out—

Mr. TYDINGS. All the IV-F cases.

Mr. MURDOCK. It seems to me that if the language in question should be stricken out, it would do this with the boy on the farm: He is deferred on account of doing farm labor. Then he is called up for induction. At that time his

deferment is canceled, as I understand deferment; is it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. MURDOCK. If he is physically fit and is so found, he goes into the Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. The boy is called up while his deferment is in existence.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. He is called up more or less for what is called a reexamination or reclassification. When he appears before the board, the first thing they do is to examine him, and we might as well tell the truth about the matter, the psychological factor back of it is that the registrant is in a position where he is afraid that if he does not do pretty much as it is implied he should do, something is going to happen to him. So there is a certain amount of coercion. What in the world is the use of examining a man physically when a board has already said he should be deferred because there is no replacement for him in the community?

Mr. MURDOCK. I see no reason; but I take the position that when the board calls him for induction and then finds that he is physically unfit, certainly that has canceled his deferment.

Let us apply the same type of provision to a boy, working in some plant, who is being deferred. Would the Senator from Maryland want to say to the farm boy, "Because your deferment has been canceled, because you have been determined to be unfit, you must go back to the farm, regardless"? Would the Senator want to say that to the farm boy, and still say to the boy who works in a plant, who is called up, let us say, under the same circumstances, "Although we do this to the farm boy, now that you are found to be in IV-F, you can elect to go onto a farm if you want to"? To me it is not logical.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is why we struck it out, not that we are not in basic agreement as to the intrinsic merit of a provision dealing with this subject, but it is perfectly obvious that it has not been rounded into perfect shape, and we are hoping that this matter will all be dealt with in conference.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad it was deleted.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have two questions to ask, the first one of the Chair, dealing with the parliamentary situation. If we accept the modification embodied in the Tydings amendment, and adopt it, will that carry through the modification to the bill which will be before the Senate after action on the Revercomb substitute?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is an amendment to the committee substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So that it will amend the committee substitute, regardless of any action taken on the Revercomb substitute?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The next question I would ask of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to ask a question at that point.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield to the Senator from West Virginia in a moment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In order that I may have the wisdom and experience of the Senator from Maryland in conference, let me ask him to explain to us exactly what the added sentence will do to the amendment, if he will give us an illustration such as the one he has given us in regard to the boy who is deferred for agricultural purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. At the request of the Senator from Utah, I shall read the amendment slowly as it now stands, and then attempt in a few sentences, if I may, to interpret it properly. It reads:

In carrying out the provisions of this subsection * * * the selective-service local board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

That was basically the original Tydings amendment. Now we have added the words "without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation, service, or endeavor." That is new language, and its purpose is this: The draft boards have said, "We know that the Tydings amendment is the law, but the Selective Service has said to us in so many words, 'Notwithstanding the Tydings amendment, if you find we need this boy more than the farmer needs him, go ahead and take him anyway, whether there is a replacement for him or not.'"

In order to cure that situation, we have written into the amendment a provision that the requirements which I read on page 1 shall be paramount without regard to any other service or occupation whatsoever. So much for that. I continue reading:

The foregoing provision of this sentence shall apply upon any appeal or review of a decision made thereunder by a selective-service local board.

That is inserted so that after the local board acts on a case the same formula shall apply to the appeals board in the determination of a case. I read further:

Such deferment shall be made by said board without consideration of any other circumstance or condition whatsoever.

That was inserted because it was thought that, having tried to go around the law once in a certain manner, we would close that door and say, "You cannot resort to anything else that will tear down this amendment." In other words, Congress is in this position: In order to carry out a perfectly plain and frank and clear definition of policy heretofore agreed to, we have had to restate it and write around it all sorts of safeguards to keep the executive agencies from ignoring the wish and nullifying the action of the Congress. I read further:

And during the period of such deferment for such purpose no other classification shall be made by said board.

That forbids the draft boards, while the circumstances remain the same, from calling a man back when there has been

no change in conditions, as I have said, and reclassifying him so as to put him into the service, the will of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont, then I shall yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether his new amendment, which requires the Selective Service to obey the law of Congress, would have any effect upon a situation such as that which is prevalent in my State? There are about 150 young men in Vermont working on farms, mostly their fathers' farms, who put in 6 to 10 hours a day on the farm, then take the milk from their farm to the milk plant, and on the way collect milk from the neighbors' farms and carry that also. It takes them 3 or 4 hours a day to do that, so that they put in between 12 and 14 hours a day in all, working on the farm and carrying the milk. These boys have been advised by their county farm labor directors that they must stop carrying their neighbors' milk, or they will be classed as truck drivers and lose their farm-labor deferment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the ruling of the board in the Senator's State is extreme, but I cannot say it is incorrect for the following reason: I have had brought to my attention a similar situation in my own State involving deferred men who on 1 day a week take a quantity of butter into Baltimore City, where they "huckster" it, as we say, and the selective-service board says such men are not putting in their time on the farm but are retail merchants. In another case there was a man who ran a farm during the day, with the help of his wife, and operated a filling station in limited hours in the evening. The man was stretching himself to the utmost, working all day long, and in the evening doing this extra work in order to take advantage of the prosperity in the country and make some extra money with which to reduce the mortgage on his farm.

The point is that the minute a man starts to depart from purely farm work a multitude of situations arise, and if latitude were given, an impossible condition would exist until the whole of the farm deferment program would fall into disrepute. Whereas up to the present time, so far as I know, the worker in the factory, the man in the city, the businessman, and the soldier and the sailor and the airman on the front, are all sympathetic with the evident intent of Congress, properly applied, because they do not feel that in the main the program has been abused, but that it has resulted in a considerable contribution to the Nation's total war effort. Therefore, I would have to say to the Senator, much as I sympathize with the situation he has presented, that I doubt if we can provide such exceptions as he suggests in the law.

Mr. AIKEN. The individuals in question are in a position where one agency of the Government is telling them to

pool their products and efforts in order to save tires and gasoline, and the Selective Service tells them that if they do they will be drafted into the Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, but I think we ought to be fair enough to consider such a situation as this: Let us say there are two boys, John Brown and William Smith. They grew up in the same community. They are of the same age. One goes out and faces the greatest danger on the battle front, where he may be called upon to give his all, his young life. The other one, because of his particular adaptability and the need on the farm, escapes the danger of losing his life. Therefore I believe that where a farm deferment is given to one of two young men, as it must be given all over America in accordance with the example I have presented, it ought to be for farm work and for nothing else. I do not believe that men who have been given the privilege of deferment because they are needed on the farm ought to spread their energy to huckstering, or to operations involving the use of gasoline or to anything else which is not a service on the farm within the meaning of the deferment provisions of the act.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think such a thing is happening.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do.

Mr. AIKEN. As one gets nearer to large cities such things might happen, but in my State the work involved is simply the carrying of milk from the farm to the milk plant, which may be anywhere from 5 to 15 miles away. Although probably there is no way of changing the regulations, the result is that many more men will be required to do the same amount of work than would otherwise be necessary.

Mr. TYDINGS. That may be. But in order that the war effort may continue the man ought to devote all his time to creating or producing food, and if he does not create or produce food, then he ought not to have the privilege of deferment. It is a privilege, a very high privilege, made necessary because there is no other way to produce the food than the way we have provided. But the man who receives a deferment from military service ought to meet the tests of civilian production 100 percent, and he ought not to be deferred if he meets them only 99.44 percent.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A few moments ago the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], made inquiry as to whether the amendment, as modified by the Senator from Maryland, was an amendment to the committee amendment or to the substitute which I offered. I wish to say—as was correctly answered—it is an amendment to the committee bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say to the Senator that the exact language, as now modified by the Senator from Maryland, is contained in my substitute as originally offered.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want the distinguished Senator from Maryland to know that I agree with him fully in what he is trying to do. No one has rendered a greater service in working out agricultural deferment than has the Senator from Maryland, and we all compliment him for it.

If the Senator will follow what I shall read, beginning in line 8, on page 2:

And during the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification shall be made by said board.

Should not the words "of said registrant" be inserted following the word "classification"?

Mr. TYDINGS. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. WHERRY. The middle of line 8, on page 2, of the Senator's amendment. I simply make the suggestion to the Senator in order that the language may be clarified.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the Senator's suggestion?

Mr. WHERRY. Beginning in line 8, on page 2, the Senator's amendment reads:

During the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification shall be made by said board.

Should not the words "of said registrant" be inserted between the word "classification" and the word "shall"?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the insertion of those words would strengthen the provision. I have no objection to having the words inserted. I perfect my amendment by the insertion of the words "of said registrant" between the words "classification" and "shall."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland has the right to perfect his amendment in the way he has done.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I call the Senator's attention in line 4 on page 1 of his amendment to the following words, "solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary."

Let us suppose a case. A farmer has two sons. The draft board decides that the farm could be operated with one son. So it puts the other son into I-A. He is sent off to the induction center, but fails in his examination and is not accepted, so he is back on the farm again. When he comes back is the draft board precluded from considering the fact that the individual who was sent to the induction center has been rejected? The language of the amendment would seem to imply that the only thing the draft board could do would be to consider the one item of essentiality for farm work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, I do not think such a thing as the Senator has suggested would happen very often.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, a man has either been already deferred or he has not been deferred.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But the draft board could, if it wanted to do so, again

call a man for induction who had previously failed in his physical examination.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But under the wording of the Senator's amendment is the draft board prevented from considering that rejection?

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no. If the individual has been deferred because of military incapacity, as in the case the Senator mentioned, the one who has been deferred because of physical incapacity is a IV-F. What is the Senator's question concerning the IV-F individual?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. As I understand the Selective Service Act, generally, the draft board could send him again to an induction center, even though he had been rejected.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But does not the language of the Senator's amendment which I have read prevent the board from considering the previous rejection at all?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Would not that language prevent the board from considering anything but agricultural essentiality?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, it would not; not if the individual had already been deferred because of physical incapacity, because obviously he could not again be called for military service unless he had been cured of his physical disability.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. He could be called, of course, but he could not be inducted.

Mr. TYDINGS. The original intent of the so-called Tydings amendment was to exempt only men who were going to be taken into the military service for whom there was no replacement.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. We are now dealing with men who could not be taken into the military service because of physical disability. In my opinion such men always remain under the jurisdiction of the draft board for further examination or for further classification, depending upon whether they improve, and what the situation is.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. So the language of the Senator's amendment would not prevent that?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I do not think so.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In such a case, where the farmer had two sons, and the draft board decided that the farm could be operated by one of them, and the other one was sent to an induction center, and was turned down for physical reasons, and returned home, then the draft board could consider whether the other one who had been left home originally should be taken.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; because the one with a defect who returned home would be a replacement for the other.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or the board could send the first one back to the induction center if he were found qualified and fit to go into the Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. In either case it would be a question of providing a replacement.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], as modified, to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if any Senator wishes to speak concerning the Revercomb substitute I will yield the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 16, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following proviso:

Provided, That no regulation or interpretation shall be issued, or action taken, by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission which reduces the employment ceiling of any regular publication, daily, weekly, or monthly, or of any news-gathering or news-disseminating organization, below the number employed in any such publication or organization in any month in the year 1944.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee substitute.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the heart of the committee substitute is contained in section 4 (b), in which the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, by himself, and individually, is given power to prescribe employment ceilings in designated areas, activities, or places of employment, fixing the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, who may be there employed, and prohibiting the employment of workers beyond such maximum number.

I think it is admitted that with such power the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission might close up any establishment in the United States. That probably is the most arbitrary power ever given anyone to deal with employers or plants. I have some doubt about the wisdom of granting such broad powers at all, and that question may be discussed; but I feel perfectly confident that that power ought not to be given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission over any part of the press of the United States. He ought not to have the power to close up any newspaper or magazine. He ought not to have the power to close any regular reporting agency. I do not think that anyone has alleged that an excessive number of persons are engaged in that industry. No evidence of that kind has been presented. As a matter of fact, nearly all the news-

papers and publications had fewer employees in 1944 than they had before.

My amendment is as follows:

Provided, That no regulation or interpretation shall be issued, or action taken, by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission which reduces the employment ceiling of any regular publication, daily, weekly, or monthly, or of any news-gathering or news-disseminating organization, below the number employed in any such publication or organization in any month in the year 1944.

Under the terms of my amendment, no one could start a new newspaper or publication in order to evade the draft. The amendment simply provides that in the case of organizations which were operating in the year 1944, and employing a certain number of persons, the number of persons so employed may not be reduced.

I believe there is one thing upon which we can all agree, and that is that we should maintain in this country, to the very greatest possible extent, the freedom of the press. It seems to me that the press is a unique case. It sets no example for any other industry. I very much hope that the chairman of the committee may see fit to accept my amendment, which I believe could in no possible way hinder the successful operation of the act.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, and intend to support his amendment. In the committee I offered an amendment to strike out the entire provision, because there is no question that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission would have power to establish zero ceilings and thereby, as the Senator has suggested, put anyone out of business. I believe that we ought not to give him such power. We were not successful in the committee in having that provision stricken from the bill; but I hope before the bill is passed that another attempt will be made, and that we may be more successful. Certainly the press ought not to be subject to such power. Many other industries ought not to be subject to it.

Mr. TAFT. I believe that the press represents a peculiar case. I feel that the press ought not to be limited at all in its employment. Possibly if the provision as applied to other industries is to be changed, it may be desirable to limit control over employment ceilings to 50 percent, or some other figure. However, I am glad that the Senator intends to support this amendment. I hope the chairman of the committee will accept it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope to interest the Senator in an amendment to strike out the entire provision.

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to support such an amendment if it is offered.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the question is not a vital one, if I may judge from the expressions offered in the committee. Senators who pointed out that there was power in the bill to reduce employment ceilings to zero were answered almost entirely by the statement that it would not be done. I think there is no doubt in the mind of anyone that

no administrator in the United States would attempt to close out a newspaper by this method.

It was deemed by the committee that it was better to have no exceptions, and I myself feel that the committee was wise in providing no exceptions. But no Senator can talk against making an exception of this kind, because no one can conceive of any administrator attempting to curtail or interfere with the press. Therefore the acceptance of the amendment should hinge on whether the Senate wishes to make any exceptions. If we start making exceptions there will be no end of them. It is probably better that we have faith in the administrator to cooperate within both the spirit and the letter of our Constitution.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I appreciate what the able chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee has said. In many cases all that it is necessary to do to close a newspaper in the country is to take away one printer. Some of them are being closed now. Many of them have only one printer or one linotype operator. If he is taken away, the plant must close.

Clause (2) of subsection (b) of section 4 provides that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall have authority—

(2) To prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers. No employer shall hire or retain in his employ any individual in violation of such regulations.

I do not wish to indicate a lack of trust in any Government official, but I do not intend to vote to give any man the power to do what is suggested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee substitute. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Overton
Balley	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Bilbo	Hoey	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Butler	Kilgore	Shipstead
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McMahon	Tobey
Downey	Magnuson	Tunnell
Eastland	Maybank	Tydings
Ellender	Mead	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Millikin	Vanderberg
Fulbright	Mitchell	Wagner
George	Moore	Walsh
Gerry	Morse	Wheeler
Green	Murdock	Wherry
Gulley	Murray	White
Gurney	Myers	Wiley
Hart	O'Daniel	Willis
Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have been supporting the Tydings amendment. I desire to give the reasons why I am in favor of it. I wrote to the Department of Agriculture, and on the 28th of February I received a letter from the director of the western division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Mr. Geissler. I might add, Mr. President, that his letter is a report regarding just one State, but it is typical of the agricultural States. Let me say very frankly that I do not see how General Hershey can possibly keep on taking the boys the way he has been taking them in my State and at the same time have the Department of Agriculture expect to carry out the program it has announced for North Dakota. The letter to which I have referred, from the head of the western division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, reads as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL
ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I thought that you might like a report at this time on the past year's production and the 1945 production goals adopted by North Dakota agricultural leaders after careful study of national food requirements and the State's capacity to produce.

You will note from the attached table that farmers in North Dakota are again asked to carry out another big production job. In total, it compares very closely with the 1944 effort with the exception of the flaxseed goal on which North Dakota farmers are asked to carry a large part of the critical need for an expanded acreage. While the 1945 job appears comparable to the huge assignment carried out by the State's farmers in 1944, it is in fact a bigger job because it is complicated by the effects of another year of war which means that shortages may be even more acute in many farm production facilities.

Since the adoption of the State goals, meetings have been held at which county representatives have also joined in the acceptance of these goals as a war assignment for the State. The farmer-committeemen of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency and representatives of other farm groups are already actively at work informing farmers of the 1945 food requirements and developing farm plans to meet these goals.

The 1945 goals for North Dakota, as you will notice, represent very sharp increases over the acreages and livestock numbers in the 1937-41 period. It is a very large assignment that is asked of North Dakota farmers, but they have already indicated that they stand ready to make a real drive to carry through to another year of outstanding production. This was displayed very clearly in the reactions to the flaxseed goal. They were ready to produce it if it was needed for the war, but at the same time they wanted to be sure that it was a war need for which they were producing. The \$5-per-acre payment which the Congress made possible through special authorization will furnish a very great incentive in attaining the needed production of this high-risk crop. The flaxseed goal has become a Government-farmer cooperative war project which has moved the goal from the impossible category to the difficult.

While labor is the problem of greatest concern to the farmers at present and the one

that will have the most influence on their 1945 plans, the transportation problem is also very critical and can very easily result in a major storage problem at harvest time. Shortages must also be reckoned with in virtually all of the production facilities. However, it appears that farmers generally will plant to meet war needs again this year and rely upon their own ingenuity and maximum cooperation to pull them through what they very clearly see as their toughest production assignment of the war.

I wish to repeat that statement, Mr. President: The Agricultural Adjustment Administration says it is the toughest job that these farmers have ever been called upon to do.

I continue to read the letter:

The A. A. A. farmer-committeemen, as in the past, will be working with farmers throughout the entire production period to assist them in meeting the obstacles to production that might seem impossible if the need to overcome them was less important. If courage and extra effort will get the job done, I am confident that North Dakota's farmers will come through with another outstanding contribution toward meeting war's huge food requirements.

On the right-hand side of the attached table is a comparison of North Dakota's 1944 production with average production in the 1937-41 period. It tells a story of a tremendous production for the war effort and I am sure that you have seen accounts in North Dakota papers of what this has meant in the way of vastly increased State income.

Such sharp increases in production have taken their toll in soil resources, but North Dakota farmers have been aware of this drain on their soil and have carried out a rather heavy conservation effort along with the record production job. Shortages of farming facilities might have been expected to reduce their conservation work, but actually they carried out a record amount of conservation under the agricultural conservation program of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. The Government assistance to North Dakota farmers on the soil and water conservation practices carried out under the 1944 A. A. A. program are estimated to be close to \$6,000,000 compared to \$4,810,000 of assistance on conservation in 1943. Much of the big increase in North Dakota production is the result of conservation work carried out under former A. A. A. programs. I am greatly impressed in driving through the State these days by the very marked improvement in farming methods that have been made in North Dakota in the last 10 years. As a North Dakota farmer I get a real feeling of pride out of this and you, of course, have reason for even greater satisfaction in what has been accomplished in this way. It is an accomplishment of great value to the State and the Nation as well as the individual farmers who have benefited.

When the North Dakota farmer-committeemen have completed the important 1945 farm plan sign-up, and accurate estimates can be made of the total of the farm goals that your farmers voluntarily set for themselves, I will report to you our success in the first phase of the 1945 production effort. We must first get the needed acreages planted. I will also advise you at that time regarding our progress on the 1945 agricultural conservation program and the production problems that are being encountered.

Sincerely yours,

G. F. GEISSLER,
Director, Western Division.

Mr. President, in order that Senators may understand the situation our farmers confront, and what they are asked to do, I read from some tables

which have come directly from the Department of Agriculture.

Take, for example, the matter of sows which must farrow in the spring. The yearly average between 1937 and 1941 was 99,000. In 1945 the farmers were asked for 190,000 sows, an increase of 92 percent of parity, or 192 percent. Mind you, Mr. President, this request was in spite of the fact that last year the O. P. A. set ceiling prices by which the farmers of North Dakota were robbed of hundreds of thousands of dollars. It was at a time when the 5 packing plants refused to buy North Dakota hogs because, so they said, they had no room for refrigeration. They were buying hogs weighing less than 200 pounds, and hogs weighing more than 330 pounds, at a discount of 4 or 5 cents a pound. The result was that some of our farmers who were unable to pay \$1 a bushel for barley, and from \$1.10 to \$1.15 a bushel for corn to feed the hogs, which were rapidly attaining more than top weight, sometimes had to sell them at a sacrifice.

Let us take the matter of corn. The average for the 5-year period to which I have referred was 1,109,000 acres. This year the Department of Agriculture wants us to plant 1,283,000 acres.

The yearly average for oats from 1937 to 1941 was 1,816,000 acres. This year the Department of Agriculture wants us to plant 2,560,000 acres.

The yearly average for barley during the same period was 1,859,000 acres. This year our farmers are asked to plant 2,640,000 acres.

The yearly average for wheat during the same period was 8,749,000 acres. This year our farmers are asked to plant 10,000,000 acres.

The average yearly acreage of flaxseed for the 5-year period was 564,000 acres. This year, believe it or not, the Department of Agriculture wants us to plant 1,807,000 acres, or more than three times the former average acreage.

Our average yearly acreage of Irish potatoes was 143,000 acres. This year we have been asked to plant 187,000 acres.

Our average yearly acreage of alfalfa seed was 18,000 acres. This year we have been asked to plant 40,000 acres.

I now come to the subject of cattle, and I invite the attention of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who has been very much interested in that subject. I am sure that the figures which I shall present with reference to North Dakota will correspond very nearly to those with reference to Nebraska.

For the 5-year period to which I have already referred the number of cattle and calves raised in North Dakota was 1,256,000. This year the Department of Agriculture wants us to raise 37 percent more or 1,720,000 head.

I am sure that the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska will recall that only a few weeks ago he stood beside me on the Senate floor and told me that the feeding lots in Nebraska were empty, and that the farmers there were losing money. He was appealing most eloquently for relief.

For sheep and lambs, the average for the 5-year period in North Dakota was

913,000. This year we are asked to produce 1,058,000.

For the 5-year period between 1937 and 1941, North Dakota raised 7,097,000 chickens. For 1945 the Department of Agriculture wants the farmers of North Dakota to produce 11,500,000 chickens.

The Department of Agriculture has not yet fixed the quota on eggs, but they want us to produce more milk. For the 5-year period to which I have referred the average yearly production of milk in North Dakota was 1,985,000,000 pounds, and for 1945 we are asked to produce 2,152,000,000 pounds.

Mr. President, I have not counted them, but I have before me approximately 500 letters which have come to me within the past 10 days. I wish to read some of them at this time. Any Senator who wishes to do so may examine them. They are practically all alike. I now hold in my hand one from Manfred, N. Dak., written on the 25th day of January, which is about the time the letters commenced coming to me. It was shortly after General Hershey had issued the call which really set aside the Tydings amendment. The letter was as follows:

We want to inform you that awful things are going on here. All the boys who had still been deferred are now being sent to Fort Snelling. While they are gone we do not know what to do with the stock and sheep. There is just too much work for old farmers and worn-out mothers to do. What must be done with these fresh and calving cows and lambing sheep?

We expect you to help us now, not next week or later. See that these boys who are still on the farm stay.

Yours respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. B. E. FEHR.

Here is a letter from Fredonia, N. Dak. I might say that these letters are available to any Senator who cares to examine them. I notice that some Senators are nodding their heads, indicating that probably they have received similar letters by the score. The letter from Fredonia reads as follows:

FREDONIA, N. DAK., January 25, 1945.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I will ask you a question. I am a farmer. I own 5 quarters of land—350 acres crop land—and a full line of machinery, 45 head of cattle, some horses, hogs, and everything. So, I got one boy.

He is 18 years old. Now, that's all the help I got beside me. I am 45. So, what can I do when they call him in the Army? My wife is in poor health. Is there any chance for me to keep him at home? When they call on him, I got to quit farming as soon as they call him. So, please let me know as soon as you can. I always depend on LANGER.

Yours,

FRED WESZNER.

Here is one from Burnstad, N. Dak.:

BURNSTAD, N. DAK.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER:

Received your letter some time ago about the new set-up which passed in Congress and am very glad of some of the things.

But the most thing I'd like to know or like to have is hired help. We all know and all hear that the IV-F's are going to be drafted so I would like to know if I couldn't keep one back. I farm a little better than 300 acres and have 90 head of cattle which to be taken care of and am all alone, which is too much work. Am 46 years old, farming all my life. Would appreciate very much if you could do something for me.

Let me know soon.

Yours truly,

WENTELL BECKER.

Here is a letter from Solen, N. Dak.:

SOLEN, N. DAK., January 23, 1945.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am writing to you asking for advice about my son. He is in class II-C now until May. But they want to take all the farm boys to Fort Snelling that are in II-C.

I am a sick man. I was to see the doctor last week and he cannot help me. Please see what you can do about it and let me know right away. I would appreciate it very much. I plant over 400 acres of crop and have 45 head of cattle. He is the only one that can work. I have two girls and another boy, yet, that is going to school. He also is sick with hay fever and cannot work. The doctor said not to keep him on the farm because that won't help him. That is why I am sending him to school.

So please help me so my son won't have to go. If they take him I have to quit farming and without farming I cannot make a living.

Very truly yours,

JACOB HEINERT.

So I could go on with letters, Mr. President, but the ones I have read are typical.

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

North Dakota

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from North Dakota if he has continued to get letters, as I have, even after the so-called corrective Hershey directive went out, notifying the local draft boards to comply strictly with the law as set forth in the Tydings amendment. Does the Senator still have letters coming to him from different draft boards?

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska that when I got these letters I packaged them and got in touch with General Hershey. When I went to see him he commenced to tell me that the Tydings amendment had been—I say set aside, but he used other words. I said, "Very well, General, it will be a great favor to me if you will talk directly to the people of North Dakota." The result was we went over to a radio station and there we made a 15-minute record, of which General Hershey took about 13½ minutes. We advertised that fact in North Dakota and General Hershey talked directly to the farmers of the State of North Dakota. I thought that would be a fair way. Notice was given to all the draft boards so that they could listen in. That record was broadcast not only once but several times, not only by one radio station but by practically every radio station in the State of North Dakota. When he got through explaining to the farmers of North Dakota, Mr. President, believe it or not, I received more letters, let me say in reply to the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska, than I got before that record was broadcast on those radio stations, some of them in Nebraska, so I have no doubt the junior Senator from Nebraska had much correspondence along the same line. I continued to receive letters from farmers who said they had heard General Hershey talking over the radio.

Now I ask unanimous consent to place the table in the RECORD at this point in my remarks—the table accompanying Mr. Geissler's letter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted. The table is as follows:

Commodity	1945 goals with comparisons			1944 production with comparisons				
	Unit	1945 goal	1937-41 average	Goal as percent of average	Unit	1944 production	1937-41 average	1944 as percent of average
Corn	Acre	1,283,000	1,109,000	116	Bushel	36,250,000	21,017,000	172
Oats	Acre	2,560,000	1,816,000	141	Bushel	82,041,000	38,098,000	215
Barley	Acre	2,540,000	1,859,000	142	Bushel	59,062,000	28,781,000	205
Wheat	Acre	10,000,000	8,740,000	114	Bushel	161,630,000	88,437,000	183
Flaxseed	Acre	1,807,000	564,000	320	Bushel	7,661,000	2,563,000	299
Irish potatoes	Acre	187,000	143,000	131	Bushel	20,875,000	13,539,000	154
Legume seeds:								
Alfalfa	Acre	40,000	18,000	222	Bushel	27,000	20,000	135
Sweet clover	Acre	20,000	29,000	69	Bushel	29,000	74,000	39
Sows farrowed:								
Spring	Number	190,000	99,000	192	Number	160,000	99,000	162
Fall	Number	(¹)	16,000		Number	25,000	16,000	156
On farms Jan. 1:								
Cattle and calves	Number	² 1,720,000	1,256,000	137	Number	³ 1,905,000	1,256,000	152
Sheep and lambs	Number	² 1,058,000	913,000	116	Number	³ 967,000	913,000	106
Raised on farms:								
Chickens	Number	11,500,000	7,067,000	162	Number	12,309,000	7,097,000	173
Turkeys	Number	1,200,000	1,424,000	84	Number	992,000	1,424,000	70
Farm production:								
Eggs	Dozen	(⁴)	27,917,000		Dozen	55,667,000	27,917,000	199
Milk	Pound	² 1,182,000,000	1,985,000,000	108	Pound	2,183,000,000	1,985,000,000	110

¹ To be announced later.

² Jan. 1, 1946.

³ Jan. 1, 1945.

⁴ No State goals established.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also have before me a table furnished by J. M. Thompson, Assistant Director, Western Division, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, showing the harvested acreage and production of grains for various years.

Mr. Geissler in his letter stated what

a very fine job the farmers of North Dakota had done. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table furnished by Mr. Thompson, because it shows that without exception the production of corn, wheat, oats, barley, flaxseed, and grain sorghum was greater in 1944 than in any previous

year. I did not mention rye because it happens the year was a poor one for rye and the figures for rye are a little bit less.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the table may be printed in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

Harvested acreage and production—Grains

	Harvested acreage (thousands of acres)					Production (thousands of bushels)						
	Average, 1930-39	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	Average, 1930-39	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Corn.....	99,049	86,738	86,186	89,494	94,455	97,235	2,307,452	2,440,200	2,677,517	3,175,154	3,034,354	3,228,361
Wheat.....	55,743	52,080	55,642	40,464	50,648	59,309	745,575	816,698	943,127	981,327	841,023	1,078,647
Oats.....	36,653	35,393	37,965	37,899	38,395	38,984	1,016,061	1,235,628	1,180,663	1,358,730	1,137,504	1,166,392
Barley.....	10,732	13,496	14,220	16,782	14,768	12,359	226,460	309,235	362,082	426,150	324,150	284,426
Rye.....	3,298	3,210	3,570	3,837	2,755	2,254	37,899	40,601	45,364	57,341	30,452	25,872
Flaxseed.....	1,780	3,180	3,275	4,402	5,847	2,714	11,252	31,127	32,285	40,660	51,946	23,277
Grain sorghums (for grain).....	4,083	10,325	5,982	5,896	6,662	9,117	52,747	121,371	111,784	107,245	103,864	181,756
Rice.....	943	1,069	1,214	1,477	1,468	1,466	45,712	52,754	51,323	66,363	64,843	70,237
Total.....	212,281	206,391	208,054	209,241	214,998	223,518	4,443,158	5,056,614	5,404,145	6,212,970	5,588,136	6,059,218

Source: Annual Summary, Crop Production, BAE.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to another very important matter, namely, that of farm machinery. Last year I conducted a series of hearings, and in the one little county of Hettinger alone, of which the county seat is Mott, the county agent testified that because they did not have proper machinery the farmers there lost more than a million bushels of wheat and flaxseed. When I returned to Washington I took the matter up with the War Production Board and was informed the situation would be remedied. They said that no longer would farm machinery be rationed. I call the attention of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to this statement, because I conducted one of my meetings in a county adjoining his State, and I found the situation to be exactly the same in South Dakota as it was in North Dakota. The War Production Board said that more farm machinery would be manufactured. "The time was," they said, "when many tractors and combines were sent to Canada; they have been taken right by the doors of the farmers of North and South Dakota through Portal to Canada, but that is a thing of the past."

I called the attention of the distinguished Senator the other day to the fact that in the little town of Portal, one little port of entry, in the month of July and the first 2 weeks in August last year, while the farmers of the Northwest were begging for combines and tractors, through that little town in 6 weeks there were shipped 355 combines and 655 rubber-tired tractors. They were taken right by the doors of the farmers of the United States under lend-lease and exported to Canada.

What is the situation today? Farmers keep writing and telegraphing for machinery, and when we go over to the War Production Board what do they tell us? A few weeks ago they said the concerns manufacturing farm machinery were nearly 40 percent behind schedule. It is not quite so bad now. A farmer telegraphs and says, "I want a wheel, just a wheel for an old drill," and he

cannot get it. Send a telegram to an implement house in North Dakota, and it will be found it cannot furnish it. Farmers telegraph for plows and cannot get them. They cannot get tractors; they cannot get binders; they cannot get drills. Yet, in spite of that, we find that the A. A. A. and the Agricultural Department are asking farmers to raise larger crops than they ever raised before in their history.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not care to interrupt the argument the Senator is making, but I should like to make an observation relative to the demand for farm machinery by farmers throughout our section.

Located about 40 miles from where I live in Nebraska there is a town called Beatrice. Recently a farm sale was held there, because the farmer who had operated the farm had passed on, and his widow, who was the administratrix of his estate, advertised the farm for sale. It is a fine farming community, and the farm home was like a great number of others in that section. It was not unusually large, but, on the other hand, it was a good sized home. This sale was not one of the ordinary commercial sales, such as a sale where a great deal of machinery is offered.

It so happened that 3 years before the farmer bought a new row-crop Farm-all tractor. Selling some of the machinery that goes through the O. P. A. routine sometimes involves a great deal of difficulty, so the banker told the widow to advertise the tractor for \$800, and ask that those who wanted to buy should bring certified bank checks, because they wanted no question about settlement, or any question about whether the payment would go through the O. P. A., whether it was over or under the price fixed. In this community, which is just about like all average farm communities in eastern North Dakota, on the afternoon when the tractor was sold 170 farmers put up certified checks for \$800 apiece to buy that one farm road tractor. In

other words, \$136,000 was put up in the effort of these farmers to buy one used tractor.

Mr. President, that gives some idea of the scarcity of farm machinery. I think it is one of the most unfortunate conditions that have come to my attention. In the Senate we are talking about legislation to provide against unemployment. After the war ends there will be so much consumer demand that, in my opinion, we shall not be able to meet it. Our manufacturers have not made an automobile for 4 years, and before the war they made 5,000,000 each year. They have not made a washing machine or a radio. The junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] knows about that. None of these articles could go on the market in the last few years. On top of that, there is machinery that is worn out, and replacements are now needed. Yet the officials in the Government agencies in Washington have allocated these things under lend-lease to countries which either cannot or will not use the implements, and allocated them to other departments which could not use them.

I call attention to what has been referred to by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, that in order to have food produced for the Army and the civilian population some machinery must be afforded now to the good old United States of America. These stories spell what we need. We need farm machinery, especially so since the farm boys have been taken off the farms under the directive of General Hershey.

I desire to say one more thing, although I do not wish to break in on the Senator's argument.

Mr. LANGER. I want the Senator to take all the time he desires.

Mr. WHERRY. In Nebraska last year we had the largest corn crop in the history of the State, and at the time when the Hershey directive was issued, which we have been trying to clarify under the Tydings amendment, there were 100,000,000 bushels of corn in the fields not even shucked, most of it lying on the ground because corn pickers were not available

and we did not have the boys to shuck the corn. No farm boys, no farming equipment, no repairs, no transportation, no lumber, no cribbing, and to keep consistent with agriculture the departments and agencies say "No" to all appeals for aid.

Now the Government is asking for an increase of 13½ percent all along the line in production of food; yet it has taken the boys, under what I call a circumvention of the Tydings amendment, and is not giving our farmers the machinery with which to replace the old machinery, or providing men to replace the boys taken off the farms to do the hand work.

If this country is to go forward this year in the production of the agricultural supplies which are so badly needed, the departments must make available some of the machinery required for farm purposes, and furnish it to the farmers, instead of sending it across the water to countries where the people do not even know how to use it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me call the Senator's attention to one other matter before he takes his seat. I spoke a few days ago about some of the non-farm tractors, tractors set aside to fix up golf courses, so that some can go out and play golf.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me tell the Senator about that. That was one reason why on February 19, 1945, I introduced Senate bill 585. It was to help the boys who come back from the service and put more machinery on the farm. When the men in industry go to their positions their tools are there, but in the case of veterans who come back from the service and want to go back on the farm, where they have liquidated their machinery, where they sold out, they cannot resume the operation of their farms, even though they have the farms, because of the scarcity of machinery. If they go to the retailers they find they have orders stacked in some places so high that a veteran would not get a piece of machinery for the next 2 or 3 years. So we investigated and we found that farm machinery was being manufactured for nonfarm agencies, and that there is a great deal of nonfarm machinery manufactured and allocated on order.

Take the case of manure spreaders. The idea of a nonfarm manure spreader. I do not know where it would be used. Or take a nonfarm tractor. I was told by an official of one of the largest implement firms that they had 800 tractors on order for nonfarm use, and they had to be bought by institutions or by those who are not in the farming business. Yet they are farm tractors.

Therefore I introduced Senate bill 585, providing for the transfer of those implements to the War Food Administration for distribution where they will be in essential use. Let us get these tractors, and let us get the manure spreaders, and the other implements, on the farms, where they belong. A great volume of equipment which the farmers could get, is lying in the wholesale and retail houses. There are all kinds of implements manufactured today for civilian purposes which the farmers cannot get, yet they are in dire need of tractors right

now in order to start off with the spring crops.

Mr. LANGER. Could the farmers in Nebraska get corn pickers when they needed them?

Mr. WHERRY. No. There is a well-beaten path I have trodden to all the agencies in an effort to get corn pickers. Now the farmers want machinery. The boys are coming back, and every boy who comes home and wants to go to farming should have a chance to do so. The W. P. B. should certainly take into consideration what Canada has done. Canada has made an allotment of steel and has put into a pool all the steel necessary to manufacture machinery and give it to the returning veterans, and the United States should do the same, and could do the same without detracting from the quotas set aside for the farmers of this country.

I thank the Senator. I did not intend to interrupt him, but this matter has been on my heart and mind, and I thank him for giving me the opportunity to say a word about it.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator. I ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] if he does not remember the letter he put into the RECORD last year from a soldier in Africa telling about the warehouses there filled with rubber-tired combines, not one of which had been used.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I remember the letter very distinctly. The combines, which were large ones, were stored in the warehouses in north Africa, and the average farmer in the area in which they were stored has a 10-acre farm on a hillside, and anyone who knows anything about a farm knows it is not possible to use that kind of a combine on that kind of a farm; but some smart boy conceived the idea of filling the huge warehouses in north Africa with that kind of farm machinery.

Mr. LANGER. What is the situation with regard to the farmers in South Dakota being able to obtain plows?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There are not any.

Mr. LANGER. Or binders, or drills?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There are none of them.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, they are not rationed, but there is no place where they can be bought in the State of South Dakota, no matter where one goes?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. For example, the quota of corn pickers in Cass County was 5, and there were 251 applications for the corn pickers. Senators will remember that I referred to that situation some 5 or 6 weeks ago.

So, Mr. President, I shall watch with a great deal of interest the action which will be taken, even though the Tydings amendment has been adopted, because thousand of farm boys have heretofore been taken out of my State. Even though the Tydings amendment becomes law I shall watch with a great deal of interest to ascertain whether more at-

tention is paid to the present Tydings amendment, which has now been adopted and incorporated into a proposed law, than was paid to the original Tydings amendment. It seems to me that when an official deliberately sets aside the law and takes young farm men, with the result that so many farmers must quit farming, some remedy shall be found by Congress, because in the last analysis it is the Congress which the people will hold responsible.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from the Governor of Montana be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATE OF MONTANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Helena, February 20, 1945.

HON. B. K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
MY DEAR SENATOR: On February 15, I wired you as follows:

"Under Hershey's interpretation Tydings amendment selective service is stripping agriculture of essential and irreplaceable men. Unless Congress intervenes and makes sure Tydings amendment complied with production in Montana will be tremendously reduced. Farmers have taken a beating and under present operation selective service they might as well close up shop. Please use your best efforts to protect the people of Montana."

In order that you may be better informed of the problems confronting the farmers of Montana, due to the manpower shortage, I am enclosing a few of the many letters I have received in regard to the situation, which is becoming critical.

I am also enclosing copy of a statement which I have sent to all selective-service boards and to General Hershey.

I am unalterably opposed to the wholesale induction of farmers and farm workers where no replacements are available and sincerely hope that something can be done to prevent further stripping our farms of essential workers.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Cordially yours,

SAM C. FORD, Governor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee substitute and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 16, line 6, it is proposed to strike out in section 4 (b) the words "and (2)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(2) to prescribe minimum requirements of production in designated places of employment, plants, or units of production, either in toto as to such places, plants, or units, or as to workers by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, who may be there employed, and (3)."

On page 16, line 9, it is proposed to insert in the same section, following the word "regulations", the following: "No employer or employee, acting alone or in conjunction with others, shall perform any act or enter into any agreement or conspiracy willfully intended to decrease or slow down production, in violation of such regulations."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana has offered two amendments. Does the Senator want them to be considered together or separately?

Mr. CAPEHART. I want them to be considered together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be considered together.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall speak only briefly on the amendments. My only purpose in offering them is to be helpful.

First, I should like to say that I am opposed to the general principle of any forced manpower legislation. However, if, in the opinion of this body and if in the opinion of the Army and the Navy, such legislation is needed, then let us enact legislation which will get the job done.

The only purpose of the proposed legislation we have been debating is to insure adequate production. The only interest the Army and the Navy have in the bill is that they shall be supplied with an ample amount of war material. The only interest the men in the services, some of whom are sitting in the gallery, have when they are on the fighting line is that they shall have a sufficient amount of war materials, that they shall have guns when they need them, that they shall have tanks when they need them, that they shall have ammunition when they need it. I am certain the Army and the Navy care not whether we supply them with sufficient materials of war by using 10,000,000 men or 20,000,000 men. Therefore the problem is one of production.

My amendment will help production. I think it has been brought out in the debate and in the hearings that manpower shortage is spotty; that we have a shortage of war materials possibly only in certain factories, or in connection with certain items. My amendment, if adopted, will do this: Where there is a shortage of any given item in any given factory—and the War Department of course knows of that shortage—my amendment will enable the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to establish a minimum requirement of production if that specific factory and it will prohibit the employer or the employee, or both, from slowing up production in any way whatsoever.

It will enable the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and the Army and the Navy to go into the factories where there is a genuine shortage, factories which are producing critical materials badly needed at the front, and give them the opportunity to do the things necessary to get the materials to our boys who are fighting on the fronts.

That, as I see it, is the only purpose of the proposed legislation now pending before the Senate.

I hope the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee will support my amendment, and I ask for its adoption.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana seems logical. It is, as the Senator from Indiana has said, logical from the standpoint of increasing pro-

duction and manpower; and it seems therefore to have a place in the bill. But the amendment goes to the heart of what have become practices of industry and labor in working out understandings and contracts. Therefore the amendment is more complex than it appears to be on the surface or on first reading. I think it would be unwise to adopt this type of amendment. The amendment would modify the Fair Labor Standards Act. It would enter into the field of labor relations. It would multiply the possibilities of invitation to dispute which I mentioned in my opening remarks on the bill. It would multiply contests between labor and employers. In the final analysis it would not be an invitation to discuss the question of constitutional rights, but would be a step toward an invitation to litigation of various minor matters.

Mr. President, I ought to point out that our task in conference will be a terrific one, because one bill under consideration follows one philosophy and another follows another. In view of the situation I trust the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me to place in the RECORD an extraneous matter which does not refer to the Senator's amendment, and which it will take me only a few minutes to present?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this morning in the hearing held in the Appropriations Committee, General Hines appeared before the committee and submitted a matter which I think the Senate ought to know about, in the consideration of the pending bill generally.

In the so-called G. I. act, on page 14, there appears this language with reference to returning soldiers, which is found in subsection (b) of section 700, under title V:

(b) Such person shall be deemed eligible to receive an allowance for any week of unemployment if claim is made for such allowance and the Administrator finds with respect to such week that—

(1) the person is residing in the United States at the time of such claim;

(2) the person is completely unemployed, having performed no service and received no wages, or is partially unemployed in that services have been performed for less than a full workweek and the wages for the week are less than the allowance under this title plus \$3;

(3) the person is registered with and continues to report to a public unemployment office, in accordance with its regulations;

(4) the person is able to work and available for suitable work: *Provided*, That no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this subparagraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

General Hines asked for an appropriation to pay such claims, and the committee found a very unusual situation existing in that connection. In a short time, from February 3 to February 10, one week, the amount paid was \$602,000. I shall ask later to have the list incorporated in the RECORD, together with General Hines' letter, so that Senators may see the number of claims being presented from their States.

General Hines testified that 27,000 returning soldiers were being paid \$20 a week because they could not find employment; and such payment is provided for in the act. Think of it! We are about to draft young men for work, yet here is a reservoir of 27,000 young men, returning soldiers, able and willing to work. They must register their names with the employment office. If we need workers, I cannot imagine why this reservoir of 27,000 men, costing us an enormous sum of money, cannot be used, instead of drafting or conscripting labor. Why cannot the returning soldiers be used? What is the matter with our officials? What is the matter with the War Manpower Commission? Why does it not undertake to use this reservoir of labor before undertaking to do what I think is a violation of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States?

I bring this question to the attention of the Senate, and especially to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. I think there ought to be some explanation as to why the Government is paying more than \$30 a month to each of these returning soldiers, having them register, and having them certify that they are without employment and cannot get it, while at the same time the Congress is called upon to draft other laborers to do the work which no doubt these boys would be glad to do.

Mr. President, I ask that the exact terms of the statute, together with the letter from General Hines to me, which I received just a few moments ago, and the list, by States, of the returning veterans, showing the amount which they are receiving, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

TITLE V

CHAPTER VII—READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

SEC. 700. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable, after active service of 90 days or more, or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, shall be entitled, in accordance with the provisions of this title and regulations issued by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant thereto, to receive a readjustment allowance as provided herein for each week of unemployment, not to exceed a total of 52 weeks, which (1) begins after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the date of enactment hereof, and (2) occurs not later than 2 years after discharge or release or the termination of the war, whichever is the later date: *Provided*, That no such allowance shall be paid for any period for which he receives increased pension under part VII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a) or a subsistence allowance under part VIII of such regulation: *Provided further*, That no readjustment allowance shall be payable for any week commencing more than 5 years after the termination of hostilities in the present war.

(b) Such person shall be deemed eligible to receive an allowance for any week of

unemployment if claim is made for such allowance and the Administrator finds with respect to such week that—

(1) the person is residing in the United States at the time of such claim;

(2) the person is completely unemployed, having performed no service and received no wages, or is partially unemployed in that services have been performed for less than a full workweek and the wages for the week are less than the allowance under this title plus \$3;

(3) the person is registered with and continues to report to a public employment office, in accordance with its regulations;

(4) the person is able to work and available for suitable work: *Provided*, That no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this subparagraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

MARCH 2, 1945.

HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: In compliance with your telephonic request of this date I wish to advise you that during the week of February 10, 1945, 27,877 veterans were paid \$627,757 as readjustment allowances under Title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

To be eligible for such allowances a person must be residing in the United States (as defined in section 1502 of the act) and, except as to self-employment, be completely unemployed, and able to and available for work at the time of application.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Readjustment allowances—Number of veterans paid and amount paid for week ended Feb. 10, 1945, under title V, Public Law 346 (78th Cong.)

	Feb. 3		Feb. 10	
	Number of veterans paid	Amount paid	Number of veterans paid	Amount paid
Alabama.....	509	\$11,423	399	\$8,542
Arizona.....	141	3,157	153	3,339
Arkansas.....	420	10,409	434	10,396
California.....	1,831	48,003	1,768	44,087
Colorado.....	59	1,241	57	1,294
Connecticut.....	515	11,675	470	10,613
Delaware.....	35	740	43	869
District of Columbia.....	364	7,237	400	7,063
Florida.....	411	10,225	440	9,791
Georgia.....	368	9,670	370	10,178
Hawaii, Territory of.....	12	240	10	200
Idaho.....	16	520	29	1,008
Illinois.....	931	23,231	845	20,665
Indiana.....	535	10,284	503	9,544
Iowa.....	494	11,990	451	10,676
Kansas.....	71	1,653	66	1,461
Kentucky.....	449	11,526	491	11,672
Louisiana.....	77	1,693	58	1,415
Maine.....	139	2,755	197	3,323
Maryland.....	118	2,480	121	2,592
Massachusetts.....	1,070	21,206	859	18,381
Michigan.....	477	12,221	524	12,835
Minnesota.....	395	8,245	458	9,638
Mississippi.....	175	4,346	134	3,002
Missouri.....	422	9,320	422	9,458
Montana.....	61	1,298	63	1,395
Nebraska.....	9	300	11	320
Nevada.....	9	177	9	217
New Hampshire.....	122	2,642	117	2,783
New Jersey.....	1,240	29,146	1,264	28,504
New Mexico.....	11	220	13	260
New York.....	1,910	40,799	3,837	80,709
North Carolina.....	691	14,196	660	13,974
North Dakota.....	13	279	14	299
Ohio.....	214	7,022	199	6,028
Oklahoma.....	77	1,522	74	1,464
Oregon.....	66	1,578	56	1,314
Pennsylvania.....	3,125	63,986	3,153	64,794
Puerto Rico.....	3,145	88,043	3,202	81,768
Rhode Island.....	897	8,180	400	8,482

Readjustment allowances—Number of veterans paid and amount paid for week ended Feb. 10, 1945, under title V, Public Law 346 (78th Cong.)—Continued

	Feb. 3		Feb. 10	
	Number of veterans paid	Amount paid	Number of veterans paid	Amount paid
South Carolina.....	285	\$6,207	268	\$6,837
South Dakota.....	44	1,034	54	1,525
Tennessee.....	1,002	25,900	1,100	28,796
Texas.....	2,108	49,984	2,470	49,229
Utah.....	28	597	17	328
Vermont.....	42	883	51	1,254
Virginia.....	162	4,041	193	4,885
Washington.....	73	1,453	71	1,414
West Virginia.....	580	11,587	635	12,675
Wisconsin.....	244	5,436	233	4,847
Wyoming.....	1	20	1	154
Total.....	25,693	602,025	27,877	627,757

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I urge Senators to look into the situation and see what ought to be done about it. I especially urge my good friend from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to look into it. I urge the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to look into it, and see if this reservoir of labor cannot be used before we undertake to draft men and make them work whether they are willing or unwilling.

I thank the Senator from Indiana. Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee, not by way of argument, but by way of pointing out the fact, that the committee, in its hearings and discussions, did consider the very problem which he has stated. The answer we received was, of course, that even if all the veterans were put to work, that would not meet the demand for manpower. That does not mean that if one man is needed, and he is obtained, he is not helping, or that if one man who is needed is not obtained, the program is hindered.

In our report, on page 3, the committee considered this question. The statement of the committee is in keeping with what the Senator has said. I read from page 3 of the report of the committee:

To meet these needs we must look to several sources. We anticipate that a high proportion of the approximately 400,000 veterans who will be discharged between January 1 and June 30, 1945, will accept war work, provided we take proper measures to enable them to accept such war work without jeopardizing their reemployment rights in non-war jobs. During this same period the normal net increase in our employable population will be about 500,000. And finally, some 200,000 workers will become available from munitions programs which are declining or will remain at current levels. Although about 35 percent of our war-production programs are declining, such declines rarely match rising programs, either geographically or by needed skills. Despite the best efforts of management, labor, and Government, experience has demonstrated that releases from declining programs result in some "evaporation" of workers from the labor force and some dissipation to less essential activity. But even if every worker from these sources were placed in war production, we would still

be confronted by a net manpower deficit if manpower legislation is not enacted.

That means not only that we have gone into the question, but that if this source of 27,000 men is not being used, it is our duty, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, to see that they are used, or made available for use.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let me say that I think so, too. The remarkable part about that testimony, as it was given before our committee this morning, is that it shows that we are paying out nearly \$100 a month to each of these returning veterans. They are asking for employment, but cannot get employment. They would not receive the \$80 or \$100 a month from the Government if they could obtain employment. I have no doubt that they would very much like to have employment. I believe that if the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission would get busy, he could relieve the situation to the extent of supplying nearly one-tenth of the needed men, at least; and that would be very helpful. If we are required to violate the terms of the Constitution, as it seems to me, in order to put men to work regardless of whether they wish to work, it strikes me that if we have a reservoir of men, returning soldiers, who wish to work and whom we are paying, anyway, we might save at both ends of the line by putting these men to work.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee why they cannot work. The laws says they cannot be paid unemployment compensation if they can get jobs.

Mr. MCKELLAR. No; we are told they are on the lists at the employment agencies, including the list maintained by the Director of the War Manpower Commission. They must register with him. They do not have to work, so General Hines testified this morning; and, therefore, the Government is paying them to be idle, when the War Manpower Commission is saying that it is absolutely necessary to have workers and that we must draft workers.

Mr. TAFT. Then, if the Senator's conclusion is correct, it points to the fact that there is no shortage of labor, because those men are listed as available for work and they cannot get work.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I cannot say that absolutely, because at present there are 27,000 men in the situation of having the Government pay them a little less than \$100 a month, and I believe the request is for the drafting of approximately 400,000 men, if I recall the figures correctly.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I think I can correct the Senator from Tennessee, if the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I should be very happy to have the Senator do so. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. They are drawing their money under the G. I. bill of rights.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Under the G. I. bill of rights it is not a question of whether a man is physically able. The question is whether he has been declared physically unable by the Veterans Bureau. A great many of the returning veterans—in fact, practically all those returning from the Pacific area—are suffering from tropical diseases, such as malaria, which make them unfit for work. They want to get jobs. They do not want to be rated as physically unfit. They apply for work, and they work for a few days, and then malaria or some other tropical fever strikes them, and the employer has to lay them off. Then they draw the money under the G. I. bill of rights money which they would be entitled to draw under their severance pay. That is where the money is coming from.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will examine the act, he will find that it provides that the veteran has to be able to work and available for suitable work.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The veteran makes such a statement to the employment office, and his name is left there. So long as he is left in that situation, without work, if the employment service does not give him work the Government must pay him \$20 a week. There are 27,000 veterans in that situation. If Senators will examine the list they will find a number of veterans from each State who seek employment under those circumstances, but are not employed, although they say they are able to work. They certify that they are able to work and that they are available for work. Yet the War Manpower Commission does not put them to work.

Under those circumstances it seems to me that there is something wrong somewhere, inasmuch as those men certify they are able and willing to work and want work, as they have shown by appearing and filing their names. I think they should be put to work before we undertake to violate the terms of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution and have involuntary servitude imposed upon other men who likewise want to work.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee, in further development of that thought, that 2 weeks ago I was in an office where there were five men, all of them discharged veterans who had suffered from battle shock and were mentally off balance. They certified they were able to work and ready to go to work, and they were incensed because they could not get a single recruiter to accept them. I was informed by the manager of the office that they had been there every morning for 6 weeks. They could not be persuaded to go to the Veterans Bureau for examination, because they said they had been promised a job and were there and wanted one. Yet anyone who examined them could tell they were mentally off balance.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, salaries are not being paid to such young men.

Mr. President, I merely wish to leave that thought with the Senate. I thank the Senator very much for permitting me to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I agree with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that this proposed legislation is most complex; and I am generally opposed to such legislation.

However, under the bill the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission would be given the right to place employment ceilings on factories. That means that he could say to one factory, "You shall have 500 men," and to another one, "You shall have a thousand men," and to another one, "You may have 1,500 men," or "10,000 men," or whatever the number might be. My position is, since I know something of the manufacturing business, that once the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission places such a ceiling on a factory, he automatically accepts responsibility for running the factory; and if we are going to permit him to place a ceiling on the number of persons who shall work in a factory, he should likewise have the right to prescribe the minimum production, and he should have the right to say that neither the management of the factory nor its employees shall interfere with producing such minimum amount.

I am making this suggestion only in an effort to be helpful. I have a son on the battle front in Belgium. The pending bill is a production bill. We are talking about getting the job done, getting supplies to the boys overseas in order to win this war.

I wish to repeat what I said a moment ago. The time is now here when production must be increased. In many instances factories with orders from the War Department are not producing. Other factories are producing critical materials. Possibly in some cases the day they are finished they are immediately flown overseas. If we are going to enact such legislation as this, then let us pass a measure which will enable the War Department to get the job done.

I appreciate that I am a freshman Senator, and I am grateful to the Senate for listening to what I have to say.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me ask the Senator whether his second amendment requires the first amendment in order to make it work. Or can the second amendment stand by itself?

Mr. CAPEHART. I rather think not. Let me state how the situation seems to me. Many thousand factories in the United States are making war materials. It is impossible for the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission even to set a ceiling on all factories. There simply are not sufficient hours in a day to enable him to do that. The best he can do is to pick out the factories here and there that are falling down on the job. The purpose of the amendment is to provide that in the case of a factory which is falling down on the job, a factory manufacturing critical materials which are needed now—not tomorrow or the next day—by the boys at the front, the War Department, through the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, may step in, and say, "Here, 1,500 men; 1,500 guns a day; and no one, neither manage-

ment nor employee, dare interfere with that production." That is the purpose of the amendment. The amendment is not directed against any class. It is designed to get the job done.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I can understand the application of what the able Senator from Utah said regarding the difficulty of prescribing minimum requirements of production.

Mr. CAPEHART. I can understand it also.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On the other hand, I cannot for the life of me understand why there should be the slightest hesitation in saying emphatically and without reservation that no employer or employee, acting alone or in conjunction with others, shall perform any act, or enter into any agreement or conspiracy, willfully intended to arbitrarily or artificially decrease or slow down production essential to the supply lines to our soldiers. Certainly that is one of our present sources of difficulty. I am not talking about forced labor. I am talking about forced interference with labor's rate of production if and when it occurs during the war.

Mr. CAPEHART. Suppose a factory has an order to build a hundred thousand units of some article. That may be the only order which it has. It has 1,000 employees. It is building 5,000 units a day. The contractor knows that at the end of 20 days the order will be filled. The tendency on the part of management is to spread the work out and hold those men in the hope that it will receive another order. Such action ties up manpower.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The statement which the Senator from Indiana has made is confirmed by a letter which I received yesterday from a union employee in one of the large plants of my State. He stated that an inspection or investigation of plants should be made. He said that the plant in which he was employed could produce 25 percent greater results and reduce present employment 25 percent. It seems to me that that is the nub of the whole question. We want additional manpower for the services, and we want production to be increased. Our problem is to find the way to achieve those results. I am not a member of the committee which has been considering the pending bill, and I am looking for light. We all want to do what is necessary to achieve the desired results. But we do not wish, by unseasoned legislation, to do more harm than good. A large percentage of American workers are doing and have done a magnificent job. But there are slackers, and they must be reached effectively so that the need of the Nation may be met.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Reference has been made to the penalty clause. If an employee or employer should be guilty of a violation, what would be the penalty?

Mr. CAPEHART. It would be the same as is provided elsewhere in the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. What is the penalty which is provided in the bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe it is a fine of \$10,000 or 1 year in jail.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand the penalty clause, it is covered by the last sentence of paragraph (b), beginning in line 8 on page 16 of the bill. The sentence to which I refer reads:

No employer shall hire or retain in his employ any individual in violation of such regulations.

I understand that section 7 incorporates by reference the penalties of the Second War Powers Act. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator is intended to bring about the same incorporation by reference.

Mr. OVERTON. The penalty clause is very confusing. I have been unable to understand what penalties are prescribed by the bill.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think a complete answer is that great difficulty will be had in construing the bill.

Mr. TAFT. The penalty clause seems to be fairly clear. It is incorporated by reference from the Second War Powers Act, and reads:

Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, by any provision of this subsection (a) or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, whether heretofore or hereafter issued, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

I do not say that that is a very good method to use in incorporating a penalty. But it has been done. If it has been done as to the existing clause it is also done, it seems to me, by the amendment submitted by the Senator from Indiana. I think the entire language should be clarified; but I believe that whatever penalty is imposed under subsection (b) is also covered by the Senator's amendment. In other words, I do not think the objection is a legitimate objection to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator from Ohio agree with me that section 7 should be entirely reframed?

Mr. TAFT. I think it should be eliminated or spelled out in so many words, the same as it is spelled out in the Revercomb substitute.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the committee substitute.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have just finished a careful third reading of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I apprehend that perhaps it carries more complexities than have up to the present time been adverted to.

In considering the amendment it seems to me that we must consider it in the light, first, of the committee amendment, which is now before the Senate. Then, having in mind that we may presently come to a consideration of what is known as the May-Bailey bill, we should consider the amendment in the terms of that bill.

We have heard a great deal of talk from time to time about the several manpower bills. We have heard them designated as the work-or-fight bill, the work-or-jail bill, the work-or-fine bill, and so forth. I undertake to say that we do not have before us, neither in the committee substitute or in the bill which passed the House, any work-or-fight bill, any work-or-jail bill, any work-or-fine bill, or any work bill whatsoever. I have read with care the bill which passed the House, and I have studied it carefully. I have also given careful study to the bill reported by the committee. I have been unable to find in either bill one word which would require 1 hour of work to be done by any person in the United States. Mr. President, perhaps we might more correctly term these bills "lead the horse to water" bills.

They do in fact provide, or at least the May bill provides, a requirement that under certain circumstances a man shall seek employment and that he shall go on the roll; but I have sought in vain in that bill one single requirement that he shall do 1 hour of honest labor after he gets on the roll. It is not there. You can lead him to water, but even the May bill is silent when you attempt to make him drink.

Mr. President, I think it was said many years ago that we were faced by a condition and not a theory, and we are faced by a condition in the problem now before the Senate. I refer to the broad problem, and not any of the proposed solutions. If in truth we have reached the point in the history of the United States when the life of the Nation requires that men, or men and women, or men, women, and children, shall give something more than has been given to guarantee that this country and its men and women now on every continent and sea, and above the earth and below the sea, around the world, shall be backed up at home, there can no longer be argument here directed at "slave labor," there can no longer be argument here to the effect that we are forcing men into servitude. Any American should be ashamed to make such a statement if we face such a condition.

Mr. President, I apprehend that the question before us is not whether we are going to meet such a condition adequately, but are we faced by the condition? If we are in fact faced by that condition, then the amendment of the junior Senator from Indiana should be but the beginning of adequate legislation to safeguard our people. If we are not faced with that necessity, then we have an altogether different problem, and perhaps we can answer our necessities with something less drastic than total mobilization, remembering always that total mobilization of men, women, children, money, and property, everything,

is right and must be had if the exigencies of the occasion require.

Very grave doubt has been expressed on this floor on a number of occasions as to whether we are faced by that necessity. I confess that I entertain such a doubt. I entertain it for the same reasons that have been expressed by many of my colleagues during the consideration of the pending legislation. I know of the record of production American industry has made on a voluntary basis, and I cannot yet feel convinced that it cannot be continued. I can understand that some inducement may be worth while, but I cannot yet believe that coercion is called for. But if it be called for, I want to be registered and recorded now as going with the junior Senator from Indiana and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who so eloquently presented his cause a few days ago.

Mr. President, let us get back to the question of the legal effect of the amendment of the junior Senator from Indiana, if it be incorporated in the existing substitute. I stated a few moments ago that we have no work-or-fight bill, we have no bill before us, nor was there one passed by the House, requiring an hour of labor. A study of the bills shows that conclusively.

The May bill carried provision for compulsion to the extent of requiring the individuals coming within a certain classification to report for employment, and not to leave that employment, but as to the interim between the reporting and leaving, the May bill was silent. Having reported for employment, an individual might or might not work, as he saw fit, he might start a continuous absentee record, or he might follow the well-known sit-down procedure. There was nothing in the bill to make him work. If we have to make people work, let us do it along the lines of the plan of the Senator from Indiana. But if we do not have to, if the May bill goes even further than the necessities of today require, and if the considered opinion of the committee is correct, then it is enough simply to issue, as the committee suggests, what is in the nature of a legislative invitation to certain persons now employed in certain plants or activities where, perhaps, the activity is not so essential as to require the number there employed, or the number there employed are more than are needed to do the job, and who will be dropped from the rolls of that type of activity, to seek jobs, or get on the pay roll of certain war industries.

Incidentally, and in passing, the pending amendment actually sets a ceiling upon a given activity. Using the example given by the distinguished Senator from Indiana, it says to a man who employs 10,000 workmen, "You can get along with 8,000, therefore cut down the number on your rolls to 8,000," thus releasing from employment 2,000 workmen, having in mind that if the workmen are so released they will seek other jobs, and may be channeled voluntarily into the war work where they are needed. The bill contains no requirement that they shall go there, but there seems to be a hope expressed in the language of the bill that they will do so.

What the bill does is to set the ceiling and kick 2,000 men out of work in the case I have referred to. Those men are going to be out of work for 30 days before they can do anything about it unless they themselves go forth and find jobs. The bill does not even contain the requirement that the War Manpower Commission shall invite the men to go to work, but we can assume that the War Manpower Commission will in such an event exercise what would be to the War Manpower Commission, I am inclined to believe, a most rare discretion.

Mr. President, the substitute bill, in the instance I have referred to, will result in kicking 2,000 men out of that particular job, and some other number of men out of some other job, and so on, until, under its operation, in the wisdom of the War Manpower Commission, there will be a sufficient number of men out of jobs so as to cause them, under some type of a law of diminishing returns, to find one of the jobs where they are needed. That is the way it would operate with respect to the workman, and that is the man in whom we are interested. We are not interested in the employer. We are simply using the employer as a bat, in which case the workman is the ball, and we are trying to hit the workman, through the employer. That is the way it will work.

On the part of the workman, Mr. President, it is voluntary. He goes, because he himself decides to go, and gets a job where he is so desperately needed. He need not go. He goes or does not go in his discretion. And having gone to the job, he remains there at his discretion. He may leave as and when he pleases.

In view of the fact that there is in the substitute bill no compulsion upon the worker—and, frankly, I am of the opinion now that a sufficient case has not been made to require compulsion—if we are to act upon that principle, then the thing we want to keep away from is compulsion in any other guise. If we place the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] in the substitute bill, we change the whole character of the substitute bill; we make it more compulsory than the main bill; we make it do what we are all willing to pass legislation to do if it be necessary—we make it a work or fight bill, or rather a work or jail bill, because for the first time there goes with the legislation a requirement to work on the job; and also there will go into the legislation a prohibition, as I view it, against any workman now on the job, or hereafter going on the job, quitting work, because the second provision of the proposed amendment provides:

No employer or employee, acting alone or in conjunction with others, shall perform any act or enter into any agreement or conspiracy willfully intended to decrease or slow down production, in violation of such regulations.

The regulations establish ceilings. In the first part of the proposed amendment it is proposed:

To prescribe minimum requirements of production * * * either in toto as to such places, plants, or units, or as to workers by age, sex.

And so forth. In other words, the proposed amendment to the committee sub-

stitute will require that the workman stay on the job, do the job, and refrain from doing anything that will decrease production or slow down the operation of the plant.

Mr. President, I apprehend that among the ways in which one may willfully slow down production or decrease production is that of willfully turning around and walking away from the job—what is sometimes termed quitting it. That would appear to me to be one of the methods which would immediately come to mind by which one might slow down and decrease production.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course the second part of the amendment only prohibits such a slow-down in violation of certain regulations. They must be regulations prescribing minimum requirements. I would question whether the amendment would apply to a strike or is intended to prohibit a strike. I do not think the Senator from Indiana so intended. I doubt if the amendment would do so. I think it would prohibit an arbitrary limitation by a worker not to make more than 6 tires a day, we will say, when the Manpower Commissioner might say that there is no reason why a man cannot make 8 or 10 tires a day. I think that is what the amendment intended to accomplish. I think the Senator from Oregon places a rather broader construction on the amendment than is justified.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, that is, of course, a matter of opinion. I see the logic of the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and I have of course a high respect for his judgment.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. If what the Senator says is correct, then it would mean that a man would be subjected to punishment if he quit his job, no matter what the reason might be. Not only would a man who quit his job be subjected to punishment by being sent to the penitentiary but anyone who went on strike could be sent to jail. Certainly I would not vote for such legislation, because if it were enacted, then in my judgment it would mean practically the imposition of slavery upon individuals in their jobs. I cannot conceive that any Senator would want to go so far as to say that he would send a man to the penitentiary because the man happened to quit a job regardless of his reasons for doing so. If we are to adopt such a philosophy in this country, I am sure the boys who are fighting overseas will wonder for what they are fighting.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that if we adopt this amendment we would allow the War Manpower Commission to prescribe minimum requirements. In other words, we would say that the Commission could fix the ceiling, and would have sufficient wisdom to say, "You must produce so

much goods from that plant." We would say that it has the power to prescribe that a certain amount must come out of the plant. By doing so we would concede that it had all the wisdom necessary to deal with production.

Then we say in the next paragraph—and the two paragraphs are tied together—that—

No employer or employee, acting alone or in conjunction with others, shall perform any act or enter into any agreement or conspiracy willfully intended to decrease or slow down production, in violation of such regulations.

I take that to mean that if a man willfully quits his job, and his action interferes with the production of the amount which the War Manpower Commission says should be produced in a given plant, such a man will be guilty of a misdemeanor, and under the act may be subject to imprisonment for a year and a fine of \$10,000. That is the way I read it, because he would willfully quit his job. He would willfully thereby reduce the minimum set by the Manpower Commission. I do not believe that the Congress should say that the wisdom lies in the Manpower Commission to say exactly what every factory in America should produce, and that if any factory fails, because of management or labor, in the production of that exact amount, there should be a penalty.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am in accord with the construction placed upon the proposed amendment by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. As I read the words, that is what they mean.

As I stated earlier, I can conceive of a situation in which I would even go to the extent of voting for that type of required effort. To me it is neither involuntary servitude nor slavery. It would be a lesser sacrifice, a lesser surrendering of liberty than that which has already been undertaken by 12,000,000 young men and women who have been called into the armed services, or who have voluntarily gone in.

The point is that we may have to do it. It is the last thing we want to do; and there must be more than merely a clear case in favor of doing it. There must be such proof as will lead a reasoning mind to no other conclusion than that it must be done. Then I am prepared to go along with it, and strengthen it with any requirement necessary to do the job. But, Mr. President, in this bill I feel that the proposal is wholly out of order. It puts into a plan for voluntary action on the part of workers a new compulsory provision which does away entirely with the philosophy behind the substitute bill. I hope that we may consider the substitute bill substantially as reported, and determine first, as we shall by our vote on the substitute, whether, in view of all the evidence we have or can get, this step alone is enough to do the job. Then, if we must go beyond that, let us go with our eyes open.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I ask to have read from the desk; and I also ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The amendment submitted by Mr. BAILEY was read, as follows:

On page 19, after line 16, of the committee substitute, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) Any individual who willfully fails to comply with any official request or requirement made under this act to accept or continue in employment within 15 days after the effective date prescribed in a formal notice thereof from the Chairman shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not less than 30 days or more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment; and in addition shall forfeit to the United States an amount equal to any amount received by him for the period of such failure as unemployment compensation under the law of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, to be recovered in a civil suit brought by the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I intended to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the Tydings amendment for the purpose of adding, in line 5, after the word "agricultural" the words "or fishing". I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah whether it is his interpretation that under the Tydings amendment the words "agricultural occupation or endeavor" would include commercial fishermen? In my State, and in the State of the Senator from Maryland, as well as that of the Senator from North Carolina, commercial fishermen do not reap a harvest from the land, but they do reap a harvest from the sea. Per capita, and per calorie value of food, they probably produce twice as much as does the average agricultural laborer.

The draft boards have variously interpreted the Tydings amendment under the Selective Service Act. In some cases they have deferred commercial fishermen, and in others they have not. In any event, they have not had the protection of the Tydings amendment; and I am wondering if we could not have some expression of intention, as to whether the words "agricultural occupation or endeavor" include the men who produce from the sea.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in answer to the question, I have heard about people planting fish eggs, but I have never heard of harvesting fish. The fish are hatched, of course. I do not believe that commercial fishing is included in the Tydings amendment. I am sure that if the Senator from Washington wishes to have his amendment included, he will have to offer it formally or nothing will be done for the fishermen in the Northwest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] why objection is made to including commercial fishermen among those deferred from selective service.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, my opinion is that from the standpoint of the production of food, many persons who are engaged in harvesting fish render just as much service to the war effort as do those who are engaged in harvesting farm produce on the land. I believe the difficulty arises from the inability to erect a standard. For exam-

ple, many fishermen are seasonally engaged, whereas the man on the farm is engaged in farm work more or less the year round. He goes from the planting of wheat to the harvesting of wheat, and then the planting of other types of food and other harvesting later in the fall, driving cattle to the barn, and feeding them produce from the farm during the winter. So there is a cycle of production the year round on the farm.

The difficulty has been to deal with fishing on the year-round basis. I believe the Senator would at least find sympathetic consideration for his very worthy endeavor to classify those who deserve to be classified in the fishing industry under the general rule which is now applicable to food production. I believe he would be well advised if he could, between now and the time when the bill is finally acted upon, find some language which would deal with fishing as a year-round occupation. I believe there is a reluctance to defer men for 3 or 4 months for the oyster season, for example, and another 4 or 5 months for the shad season, the rock season, the herring season, or the tuna season. The difficulty is that the man must be regularly employed.

If he can find some language which will tie in with the agricultural provisions and will be on all fours, so to speak, with the agricultural conception of deferment, I believe I would have a very sympathetic reception for such an amendment; and, inasmuch as I am in sympathy with what he is trying to do, I shall be glad to cooperate with him in any way I can toward the accomplishment of that result.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me, let me say that in my section of Puget Sound many of the fishermen are working all the year round. Many of them go into the southern waters in the winter and into Alaskan waters in the summer. In many cases a man will appear before a draft board and will be asked by it, "What are you doing now?" He will reply, "Well, in the summertime I fish in Alaska."

The draft-board officials then will ask him, "What are you doing now?"

He will reply, "I am ashore, on the beach."

"Well," they will say to him, "come on, into the Army you go."

He may be the engineer or the skipper of a fishing ship. That will mean that two or three other men will be out of work for the season.

Inasmuch as the O. P. A. has informed me that next year the supply of meat will be 20 percent less than the supply available in 1944, the importance of fish products becomes greater. So it seems to me we should put the Selective Service System on notice that in cases of requests for occupational deferment in which the men can prove they are producing or catching fish, they should be given as much consideration as is given to agricultural labor, and they should be given the same protection.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that if he can devise

some sort of a unit system—namely, a system requiring that the fishermen be employed all the year around, or the equivalent, and that they be able to prove that in the past they have produced a minimum number of pounds of sea food, so that the system would not be abused—the Senator might get somewhere. The difficulty has been that in many sections of the country there are many men who follow the water for 2 or 3 or 4 months, during a particular season, engaging in oystering or crabbing, or whatever their particular bent may be, and then in the off seasons, the seasons during which they are not able to obtain sufficient income from the sea, turn to more lucrative work. They engage in such work between the fishing seasons. So it would not do to defer a man who follows the sea only 4 months of the year.

If it is possible to work out some standard whereby deferment may be granted a man who is regularly employed in such work on the sea or the water, and who, in fact, is doing about the same on the water, so far as the production of food is concerned, that we expect the men on the farms to do, I believe I would give very sympathetic consideration to such an amendment. But unless it is so safeguarded, I believe the Army and the Navy would be opposed to it, and it seems to me many of the governmental bureaus would also be opposed to it, for they would very likely believe that the disadvantages would offset the advantages.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, if the bill is passed without such an amendment, the fisherman who goes to Alaska in the summertime will be placed in a war plant, and there will be a lack of production of fish.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suggest to the Senator that he ask the officials of the Selective Service System to sit down with the proper officials of the Bureau of Fisheries, and see if between them they can evolve a regulation or an amendment, for that matter, or a new law, after the pending measure is enacted, which would give the fishermen treatment equal with that accorded other persons who are producing food.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, let me say further that if such an amendment is worked out, it will be adopted, and I know my colleagues will do the best they can do to sustain it in conference.

Mr. President, I think we should not longer interfere with a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. I am sure he requested a vote some time ago, and I should like to have a vote on it. But I think it necessary to say a few words about the amendment, before the vote is taken.

Before the junior Senator from Oregon spoke, I did not interpret the amendment as in any way being an antistrike amendment or an antisabotage amendment or anything of the kind. I am sure the average Senator would not so interpret it, and I am sure the author of the amendment would not like it to be interpreted in that way. I am also sure that if the time ever comes in America when such a law has to be passed—and I think

the time will not come—we would wish to act directly on that proposition, not indirectly, as the pending amendment would do.

Mr. President, one other thing should be stated, namely, that if the two parts of the amendment are separated, as was suggested by the senior Senator from Michigan, of course that would not do at all. The assertion in the second part of the amendment is connected up with the violation of such regulations, and the regulations are mentioned in the first amendment. If we were to adopt merely the words of the second amendment, as the senior Senator from Michigan suggested, we would interfere with an excellent practice in the ending of contracts and the taking on of new contracts, where employers try their best to see that unemployment does not occur. I am sure the Senator from Indiana would not like to see placed upon the amendment the interpretation the senior Senator from Michigan has suggested.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote. I hope the amendments will be voted down.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, let me say that the amendment is not in any way intended to be an antistrike amendment. It is intended to help production for the Army and Navy, to place the necessary war materials into the hands of the boys on the fighting fronts.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, let me say just a word before the vote, if I may do so. Under the amendment as proposed by the Senator from Indiana the regulations which are referred to in the second portion of the amendment are an essential portion of the amendment. Those regulations, I take it, refer perhaps entirely, and certainly partially, to those which would be covered in the first portion of the amendment, namely, regulations under which there would be a prescription of the minimum requirements in designated places of employment, and so forth.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is to be granted the power provided under the amendment. To my mind that is highly inadvisable, particularly in view of the fact that we have the War Production Board, which, to my mind, would be a much more appropriate agency than would the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to handle the matter of prescribing the minimum requirements of production.

In any event, whichever of the two may be the more appropriate, the amendment might quite readily lead to conflict between the two because there would be on the one hand, the War Production Board and, on the other hand, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, undertaking to prescribe regulations respecting production; and it seems to me that situation would inevitably lead to conflict.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that, for the reason I have stated, the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think the same reason the Senator has given—namely, that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is not

qualified, and that the matter should be under the War Production Board—likewise applies so far as concerns the ability and wisdom of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to regulate and designate the number of persons who shall work in each factory. If one is pertinent the other is pertinent. If we are to have the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission designate the number of men who shall work in a factory, then we should likewise prescribe the minimum requirements. Why confuse matters by bringing in another agency? I see no reason for rejecting the amendment on the basis that one agency may have more wisdom than another. I have repeatedly said that in principle I am opposed to all manpower regulation. But if we are to enact legislation, then let us enact the kind which will result in getting the work done. My amendment will do that.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have listened to the Senator from Indiana. I was inclined to vote for his amendment until I heard the statement made that under it a man might be convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary.

I have listened to some of the arguments which have been made with reference to backing up the boys who are overseas. I believe that every Senator wants to back them up. No Member of this body has a monopoly on patriotism. No set of individuals, no War Department, no Navy Department, no business group, and no labor group has a monopoly on patriotism.

The other day I received a letter from a boy overseas. I am sorry I do not have it with me. I mislaid it. The boy wrote to his parents and wanted to know why the Congress of the United States was considering a work-or-fight bill. He said, "I am over here fighting for democracy. While I am doing that I do not wish to see us lose democracy at home. That is the way other boys with whom I have talked feel about it. We do not wish to see our mothers, wives, and sisters compelled to work where some bureaucrat tells them they must work."

Merely because the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have told us what to do about civilian problems, that is no reason why we should follow their instructions. Representatives of management and industry came before the Military Affairs Committee and said that they were opposed to the pending legislation. Certain representatives of labor did the same. I am willing to concede that abuses have been practiced by both management and labor in the hoarding of labor in some of the plants of this country. To a large extent it has been done because of plans which were incorporated in the cost-plus agreements which had been entered into. Those practices should cease. We do not need compulsory legislation for the men and women of this country in order to bring about production. It is inconceivable to me that at this stage of the war, when everyone is saying that the progress of the war is quite satisfactory, and that our armed forces are doing wonderfully well, that certain persons should say, "We must have a work-or-fight bill so that we can say to men and women

that they must work here or they must work there." We do not want bureaucrats going into a home and saying to the wife, daughter, or sweetheart of some boy, "You must go to work in this plant or in that plant."

Mr. President, shall we adopt Hitler's philosophy for this country? Shall we adopt Mr. Stalin's philosophy? The greatest manpower in the world is in Russia. There men and women are told that they must work. They are told that they must carry the hod, and that they must do other kinds of labor. They are told that they must go into the Army, or that they must do this, or do that. What has been their record in producing war material as compared with the record of the United States of America, where we have free labor and free industry? What has been the record of any country on the face of the globe which has compulsory work-or-fight laws?

I know that there are those in the United States who say that after the war is over the only thing which will save us is a military dictatorship, or something of that kind. I refuse to believe it.

I believe that we can maintain this country as a democratic republic. I am opposed to any step, and will fight any step, which is designed to give anyone power to establish either a military dictatorship or any other kind of a dictatorship in the United States. That is the direction in which we shall be headed if we enact legislation providing that a man may be sent to jail if he quits a job. Any legislation of that character which we may put on the statute books will not be taken off very quickly. We shall be confronted with one emergency after another, and told that it is necessary to maintain the work-or-fight statutes in existence. Mr. Hitler said that he was confronted with one emergency after another. He made such statements in order to establish a complete dictatorship. The same was true with reference to Italy under Mussolini.

Mr. President, I am really shocked to think that any Senator would say that he wished to see a bill passed providing that a man could be sent to the penitentiary for a year, or fined \$10,000, merely because he refused to work. If a businessman or the head of an institution should conspire with some labor leader to harm the Government by slowing down work, or assigning a man to a job who should not be so assigned, that would be one thing. I believe that is what the Senator from Indiana had in mind. It is inconceivable that he had in mind what the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has said the amendment would accomplish.

Apparently there is some question as to interpretation of the amendment. I intend to vote against it.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. It was never my intention that any person should be sent to the penitentiary as a result of the amendment which I have proposed. In

order to make that perfectly clear, I ask that the amendment be modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment. He will state the modification.

Mr. CAPEHART. In line 10 of my amendment, after the word "others" I modify the amendment by inserting the words "while in continuance of his employment or in his capacity as employer." That will eliminate any misunderstanding that may arise.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am not sure, on the spur of the moment, from hearing the modification read, how that would change the situation. Consequently I am not prepared to discuss the particular change at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, under the modification a person would not have to quit his job, but could simply lay off for some reason or other, and if he should lay off for a few days, under the modified amendment he would still be subject to the penalty, as I understand. He would still be continuing in the employment.

Mr. WHEELER. I have not followed the suggested modification. It is not only the particular amendment now pending and the situation called to our attention by the Senator from Oregon that concern me, but I have particularly in mind the so-called May-Bailey bill, the work-or-fight bill. As I stated, I have heard arguments to the effect that if we did not support the boys overseas, this and that would happen, that they are appealing for some such action. I have received a great many letters from boys overseas quite recently, and I have not received a single letter from any soldier anywhere in the United States or overseas advocating the kind of legislation now proposed. I have received letter from soldiers, and have seen letters written to their parents, as I stated a moment ago, asking, "What is the matter with the Congress? Do they want to say that my mother or my wife can be taken out of her home and placed in a factory or somewhere else?" Do we want further to break up the homes of America? Do we want to fasten upon the people of this country a dictatorship, from which they would not escape very soon, once it were adopted?

Mark my word, Mr. President, if that sort of measure is adopted, we will hear from these boys when they come back, because they are not going to favor the establishment of a Fascist government in the United States after they have bled and died in the fox holes all over the world.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for the compromise bill which came out of the Committee on Military Affairs, but I hope that when the bill goes to conference it will not be brought back with some compromise made in conference which will say to the mothers of America, or to the wives of America, or to the daughters or sweethearts of America, "In the name of preserving democracy in the United States, we are going to take you out of your homes by the nape of the neck, and put you here and put you there," just as Hitler does, just as Stalin does, just as Mussolini did, and just as every other dictator on the face

of the globe has done. While we were giving lip service to democracy, we would be taking a step toward dictatorship. Someone has well said that when dictatorship comes to the United States of America, it will come in the name and under the guise of preserving democracy.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I would not speak again on this subject in the Senate except for a word just spoken by the Senator from Montana. I hope every Senator will give earnest and careful consideration before he votes for any of the bills which have been offered to the Senate on this subject matter. If Senators vote for a bill and it goes to conference, and the conference finally decides, under whip and spur from the military leaders, to bring back a work-or-fight bill, Senators will have lost their opportunity to vote except either "Yes" or "No" on the conference report, and I do not want to be in that position.

The case of the British during the war has been cited to show why we should support a work-or-fight bill. The miracle of war production, that is, the miracle which has been performed in this country during the last few years, has been due in no small part to the effectiveness and the wholehearted effort of free American labor. Donald Nelson, the former head of the W. P. B., said that our war production was due to the intelligence and know-how of free American workers.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The success of the Russian armies and the success of the British armies has been due almost entirely to free enterprise and free labor in the United States of America, to what we have produced.

Mr. CHANDLER. I may not go so far as to be in complete accord with the Senator's statement, but I will say that without thousands and thousands of tons of American matériel, some of which I had the privilege of seeing go from the head of the Persian Gulf through Iran, to be used by Russian soldiers against the Germans, I have an idea that the Russian nation never would have been able to withstand the assault of the Germans at Stalingrad.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Our country has produced more than any other country has produced, and we have done it under the voluntary method. Why should we, just before the war ends, discard the method which has been so successful, and undertake to institute methods which have not been so successful?

Mr. CHANDLER. I cannot answer that question. I may say to the Senator that if I had a business which had been conducted and had done as well as the American people have done during the last few years, I would not change it for anything in the world.

Let me give some facts—and they are facts. The American Federation of Labor recently made a survey, and said they could find no evidence of manpower crisis in this country, except the crisis of manpower waste. They reported:

Careful examination of the facts has revealed no manpower shortage which could require national-service legislation. In spite of newspaper headlines claiming a production crisis, December war-production records show an outstanding achievement. Sharply increased schedules were exceeded or met within 1 or 2 percent. Although the goals were exceptionally high, we came nearer reaching them than in almost any other month of our peak production year. This was all done voluntarily, by free American labor and employers in cooperation with government.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat something I said the other day which I believe to be true. I think the manpower situation in the United States at this hour is the best in all the history of this country. I think the cooperation between employers and employees is the best at this hour it has ever been in all the history of this country. If that be true, Mr. President, why should we change the rule of the game? Why should we hazard our record by adopting some other system? On January 12 the War Production Board, through its chairman, announced the new 1945 schedules of production. They will amount to \$64,500,000,000 worth of munitions, compared with \$64,000,000,000 worth the year before. So there will be an increase of only about \$500,000,000 worth in the amount of munitions produced in the United States this year. That is not a tremendous increase. The \$64,000,000,000 worth of munitions were produced, and the schedules were met the year before.

I wish to refer again to Joseph Keenan, the Vice Chairman of the W. P. B., who said of airplane workers' increased production in this country:

Their sense of participation and feeling of fair play have been so heightened that they broke all records.

Rear Admiral Frederick G. Crisp said in January 1945 that production achievements to date have been nothing short of miraculous.

W. P. A. Vice Chairman C. S. Golden and J. D. Keenan said in January 1945:

Free labor in the United States has been able to meet every demand upon it. Despite all the difficulties and handicaps American workers have made the grade in every instance.

I should like to say a word by way of comparison between the system used by the United States and Great Britain, one of our major allies. In Britain, where they have been operating under compulsory labor since May 22, as I recall, 1940, the absentee rate in 1943 was 10 percent, and in 1944 it was 10 percent. In America the absentee rate was between 6 and 7 percent.

An impartial poll of British public opinion on compulsory labor stated—

The managements complained of indiscipline of the new labor which was unwilling because it was drafted. * * * A minority of conscripts was satisfactory.

Are we now, Mr. President, to kill the valiant spirit of voluntary cooperation by a system of compulsion in this country?

Under labor's no strike pledge, the strike record in the United States has been exceptionally low. In 1944 only

one-tenth of 1 percent of work time was lost by strikes in the United States. Man-days worked averaged 700,000,000 a month. Man-days lost by strike were only 700,000.

In Britain last year under compulsory labor, strikes caused more losses of production than at any other time during the last 12 years. Strike loss in Britain in 1944 was 16 percent above that in the United States of America. The British lost 3,600,000 man-hours. The actual loss in America was a little over 7,800,000, but it must be remembered that we have two and a half times more workers in war industries in this country than they have in Great Britain.

In December of this year we turned out 32 percent more critical aircraft than the month before, and 61 percent more mortars. We increased production of tanks, heavy trucks, and field artillery by 11 or 12 percent.

Mr. President, I wish to plead with the Senate, because I am anxious that it not support any bill on the pending subject that I have seen. I am prepared to vote for any bill that will shorten the war 1 day, or save one life, or save the leg of one American soldier; but I do not want to see a bill enacted under whip and spur in order to save the face of someone who has made a mistake, a military mistake which I regret. I regret the mistakes of our military just as I regret the mistakes of any other citizen. Such mistakes cost lives; they prolong the war; they cost money. But some day someone will be honest enough to admit a mistake, and not try to alibi the mistake off on someone else. I would not take one of our mistakes and magnify it to indicate incompetence on the part of the military, or to bring the American people into a situation that they ought not to be brought into.

Mr. President, if the bill before the Senate is passed we will have changed the whole history of this country. So far as I know there is not a single living human being who favored the work-or-fight bill except those who voted for it and almost expressed a wish that they had not done so when they brought it here. I do not know that the bill before the Senate has any real vigorous support. There is not a word of testimony in the hearings in favor of this bill.

If Senators vote for the bill before the Senate, or one of the other bills which have been presented on the subject, it will result in throwing the whole matter into conference, and the House has the Bailey bill, which I think it would be a great mistake for the Congress to enact into law. When a report is brought back from conference all the Senate can do is to vote yea or nay on the conference report. I want to avoid such a thing if it can be avoided. I do not want the bill to be written in conference. Under the circumstances it ought not to be written in conference, because we will get the May-Bailey bill or some version of the measure now before the Senate. As I said to my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] today when he offered his amendment which would eliminate newspapers from the provisions of the measure, under this bill the War Manpower

Commissioner can put out of business any man in the United States that he wants to, and we cannot do anything about it. Not only can he put a man out of business, but the man, when put out of business, cannot get back into business.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator, I take it, is speaking principally of the bill reported by the Military Affairs Committee, which contains no limit below which—

Mr. CHANDLER. So far as I know it is a zero-ceiling bill. That is what I understand.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the committee amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I say to the able Senator that the substitute which was offered for that bill by me fixes a limit of 50 percent of the persons employed in any businesses at the time the act goes into effect, and that limitation provides a protection to the business so that it cannot be forced out of existence.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I were certain that such a provision would be enacted into law my objection to the bill would be less strong. I am fearful that the Senate will vote for a bill, and send it to conference, with the result that we will get back a drastic bill.

I say we should not pass a bill of this kind under whip and spur. I do not wish to be harsh with the sponsors of the bill. They wish to please the military. I fear for what may happen here if we take steps which will eventually place this country under the direction of the military. The people of this country do not want the country to be directed by the military. They do not want this to be a military nation. They are willing to submit to necessary controls until the war is over.

Mr. President, I repeat, with all our failures and mistakes we have made the greatest contribution to the salvation of mankind in this war that has ever been made in the history of the world. What is the justification or excuse for now abandoning the system under which we have done all this?

I spoke to the Secretary of War this morning. He is pleading for this bill, as he says, for the protection of his boys. I am prepared, and have been all the time, to vote for any bill that will contribute the slightest bit to the success of the American arms in this war. But since the proponents of the bill have not been able to show in weeks of testimony any real justification or excuse for this departure from the customs and traditions of this country which have existed since it was established, I cannot vote for the bill.

Soon we shall be asked to draft nurses. I have no intention of voting for such a proposal. Why has the Army made the standards for nurses so high that they cannot be obtained? If American women were told that American soldiers were in distress and needed nurses, the boats would not hold the women who would storm the piers for the opportunity to

nurse them. We do not need to draft nurses.

Last year the Army reduced its program and closed certain plants. Now, because it made a mistake—and I regret that a mistake was made; everyone regrets it—in the twinkling of an eye we are expected to enact legislation to draft workers or send them to jail. We are not now faced with the question of jail sentences, but if we pass this bill, we shall be faced with it before we are through.

Mr. President, those are my reasons for voting for the Kilgore substitute for the May bill. I intend to vote for the substitute of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] rather than the committee amendment. If I feel as I do now, I may even vote against the Senator's amendment in the end. I wish to follow the thing all the way through. My colleagues on the Military Affairs Committee know what intense feeling I have with respect to this bill.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very happy that on the next to the last vote, at least, the Senator will be with me. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. While we are on the question of production, was any evidence offered before the committee showing that we are actually short of materials at this time?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not recall any.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any shortage?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is said that we are short about 200,000 workers in industry. The figure given was from 170,000 to 200,000. The shortage is scattered and spotty. According to the War Manpower Commission, the labor exists in the country, and can be obtained.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there any showing of any shortage of material of any kind which is needed?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not know about that.

Mr. WHERRY. Was any such showing made in the evidence?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not recall that it was.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In response to the Senator from Nebraska, I think it should be said that the testimony indicated that the stepping up of schedules and requirements would make it necessary to produce larger amounts than have been produced in the past. The testimony of Under Secretary Patterson was that the men now on the fighting fronts, in all their struggles up to date, had not been confronted by any shortage.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. That is the point I am making. Up to this point, at least, there is no shortage of material.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator to remember one further thing from the

statement of the Under Secretary of War. Except for the morale factor, there is no excuse for this bill, because what we do now, if it is to be effective—and I question whether it ever will be—will not be felt on the fighting fronts for 6 or 7 months from now. We came nearer meeting the greatly increased production schedules last month than in any other month. I wish to repeat something that was said the other day. Every time a production schedule is set, we break a record; then we are asked for an increased schedule.

We have a population of approximately 135,000,000. Twelve million are in the armed services. We have furnished foodstuffs, not only for our own forces, but for nearly everybody else. We have furnished clothing and material for almost everyone else, besides our own forces. Records have been broken again and again by the free workers of the United States.

The other day I asked an Army official if some day the Army would not admit that we had done about as good a job as we could do under the circumstances, and if Army officials would not some day cease to insist that we break records, at the expense of the health and welfare of all the people. We can do just so much. Under the old common law a man was ordered to be put to death by bearing weights on his chest as heavy as he could bear, and heavier. When they became heavier, he was no more.

I do not wish ever to admit that we cannot do anything. We do many things because when we talk with our allies they say that certain things cannot be done. Our men say, "Where is this thing that cannot be done?" Our allies show it to us, and we do it. Many times they show it to us because they know that that will be our reaction. We are a record-breaking people. We do not like to admit that there is anything we cannot do. I do not wish to do anything to destroy that spirit in the American people. They possess that spirit because they are free, because they are a determined people, because they are not slaves. They own their Government. They own their freedom. No other people can outdo them. We have not only outproduced any other individual nation, but we have produced more materials of war than both Axis nations. They have produced by slave labor, and we have produced with free labor. The proposal before us is to change systems.

I do not know what Mr. Goebbels will say. I am not in his confidence. I have no idea what he will say. Someone said the other day that, of course, he would think up something to say. If we pass this bill, one thing he could say, and ought to say to the American boys who are now inside Germany is, "Back home they are putting your fathers and mothers in jail. They have not produced for you."

Mr. President, I saw many a man on the fighting front who thought everyone was on strike, because he happened to need something at the moment. He needed weapons or food. When the committee of which I was a member was in the Pacific area, whenever one of our

men in the area saw a headline in the newspapers with respect to a strike, he would wonder if everyone at home had quit work. I was glad to be able to tell those men that some people were still working at home. We all regret and magnify a failure. It makes the situation look as though everything had gone wrong.

Many a soldier with whom I talked said, "Do not change the Government back home. Our country is all right. All anyone has to do to find that out is to spend 2 or 3 years in a place like this." The men would say, "Do not change our country." Every now and then a boy would say, "Happy, do not change our country. It is all right. Keep it as it was when we left it. We want to go back to it."

If I were Mr. Goebbels I would go on the radio and tell the American boys, "Your democracy has failed." The other day the Secretary of War suggested that in this particular it had failed, and could not do the job without adopting Fascist methods.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. While the Senator is speaking about breaking records, I wish to call to his attention certain paragraphs from the testimony of the Under Secretary of War before our committee. To me his statement was very impressive, indicating that we are reaching the point where perhaps we should be strengthening our production beyond what we have accomplished heretofore. I read from page 28, to show that we need still further to break records which we have already established. The Under Secretary said:

The 1945 requirements, as estimated by the War Production Board, call for more munitions than were produced in 1944, and 1944 was our biggest year in war production. How much higher the over-all 1945 requirements will be has not yet been determined.

Scheduled 1945 requirements for Army munitions are 15 percent above the 1944 production figure. For a number of critical items the required increase is much higher. The schedule for heavy field artillery ammunition is 200 percent above last year's production. The schedule for bombs and mines is up 49 percent, tanks up 64 percent, air-borne radar 59 percent, clothing 29 percent.

That program for Army munitions for 1945 is a staggering task. Yet even these sharply increased schedules do not fully reflect military needs, for our needs have been scaled down in the light of known limitations on productive capacity.

It is also a matter of concern to us that last year we were unable to make more modest production schedules for a number of critical items. In the second half of 1944, output of mortar ammunition was 12 percent below the schedule of June 30, 1944. Production of cotton duck was 14 percent under schedule, heavy-duty truck tires 10 percent under, and 105 howitzer ammunition 8 percent under. Deliveries of 2½-ton trucks dropped 13 percent under the June 30 schedule, and deliveries of heavier trucks dropped 20 percent below schedule.

We mean to meet the needs for 1945.

I am sure the Senator means to meet them. It is our obligation to do all we can to see that they are met.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am glad the Senator raised that point.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. Before I yield to the Senator from Vermont, I wish to answer the Senator from Ohio. The answer fits like a glove. I read from Labor's Monthly Survey for February 1945:

On January 12, War Production Board Chairman Krug announced the new 1945 war production schedules. They will amount to \$64,500,000,000 worth of munitions compared to \$64,000,000,000 worth produced in 1944—no significant increase.

It is an increase of only 5 points—only \$500,000,000.

Very well. The chart I have shows that new war production schedules for the first half of this year amounted to \$16,400,000,000 worth in the first quarter and \$16,700,000,000 worth in the second quarter. This compares with \$15,800,000,000 worth in the last quarter of 1944, an increase of only 5.7 percent at most.

Very well. If this justifies sending people to jail or making them work, uprooting them, moving them all over the country, ordering them about, we should remember that in England, under this system, a million certifications were made in 5 years, and 5,400 persons were prosecuted under it, and more than 4,700 persons were sent to jail.

Mr. BURTON. That was under the compulsory labor system, not under the bill now before us.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand, but that is what we will have here, once we start.

Mr. President, I am not giving you riddles; I am giving you the facts. Since the peak of December 1943, munitions production has declined 8 percent to November 1944.

While I am not blaming the military, they are responsible for the cutting back and cutting off and closing and shutting down. We have to make it up. But why does not someone be honest enough to say, "I ordered this shut-down, and I was mistaken, and I want it put back." I want someone to be honest enough to say what is the case. We would not strip him of rank or dock his pay or anything of the sort. We are just as sorry as he is.

Now production must rise again; but even when it reaches the high point of the 1945 schedule, the over-all program will be less than we accomplished in December 1943.

Now we are going to try to do something that we have already done with volunteer labor; but we cannot do it that way this time, it seems; we are told that we must change the rules of the game, that we must change the system.

Mr. President, I wish I knew who was responsible for this measure. I confess I do not know. As we used to say down in the State legislature, some smart fellow thought this up.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. A few minutes ago the Senator from Kentucky said that if he were in Mr. Goebbels' place he would lose no opportunity to tell our boys at the

front that democracy had failed. I rise to say that Mr. Goebbels will not have to do that, because Mr. Stimson has already done it, and I think his exact words should be put in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. CHANDLER. I referred to that. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so. Mr. AIKEN. The Senator referred to it?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The exact wording is printed in the Washington Post of February 19. The words are as follows:

The inevitable result of this failure of American democracy is now becoming apparent at this crisis of the war.

Those are the exact words which are credited to Mr. Stimson. If Mr. Stimson tells the American boys that democracy has failed in this country, why in the world does Mr. Goebbels even have to do it?

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, I regret the statement by the Secretary of War. I wish he had not made it. If any Senator had made it, he would have gone to the whipping post quickly. If any Senator had made such a statement, it would have been claimed that he was giving comfort and aid to the enemy.

I regret that any such statement was made, and I am quite sure the Secretary regrets it now.

Mr. AIKEN. And then we are informed, according to a speech by Mr. Ira Mosher, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, that—

Supporters of the May bill were pointing with pride a few days ago to an editorial in the Stars and Stripes purporting to support the measure. This editorial supposedly reflected the soldier attitude toward national service. It now develops, according to an Associated Press dispatch from Paris, that the editorial was placed with what protesting G. I. staff members of the publication called brass-hat interference with a service publication. The editorial, the staff protests, was written by a lieutenant colonel, and was inspired by a cablegram from the Under Secretary of War.

So here we have the Secretary of War telling the boys that democracy in their country has failed, and the Under Secretary of War attempting to stir up political discontent among the boys at the front in order to get this bill through.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, it is always open season on Members of Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. When we are talking of replacements in the Army, I think we are speaking of replacements in the wrong place. The replacements should be made at the Pentagon Building, right at the top.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I said, of course it is always open season on Members of Congress, and we should not be thin skinned. We have to take all kinds of criticism, just or unjust, fair or unfair; and those who have been in Congress long enough expect it. Such criticism is made of us by persons who exercise the greatest latitude and who are under no responsibility, but we must face the voters. Of course, for years there has been under way a movement to keep the umpires off the field and put them in the grandstand. Many persons have said that should be done. But the movement never succeeded.

The statement I made a few moments ago was a complete answer to the statement of the Under Secretary of War, read into the RECORD by my friend the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. I wish to add that in the last 6 months of 1944 we made substantial gains in every one of the critical war production programs. Remember, now, Mr. President, we made gains in every one of the critical war production programs, gains ranging from 20 percent to 200 percent. In view of this miraculous and outstanding performance on the part of the patriotic men and women of this country, I ask now, Is the Senate going to say to them, "Your reward is a form of slavery or a form of forced labor or a departure from the time-honored customs and traditions of the people of this great free country"?

Mr. President, I will not vote for it. I do not intend to encourage it. I fear what may result by our passage of such legislation. I started out as a foe of it. My intense hatred for it and all it stands for has increased every day the legislation has been pending.

Before Senators vote, I should like to make a further statement. Inasmuch as the Senator from Montana indicated that he would vote for such a bill, I want the Senate to remember what that may mean. That may mean that the conference may rewrite the bill, and then it will be too late. Senators then will have to vote against it all or vote for it all. I do not want to be placed in that position.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a letter which I ask to have read by the clerk. The letter is from Glenn L. Martin, one of the largest airplane manufacturers in the country. He wrote the letter to the Secretaries of War and Navy. I think the letter throws a great deal of light on this debate, if Mr. Martin's figures are in line with what the Army and Navy understand to be the facts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

THE GLENN L. MARTIN Co.,
Baltimore, Md., February 7, 1945
The Honorable HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Pentagon Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We have been told by representatives of Selective Service, Army and Navy, and War Production Board that all of our present male employees now between the ages of 18 and 30 years of age will (subject to physical examination) be called for duty with the military services by approximately May 1, 1945.

Of this group, the induction of all our employees between the ages of 18 and 26 has been accomplished, which together with volunteers from this organization accounts for more than 23,000 employees now in uniform.

The balance (age 26-30) will take the vitally irreplaceable manpower out of this organization.

As president of this company, I feel it my duty to call to your attention at this time

the far-reaching effect the loss of this personnel will have on our operations.

We are under contract to deliver essential aircraft to both the Army and Navy, upon which minimum delivery requirements have been established. If the above-mentioned policy is effected, the fulfillment of these aircraft delivery schedules is not attainable.

We do not wish to be considered alarmists, but, on the other hand, it is our desire to acquaint you with the absolute true facts.

For example, in our engineering department, out of a total of 19 senior aerodynamicists, 18 are subject to this draft. Out of 39 senior stress engineers, 27 are subject to the present call. Thirty-three percent of all technical employees now in the engineering department are under 30 years of age and are subject to the present draft policy.

In another department 37 percent of our tool designers, including fabricators, are subject to the present draft.

The inspection department, a group of 190 supervisory personnel, will also suffer severe losses.

Our quality central engineers, numbering 80 technicians, have 66 of their number subject to the present draft. The X-ray department, which performs a very necessary function required by Army and Navy specifications, will lose 50 percent of its personnel.

The manufacturing department has 25 percent of its foremen and subforemen subject to the draft. Leaders and other first-line supervision are likewise similarly affected.

The important thing to note is the fact that such a sweeping draft policy, based entirely on age, will throw a highly skilled organization out of balance. For example, 19 senior aerodynamicists are required to keep 35,000 employees manufacturing, but if this number is reduced to 1 or 2 men, their part of engineering will be missing and production drawings cannot be released to the shop for work. Therefore many thousands of shop employees not subject to the draft will be thrown out of work and in varying degrees other important departments so completely out of balance, after satisfying the draft, will obviously require a complete reorganization of the company's business. The constant reduction of supervision and material will close down divisions and departments of the company in varying degrees.

We respectfully urge an immediate survey of the aircraft industry by experienced aircraft manufacturing representatives of yours to present to you the full details in support of my very brief statements. This company is ready and willing to cooperate to the fullest extent in trying to arrive at the facts for your consideration.

We wish to assure you that when a final decision is made and you have determined the number of airplanes and the amount of engineering to be sacrificed and the men that should be drafted from our plant, we will then immediately reorganize what we have left and apply the group of remaining personnel to work assigned to us in accordance with the dictates of your priorities. All employees that cannot be efficiently utilized, due to the resulting critical shortage of experienced technical and administrative men, will be released from work and made available for other plants.

Very truly yours,

GLENN L. MARTIN,
President.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read another letter which I have received. It came from a worker in one of the shipyards of my State. I ask that his name be not read and that the letter be returned to me. I merely want the letter to appear in the RECORD. I do not wish to involve the writer in any controversy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested. The legislative clerk read as follows:

Senator MILLARD F. TYDINGS,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I had an experience the other day, which I think should be brought to your attention.

The other morning, in order to keep an appointment it became necessary that I hail a cab in order to get to my destination in a certain time. During the ride the driver and I engaged in a little conversation, in which he advised me of these facts.

About 2 weeks prior thereto and during the period of this work-or-fight legislation, he, feeling particularly conscientious, gave up his position as a cab driver in order to make application for a position in one of our local shipyards, he having had prior experience as a welder. On an appointed day he reported for work. He worked all morning at his given job and after lunch started the afternoon session. He had worked probably 10 minutes when he was approached by his foreman, who asked him how much work he had done that morning. This was shown to the foreman, who immediately took him from his welding job and placed him in some other position, telling him that he had accomplished too much work. During the 8 days subsequent he advised me he did not do 1 full day's work. He became disgusted with the whole thing, and on the ninth day reported back to his old position as a cab driver.

Senator, I am a State employee, and, as you know, as such, am poorly paid. Isn't there anything that you can possibly do, in order to eliminate some of the national waste which is so prevalent in our present war effort. You know and I know that this is simply increasing the national debt to unheard of amounts. We will not pay it, but future generations will pay it or else.

Please give this little note your most courteous consideration.

Yours for a more economically operated war effort.

Yours very truly,

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senate takes a recess, and before considering the Executive Calendar, on which there is only one nomination, I wish to urge, inasmuch as we shall not have a session of the Senate tomorrow, that Senators be present on Monday, and be prepared to make progress in the consideration of the pending legislation. It has been several weeks since the matter first came to the attention of Congress through the message of the President of the United States, through action in the House, and through the hearings which were held by the Senate committee. We have now been considering the bill in the Senate for a week, and have voted on only one or two comparatively minor amendments, although in a sense they were important. We have made no speed and no headway yet in the consideration of the real need sustaining the proposed legislation.

There are now pending three proposals, the bill as it passed the House, the amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, and the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. I have endeavored to secure an agreement for a vote on the substitute at an hour on Monday, but the effort has failed. Therefore I hope that when we resume consideration of the bill on Monday, Senators will attend the sessions

and limit their discussion to the matters which are before the Senate at the time, to pending amendments, and that we may dispose of the bill and all amendments.

If the committee amendment should be agreed to by the Senate, it would have to go to conference. If it should not be agreed to, and anything else were adopted as radically different from the bill as it passed the House as the proposed committee amendment, that would have to go to conference. Whether we like it or not, it may be that the legislation will have to be written in conference. If that shall be the case, the bill should get to conference as soon as possible, assuming we are to have legislation at all.

For these reasons I urge that Senators make every possible effort, during the further consideration of the bill next week, to speed up action on it, and get it disposed of.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

William A. Brophy, of New Mexico, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, vice John Collier, resigned.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar.

TREATIES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read Executive A and H, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the treaty go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the treaty will be passed over.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chaplain Robert D. Workman to have the rank of rear admiral in the Navy.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received March 2 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

FLORIDA

R. Hunter Browning, Madison, Fla., in place of E. J. Harris, resigned.

William F. Johnson, River Junction, Fla., in place of D. H. Morgan, retired.

GEORGIA

Catherine R. Lanneau, Barney, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sarah W. Turner, Pelham, Ga., in place of J. L. Cooper, transferred.

Margaret D. Cate, Sea Island, Ga., in place of C. D. Bruce, resigned.

ILLINOIS

George Bigler, Clarendon Hills, Ill., in place of E. G. Mochel, retired.

IOWA

William J. Maguire, Vail, Iowa, in place of Martin O'Connell, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Daris U. Foley, Jamestown, Ky., in place of O. D. Smith, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Arthur I. Brown, South Lee, Mass., in place of F. G. Fanning, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Henry Swaffield, Sterling, Mich., in place of E. G. Abbott, deceased.

MINNESOTA

H. Carroll Day, Albert Lea, Minn., in place of B. M. Loeffler, retired.

Anthony G. McDougall, Baudette, Minn., in place of P. B. Sanderson, retired.

Joseph F. Meighen, Preston, Minn., in place of M. E. Gartner, retired.

MISSOURI

Curtis M. Van Hoozer, Blythedale, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEBRASKA

Harold C. Bruce, Verdigre, Nebr., in place of C. O. Kocina, transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

Byron U. Richardson, Pinehurst, N. C., in place of F. T. Currie, removed.

OREGON

Pearl A. Carsley, Malin, Oreg., in place of M. W. Thomas, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Olive Ruth Keeney, Dickerson Run, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

PUERTO RICO

Ramon Zaragoza, Penuelas, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Norman Glenn Anderson, Andrews, S. C., in place of J. R. Thompson, transferred.

Thomas P. Scott, Whitmire, S. C., in place of G. A. Douglass, transferred.

TEXAS

Ida D. Martin, Wiergate, Tex., in place of F. W. Hines, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Joseph F. Suttle, Dahlgren, Va., in place of L. A. Ashton, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bernice E. McDonald, Mount Clare, W. Va., in place of M. J. Fowler, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 2 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

Robert D. Workman, to have the rank of rear admiral in the Navy while serving as Chief of Chaplains under the Chief of Naval Personnel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, whose nature is to have mercy and forgive, we praise Thee for the advent of our Saviour, who came to give liberty to those who were in bondage and manhood to those who were chattels. Rising to the highest sphere of service, may we be examples and an inspiration to arouse righteous enthusiasm in the breasts of men. Make us willing to yield comfort and pride and all things else save fidelity to the truth.

In its career of prosperity, wilt Thou lead our great Nation aright; purge its ignorance, its corruption, and all attendant evils. May it be a source of strength to all humanity, seeking justice and peace by forbearance; then will the world believe that we are a free and a temperate people. O hasten the time when nations shall be brought from barbarism; when truth and love shall be in the ascendant; when peace shall smile on the races of earth and creation shall no longer groan and travail in pain. In the name of our Lord and Master, we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On February 13, 1945:

H. R. 621. An act to further amend section 23 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1427. An act relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

On February 28, 1945:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; and

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service.

On February 24, 1945:

H. R. 1808. An act to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co. the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE TO SAVE
JEWISH PEOPLE OF EUROPE

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to say a few words about a matter which has just come to my attention and which has shocked me very much. Some months ago a representative of an outstanding humanitarian American organization, the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe, was sent to Turkey on behalf of this committee to try to organize the rescue of Hebrews from the Balkan countries.

This representative, Mr. Eri Jabotinsky, went with the full approval of the President's War Refugee Board and of our own Department of State, which granted him the necessary exit visa and arranged for his priority on an Army bomber. I will not take up my colleagues' time to tell here of the valiant and important work which Mr. Jabotinsky did in Turkey, whose confidential reports to the War Refugee Board are available to the Members. Jabotinsky's work and program were in complete accord with America's policy of leadership and traditional stand of justice and aid for the persecuted.

Last week a cable was received from Mr. Jabotinsky stating that he was being forced to leave Turkey. This curious statement was cleared up by an Associated Press dispatch from Ankara, received on the 24th of February, explaining that Mr. Jabotinsky, in Turkey on a bona fide mission from the United States, had been "arrested and deported to British-controlled territory," and this report further stated that the deportation had nothing to do with our great ally and friend, Turkey.

It is with great indignation that I received this news, and, as an American citizen, I demand that a stop be put to such brazen and open interference with our foreign policy by an outside power. Since when has our foreign policy been dictated by another nation? I have already stated that the American organization which sent Mr. Jabotinsky on his mission has many supporters among Government officials and a good many of my colleagues have subscribed to the program of the emergency committee. Many of these leading Americans have instituted the proper measures to secure the release of Mr. Jabotinsky from British arrest and custody. One item which I should like to read before the House is a letter from one of the committee's cochairmen, Mr. Ben Hecht, to His Excellency the Earl of Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, which

will appear in the Appendix as an extension of my remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SOMERS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a copy of a letter written by Mr. Ben Hecht, cochairman of the American League for a Free Palestine, to the British Ambassador to the United States, Lord Halifax.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there came to my office this morning one of the clearest, soundest, briefest discussions of economic law which has come to my notice.

This article is entitled "Federal Taxes and the Worker." It is taken from the Railroad Workers Journal and written by Robert B. Dresser. It is particularly important that every Member of this House have an opportunity, not only to read this splendid document but to have it where he can readily refer to it. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein this splendid article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record and include therein a copy of a letter from one of his constituents on the farm problem.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an article entitled "War Destroying Europe's Middle Classes."

Mr. RILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the Columbia State.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House this afternoon for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article by the president of the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein an article published by the Florida Historical Society.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a certain letter which he had recently sent to Judge Vinson.

HURRAH FOR TEXAS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, this year on December 29 we will observe the one-hundredth anniversary of the annexation of the United States by the Republic of Texas, as all Texans in their innate modesty would have us believe. But today, the 2d of March, is Texas Independence Day.

We hail the State of Texas, large not only in area but great because of the character of its citizens, not the least among whom are those who honor themselves and their State by representing it in this Congress today. We do well to congratulate you and your constituents upon what you of the Lone Star State have accomplished over the years for yourselves, for the Nation, and for posterity.

As the representative of that other independent republic of yesteryear I share your pride in the fact that "independence was and is our boast." Vermonters agree that you have a right to be proud of the record your sons and daughters, true to the traditions of the fighting stock from which they come, have made throughout the years so crowded with honorable achievement.

May your Lone Star never set, but grow steadily brighter as it shines along the path of the future.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

MONUMENT IN HONOR OF THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill providing for a monument in honor of the Marine Corps. The bill provided that a photograph appearing in the Washington Post of last Wednesday be used as a model. Before I prepared the bill I called a newspaperman and asked how to identify the photograph. In the conversation he said, "Refer to the four marines." So I did. I thought myself there were four marines in that photograph. But later in the day when I received an enlarged photograph I found there were six marines in the photograph, so today I am introducing a new bill, using the words "six marines" instead of "four."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 28]

Allen, Ill.	Hancock	Ploeser
Andrews, Ala.	Hart	Powell
Barry	Hébert	Quinn, N. Y.
Bender	Hedrick	Rabin
Biemiller	Heffernan	Rains
Bishop	Heidinger	Randolph
Bland	Hill	Rich
Buckley	Holmes, Mass.	Rivers
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson,	Rowan
Cannon, Fla.	Luther A.	Sabath
Celler	Johnson,	Shafer
Clements	Lyndon B.	Sharp
Combs	Keefe	Sheridan
Curley	Keogh	Short
Dawson	King	Simpson, Ill.
Delaney,	Kopplemann	Smith, Maine
James J.	Landis	Snyder
Dickstein	Lane	Sumner, Ill.
Dingell	Latham	Talbot
Dirksen	LeCompte	Voorhis, Calif.
Douglas, Ill.	Lemke	Vursell
Drewry	Lynch	West
Eaton	McGlinchey	Wilson
Fenton	McKenzie	Winstead
Fogarty	Morrison	Woodrum, Va.
Gallagher	Murray, Tenn.	Zimmerman
Gamble	O'Hara	
Gearhart	Faman	
Geelan	Patterson	
Hall,	Pfeifer	
Leonard W.	Phillips	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 344 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a communication to the Farm Journal.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include House Concurrent Resolution No. 11 of the Michigan State Legislature.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two resolutions which he had introduced, and, secondly, to include certain articles from newspapers, and so forth.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech by Honorable Chih-Mai, counselor of the Chinese Embassy.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therewith two important letters on military training.

Mr. FULLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio interview on the farm draft.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in Progressive, February 26, 1945, having to do with our colleague the Delegate from Alaska, BOB BARTLETT.

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

There was no objection.

ALLEY DWELLING ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) and (b) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the 10-year period from October 9, 1934, to June 30, 1944, which includes the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 1, 1945.

REPORT ON PHYSIOGRAPHIC, ECONOMIC, AND OTHER RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE TENNESSEE AND CUMBERLAND RIVERS AND BETWEEN THEIR DRAINAGE AREAS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a copy of a communication from the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority submitting a report entitled "A Report on the Physiographic, Economic, and Other Relationships Between the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers and Between Their Drainage Areas." This report was prepared at my request under the authority vested in the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority by section 22 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and Executive Order No. 6161 issued pursuant thereto.

The report points out the similarity and interrelationship between the problems of development of the resources of the Cumberland and Tennessee Valleys.

I have heretofore recommended to the Congress the enactment of legislation to bring the Cumberland River and its tributaries within the scope of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. I take this opportunity to urge again that the Congress give consideration to the enactment of such legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 1945.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I move that the House resolve itself into Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2374, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

For the purpose of conducting the audit of all Government corporations as provided by section 5 of the act approved , Public, No. (S. 375, 79th Cong.), the Comptroller General authorized in his discretion to employ personal services by contract, or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided*, That not more than 10 persons so employed may be compensated without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, only one of whom may be compensated at a rate of as much but not more than \$10,000 per annum.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph on page 9 beginning in line 11 and ending on line 22 relating to the General Accounting Office on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia reserve his point of order?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual provision in the bill, but it is in the bill to meet an unusual situation.

In the act of February 24, 1945, Public Law No. 4, there is laid upon the General Accounting Office an unusual burden. The Comptroller General is required by that legislation, so recently enacted that I could only secure a copy from the enrolling clerk, to audit all Government corporations. It is a stupendous task. The Comptroller General has indicated to me that there are scores of corporations involved.

This situation is further complicated by the fact that this audit is required to begin with the fiscal year 1945. Already 8 months have passed; only 4 months remain in which to make the audit, and it is necessary for him to secure these men and to secure them at once. Still further complicating the situation, men of special qualification are required; the Comptroller General must have certified public accountants, men of ability and experience. In order to get them, according to his statement which I submit, he must have some latitude in securing them as they can be recruited, and in record time.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the position of the General Accounting Office

may be understood, I ask unanimous consent that the letter written by the Comptroller General of the United States may be read at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 2, 1945.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of its vital importance, I am taking the liberty of writing you concerning the provision on page 9 of the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1945, H. R. 2374, which, if enacted, will give me the authority to employ the necessary personnel to accomplish the audit of all Government corporations, as required by section 5 of Public Law 4 (S. 375), approved February 24, 1945. The provision of the first deficiency bill is as follows:

"For the purpose of conducting the audit of all Government corporations as provided by section 5 of the act approved , Public, No. (S. 375, 79th Cong.), the Comptroller General is authorized in his discretion to employ personal services by contract, or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided*, That not more than 10 persons so employed may be compensated without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, only 1 of whom may be compensated at a rate of as much as but not more than \$10,000 per annum."

The report of your committee on H. R. 2374 states the need and purpose of this provision. However, I will outline briefly the reasons which make it so indispensable to the proper administration of this important and responsible new function of the General Accounting Office.

Section 5 of Public Law 4 provides that the financial transactions of all Government corporations shall be audited each fiscal year by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, beginning with the current fiscal year, and that a report of each such audit shall be made to the Congress not later than the following January 15. The enactment of said section places a heavy burden on the General Accounting Office, but one which it should and will gladly undertake. The size and importance of this new audit duty is indicated by the fact that there are scores of Government corporations involved, which on June 30, 1943, had total assets of over \$27,000,000,000 and total liabilities of over \$22,000,000,000, according to the Report on Government Corporations issued last summer by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures (S. Doc. No. 227, 78th Cong.). This same report shows that on March 31, 1944, 7 of these corporations had outstanding obligations of \$12,604,000,000, guaranteed by the United States, and 21 corporations or groups of corporations had outstanding loans of \$6,568,000,000, and that on April 30, 1944, Government corporations had 67,912 employees. The operations of such corporations extend throughout the United States and reach into foreign countries. They cover almost every field of business, industry, and finance.

Although I have consistently advocated the audit of all Government corporations by the General Accounting Office as the agent of the Congress, only a few such corporations are now so audited, and there has been no opportunity to prepare for such a tremendous overnight expansion of this type of audit.

The bills pending in the Senate (S. 469) and the House (H. R. 2051 and 2177), providing for financial control of Government corporations, all contemplate an audit beginning in the future, and until a few weeks ago there was no indication of any legislative action requiring such an early undertaking of the audit. As a result of the enactment of Public Law 4, the General Accounting Office will be required to audit the financial transactions of all Government corporations for the fiscal year 1945, more than 8 months of which have already elapsed. This leaves an exceedingly short time for the necessary organizing and staffing and for surveying the financial structure of the respective corporations in order to establish an efficient audit program.

The audit required by section 5 is a different type of operation than the regular governmental audit and requires personnel of different qualifications and training. The organization which is to perform it must have highly competent direction and a qualified staff of employees if the audit is to be performed effectively and produce the benefits which the Congress intended. In the present manpower situation it will be practically impossible to obtain a man of the caliber needed to head the organization, and to recruit qualified personnel in the required numbers without authority of the character proposed by the quoted provision of H. R. 2374. On the other hand, with such authority we will have the key to the problems of personnel, organization, and performance of the work.

I have not heretofore favored the granting of statutory authority to employ personnel without regard to the usual restrictions on such employment. In fact, I have repeatedly urged the Congress not to grant such authority except for the most cogent reasons. Moreover, I realize that the quoted provision is subject to a point of order. Yet similar authority has been freely granted to other departments and agencies in dozens of instances in appropriation acts for the current and prior fiscal years. I am moved to ask for it in this instance because of the great emergency which the General Accounting Office faces in carrying out the audit duties now imposed on it by law, and because I feel I would be remiss if I did not come to the Congress as quickly as possible, report the situation, and suggest a solution. The pending deficiency bill, I believe, offers the earliest opportunity of enactment of a provision to help solve this pressing problem. Attention is invited to the fact that although authorized by section 5 of Public Law 4, no additional appropriation for this work is being sought or is necessary at this time.

In this instance I strongly hope that the House will be led by its spirit of fairness and its desire for effective results to approve the provision and provide a means which will better enable the General Accounting Office to perform the duties prescribed by section 5 of Public Law 4.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I trust that after hearing the conclusive and convincing reasons given by the Comptroller General in support of his request for the inclusion of this provision in the bill the gentleman from Georgia will determine not to press his point of order. If he insists on the point of order it must be conceded under the rules.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I have conferred this morning with Mr. Frank Yates, Assistant Comptroller General, with reference to this matter. I am satisfied that it can be worked out by regulation with the Civil Service Commission. The provision proposed to be enacted in this bill is not temporary legislation, not limited as to time or number or as to type of position. It is a blanket, wide-open-door exemption from Civil Service for the purpose of auditing the accounts of these corporations.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. If the words "during the fiscal year 1945" were placed ahead of the word "for" on line 12, would that not meet the objection raised with reference to that particular paragraph? That would avoid its being permanent legislation.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I could not agree to that, and I will explain why.

We recently passed a Veterans' Preference Act, in the Seventy-eighth Congress. We promised the veterans of this country that they would have preference where they were qualified for positions in the Federal Service. They cannot get that preference if we exempt the positions from civil-service procedures. I voted for that act in good faith. As far as it lies within my power, I am not going to permit it to be evaded by anybody at any time. We either meant what we said in that act or we did not, and I think we ought to stick by it.

The Civil Service Commission has authority with the approval of the President of the United States to make exceptions wherever they are necessary. Of course, we all know Lindsay Warren. We all love him. I would rather trust him with an exception of this sort than anybody I know of. But we have just been through an experience in this Congress which indicates the fallacy of legislating on the theory that a particular man is going to discharge a particular duty. We had to undo something we did when we placed the loan agencies, which this also affects, in the hands of the Department of Commerce because Mr. Jesse Jones was going to be Secretary of Commerce. Let us not make the same mistake again.

I wish to point out not only to the committee but to Mr. Warren himself that the War and Navy Departments, the W. P. B., and the O. P. A., all through this war emergency have been operating under civil-service procedure and have employed literally hundreds of thousands of people, many of whom are expert engineers, accountants, auditors, and specialists of all kinds. The same thing can be done to meet this emergency. I am quite sure the Commission will cooperate with Mr. Warren in solving his problem.

I have no objection to the exemption of the head of the new auditing section he is going to set up from the Classification Act. It will take a high-class man and they ought to have one, and they are going to have to pay him to get him. I am quite sure those things can

be worked out. But, Mr. Chairman, I must insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia makes a point of order against the paragraph he pointed out. The gentleman from Missouri concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 9, after line 10, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"For the purpose of conducting the audit of all Government corporations as provided by section 5 of the act approved February 24, 1945, Public, No. 4, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Comptroller General is authorized in his discretion to employ not more than 10 persons without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, only one of whom may be compensated at a rate of as much as but not more than \$10,000 per annum."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for the employment of a maximum of 10 men without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act, to undertake and direct this new and highly important work. I trust it meets with the approval of the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

War housing: For an additional amount to carry out the purposes of title I of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 9), and subject to the applicable provisions of the joint resolution approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1115), \$84,373,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, but not to be available for obligation for new projects after June 30, 1945.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 10, line 12, before the period insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That all obligations of this additional appropriation for projects in which (1) the War Department has a paramount interest shall first be jointly authorized in writing by the Secretary of War and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, (2) the Navy Department has a paramount interest shall first be jointly authorized in writing by the Secretary of the Navy and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, (3) the War and Navy Departments have a joint interest, direct or indirect, which they shall be presumed to have as to all projects in which the interest of either Department is not paramount, shall first be jointly authorized in writing by the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this proposal in a modified form was considered at some length by the subcommittee when drafting the bill under consideration. We have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 10, line 9, after the figures "\$84,373,000", insert a comma and the following language: "Of which amount not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 10, line 9, strike out "\$84,373,000" and insert "\$42,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment, not because it cuts the amount down to what I think it should be, but because I believe it is a compromise and perhaps the House might be willing to go along on some kind of logical approach to the problem. The whole set-up here is pretty bad. The housing that has been built has been terribly expensive and poorly designed, and it has not been of the character which it should be, for the amount of money that we have dumped into it. This proposal is to cut the figure down to \$42,000,000. This would permit them to put in stop-gap houses and have them ready in any spot in the United States in 60 days. It would permit putting in as many as are asked for here.

The most peculiar thing about this set-up is that whereas in previous bills they have told us they were going to put in a lot of trailer and stopgap units, here they come and state they are only going to put in a thousand out of a total of 30,000 of that character of units. It is perfectly ridiculous, because regardless of how long the war continues, we will do much better if we have to step up construction in some of these places, if we put in these trailers and quick construction jobs.

I called attention to the fact yesterday that there is no need of any such quantity of housing as they have set up. In some places where they anticipated an increase of approximately two or three hundred families over what they had on the 1st of January, they have units totaling at least 500, and they have 2,000 under construction. It just does not make sense under any kind of analysis.

I hope the Committee will adopt this amendment and save the Government \$42,000,000. It will help the war effort, because it will prevent so much of the labor in those critical areas being diverted to construction jobs which will require from 3 to 6 months to complete, and which will require a great deal of labor.

I hope the Committee will adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are two war fronts, the battle front and the home front. And the home front is as important as the battle front. Unless we supply our men with ample munitions and equipment they cannot win the war.

The truth about the matter is this is a war of production. That nation which produces materials of war more effectively and most rapidly will win the war. Up to this time we have won it not only through the superior courage and stamina of our troops but, also, through our superior production.

Now, we cannot produce munitions without workmen. We cannot have workmen unless we provide them with housing accommodations. This appropriation is to provide the necessary housing accommodations. This appropriation is to sustain the home front.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a haphazard estimate. It is not a blanket, over-all appropriation to be allocated and disbursed at the will of the National Housing Agency. The estimate was presented, item by item, specifically, for constructing or providing housing exactly where it is needed. May I submit the testimony of the most dependable authority on this question, namely, Under Secretary of War Patterson. He appeared before our committee in support of the estimate and we went into the matter very exhaustively with him. Among other things he said: "If we cannot offer housing, we are and shall continue to be unable to recruit sufficient labor to turn out the required production."

In other words, he says unless we can provide the housing for which we are making this appropriation we cannot get munitions across to the fighting forces where they are needed and where our American chiefs of staff and our Allied commanders are expecting them and planning to use them. That in itself justifies the appropriation, but let us go a bit further. He says:

It is known that there is now and for some time to come will continue to be a serious manpower shortage.

You cannot supply that shortage if there is no place for the workmen to live, no place for their families to live when they are recruited for the job; without these elemental facilities, they will not stay, they cannot stay.

I wish there were time to include in the RECORD portions of other pertinent statements by Secretary Patterson, but let me add one statement by Vice Admiral Moreell. Admiral Moreell said, and he is specific, just as this entire appropriation is for specific needs.

The units which we are asking for now are to take care of an increase of 44,331 employees.

Not "so many thousand" on a rough guess, but the exact number actually needed to carry out our part of this war program—to support the men now on the other side—we need and must have on this one factory front alone, 44,331 employees. These men cannot be employed unless this money is provided.

Mr. Chairman, we have already cut this item to the bone. The estimate submitted to us was for \$90,000,000. We have included it in the bill as \$84,000,000 due to the fact that we found duplication in the estimates. We found the same items estimated under the Navy funds and, under the housing funds, items which were identical. Again, after a resurvey the Navy reported, for example, that in the Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va., Navy Yard they would be able to get along without the appropriation originally requested. So we have already reduced this appropriation to the irreducible minimum. What remains is necessary in order to keep faith with the men fighting on the other side.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the House first to the fact that on this item there is a reduction made by the committee of \$5,627,000. The committee considered this estimate very carefully. We tried to secure the most complete information, from the most responsible witnesses. Judge Patterson came before the committee and testified that this amount was absolutely essential. I for one do not see how we could go much further than we have gone in the way of a cut.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The only cuts that were made, of course, were where I found in cross-examining Admiral Moreell a group of projects that were duplicates in the Navy estimate and in this estimate.

Mr. O'NEAL. But the amount was reduced. The gentleman is to be commended for discovering the discrepancies. I think it was a very fine piece of work. The fact remains, however, that we reduced it \$5,627,000. Certainly Judge Patterson is not going to come before us and advocate something so wild that the item can be cut 50 percent as the gentleman from New York suggests. Furthermore, Admiral Moreell, who is entirely reliable, testified at great length and was willing to answer questions about any individual item in this request. After going all the way through it, supported by other representatives of the Army and Navy the committee thought this amount was necessary.

Mr. Chairman, there is another thing we should consider in this matter. On page 163 of the hearings there is a list of all the projects. There is a man in this House representing every State mentioned in this list and every district in which a project is located.

Mr. Chairman, because expenditures are going into Members' districts, they will not sit here, as honorable Members of this body, and allow wanton, wild, and reckless spending, possibly twice what we need, and if there is anyone here from the State of Alabama, from Alaska, Arizona, California, and all the other States mentioned, who feels that this is too much and it is a waste of money to

proceed with these projects, he should come forward and tell the committee that this is a wild estimate or that the housing is not needed. There is nothing in here for Kentucky, but I happen to know something about one of the items for Indiana. They are asking for 550 units. They are putting up another \$28,000,000 powder plant over there. It is being constructed out in a little community, many miles from a large community. When I say "many" I mean 15 or 20 miles. The larger community is fully occupied and lacks housing for its needs. But certainly with \$28,000,000 to be expended there for this powder plant, something has to be done to take care of the people who are to run the plant and even those who are going to construct it. Therefore, when the Army and Navy come up here and give testimony as to their needs, when we have first-hand information from Members of Congress who say by their silence, if not by their audible expression, that this is needed, it is in the interest of doing a proper job for the war and we should not make the drastic cut proposed by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment, which proposes to reduce the estimate of \$84,373,000 by one-half, strikes at the very heart of production.

Last summer and fall I had the opportunity to personally investigate the housing conditions in the San Francisco Bay area. I saw conditions of squalor created through lack of adequate housing to take care of the tremendous increase in population of workers and their families that have no place in American life.

ONE OF THE GREATEST PORTS OF EMBARKATION

San Francisco is one of the world's greatest ports of embarkation. As the war in Europe comes to its climax and begins to drop off, the war in the Pacific will increase in proportion and San Francisco and the entire San Francisco Bay area will be called upon to further tremendously increase its activity. Shipping will increase; greatly increased quantities of war supplies will flow to our fighting men through the Golden Gate. If these vital war cargoes are to move smoothly and swiftly to our men, steps must be immediately taken to properly house the workers who will handle those supplies.

All shipping is under the control of the Federal Government, and only the Federal Government can meet the emergency to provide these homes.

PROBLEM GROWING IN INTENSITY

This is a problem that has been growing in intensity from the outset of the war. It has passed the denomination of "need" and has reached the point of emergency. Various governmental agencies interested in the war effort have made surveys of these conditions and the housing needs. They have made various recommendations as of the dates of their investigations. With continuously increasing numbers of workingmen being recruited, particularly longshoremen and warehousemen, who handle these vital war materials, the requirements have become more urgent.

The situation has become so serious that notwithstanding the urgent need for increasing the number of men recruited as longshoremen and warehousemen, the Joint Employer-Union Recruiting Agency operated in San Francisco was forced to turn down 107 applicants between January 5 and 31, 1945, because adequate housing to care for them and their families was not available.

TWO THOUSAND FAMILY UNITS URGENTLY NEEDED NOW

It has been recommended by representatives of the Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union who are probably in a better position to know the needs than any other group, that some 2,000 family units are urgently needed now. The longshoremen and warehousemen have responded faithfully to the Nation's needs in speedily loading our ships with war supplies so necessary to the success of our fighting forces.

I strongly urge upon the committee that it favorably consider a sufficient appropriation to properly relieve this deplorable situation.

I offer for the RECORD the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 17, 1945.
Congressman RICHARD J. WELCH,

United States House of Representatives:
This board and the War Shipping Administration are deeply concerned over the serious and continuing shortage of housing for longshoremen in the San Francisco Bay area. It has become necessary in recruiting new men for longshore employment in order to meet increasing demand on this port to insist that only men already in possession of housing will be accepted for the industry under today's conditions. This seriously limits our ability to expand port labor supply and to meet considerable expanding needs for additional longshore labor. In view of this situation I trust that every effort will be made to obtain concurrence in proposal that maximum suggested funds be appropriated to provide new construction of housing in the San Francisco Bay area.

PACIFIC COAST MARITIME INDUSTRY BOARD.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, we all realize that in every theater of this war the offensive of the Allied Powers is being stepped up. The termination of hostilities will be determined in the matter of time by the success of those operations.

It is very natural that this enlarged scale of warfare requires greater production, and greater production can be had only through the efforts of the men and the women who produce these various articles in the plants that are scattered over this country. They cannot produce those articles or work in those plants unless they have some place in which to live.

Many of these projects which must be either created or enlarged are necessarily in rural areas because of the danger involved in the operation and the character of the output. Consequently housing is necessary. Under the provisions of the act this housing is all temporary and must be salvaged and removed to get out of the way of private enterprise when the war is over.

May I call your attention to some statements made by Judge Patterson be-

fore the Committee on Appropriations with reference to the intensified nature of our present operations. On page 169 of the hearings, after reciting the urgent necessity for this housing, and after the identical places of the allocations had been given, he had this to say:

Production of all heavy field artillery ammunition must be increased by 89 percent.

Small-arms ammunition schedules call for a 50-percent increase.

Our plans call for 24 percent more production of heavy artillery and replacement components; 19 percent more tanks must be delivered. Further increases are likely.

Production of heavy-heavy trucks, over 2½ tons, must be increased by 12 percent. Light-heavy trucks, 2½ tons, production was 12.9 percent below schedule for the last half of 1944 and at the end of the year stocks on hand were 65 percent below authorized stock levels and current unfilled demands.

That is because we could not possibly make enough last year.

Output of air-borne radar must be 31.9 percent greater.

Production of field and assault wire must be increased by 50 percent. Deliveries of dry-cell batteries are scheduled to be increased by 27 percent.

Production of cotton duck is expected to be 12 percent greater during the first quarter of 1945 than during the last quarter of 1944 and still will fall about 25 percent short of the current requirements, without taking into account previous deficits.

Heavy-duty truck-tire production for the first quarter of 1945 is scheduled at nearly 13 percent in excess of output in the fourth quarter of 1944.

Output of critical aircraft, including B-29 heavy bombers and A-26 attack bombers, must be sharply increased during the first 6 months of 1945. Requirements for many of these planes are practically unlimited.

And so forth. In other words, this is simply an effort to enable those on the home front to see that these boys who are fighting so bravely in the various theaters of war, on land, on sea, and in the air, may have the equipment of every character that they need to carry on their respective tasks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is pending before us seeks to cut this appropriation in half. In fact, it takes off, I believe, a little more than half of it.

I cannot speak for the various projects throughout the country but I do know something about one of these projects, and I want to localize my remarks to that particular project, and that is the one at Huntsville, Ala., calling for 500 family units and 300 dormitory units.

May I say here that the only housing projects carried in this bill for the State of Alabama are those units in my district and units at three different places in the district so ably represented by my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], who I know can very well speak for the urgency of the housing at those three particular places.

At Huntsville ammunition is being made every day for our fighting forces. It was a great thrill to me recently when I was in Belgium to run upon a young ordnance officer who, finding out that I was from Huntsville, said "You would be pleased to see the amount of ammuni-

tion we handle out here that comes directly from Huntsville."

I have visited at Huntsville, both the Huntsville Arsenal and Redstone Arsenal, a great many times when I have been back home. I have seen the products they are making. I have heard told the story of how a great amount of certain types of ammunition was flown by plane at the time of our invasion of north Africa.

Only recently those facilities have been expanded. Redstone Arsenal is in the process of being further expanded now. I had a letter just yesterday from the commanding officer of the Redstone Arsenal telling me how badly the housing is needed there. When we go back into the House I intend to ask permission to include at this point that letter from Colonel Hudson, the commanding officer at Redstone. He tells me they are going to have to employ a great many additional workers. There is absolutely no unoccupied housing there. The people are going to have to be brought in there, a great many of them, in order to fill the needs in stepping up the production that is required in that particular plant. You cannot bring them in and just expect them to camp by the side of the road. Housing must be provided, and there is no way of getting the housing down there except through this program that has been proposed. I do not know whether other districts can stand to have their housing projects cut in half, but I do know that this project cannot be cut in two if we are to produce there the munitions of war we are expected to produce.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. May I point out that a large number of industrialists appeared before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds during its hearings, and they told us that one of the largest causes of labor turn-over is lack of adequate housing for the employees. I know for a fact that is true in the gentleman's district.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure that is correct. I, for one, would not advocate the building of a single house we do not need. I certainly would not advocate wasteful housing or housing that is going to be left to form ghost towns when the war is over. But I know that we cannot produce the goods of war at the Huntsville Arsenal and at the Redstone Arsenal unless we have housing. I would suggest that if there is any Member from any district covered by these housing projects who can have his project cut half in two and still do the job, he get up here and tell the House so.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. I can testify that this is so inadequate that we will need just about double the quantity that is carried in this bill without any cut whatsoever.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should not be at all surprised to know that that is true.

The letter from Colonel Hudson, referred to above, follows:

ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
REDSTONE ARSENAL,
Huntsville, Ala., February 27, 1945.
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I appreciate your support before the House Appropriations Committee on behalf of additional housing needed at Redstone Park. As you know, it has become impossible to obtain any kind of housing accommodations in and around Huntsville. Because of this situation representatives of the N. H. A., on completion of their housing survey last month, recommended the expansion of Redstone Park.

We are starting the construction of a new production line and are doing considerable expansion work in existing facilities to provide for our increase in production schedules this year. The expansion program includes mechanization of the present production lines which will not only increase productive capacity but also efficiency of operations. In other words, fewer man-hours will be required per unit produced. We have had a pretty bad siege of weather since the first of the year which has delayed construction progress. I am hopeful, however, that by the end of June the new line will be substantially completed, as it now appears that it will have to be put into operation by then to meet production schedules.

The employment situation is becoming more critical every day. Farm labor is beginning to return to the farm, and it is going to take an all-out effort on the part of W. M. C. and U. S. E. S. to recruit enough employees to keep pace with our requirements. Our employment is now 4,411 and must be increased to over 5,000 by summer. Replacements necessary because of turn-over, including those returning to farms, are added to these requirements.

I know that you will be interested in seeing the improvements now under way, and I hope it won't be long before I will have the opportunity of showing them to you. Your continued interest in activities concerning the arsenal is greatly appreciated.

With best of wishes and kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

CARROLL D. HUDSON,
Colonel, Ordnance Department.

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

Mr. CANNON from Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 17 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD for the purpose of justifying the action of the subcommittee on the item of national housing in this first deficiency bill. A perfect explanation of the figures is set forth on pages 6 and 7 of the report which under leave granted me I insert at this time:

Title I of the Lanham Act of October 14, 1940, as amended, authorized an appropria-

tion of \$1,500,000,000 for the purpose of meeting acute housing shortages for industrial workers and for families and civilian personnel of the Army and Navy and civilian employees of the United States Maritime Commission. There has been appropriated against such authorization \$1,380,000,000, and as of January 31, 1945, there remained available for further programing but \$7,878, which assumes definitely obligating all projects in the commitment category.

The Budget has proposed an additional appropriation of \$90,000,000, all of which is earmarked for presently known needs for immediate purposes. These are set forth in the tabular matter on pages 163-164 of the hearings.

Of the total additional amount requested, approximately \$40,000,000 is intended for meeting needs sponsored by the Army and about \$29,000,000 has Navy sponsorship. These needs were justified to the committee by Under Secretary of War Patterson and Vice Admiral Moreell, respectively. The remaining amount of the estimate is for providing "must" housing in industrial areas and on account of commercial activities in which both the Army and Navy have a single or dual interest.

The committee is recommending an appropriation of \$84,378,000. The reduction of \$5,627,000 is responsive to these factors: (1) The Navy had made provision in its own supplemental estimates for the instant bill for 700 family type units at the naval ammunition depot, Hastings, Nebr. The amount involved is \$2,520,000. That amount has been deducted from the estimate under this head and is provided for under the Navy head. (2) A Navy restudy, according to a communication the committee has from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, dated February 21, 1945, has indicated a probable lessened need in the Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va., area, which would release \$5,800,000 of the \$90,000,000 estimate. The committee has taken off half of such released amount, allowing the remaining half (\$2,900,000) for providing 1,000 units in Honolulu, where an acute housing shortage exists which is hampering the operation of vital military installations. One thousand units have already been programed for Hawaii out of funds heretofore made available.

The Administrator of the National Housing Agency has assured the committee that the instant proposal applies to projects which are not susceptible of private financing and that privately financed construction is availed of to the utmost.

Furthermore, as the members of the subcommittee know, it was impossible for me to be present during much of the hearings on this particular bill. My absence resulted from the necessity for appearance on my own subcommittee on appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary. However, I did take leave from my subcommittee in order to be present at some of the testimony for the National Housing Agency. The record will reveal under a subcaption, "Housing for the Detroit Area"—page 212—the following statement in reply to my question as to Detroit being a critical area:

Mr. BLANDFORD. We have had a very serious situation in Detroit, particularly with respect to the Negro families. There has been an increase in the Negro population in Detroit during the war, about 70,000 persons. I think it is estimated there are about 20,000 families, and that has imposed upon us there a rather unsatisfactory housing condition, with considerable congestion, and we have been only able to finance and provide about 5,000 units.

I think those two facts indicate the seriousness of the congestion. Had conditions been better we would have done more, except for the practical problem of finding sites for such housing. It has reached the point which I think is rather serious and it has handicapped the war effort, but we are asking for another 1,000 units to at least give some relief to that situation.

Mr. RABAUT. Are those temporary or permanent units?

Mr. BLANDFORD. We have half a dozen older units which have caused us very deep concern. They would be temporary units.

The Citizens Housing Planning Council of Detroit has been cooperating with us, and the Detroit Victory Council has been a very important agency in helping us.

The Urban League, the Great Lakes Steel Corporation, and the Congress of Industrial Workers have all written in strongly urging that something be done to relieve the congestion.

Mr. RABAUT. How much have you in this bill for Detroit?

Mr. BLANDFORD. We have 1,000 units, Mr. RABAUT. It should be more, but I think we will have a time finding sites for them.

Mr. RABAUT. You are looking that situation over and doing everything you can?

Mr. BLANDFORD. Yes, sir; we are trying to keep in touch with that situation constantly. We would like to move on this immediately.

Mr. RABAUT. I think you will find sympathetic consideration given by the committee.

I have two of these letters which Mr. Blandford has received which I should like to put into the record following my remarks. One of them is from the Great Lakes Steel Corporation, and the second one is from the United Automobile-Aircraft-Agricultural Implement Workers of America.

Mr. CANNON. You may include them as a part of your remarks.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

GREAT LAKES STEEL CORPORATION,
DIVISION OF NATIONAL STEEL CORPORATION,
Ecorse, Detroit, Mich., February 5, 1945.

Mr. JOHN B. BLANDFORD, JR.,
Administrator, National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand there are prospects for a new housing project in the southwest district of Detroit, or what is known as the down river district of metropolitan Detroit.

Industries in the down river district realize the necessity for relief from the housing scarcity. The Great Lakes Steel Corporation, being the biggest industry in this district, has had tremendous difficulty in the last 3 years in finding shelter for its employees.

We are totally engaged in war work and have in the neighborhood of 3,000 men in the services. We have held a high priority with the War Manpower Commission and have had to depend entirely on in-migrants. Our labor turn-over has been exceptionally high because of the lack of housing, and the shortage of labor has created many problems. We find that many men who would have liked to work for us cannot do so because they cannot find housing. At the present time among our employees alone there is a demand for approximately 1,500 homes, both white and nonwhite.

The above-mentioned conditions have been aggravated because of the congested transportation and we feel sure that if the housing is located in the down river district, both industry and the war effort will benefit.

Hoping the project will materialize, I am,

Very truly yours,

GREAT LAKES STEEL CORPORATION,

J. E. FINK,

Vice President in Charge of Operations.

UNITED AUTOMOBILE-
AIRCRAFT-AGRICULTURAL
IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Detroit, Mich., January 27, 1945.

Mr. JOHN B. BLANDFORD, JR.,
Administrator, National Housing
Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLANDFORD: As you know, our organization has been actively interested in the war-housing problems of congested production areas, and has always sought to be of help in effecting solutions to these problems.

In the spirit of desiring to be helpful to you, therefore, I take this occasion to call to your attention the plight of our Negro war workers in Detroit with respect to the question of housing.

You know also that the lack of adequate, healthy, and safe housing for all workers has more or less always been one of Detroit's major problems even before the war. With the war and the sharply increased tempo of production and the great influx of new workers, you can readily understand the impact on Detroit and its already inadequate housing supply. The lack of decent housing for Negroes, of course, has been chronic for many years. You can easily understand, too, what the effect here was when you consider that as a general practice Negroes are forced to find homes in rigidly defined geographical areas that had reached the saturation point years ago insofar as decent housing was concerned. This fact, coupled with the fact that Detroit's Negro population since 1940 has increased by nearly 70,000 persons and with in-migration continuing at the rate of nearly 1,000 families monthly, serves to indicate the utter seriousness of the problem. I think, too, that you will readily agree that provision of housing for Negroes has not kept pace with the population expansion. I understand that in 1944 alone over 7,000 Negro families made application with the local war-housing center for housing with about 1,400 being provided for. This does not take into account the great many thousands that had applied in previous years and for which housing has yet to be provided. I understand the total backlog of applicants still unprovided for by the war-housing center approximates 15,000.

I need not dwell any longer on the seriousness of this situation, since the facts speak for themselves. My immediate concern, of course, is with the effect this problem is having on war-production schedules, what with the lowered worker morale, lost work days because of house hunting and the tensions consequent of situations of this nature.

I cannot say strongly enough how vitally important it is that the National Housing Agency immediately take whatever steps are possible to alleviate Detroit's acute housing problem. In line with this, I would recommend the immediate announcement by your Agency of the programing of at least 3,000 additional temporary war-housing family units by public construction, and 1,500 to 2,000 H-2 or title 6 units.

I feel that nothing short of this sort of a minimum program being announced immediately can prevent a serious break-down here in civilian morale and ultimately reflect itself in lowered production of vital war implements.

Sincerely yours,

R. J. THOMAS, President.

Mr. Chairman, as one of my colleagues so aptly put it this afternoon, there are two fronts to the war—the fighting front and the production front. Housing is necessary to the production front. It is justified by officials of the Army, Navy, merchant marine, and leaders of industry, as well as labor. It is an expense resulting from the problems of war, and

for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, the appropriation should be sustained.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to the pending amendment. It would cut the deficiency housing appropriation in half.

I have here a letter from the Seattle Chamber of Commerce which tells directly of our need for housing in that Pacific coast war-production center:

SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1945.
Hon. HUGH DE LACY,

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DE LACY: Numerous telegrams and letters from the Seattle Chamber of Commerce informs me that a very critical situation exists in the Puget Sound area because of the housing shortage.

With the increasing traffic to the Central and South Pacific, a large part of which moves through the ports of Seattle and Tacoma, the present condition will be greatly aggravated unless immediate relief is given.

Although there is now a labor shortage of approximately 26,000, an additional number of workmen will be needed as the war against the Japanese will demand a still increasing amount of supplies and men.

To relieve the situation as it now exists, a total of 6,288 units has been approved by the various branches of the National Housing Agency, but construction cannot be commenced until the necessary money has been appropriated by Congress.

We strongly urge you to do everything within your power to bring about an alleviation of this alarming situation.

With best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

By J. J. UNDERWOOD,
Manager, Washington, D. C., Head-
quarters.

Mr. Chairman, housing projects are not built unless they are needed to boost war production. Appearing before the committee, the Secretary of War, the Honorable Judge Patterson, testified as follows—page 170:

The War Department is convinced that it cannot recruit the necessary labor forces without provision for additional housing. Whether or not the May-Bailey bill is enacted, we cannot expect these people, whom we must employ, to move into areas in which there is no decent housing available to them. * * * Our conclusions have been reached in consultation with, and are concurred in by the War Manpower Commission, National Housing Agency, and the other governmental agencies which have studied the problem. They all agree that there must be more housing provided immediately if war production is to be carried on at the rate it must be.

The projects scheduled for construction are needed.

Cutting the appropriation in half will cripple an important war activity.

Thousands of workers and their families are without decent shelter in the Seattle area now. We should not add to the difficulties these patriotic men and women labor under.

It is our business to reduce those difficulties.

I hope and am confident that the amendment will be voted down and the total appropriation, \$90,000,000, small enough in itself, will be approved.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York who offered this amendment is one of the ablest, most earnest, zealous, and helpful Members of the House. We agree with him that it would be criminal extravagance to appropriate money for building a single housing unit that was not absolutely necessary. But which of these has not been justified by proof in the hearings that they are so needed? We know the conditions in our own districts. It is not a question of desiring temporary housing for the sake of getting it, but for the sake of getting war work done. Consider the housing units that are to be built in my district. One of the largest ammunition factories in the world. Production must be increased to insure adequate supply for our fighting men. More workers are needed. We must have homes to hold the ones we now have and others for the new employees. It is impossible to get places for the people to live.

At Talladega they have just recently enlarged that plant. As a matter of necessity, at the insistence of the War Department, they are building an additional plant and are crying for additional workers, and there is no place to put them. I was there the other night when people were sleeping in the chairs in hotel lobbies and every room was packed. There are no houses of any kind for rent. Therefore, under those conditions, the War Department has to certify that these additional facilities are necessary. The situation is the same in the other places. In Anniston right now, realizing the need which will be only partially supplied by this appropriation, if it is not cut down, a committee of private citizens is seeking ways and means to build other housing units with private funds, over and above those contemplated in making the full amount of the appropriation now in this bill.

The funds carried in this bill will be inadequate, but without this aid there is no hope of relieving the desperate housing shortage which exists there. So, in each of the three plants for which I am speaking, why, to cut this item a penny would be a crime, and it is not going to be anywhere near sufficient even if every dime of it is appropriated.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I yield always, and gladly.

Mr. TABER. I have had some experience with this outfit. They came up in my territory, and they spent three or four million dollars building a great number of houses. They were very poorly designed. Nobody could live in them. Finally they turned them into a stockade for German prisoners of war. That is the way it has worked out up in our territory. I find that in so many places that I feel it is being run very, very badly and loosely.

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to have the pleasure of yielding again to the dis-

tinguished gentleman from New York, and I am always happy to do so. I appreciate his testimony. If we had had spent in our districts, where the need is absolutely so great as to be pathetic, the money that was spent in his district, which has proven not to have been so necessary, then we would not be here as we are today, pleading with you not to cut this meager appropriation by one dime.

We are trying to supplement, out of private funds because of the absolute necessity, not having had the generous appropriation that has been given to the District so ably represented by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. HOBBS. Nothing could give me greater pleasure than to yield to my distinguished colleague and fellow committee member from California.

Mr. TOLAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he thinks we can separate the Army and Navy front from the home front of production? Are they not inseparable?

Mr. HOBBS. Absolutely; they are inseparable.

Mr. TOLAN. Poor housing, insufficient housing, strikes at the very heart of the home-front production, does it not?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly, sir. The gentleman knows, and so do those of us who are familiar with the great need this deficiency bill seeks to subserve, that there is nothing more lethal to our war effort than to have cramped quarters or no quarters at all for the men who are fighting the battle on the home front.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I have no personal knowledge of the projects covered by this proposed appropriation with the exception of one located between Marietta and Atlanta in the State of Georgia where the Army built an aircraft plant which is now operated by the Bell Co.

As of about the end of last year the Bell Co. was employing in that plant some 25,000 people. They are making B-29 bombers. On account of the accelerated program for the production of that type of aircraft they have been instructed to employ 4,000 additional people.

There is no housing available either in Atlanta or Marietta. Marietta was a city, before this plant went there, of about 8,000 people. The housing situation in Atlanta has been very bad for a considerable length of time.

This bill, as I understand it, would provide a thousand units in the neighborhood of that plant. While they will not be built in my district—they will be built in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], perhaps if they are built near the plant—but they will serve a purpose which is absolutely essential if we are to have these additional 4,000 workers engaged in the production of B-29 bombers.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is Marietta a part of Atlanta?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; it is not; it is the county seat of Cobb County, located 20 miles northwest of the center of Atlanta.

Mr. TABER. Two projects submitted here: One in Atlanta and one in Valdosta. That is all I know of in Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. This is the Bell plant, the Atlanta item. They have it under the heading of Atlanta. Valdosta is 200 miles southwest of Atlanta in an entirely different part of the State.

This is something that is absolutely essential. I have seen pictures within recent weeks of workers sleeping on benches in public buildings near this plant in Marietta. If we expect to get these additional workers and get the additional planes which are doing such an effective job out in the Pacific, we must have this housing. While I do not know anything about the other projects, I hope the amount will not be cut and that the amendment will be defeated, because I think we need the full amount recommended by the committee.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. I should like to ask the gentleman if he knows of any strikes in Atlanta or in that area?

Mr. RAMSPECK. We have had no strikes so far as I know in any war plant in the State of Georgia since the no-strike pledge was entered into.

Mr. HOBBS. I should like to say to the gentleman from Georgia that as far as my own district is concerned it gives me pleasure to pay the same tribute to organized labor which has done such a splendid work in all of our war plants. Every single project has been built on time without a moment's stoppage of work, and every single one of them has been done ahead of schedule and within the estimate. No increase in initiation fee nor dues has been charged by any labor union in the Fourth Congressional District of Alabama.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I understand that these workers in the Bell plant are doing an excellent job, a great many of them coming there without any training, were trained after they came to Atlanta. They came from all over Georgia and the other Southern States, and some even from as far away as New York where the Bell people trained them and sent them down there. Most of them are native Georgians who have sons or brothers in the Army or the Navy and they are interested in this job. They do need a place in which to live.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore oppose the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] is recognized.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to vote for the pending amendment. There is an evil which exists, nevertheless, I believe the housing projects which are asked for in this appropriation should be allowed.

The vice is more fundamental. The mistake that has been made was in putting these projects in places where there are no homes and neglecting other places where there are homes. That was the mistake. It is the obligation of the proper committee of this House, in my opinion, to look over this assignment of contracts and see that they are allotted to places where there are thousands of housing units, to places with thousands of empty homes not being utilized.

I shall vote against this amendment but I hope those in authority will in the future endeavor in assigning the contracts to put them not in glutted areas, not in areas where there is no housing, but will take care of the surplus labor areas of the country and areas where there is adequate housing.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 47, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 10, line 12, after the amendment previously adopted, insert "Provided, That funds appropriated herein under this head shall not be available for expenditure where private builders are able, ready, and willing to supply the housing needed at rates satisfactory to the area-rent-control authorities and provided, that for this purpose a resolution by the local governing body of the community where the project is to be located will be accepted as evidence of the availability or nonavailability of private financing and construction."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I must lodge a point of order against the amendment. It is legislation on an appropriation bill. It is not admissible under the Holman rule because it involves executive discretion and does not show patent retrenchment on the face of it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold the point of order for a minute?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to withhold the point of order temporarily.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of offering this amendment is to place before the committee the need for giving greater consideration to the possibility of private construction. The amendment suggested itself to me because of an instance where the manager for the housing people proposed construction of a public housing project and the people in that community said to me: "If this housing is needed, there are plenty of people in this community who are ready, willing, and desirous of financing it. There is no need for the Government to provide money to come in here and finance a public-housing project."

I asked then, "Are you willing to build it and abide by the rent-control rules

that they have set up here?" They said, "Yes."

Subsequently the Housing Authority decided that there was no housing needed in that particular community, and the Government was saved the expenditure. I have no doubt that there are other places where private funds are available for building all the housing needed.

The amendment would in no way cripple the construction of public housing where it is needed, but it would insure the use of private funds where they are available. While I recognize that a point of order may be lodged against the amendment, I was hoping that because of its merits the point would not be pressed.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri insist on his point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I regret that I must insist on it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 404 of the act of December 23, 1944 (Public Law 529, 78th Cong.), the amount available to the Weather Bureau for the purposes specified in that section shall be \$498,080.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

WEATHER IN THE POST-WAR PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, this country has been endowed by nature with many wonderful natural resources. We may not usually think of weather as one of them, but it is, and a very important one. There are many different kinds of weather and climate in the world, and not all of them are productive. The United States has some of almost every kind, but taking the land as a whole we are about as well off in weather and climate as any country on earth, and a lot better than most. Without favorable weather and climate some of our important natural resources would be of little or no value—our fertile soils, our forests, our lakes and rivers all depend upon rainfall, favorable temperatures, and other climatic factors. If we lose these, our soil loses its productivity, our waterways disappear, and many of our economic assets become valueless. So while we cannot control or process our weather resources as we do our minerals and our forests, we should utilize these resources to the utmost. They are constantly replenished, and although for relatively short periods they may fail us as during droughts, they are not inexhaustible like minerals. But we do not always make the best use of our climatic assets. It is the possibilities in this field that I would like to bring to your attention.

HISTORY OF WEATHER SERVICE

Long ago, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, statesmen and scientists recognized that because weather information is of such importance to human welfare, governments should accept the responsibility for organizing and maintaining national meteorological services. At first this public-spirited view applied primarily to warnings of destructive storms, but later it

came to mean day-by-day weather forecasts. By the end of the nineteenth century the principal world powers had nation-wide services in operation. In this country a small system of meteorological observations was started by the Army medical organization before 1850 and later the Signal Corps pioneered in extending the organization over the land. At sea the Navy did much to organize marine weather information. In 1890 these divided facilities were brought together into the unit which became known as the United States Weather Bureau, that organization that comprises the national weather service of the country, authorized by the Organic Act of 1890—act of October 1, 1890 (26 Stat. 653). Many additions and improvements have been made since that time so that by 1940 this country probably had the most intensive and progressive meteorological facilities in the world.

Scientists discovered early that meteorology in some respects is unique among sciences. The movements of the atmosphere which produce weather and climate are complex; they are not held within national boundaries, but are more or less interdependent throughout the atmosphere. To render his weather information services the meteorologist must have large numbers of daily reports from all over the country or even the hemisphere or the globe. Meteorological organization is thus an international matter and it requires a high degree of technical coordination. Observations must be standardized and correlated. For this purpose the basic meteorological organization is always integrated into a single national meteorological service which coordinates and unifies the techniques both nationally and internationally, a first requisite to reliable weather information services.

Most of you are familiar with the daily weather forecasts by radio and press but this is by no means the most productive service of the United States Weather Bureau. This public service is somewhat like the general agricultural advices published in various periodicals for use of the average farmer. They are helpful but in individual cases they are not usually as good as specific information designed to fit the particular case. The other, special services of the Weather Bureau are instrumental in adding hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the national income and in the saving of many lives and much property. They are indicative of the possibilities for further development of our natural resources in weather and climate. Among these special services are the following:

RIVER AND FLOOD WARNING SERVICE

There is an average annual property loss of \$100,000,000 in this country resulting from floods. Statements furnished by property owners and others show that the river and flood forecasting service of the Weather Bureau is instrumental in the saving of \$15,000,000 in property annually through its forecasts and warnings. This saving is accomplished by Weather Bureau expenditures costing less than \$300,000 annually—less than one-fiftieth of its annual savings.

In the early years of the river and flood service forecasts and warnings were required only by communities along the main channels of the principal rivers where forecasts could be made for a city from the reported river stage at points upstream. On a river the size of the Missouri it is possible to anticipate rises as they move down the river, and the distances between points are large enough to give time for protective action after the forecasts are issued.

After the Nation-wide flood-control program began, the attention of cities and industrial areas located outside the flood plains of the larger rivers, but on tributary streams, was directed to the advantages of a flood-forecasting service. Accordingly, the demands for such service have been heavy and have been met in part only.

Unfortunately, on the smaller streams, the forecasting techniques used on the larger rivers are not successful because the relation of river stages between points is not consistently reliable and represents too short a time for effective action. Such forecasts must be based on rainfall, necessitating a network of stations which report amounts of rain as it falls to the river-forecast center. Of the needed 2,100 such stations, approximately 1,200 are now in operation.

There are other uses. The irrigation interests of the West are dependent for water supply on river flow from the snow fields. Inland water transportation bases its operations on the forecasts of the navigable river stages. The hydroelectric utilities operate on advance information of river conditions. Agricultural interests use the fertile flood plains of the principal rivers.

The river and flood service is conducted through 85 Weather Bureau offices located at strategic points on rivers subject to flooding. Floods occur at irregular intervals and the forecasting of floods, unlike the forecasting of weather, is not a daily occurrence. It is thus difficult to be sure that local observers are always on the alert. The same difficulty is experienced at river-forecast centers where, owing to limitations in staff, it is not possible to keep up a continuous river-service activity except at the larger river centers.

The year 1944 was noteworthy for its disastrous floods in the extensive agricultural regions of the lower Missouri and Arkansas and the middle Mississippi Valleys. Heavy rains and floods began in April and continued through May and June in many sections, seriously delaying crop planting and in many places necessitating replanting of crops vital to the conduct of the war. By summer farmers were hauling water in parts of the Ohio Valley where in 1937 they had suffered disastrous floods while in the dry Dust Bowl of the thirties prolonged rains now seriously delayed the wheat harvest in the Plains States.

The magnitude of the great flood of 1944 in the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys is shown by the stage reached at St. Louis, Mo., where the combined flows of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers produced a crest of 39.1 feet, exceeded only by the flood of 1844 when 41.4 feet was reached. The property damage caused

by the floods in the Missouri River Valley alone during 1944 has been estimated at \$43,500,000, and in the middle Mississippi Valley at about \$19,000,000. The warnings and advices of the river and flood forecasting service of the Weather Bureau are credited with having led to the saving of \$13,000,000 worth of property which would have been lost during these floods if no warning service had been possible.

Floods such as the above which result from rather general rains and affect principally the larger rivers, can be quite accurately forecast far in advance so that protective measures can be taken. However, there is another type of flood, commonly known as the flash flood, which occurs in the smaller rivers and is generally caused by intense isolated storms. These storms come mainly during the summer season and while the conditions favoring the development of such storms can be forecast, the locality in which they will develop cannot be forecast with great accuracy now. Consequently a cloudburst in a local area may send a wall of water rushing down a narrow valley and overwhelm a community in its path without warning.

Such flash floods occur in almost any section of the country and exact a heavy toll in life and property. Other examples are the two disastrous floods in the Elkhorn River Basin in northeast Nebraska only a month apart, in May and June 1944. The property loss in the two floods, in a basin whose total drainage is only 6,000 square miles, has been estimated at \$10,000,000. In different sections of Pennsylvania two flash floods, in May and again in July 1942, took a combined toll of 48 lives and a property loss of \$20,000,000. In September 1942 a destructive flood in the narrow plain of the Eau Galle River in Wisconsin, which drains an area of about 100 square miles, practically destroyed the town of Spring Valley. Of 260 homes in Spring Valley only 25 were on high enough ground to escape the destructive effects of the flood.

The flood damage on the smaller tributaries of the Missouri River is known to reach several million dollars per year on the average. In June 1940 excessively heavy rains in northeast Nebraska resulted in a disastrous flood in small creeks in that area causing loss of life and considerable property damage.

Following that experience, a flood-warning network was organized by the Weather Bureau. The network consists of selected local citizens who act as rainfall observers in the headwaters of small river basins. They telephone reports of heavy rainfall to communities downstream.

The system described above was in operation in the Elkhorn River Basin in Nebraska during 1944. In May of that year heavy rains measured by the rainfall observers in the headwaters of the Elkhorn and in the Logan Creek area were reported by telephone to the keyman in the community below and flood warnings were issued. However, on the night of May 11-12 an unusually intense storm struck that particular community, flooding the streets, disrupting communi-

cations, and completely isolating the town. Only through the heroic efforts of public officials and others working with them were warnings gotten out to the people. In the words of a keyman the story is best told:

Many were up all night and the river was watched very closely. Warnings were sent out by long and loud whistles. At 5 a. m. all businessmen were in their stores and people were on the lookout. But the water hit us like a 3-foot wall. It did not give them time enough. And, as set out before, were any one man to know what was coming, he nor anyone could have made people believe this was coming, or could have come. So, in my opinion, no warning at that time could have done much more than was done. However, from now on I am very sure all warnings will be given close attention by all.

I cannot say the value of this warning, but do know that after this community was hit, all farmers and towns east of here took this warning and it was of untold value. It is too bad that it must take something of this nature to teach people to heed warnings of such value to them. But the amount of damage is yet unguessed, and as to the buildings it may take years to tell. The papers that will soon reach you picture a part, but the loss and smell cannot go into a picture.

Mr. Chairman, another flash flood of nearly the same magnitude struck the lower Elkhorn just 1 month later, in June 1944. Largely due to the fact that they were now ready to heed the warnings, and too because telephone wires were not down as in the previous flood, the people were ready when warnings were flashed. A survey of savings resulting from the flood-warning network in these two floods has been reported at an estimated \$900,000. This is nearly 500 times the extra cost of the new warning network in that area.

WEATHER MAPS AND AGRICULTURE

Weather maps are highly important. They are the basis of nearly all modern weather forecasting. Daily weather maps of past years show the nature of weather changes and their movements, also the habits of storms. For example, their importance in military operations became evident early in this war. General Arnold has made a public report which includes information on the expansion of weather facilities to meet the war emergency. He said, "Weather is a critical factor in this war. The side making the best prognostications has a tremendous advantage." On the successes attained in this job a recent magazine article says:

This up-to-the-minute forecasting of weather 400 miles from the nearest Allied observation stations was not done by aching joints or a wet finger to the wind. It was done by long looking at past weather maps. Digging into old files, the United States Weather Bureau had reconstructed maps of Northern Hemisphere weather, one for each day of the past 45 years. The task was laborious and expensive. Weather Bureau files, records of Allied Governments, all available ship logs were combed to reconstruct the temperature and pressure every day since 1899.

Before the days of modern weather maps, thousands of lives were lost each year in storms, floods, and blizzards, and little could be done to prevent loss of crops and livestock.

Nearly all weather forecasting today is done by means of weather maps, but the maps that are used now are quite different from the ones they made in the early days of the weather service. In the old days the weather forecasters mapped the weather at the ground and did the best they could in guessing at what was going on in the upper air. Today's weather maps are drawn at many different levels. Special instruments are sent up to measure weather conditions in the upper air and send messages back by radio. Balloons are also used to show the direction and speed of the wind at various heights above the ground. All this makes it possible for the weather forecaster to construct a sort of bird's-eye view of the atmosphere in three dimensions by using several maps and diagrams.

Dependable forecasts 5 days to a week in advance are much needed for farming. For this purpose it is necessary to use other methods of drawing weather maps. In general, this involves a study of weather conditions over the entire Northern Hemisphere. The weather forecasters use what might be called average maps. For example, for weather forecasts 5 days ahead the Weather Bureau draws maps showing 5-day averages of conditions around the Northern Hemisphere. These maps show that the movements of weather around the world and also north and south between the equator and the pole vary over periods of several days or weeks. These maps give a measure of the strength of the circulation of the atmosphere. By watching the maps the forecasters are able to tell in a general way how much rain or snow there is likely to be in different parts of the country in the next 5 days and whether the temperatures will be about normal for the season or above or below the average. The Weather Bureau began experimenting with this new type of forecasting before the war, and has used it to a large extent during the war.

The weather in every part of the world, to some extent at least, affects the weather in every other part. The weather of Asia affects the weather over the United States, but it undergoes many changes in crossing the Pacific Ocean and there are many things that must be taken into account.

The earlier method of forecasting the weather; that is, by mapping conditions in great detail and watching their movements and changes has been very much improved in the last few years. This method is absolutely necessary for the safety of flying. It also provides vital information regarding storms, floods, cold waves, freezing temperatures, and also weather forecasts for the next day or two which are so beneficial to agriculture, commerce, and industry.

Improvement and extension of the newer method of forecasting the weather several days ahead would be of enormous value to the people of the country, especially the farmers. Even greater benefits would come if it were possible to make accurate forecasts for weeks or months. The weather bureau fully realizes this. Information of this kind is of vital importance in time of war. The most concentrated efforts have been made since the beginning of the war

to improve on this type of weather forecasting and to find new methods of looking further into the future. There is every reason to believe that as a result of the war the farmer and the businessman will find improvements in this type of forecast. It is in this field that we must look for the greatest benefits in the usefulness of weather forecasting for agriculture.

WEATHER AND TRANSPORTATION

The benefits of weather service to transportation are of interest to nearly every one of our citizens. There are many ways in which the Weather Bureau serves railroads, bus and truck lines, railroad express companies, and all other kinds of transportation. This includes warnings and advices needed to protect perishable products all along the line from the pick-up at farm or factory to final delivery to the customer. Weather information is needed for day-to-day operation of freight and passenger trains, for planning work of repair and road gangs, and for many other purposes on all the railway systems of the country. Here the forecasts, warnings and flood information are indispensable.

Nearly every Weather Bureau office in the country furnishes weather information as an aid to transportation. They make prompt and regular delivery of information to shippers, giving special attention to warning of sleet, heavy snow, cold waves, floods, and unusually high or low temperatures. Shippers' forecasts tell where to expect temperatures injurious to perishable goods during the following 36 to 48 hours within a radius of several hundred miles. One of the purposes of these forecasts is to aid in planning artificial heating and refrigerating in freight cars.

To give a specific example, there are large carload distributors of bananas that are received from Central America and South America. The fruit is hauled from port to interior markets. Bananas must not be exposed to low temperatures. The variation of temperature cannot be large. In general, the range is from 52° to 62°. Temperature forecasts are relayed to field men of the fruit companies who are stationed at strategic points along the shipping route. They look after heating, icing, or ventilating the cars in accordance with the weather forecast.

The same kind of information is required for shipment of many other farm and orchard products such as apples, pears, lettuce, celery, melons, peaches, berries, onions, potatoes, and so forth. Special attention has to be given to cross-country shipments of berries, fruits, and vegetables from the Pacific Northwest to eastern markets.

Another example is the shipment and delivery of livestock. In winter weather forecasts are used to regulate the depth of bedding for the animals and the amount of heavy paper or canvas tacked on the side of the cars. For example, in the case of hogs, if a cold wind blows on one side of an unprotected car the animals will pile up deep on the opposite side and those at the bottom are suffocated. This is also true of sheep and lambs. In the shipment of poultry, there are other problems.

Another example is iron ore which usually contains considerable water. If it freezes in the car or loading bins there is serious trouble. It may have to be steamed before it can be dumped into the loading bins at the docks. Close contacts between the Weather Bureau and operators keep delays and expenses of this kind at a minimum.

There are some of the same problems in the shipment of coal. The official of one company reported that before they started using Weather Bureau forecasts they had charges of more than \$100,000 in 1 year due to coal that was frozen in cars and could not be unloaded. Carloads of sand, gravel, bauxite, and other products get wet and freeze unless temperature forecasts are available.

Transportation is seriously affected and sometimes completely tied up by heavy snow. On receipt of warnings in some cities it takes hundreds of extra men to keep snow and ice from clogging the railroad switches. Whether or not to bring out the snow plows is a problem in many of our larger cities every winter.

WEATHER AND INTERNATIONAL FLYING

There is another field in which weather reporting and forecasting will have to be developed in the future. This is in international flying. In the recent International Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago more than 50 nations were represented, and it was agreed that weather reports and forecasts of special kinds for aviation will become more and more important after the war. On the airways within the United States weather service for flying has been expanded in recent years. Fortunately, this growth began several years before the war. This helped the Weather Bureau in dealing with the great increase in pilot training and in the delivery and use of military aircraft in this country. However, this requires only short range weather reporting and forecasting, usually for 6 to 12 hours. When the time came early in the war to make long delivery flights across the country and to move large numbers of bombers and fighter aircraft to the theaters of war, it was necessary to make airway forecasts longer in advance and out over ocean areas where not much flying had been done before.

Much of the flying of the future will be of this type, that is, long range flights clear across the United States or across the oceans to other countries. The International Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago recommended that the weather bureaus of the countries, including the United States, be prepared to furnish weather service of this type. Experience in making forecasts of this kind is gained only after months of study and practice. We must be ready for commercial international flying after the war, when planes from this country will be going to all parts of the world and planes from many foreign countries will be coming to the United States.

FOREST FIRE WEATHER WARNINGS

Another important activity of the Weather Bureau is the forecast service carried on as an aid to the forest protection agencies. In the conservation of our natural resources, the preservation of

our forests on a planned-yield basis are severely threatened each year by the possibility that forest fires, started by lightning or by human carelessness, may wipe out in one day the stands of timber that have taken years to grow. Weather reports and forecasts are major factors in planning for prevention and suppression of forest fires on dry, hot, windy days, or on days when lightning storms are prevalent. Much has been accomplished, in past years, by the operation of the Weather Bureau's fire-weather warning service; but as more roads are constructed through the forest areas, giving access to greater numbers of the public, increasing care will have to be taken to provide adequate guard on the forests when critical weather conditions prevail. The fire-control agencies of the Forest Service and of the National Parks Service can carry out their protective action with greater economy and efficiency if they are provided with accurate, dependable weather forecasts issued by experienced weather forecasters who know the problems of forest-fire control.

There are many other fields in which weather information can be used to increase operating efficiency. Meteorological developments during the war have pointed the way to better use of our climatic resources in increasing the productivity of American business economy. Costly mistakes of the past, such as overdevelopment of semiarid regions, can be avoided if due consideration is given to meteorological advice. After the war there will be meteorological consultants engaged in the private practice of the profession who can make specialized studies of the particular needs of individual business enterprises in order to determine how to make best use of the favorable conditions of weather and climate in designing and conducting its business operations. Then the country will reap additional benefits from the intensive work that has gone into meteorological developments during the war, the results of which are being collected and organized for public and private use through the national meteorological service of the Weather Bureau.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

Salaries and expenses: The limitation in the appropriation for salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority, in the National War Agency Appropriation Act, 1945, on the amount which may be expended for travel is hereby increased from \$375,000 to \$475,000; and of said appropriation not to exceed \$280,477 is made available for expenses incurred during the fiscal year 1945 incident to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the emergency refugee shelter at Fort Ontario, N. Y., provided for in the President's message of June 12, 1944, to the Congress (H. Doc. 656).

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that part of the section following the semicolon in line 20 and ending on page 14, line 2, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; furthermore, that there is no specific authority in existing statutes for the operation of this particular program. The Executive order of the President which created the War Relocation Authority does not encompass the activities for which these funds would be used.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the item is not subject to a point of order. As the committee will recall, the action of the military authorities in moving from the West Coast for supervised segregation all persons of Japanese ancestry, was one of the most mooted questions in the early days of the war. It was done under Executive authority by virtue of Executive Order No. 9102, establishing the War Relocation Authority in the Executive office of the President and defining its functions and duties. It was financed as many of the early war activities were financed out of the President's special fund. It is therefore authorized by law. This is tantamount to a reappropriation of funds, and is admissible under the rules. There are no grounds upon which a point of order can be sustained.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman has been referring to the Executive order which created the War Relocation Authority; but this refugee activity ostensibly would be conducted under the Executive order which created the War Refugee Board. I submit that there has been no legislation enacted by Congress which authorizes the appropriation of funds for this specific program.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As I understand, the gentleman's point of order goes to the item in line 21 on page 13 appropriating \$280,477. That is in effect a reappropriation for the War Relocation Authority and is therefore in order.

Mr. DWORSHAK. No provision has been made for funds for the operation of the War Refugee Board. I am not questioning the Authority for the appropriation for the War Relocation Authority, but there is no existing authority for the other activity.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This is really a function of the War Relocation Authority, and we are merely making a reappropriation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There has never been any appropriation made, so it cannot be a reappropriation for the War Refugee Board.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This is a reappropriation of funds formerly supplied by the President's fund.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There has never been any appropriation for that activity.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if it is his contention that the Executive order by the President would be law within the meaning of the rule requiring appropriations to be authorized by law?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In the Federal Register of Friday, March 20, 1942, appears a copy of the Executive order. Its functions are fully outlined there. One of its duties would be the establishment of such a refugee shelter as is provided here in the bill. Money has been provided for the support of the activities of this Authority out of the President's fund. This activity was initiated under competent authority and under authority of law and is work in progress. It is therefore in order under the rules of the House.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, may I add this point: The chairman of the committee persists in referring to

Executive Order No. 9102, which created the War Relocation Authority, while I also direct attention to another Executive order which was issued on January 22, 1944, under which the War Refugee Board was created and under which this particular activity has been maintained. There has never been any specific authority in law or any appropriation made heretofore, so it cannot be a reappropriation of funds.

Section 213 of Public Law 358, making appropriations for the executive offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, requires any agency established by Executive order, having been in existence for more than 1 year, to come to Congress for a regular appropriation. As the War Refugee Board had been created under Executive Order No. 9417 and had utilized money provided by the President from his emergency war fund, it is obvious that no specific authorization has heretofore been considered by Congress for this activity.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPARKMAN). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] makes the point of order against the language beginning in the concluding part of line 20 on page 13 and extending through the balance of the paragraph, that this appropriation is not authorized by law.

Under the rules of the House, no appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

It is the opinion of the Chair that an Executive order does not meet the requirement stated in that rule. Therefore, not being authorized by law enacted by Congress, the appropriation would not be in order. The mere fact that it may be a reappropriation would not make it in order if the original appropriation was not authorized by law.

Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

Damage claims: For the payment of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death adjusted and determined by the Secretary of War under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," approved July 3, 1943 (Public Law 112), as fully set forth in House Document No. 72, Seventy-ninth Congress, §141,537.36.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries many million dollars of nonwar deficiency appropriations. We have heard much talk about the necessity of economy in the civil activities of the Government. If economy is not just talk, when do we start?

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to some parts of this bill where we could save some of the taxpayers' money. I would especially like the attention of the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the committee. As I said on the floor on Wednesday to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations he is responsible more than any other Member of the House of Representatives, for not cutting down unnecessary expenses. The gentleman at that time asked me what I would cut out of the bill. I wanted to present this to him and I do so now, in an effort to convince the chairman that we ought to reconsider Federal Crop Insurance.

The item amounts to \$30,000,000, subscription to the capital stock of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; for an additional amount of capital stock for crop insurance.

I would like the membership of this committee to read the testimony that was given before the Committee on Appropriations by Mr. J. Carl Wright, who is manager of that Corporation. I do not know Mr. Wright. I do not know anything about him at all. However, when I read all the testimony contained in the hearings before the committee, given by Mr. Wright, I cannot understand how the committee can authorize the expenditure of \$30,000,000 more for the Federal Crop Insurance Act, and then permit him to operate the Corporation.

Let me call your attention to the fact that the act was passed in 1938. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was supposed to incorporate for \$100,000,000. Congress paid in \$40,000,000 at that time. This man, Mr. Wright, is manager of the Corporation. I do not know who the trustees or directors of the Corporation are. The stockholders are the taxpayers of the United States. The taxpayers of this country furnished \$40,000,000 for this fellow to squander in 5 years.

The capital of Crop Insurance Corporation has been impaired to the extent of \$37,500,000. There are two and one-half million he says remaining as capital. All the rest has been squandered. It has been wasted. It has been lost to the taxpayers.

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

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield right now.

Mr. Wright claims he has made about \$7,000,000 on the increase in prices of the commodities which he used for the purpose of bargaining in this insurance. This also he lost. If he has lost thirty-seven and one-half millions and made a profit of seven million and lost that, he lost forty-four and one-half million all told. Also, you have nothing but \$2,500,000 left as capital stock. What inefficiency I never heard of. No corporation can stand that kind of management, Government or private.

Now, I wish to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he can find any Member of Congress who would invest a thousand dollars in this corporation for this man to handle? If he so deliberately squanders thirty-seven and one-half million would the gentleman want to invest the taxpayers' money or

his own money so he can have an additional \$30,000,000 to blow in? I cannot see it; I would not do it and I am against such waste and extravagance and inefficiency.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I may say to the gentleman that the majority of both Houses of Congress are perfectly willing to do it as evidenced by the fact that they passed the crop-insurance bill just recently.

Mr. RICH. That is just the point. I am against it.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. I do not care whether the House of Representatives and the Senate passed that bill once or not. If you are—well, I will not say it. We may not be fools, but we do things that fools would do. That is all I can say. Anyone who would give this man, this Corporation, \$30,000,000 more does not know what he is doing. Read this set of hearings and you will conclude it is a shame, it is a crime, it is not good business at all. Nothing in the hearings justifies the appropriation.

The gentleman should give me permission to go back and offer the amendment I have at the Clerk's desk and strike out that item from the bill. That is what the gentleman ought to do.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield again to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Why does the gentleman believe the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations should not object to going back to the item just to accommodate the gentleman so that he might introduce an amendment to strike it out?

Mr. RICH. Just because I want to get a little common sense into our actions. The chairman of the committee and I had a colloquy on the floor day before yesterday in which he said that if I could show him anything that ought to be cut out he would be the first to strike it out. Now I want to see whether he means what he said. If he does he will come to the front; if he does not, then he talks one thing and does something else.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman makes a statement that is a great indictment of the people in charge of the crop-insurance program. He makes the statement that the money has been squandered.

Mr. RICH. I do. It has been wasted. It is poor management.

Mr. COOLEY. Where is the gentleman's supporting evidence for a statement?

Mr. RICH. I say that it is a deliberate—well, I cannot say "steal." When any person operates a corporation for 5 years with a capital of forty million and loses thirty-seven and one-half mil-

lion, it is mighty poor business, very poor.

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. RICH. It comes about by deliberate inefficiency on the part of these men; if not that, then ignorance. And I want to say this to you, brother, that if this is not stricken from the bill, I am going to find out more about this man and this Corporation and its personnel.

Mr. COOLEY. What is his name?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Wright. I am going to find out who the other directors are on that board; and if we do not turn back and strike that item out, then there is just not going to be a stone left unturned to correct things.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman realizes, I am sure, that the House, after a very long debate on the subject of crop insurance, and after considering the amendments to the original Crop Insurance Act, recently passed the act by a large and substantial majority in both Houses of Congress, and it is now the law of the land.

Mr. RICH. That is all right, brother; but if you did something wrong, this Congress now has the chance to correct it, to change it; and that is what I want to do today. I think it is only on the poorest of excuses that anyone can stand here today and advocate that we give Mr. Wright \$30,000,000 more to squander in the next 3 or 4 years. And, another thing, let me say that this bill is not a regular appropriation bill. Defer this matter until you have a chance to investigate it.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman realize that Congress did withhold an annual appropriation just last year and that Congress was unwilling to provide additional funds until the basic act had been substantially amended?

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean until the basic act has been tried out to see whether these people are capable of running it? Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that the men in charge of this loan agency do not know what it is all about. They admit that. They proved their inefficiency. All you need to do is to read the testimony and the hearings to substantiate that. There is not one word that would justify the chairman of this subcommittee including that amount in this bill. I think it is so serious.

Mr. COOLEY. I may say on behalf of the committee and the ranking minority members of the committee that they did withhold the appropriation for one 12-month period and did withhold it until the Congress amended the law.

Mr. RICH. You should now withhold it until the regular appropriation bill comes up for consideration so that the membership of this House may have a chance to investigate it, because you gentlemen have not investigated this or you would not put it in here now. Here is a great chance to save \$30,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. It is a crime to the taxpayers if you do not cut this appropriation from this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I disagree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 25 of the bill and to the section dealing with the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, and that lines 15 to 19 be read.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes if he wants the time at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri requests that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] have 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman doing that because of generosity or what is the object anyway?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is a very important question.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are getting some valuable information.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, you better give me this time now or I will get it in a short time again if you do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Chair did not object. Objection was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, let me read from page 547 of the hearings:

Mr. CANNON. Now, this \$30,000,000 is strictly for compliance with the act of December 23, 1944?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. And you did have a capital fund of \$40,000,000 and you say that has been impaired?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir; up to \$37,500,000, Mr. CANNON.

Mr. CANNON. And it now amounts to how much?

Mr. WRIGHT. \$2,500,000.

Mr. CANNON. That is the amount left out of the \$40,000,000?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir; \$2,500,000 is left out of the \$40,000,000, that is correct.

I could go on and read further where the other members of the committee interrogated this gentleman, Mr. Wright. Then on page 550 he gives you a table which was inserted in the record and in that table you will find that you were dealing in wheat and you lost \$26,000,000 plus, you will find that you lost on the insurance of cotton \$11,000,000 plus, then you have other charges of \$3,448, making a total loss of \$37,227,043.56.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that if we are going to do this kind of business with

the taxpayers' money, squander it in that way with inefficient men at the head of these corporations, it is about time that the people of this country wake up and say to the Congress of the United States: "You are not fit to handle the affairs of this Government of ours and we are going to put men in Congress who will see that proper officials are put at the head of each organization so that the business of the Government that is to be handled will be handled in a businesslike manner and in a way that will reflect credit on the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Chief Executive of the United States."

Mr. Chairman, as one Member of the House, I will not countenance the squandering of the taxpayers' money in that way, when we are about to go out and ask the taxpayers to buy more bonds, when we have to ask the taxpayers of this country to furnish money for someone to spend extravagantly and waste the taxpayers' money. It is time that we do one of two things. It is time that we get a new board to manage the affairs of this Crop Insurance Corporation or get a new Congress—one of the two.

If you Members feel that I am saying things that should not be said here today, then it is just too bad. I have nothing to say but words of pity for the chairman of this committee and for the Members of Congress who will allow a thing like that to happen. It is just a shame. I do hope that we do something about this, and do it now. Strike this \$30,000,000 from this appropriation, do it and do it now. Its sound, its practical, its sensible, its necessary.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has missed the boat. It is now too late to amend the provision. But knowing him as I do, knowing his large and successful business experience, his unusual ability as a businessman and his deep sense of fairness and equity, I cannot believe that he would deny to any one industry of the country, and to one industry alone—especially so important and efficient an industry as agriculture, the fundamental aid which every industry must have in order to successfully conduct its business.

No industry business in the country operates without insurance. It cannot be done. If you should by some stretch of the imagination withdraw insurance from any businessman in this city or in the Nation, or from any industry in city or country, paralysis would follow. Business cannot be conducted under modern conditions unless insured against unanticipated and unpredictable losses.

Now, that is all that this provision does. It provides for agriculture and the farmer the same right, the same opportunity, and the same facilities for security in the management of his business given every other business. Why should we differentiate as between the farmer and other enterprises? Why should we discriminate against agriculture by refusing a facility open to every other industry?

Unfortunately the Government is the only agency that can handle such a proposition. The field is too wide, the

risks to complicated and the sums involved too large to admit private enterprise. It is a national problem and a national responsibility. In helping the farmer we are helping the Nation because we are not only making it possible for the farmer to produce needed food and fiber for the Nation, with some assurance that his unanticipated losses will be taken care of, but we stabilize his income, and we, as the Committee on Agriculture indicated when it reported out the authorization, help him to carry his own relief burdens rather than leaving it to the Government.

The only reason the Congress discontinued appropriations for this purpose in the last session was that under the original law which was, of course, in the beginning necessarily an experiment, failed to make the service self-sustaining. We now have a law formulated after long study and investigation by the Committee on Agriculture—in my opinion one of the best laws that committee has reported to the House for some time under which, after a reasonable period of probation, the service becomes self-sustaining. Provisions of the new law are such that the premiums will eventually pay the losses. It will no longer be a burden upon the Government. It is necessary, however, during the tentative period to provide working capital and that is all this paragraph does. I am certain the needs of the farmer and the needs of agriculture are so obvious the provisions of the law so just and so equitable that the appropriation reported by the committee will be sustained by the House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very easy thing for the gentleman from Pennsylvania to indict those in charge of this program and to accuse them of squandering the taxpayers' money, but it is quite another thing to justify such assertions. The fact remains that the Congress in its own wisdom withheld this appropriation last year. I can say in defense of the Committee on Appropriations that they withheld the money until the basic act had been amended. I am not sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is familiar with the amendments to the Crop Insurance Act.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am not against this insurance, but I think the fact that the operation of this program resulted in the loss of almost the entire capital in 5 years shows that the law ought to be revised, or else new men ought to be put in charge so that the program would be handled as it was intended to be handled, according to the hearings—that is, the premiums received would keep the capital intact. If the men in charge have lost \$37,500,000 out of \$40,000,000 in 5 years, does not the gentleman believe there ought to be men with some experience and who know something about insurance handling this particular function of government?

Mr. COOLEY. The original experiment contemplated a possible loss of \$100,000,000. Congress embarked upon

that program, the gentleman's views to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. RICH. No; the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. COOLEY. That is true. After having operated and after having incurred losses of around \$37,500,000, we have amended the act, as indicated by the chairman of the committee, so as to provide an additional probationary period within which the crop insurance program must be self-sustaining.

Mr. RICH. How long is that?

Mr. COOLEY. Three years.

Mr. RICH. In 3 years you will lose this \$30,000,000. That is the point I am making. You have to get different men there to handle this program or you will lose the entire \$30,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that the men there probably should have the benefit of the best insurance minds in America in establishing an actuarial basis for this insurance. It is not an easy task. I do not believe you could imagine a more difficult undertaking than that of establishing an actuarially sound basis for all-risk crop insurance, something that no private corporation in America would dare to undertake at the present time, and they have not in the past.

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

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

Mr. THOM. Is it not the weather that causes the losses? It is not the management.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. Of course, they have not been able to estimate properly the losses, but with the experience they have had in the past and the experience they will have in the next 2 or 3 years they should be able, in fact, they must be able to make the program actuarially sound and self-supporting.

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

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

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina has had a part in this legislation from the very beginning.

Mr. COOLEY. I have.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. As I recall, the gentleman was a member of the Committee on Agriculture when this bill was first drawn and submitted to the Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The reason Congress felt we should do something for the farmers of the country was that the old-line insurance companies would not take the risk of insuring the crops of our farmers. If they did underwrite a risk, it was beyond the reach of the American farmer. They constituted the one large group in America which could not get insurance unless the Government did something for them. It was upon that theory that the original bill providing for crop insurance was passed.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In the bill which we passed recently we undertook to place crop insurance upon a sound actuarial basis. The gentleman will recall that at

a conference of Members of the House and Senate it was agreed that we should bring into the organization skilled insurance men who could place crop insurance on a sound actuarial basis so that it could be administered efficiently.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in connection with the gentleman's statement that this money has been squandered, it has not been squandered. The money has been paid into the pockets of farmers in all distressed areas of this country. But for this crop-insurance program and but for the money that has been paid out by way of indemnities in connection with the insurance program, we would have been appropriating money for direct relief in many of the stricken areas of America.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Is it not a fact that before we embarked upon this program we had absolutely no way of fixing rates and it was necessary that we go into this experimental stage in order to be able to determine what was needed?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. And every man familiar with the program of insurance knows it is still in an experimental stage.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I just want to recite a fact to back up the gentleman's argument. In my own congressional district a short time ago we had 20,000 acres of wheat and flax totally destroyed by flood. If it had not been insured the people would have had to be taken care of some way.

Mr. COOLEY. If they had not been insured, they would be asking for some direct relief from the Treasury. If we can perfect the program and can make it actuarially sound, it will be a great benefit not only to America today but in years to come. It will in the long run save millions of dollars and the amounts which are appropriated for direct relief will no doubt be greatly reduced.

The crop-insurance program is still an experiment and it is so regarded by all who are familiar with its history and with its operations. I am not yet willing to predict that the experiment will be successful, but I do assert that it should be continued in the hope that it may soon be placed upon an actuarially sound basis. Practically every businessman in America has an opportunity to insure his buildings and other property, including the rewards for his labor. Insurance companies are now writing insurance on just about everything conceivable, but farmers of our country can not purchase insurance of the type provided in this all-risk crop-insurance program. A

farmer has not only his money and his labor invested in a growing crop, but he also has invested in the crop his only chance of a livelihood for himself and his family. Certainly, if the Government can evolve a self-supporting program, every possible effort should be made to do so.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania indicates that the impairment of the stock is proof of bad management and incompetency and inefficiency on the part of those in charge of the program. This certainly is not true. I do not believe that even the most intelligent and best informed men of America could have in such a short period of time developed a program of this type without having impaired the capital stock. The very nature of the business of all-risk crop insurance indicates the magnitude of the task and the uncertainties of achievement. To attract participation in the program the insurance offered and the premiums charged must be made attractive to farmers. If premium rates are too high, we can not expect the desired amount of participation in the program. If premium rates are too low, the Corporation will, of course, suffer a loss. In determining a fair premium rate a multiplicity of uncertain factors must be considered.

I was chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture that wrote the first crop-insurance bill, and I was likewise chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the bill which was recently enacted, amending the basic law, and I am naturally intensely interested in the program. My interest in the program is not in any way a selfish interest. The fact is that neither the wheat nor the cotton program have yet been made attractive enough to result in anything more than a very nominal participation in the district I represent or in the State where I reside. I do hope, however, that the program will be given a fair chance and that the experiment may yet prove successful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I have taken the floor, but not to talk about the bill. During the recent colloquy which occurred between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], there occurred what undoubtedly is a clear breach of the rules of the House. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], will listen to what I have to say, and then I shall propound a parliamentary inquiry to the chairman of the Committee of the Whole House as to whether or not I am correct. During the colloquy

the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] referred to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] as "brother" on two or three different occasions. It is my understanding of the rules that no Member has a right to refer to another Member on the floor even in the second person, as "you," and that the rules of the House provide a Member shall be addressed by his name followed by the State from which he comes, and he cannot go beyond that. That was one thing that occurred.

Another thing that occurs on this floor daily, I think unknowingly or thoughtlessly, on the part of many of the older Members of the House, and certainly on the part of some of the newer Members of the House, is that they take the floor where I now stand and, after addressing the Chair, if we are in Committee of the Whole, or the Speaker of the House when we are in the House, add "members of the committee," or "ladies and gentlemen of the House." Both of those salutations are clearly breaches of the rules of the House and should not occur. It is my understanding that the rule is, when we are in the House, to address the Speaker and then stop. If we are in Committee of the Whole we address the Chairman and stop. Anything that is added after that simply makes it amateurish or in the nature of a town hall or of an ordinary ward caucus. It should not occur in the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I would like to say to my distinguished friend from Michigan there are exceptions to all rules. Today in this House of Representatives we have two distinguished gentlemen who happen to be brothers. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE]. I want to propound this question to the gentleman: Does he think the gentleman from Missouri would be out of order in addressing his distinguished brother from Oklahoma as "brother" and that that would be a violation of the rules of the House? I would like to propound that inquiry to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. I am going to include that in the form of a parliamentary inquiry to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have enjoyed, and been instructed by the gentleman's lecture, but is it not also true that under the rules of the House the gentleman has a right to call the attention of the Chair to any breach of the rules and get a correction.

Mr. DONDERO. Answering the gentleman from Michigan, may I say that I have never undertaken to be the guardian of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are now giving us a lecture.

Mr. DONDERO. I am not lecturing to anybody. I am propounding a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, it is a long one and you are facing the House. I think if you are going to address the Chair, under the rules you should address the Chair and face the Chair.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would the gentleman include in his parliamentary inquiry—

Mr. HOFFMAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I refuse to yield and the gentleman from Michigan refuses to yield.

Would the gentleman include in his parliamentary inquiry the question as to whether we have to refer to the sex of Members of the House in addressing them? The gentleman has properly mentioned that we should not mention a relationship such as brother, even though it happens to be a blood relationship. I confess that to have to indicate the sex of a Member of the House is sort of a sexy proceeding, and I would prefer, if it were within the rules of the House, to refer to those who happen to be of the female sex as "the Member from Ohio" or "the Member from California."

Mr. DONDERO. I think I understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I make a point of order that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is not speaking in accordance with the rules, because he is not talking about the bill nor any amendment to the bill, and he did not get permission to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, I must, of course, leave to the Chair any decision as to what is parliamentary or otherwise. But I may suggest that when Thomas Jefferson came to write his famous parliamentary manual he prefaced that great work by citing a classic axiom by one of the noted parliamentarians of the British House of Commons of a preceding generation to the effect that a careful and scrupulous adherence to orthodox rules of procedure was requisite to the maintenance of parliamentary etiquette and was especially necessary to the protection of the minority and the efficiency of successful majorities.

This statement based on the observation and experience of a great parliamentary leader and his predecessors reaching back several generations embodied a parliamentary formula enunciated some two or three hundred years ago. But it is still one of the fundamental principles underlying applied procedure in every legislative assembly in the world today.

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

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

Mr. DONDERO. Does not the gentleman from Missouri think that a breach of the rules of the House which in any way detracts from the dignity of this body lessens the confidence and respect of the Nation in its legislative body?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All breaches of parliamentary etiquette or departures from approved legislative procedure are subject to notice by the Chair. In the absence of notice by the Chair it is the privilege and duty of any individual Member of the House to call attention to such infraction of the rules. Of course, in the hurry and congestion of the average legislative day many minor informalities are inadvertently overlooked or ignored without serious results.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, just a few weeks ago we had before the House for consideration the revised Crop Insurance Act. Many of us who have been in favor of crop insurance were dissatisfied with certain provisions in the original act. And, moreover, some of us were not satisfied with the way the act had been administered. The Committee on Agriculture, after lengthy hearings and thorough consideration, brought the revised act to the House for consideration. It was passed by this body, went to the Senate, and was passed by that body. Conferees were appointed, and the conferees worked on the matter for a good while trying to iron out differences in such a way as to eventually make the act actuarially sound. I hope we did a pretty fair job. Time alone will tell.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, I believe, is justified in criticizing the way the act had been administered. As a matter of fact no one seemed to be satisfied with the way the act had been administered. After we passed the revised bill I arranged for a joint meeting of the Committees on Agriculture of the House and the Senate; and we invited Judge Jones, the War Food Administrator, to appear. He did. We gave him our views with reference to the administration of the act and he promised to see that our suggestions were carried out; and I have hopes that if we keep an eye on things and see that the act is administered as we think it should be administered, that by the time we are through the probationary period the act will be upon an actuarially sound basis. It would be a foolish thing for us to kill the act at this time by failure to make the necessary appropriation. It would be tantamount to saying that we did not know what we were doing a few weeks ago when we passed the act. Remember both political parties declared for crop insurance in their platforms last year. In response, not only to these declarations, but to the demands of thousands of farmers, crop insurance was revived. Are we willing at this time, before the act has been put into operation and tested, to give it a death stab in the back by failure to appropriate the funds to put the act into operation? I do not believe the House will do such a foolish thing.

We have, I believe, worked out a pretty fair crop-insurance bill. We did this

knowing that we were embarking upon a new and untried undertaking. Let us give the act a fair and honest test. If, during the probationary period provided for in the act, we fail to place crop insurance upon an actuarially sound basis, I am afraid crop insurance in this country will be dead for a long time. I am anxious to give the venture a fair test. I believe the great majority of the Members feel the same way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] was on the floor, three statements were made that do not dovetail and they are, as a matter of fact, inconsistent with each other in connection with this crop-insurance plan.

The first statement was that it was not the fault of the management, but it was the fault of the weather, that caused the failure and the loss of money. The second statement was that the old-line insurance companies could not undertake to establish crop insurance; they would not dare do it, and if they did do it the premiums they would charge the farmers would be so high that the farmers could not afford to pay them. The third statement was that within the next 3 years, with this further experimenting, we are going to establish this crop-insurance program on a sound actuarial basis.

I just wonder how you are going to place those three statements together and make sense out of them. They just do not make sense, because it is an impossible thing to control the weather, and it is an impossible thing to place this Government insurance of crops on a sound actuarial basis unless you charge rates that will be so high the farmers will be unable to pay them.

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

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to state to the gentleman that the law provides that at the end of the probationary period, the premiums shall be divided pro rata among those suffering loss. It may not be actuarially sound, but it will certainly be self-supporting.

Mr. MASON. If that is true those premiums will be so high that they could also be established by the old-line insurance companies.

Mr. COOLEY. No. I may say that no old-line company in America would dare undertake to write this type of insurance. They do write hail insurance and certain specific kinds of insurance, but no company would undertake to write an all-risk insurance.

Mr. MASON. Why? Because they would have to charge premiums so high that the farmers would be unable to pay them.

Mr. COOLEY. No. In the first place, they would not be able to obtain the data necessary as a basis for this type of program.

Mr. MASON. Yet the gentleman expects to gather that data during the next 3 years so the Government can carry it on.

Mr. COOLEY. No. They have already had 4 or 5 years to collect the data. They are not authorized to embark upon any insurance program until sufficient data has been collected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, as one member of the crop insurance subcommittee I should like to make a few observations. First, there are no old line insurance companies or any new insurance companies of any kind that will go into this over-all crop insurance program. Secondly, may I say that the gentleman, Mr. J. Carl Wright, who is in charge as Director of the crop-insurance program, has had 10 years insurance experience. Two years ago he made recommendations for a number of these changes which we adopted recently. He has actually been in charge as Director only 1 year, and during the time he has been in charge he had to administer the law as it had been enacted by the Congress, cooperating with the members of this special subcommittee. The Director worked with us on the bill and numerous changes were made according to his suggestions.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. May I call the attention of the membership on both sides to the fact that crop insurance was endorsed by both the Democratic and the Republican Parties in their last conventions, and it was written into their platforms. In pursuance of that mandate from the Democratic and the Republican conventions, we wrote this insurance act.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to correct the gentleman, because I do not think he would want to leave in the RECORD that this is an over-all crop insurance plan. I would also like to take the time to correct our good chairman by saying that I do not think my party has ever endorsed the wheat and the cotton crop insurance plan. They did endorse crop insurance, and that is one thing that has caused considerable trouble in this whole insurance program; we are just taking three crops—wheat, cotton, and flax—representing around 10 to 20 percent of the national farm income, and we are telling all the rest of the farmers to get along the best they can. If this insurance is needed why not insure all the farmers not just the wheat and cotton farmers?

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Republican platform contains a declaration in favor of crop insurance, and so does the Democratic platform. It was pursuant to both of those mandates that

we took action back in December to revive crop insurance.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I want to correct the RECORD.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Just because the ranking member of the Republican committee happens to be from a wheat section and just because he wants to play ball with these cotton boys is no reason to mislead or deceive anyone and say that the Republican Party is committed to a wheat-, flax-, and cotton-insurance program when the party went on record for a crop-insurance program. This is just one more example of New Deal legislation for the few at the expense of the many. This legislation will not help the war-food program and it is doubtful if there will be any insurance of even wheat, flax, or cotton this year.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not yield further and I thank the gentleman for his observation. I believe, however, that the Republican Party does stand for something.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Surely they stand for crop insurance and not just wheat, cotton, and flax insurance.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. And I believe that both parties endorse crop insurance, and I think that eventually the farmers of all types will have crop insurance, which I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin will agree with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rivers and harbors: For an additional amount for rivers and harbors, including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1945, to be available until expended, \$405,000.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object to the request of the gentleman from Texas, but I serve notice on the House that the Republicans are trying to have a conference this afternoon and that I am going to object to any further requests to speak out of order because I think we ought to get along with the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side, and we are ready to quit at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank both the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Missouri for this gracious consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I have made this request because of the peculiar American significance of this day. In these stirring times when the sons and daughters

of every American State and territory, true to the type of the fighting stock of their fathers, are writing their fame with their deeds on many foreign fields, we often reflect upon inspiring incidents of our history.

We are all familiar with the Old North Church, with the ride of Paul Revere, with the fact that Thomas Jefferson from the fullness of his own mind wrote the Declaration of Independence, but I wish to bring to your attention, as has for many years been my custom, that the 2d day of March marks the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of what became the Republic of Texas and in later years the Lone Star State of the American Union.

It is natural that the sons of Texas fighting in the various offensives feel that in view of this history they have a double heritage, that two countries are theirs, that two flags are theirs, that two glorious histories are theirs. They may add to the glamour of Lexington and Concord the glory of the Alamo and San Jacinto. They know that the fires of patriotism burned in the breasts of Washington and Anthony Wayne and Israel Putnam and many other heroes of their day and time, but they realize also that freedom had worthy advocates in Houston and Austin and Travis and Bowie and Lamar and scores of others who have made resplendent the pages of our Texas history.

I would like to bring it to your attention that this is peculiarly American history. The President of the provisional Republic of Texas hailed from New Jersey. One of the Presidents came from Virginia. One came from Georgia, and the last President of the Republic of Texas in the 9 years of its existence, and the one in my judgment most responsible for the annexation of Texas to the Union, was Anson Jones, who came from the State of Massachusetts, which is the home State of our beloved majority and minority leaders.

Among the annals of American history nothing is more stirring or tends more to make our blood tingle with pride as it courses through our veins than the immortal document that Travis wrote from the Alamo, where each and every one of that brave little band died in attestation of the sincerity of his words. That letter still exists, and I hope I may have the time to quote it now that you may add it to your store of inspiring American documents. These were his words, and they were addressed to all Americans throughout the world:

Fellow citizens and compatriots, I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Ana. I have sustained a continued bombardment for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion; otherwise the garrison is to be put to the sword if the fort is taken. I have answered the summons with a cannon shot and our flag still waves proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender nor retreat. Then I call upon you in the name of liberty, of patriotism, and everything dear to the American character to come to our aid with all dispatch. The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily, which will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in 4 or 5 days. Though this call may be neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and to die like

a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country. Victory or death.

Travis and every one of his little band perished in the walls of the Alamo.

Today, as the boys of the Lone Star State join with the boys from the North and the South and the East and the West in accomplishing wonderful victories on foreign fields for American arms, I am glad that we have a Nation united in brotherhood, and that we can all be proud of this Texas history, which from its beginning has also been American history.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Texas think it is a very wonderful tribute to the Mexican Nation, and to our own country as well, that now in session at Mexico City is a very eventful meeting, a meeting which bears testimony to the good feeling that has grown up through the years between our country and the great peoples below the Rio Grande?

Mr. LANHAM. It is a matter of great gratification to us all that the good-neighbor policy and the good-neighbor spirit are bringing together and solidifying more and more the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration H. R. 2374, the first deficiency appropriation bill, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TO INCREASE THE DEBT LIMIT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 2404) to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; and that the minority may have the same time within which to file minority views.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks made in Committee of the Whole a brief letter from the Seattle Chamber of Commerce on the subject under discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made today a letter to which I referred at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Jersey Journal of February 27 by one of her constituents.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a speech which she made at the Overseas Press Club annual banquet on March 1, 1945.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Miss Marian Randall, executive director of the Visiting Nurses Service of New York.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a letter from Mr. McDonald, of California.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Post.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all other business today I may be allowed to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] be allowed to extend his remarks by including certain excerpts therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole today and to include certain extracts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

FLORIDA, LAND OF SUNSHINE AND FLOWERS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk to the Members of this House for a few minutes today on the great State of Florida. Since other Members of the Florida delegation will probably have something to say on the history of our State, I will confine myself as far as possible to that history made in the Fifth Congressional District, and incidentally, this district which I represent, has the oldest historical background in the Nation.

On March 3, 1845, President Tyler signed the bill for the admission of Florida into the Union. Florida added the twenty-seventh star to the flag of the United States.

On June 23, 1845, word was received by the first State legislature, on the opening day of its session, of the death of Gen. Andrew Jackson. Out of respect to the memory of the former provisional Governor of Florida the legislature adjourned. It may be interesting to note here that the first Governor of Florida was a President of the United States.

Florida points with pride to its history, the longest and the most varied of any State in the Union. This colorful, romantic land has known the full or partial rule of four nations: Spain, France, Great Britain, and the United States.

Although it is probable that the region now called Florida was at least sighted by unknown explorers before 1513, when Juan Ponce de Leon alighted upon its east coast, this Spanish nobleman was the first to report to his government the

presence of such a land. De Leon's discovery was entirely fortuitous. He had secured permission from the King of Spain to discover an island called Bimini by the West Indians. Upon this legendary island he hoped to find both gold and a fountain of youth. He found the fountain of youth in the health-giving rays of the sun, the mild and hospitable climate, the great variety of tropical fruits and many vegetables, and in the lakes, streams, and beaches. The Spanish later implanted the gold in the golden apples, beautifully depicted in the book of the same name by the Florida author, Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings.

De Leon first came in sight of the Florida coast on March 27, 1513, probably in the region of Cape Canaveral. He did not anchor immediately but sailed up the coast to a point just north of the present site of St. Augustine, where he landed on April 2, 1513. Six days later he claimed the land for Spain, and called it Florida. He chose such a name because he had first seen the coast on Easter Sunday, which day is known to the Spanish as "Feast of the Flowers." The discoverer then sailed around the southern tip of Florida, sighted the Keys and the Tortugas, and proceeded up the west coast as far as the Apalachicola. Still believing Florida to be an island, De Leon returned to Puerto Rico.

Deciding after a few years that he would like to settle the territory, De Leon in 1521 sailed once again for Florida. This time he landed upon the southwest coast, near the present site of Charlotte Harbor. He was not to remain there long. The Caloosa Indians, taking great umbrage at the descent of the white men, shortly attacked the tiny colony. Upon receiving a wound from a poisoned arrow, De Leon retired to his ship, along with all the settlers, and sailed to Cuba, where he died in a few days from his wound. Before and after De Leon's last voyage other Spanish and Portuguese adventurers cruised along the Florida coast.

Probably inspired by the accounts of others, Hernando De Soto obtained permission to try where others had failed. De Soto landed in the region of Tampa Bay in May 1539. He then followed the route pursued by previous explorers and spent the winter near the present site of the State Capital, Tallahassee. Later he marched through the lands now embraced by Georgia, Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. He did not find the gold for which he sought. Probably his greatest achievement was that of reaching the Mississippi River inland, in whose waters he later found his final resting place.

Following De Soto's ill-fated venture the French made a serious attempt at the colonization of the southeastern coast of the United States. In 1562 Admiral de Coligny authorized a group of Huguenots, led by Jean Ribaud, to find refuge in the New World. The group led by Ribaud settled on Port Royal Sound, within the present confines of the State of South Carolina. This site was finally abandoned and Coligny finally commissioned one, Rene de Laudonniere, to head a new expedition which settled on a site near the present St. Johns River,

Here the French erected Fort Caroline, the remains of which stand on that location.

The Spanish, incensed at French activity along the coast they considered strictly Spanish, dispatched their premier warrior, Pedro Menendez, to conquer and settle Florida, to disperse and destroy the colonies of any other European power. Menendez reached the present St. Augustine Harbor on St. Augustine's Day, August 28, 1565. He at once sought out the French settlement at Fort Caroline. On September 4, discovering the French vessels before the fort, he attempted to board them but the French eluded him. Menendez then returned to St. Augustine Harbor where on September 8, 1565, the city of St. Augustine, oldest in the United States, was founded. Menendez finally returned to Fort Caroline, captured the fort and massacred the French garrison and renamed the fort San Mateo.

The fierce Spaniard now turned his talents—not all of which were military—to administering St. Augustine, exploring the interior of Florida, and establishing missions. In 1567 he left for a visit to Spain. During his absence the French exacted a measure of revenge when, in 1568, Dominique de Gourges, probably a Catholic but certainly a Frenchman first, destroyed Fort San Mateo and other defenses Menendez had erected in the vicinity of the St. Johns. After hanging the Spanish survivors of his assaults, De Gourges fled, not daring, with his inferior forces, to attack St. Augustine.

Menendez returned to that city in March 1568 and at once revealed unusual executive ability. It was during this time that he personally conducted a campaign as far north as Chesapeake Bay against a group of fugitive Florida Indians. In 1572 he left Florida for the last time. Spain was never to find an adequate successor, not even in Generalissimo Franco, who, during the height of Hitler's success, laid claim to the State of Florida as a Spanish possession.

For a generation after the departure of Menendez St. Augustine declined. In 1586 Sir Francis Drake succeeded in plundering the town and burning its fort, San Juan de Pinos. The Spanish, despite such a blow, retained control of the area and by 1593 showed evidence of resurgent power. Missionary activity for the next 100 years was to be both pronounced and successful. By 1650 the Spanish, largely through the efforts of the missionaries, had penetrated nearly all of what is today the State of Florida. Through the work of these clerics the Indians were almost uniformly pacified, and a reasonably stable government established throughout Florida. Much of that land's natural wealth today stems from the work of these men. It was they who introduced the fruits of Spain to the Indians, and who taught them to grow cotton and weave cloth from it.

Probably the most important mission area was that of Apalache, the district lying, it appears, between the Suwannee and Apalachicola Rivers. Here the missionaries spread the faith and taught the art of civilized living as early, at least,

as 1633. The Indians proved apt pupils and made the land blossom. When James Moore, former Governor of South Carolina, ruined the Apalache missions and dispersed the Indians, the area was returned to the forest. The destruction of this premier granary of Florida, upon which the capital, St. Augustine, was dependent in great measure for its supplies, dealt the Spanish a blow from which they were never fully to recover. They could no longer seriously attempt to Christianize or control any of the various tribes over which they held nominal suzerainty. They were likewise forced to reduce, for the nonce at least, their pretensions to territory; they were hard put, indeed, to hold the area between the Perdido River on the west, the Atlantic on the east, and the 31st parallel to the north.

At frequent intervals throughout the eighteenth century the Spanish and English clashed bitterly over territory, the former to hold, the latter to have. The more famous raids were those by Moore, Palmer, and Oglethorpe. Before he had laid waste to the fields of the Apalache, James Moore in 1702 ravaged the area around St. Augustine and then advanced upon the city itself. His subordinate, Colonel Daniel, commanded the land forces while he himself led the squadron which was to attack by sea. After succeeding in sacking the city, Daniel attacked its fort, Castillo de San Marcos, while Moore bombarded it from the sea. The combined assault was unavailing. Moore then determined to get heavier guns from Jamaica. Before these arrived two Spanish ships appeared on the horizon and Moore, panic-stricken, abandoned his own ships and supplies and fled overland in great haste to Charleston. In 1728 Colonel John Palmer of the Carolinas led an Indian foray within sight of St. Augustine. After inflicting terrible punishment upon the surrounding villages, Palmer retired, apparently without attempting to storm the fort. The next major effort to take St. Augustine was that of Governor James Oglethorpe of Georgia. Invading the Spanish province in 1739, the Englishman advanced upon St. Augustine early in the following year. By June he had set up two batteries on Anastasia Island and a third on the north beach at North River Point. To Oglethorpe's chagrin the fire emanating from these batteries made little impression upon the fort. After a month's siege the English withdrew.

From 1742 to 1748 the Spanish retaliated by raiding Georgia, which territory they had always claimed as their own. They even aspired to capture the entire colony, but failed miserably.

In 1763, as a result of the Treaty of Paris, Spain surrendered possession of east and west Florida to Great Britain in exchange for the return to Spain of Cuba, which had been captured by the Spanish in 1762. The Union Jack now waved above all Florida from the coast to the Mississippi. For administrative purposes the British split their new provinces formally into East and West Florida, the Apalachicola River serving as the dividing line. After this, trade, especially in West Florida, developed rapidly, and by the end of Britain's brief tenure in 1783, the Floridas were enjoying

a fair degree of prosperity. One of the interesting features of the British regime was the program of colonization. The British encouraged immigration from Europe, and in 1768 a Scotsman by the name of Dr. Andrew Turnbull landed a group of settlers in New Smyrna, Fla. The site was named after the birthplace of Dr. Turnbull's Greek wife, Smyrna. The majority of the later immigrants were Tories, who, after 1775, fled to Florida to escape their neighbors' wrath. The Floridas throughout the Revolution remained loyal to Great Britain and even attempted to conquer Georgia. The latter State returned the honor but was equally unsuccessful.

By the treaty of peace signed in 1783 the Floridas were returned to Spain and for the next 12 years the Spanish-American frontier was to be bitterly troubled by contests between the southern Americans who wished to reject the Spaniards, and Spain. That portion of Florida which was then known as West Florida was finally brought under the domination of the United States by President Madison's purchase of Louisiana from Napoleon and his interpretation that West Florida was a portion of Louisiana which he had purchased, but the Spanish steadfastly refused to accept America's patently erroneous interpretation; this merely whetted the appetite of this country for the Spanish possessions, and led to the organizing of a band of patriots in what was then known as East Florida, under the secret blessing of President Madison, who hoped to annex this part of the State to the United States, but because of bitter remonstrances from Spain and Great Britain Madison finally disavowed the work of the patriots, but the group persisted and in 1816 the insurgents and the Spanish alike, being sick of war, the group of patriots agreed to return to the Spanish fold, but only after the inducement of local government was offered. Later George Mathews, former Governor of Georgia, invaded East Florida with the hope of taking this territory, but was held to a standstill at St. Augustine. Because of the approaching war with the British in 1812 and Madison's realization that he did not want a hostile Spain in America's backyard, he repudiated the invasion. Had Mathews been able to take St. Augustine the President probably would have continued to smile upon him.

During the Anglo-American War of 1812-14 some Spanish sites were seized temporarily by Americans. In November 1814 General Jackson captured Pensacola, which had been used by the British as a base of operations against the Americans with the connivance of Spain and as a shelter for the Creek and Seminole Indians, allies of the British, which tribes had been defeated by Jackson earlier in the year at Horseshoe Bend, in Alabama. Pensacola was returned to the Spaniards almost immediately after its capture.

After the British war, the hero of the West was to have further sanguinary dealings with both Englishmen and Indians. In 1818 Jackson humiliated the Seminoles in the first of the great Seminole wars. It was during this campaign in Florida, still Spanish territory, that

Jackson seized Pensacola. This time Jackson garrisoned the fortress town with American troops, declaring the while that if Spain could not keep her house in order, he could. John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State, warmly sustained him.

Jackson's flagrant disregard of Spanish sovereignty made Madrid painfully cognizant that the Floridas could not be held much longer. Deciding to sell them before they were grabbed by force, the Spanish minister to the United States, Onís, was ordered to affix his signature to the Adams-Onís treaty of February 1819, by which the Floridas were ceded to the United States in exchange for the latter's assumption of its nationals' claims against Spain, amounting to \$5,000,000. The treaty was ratified 2 years later to the month.

The actual transfer of the Floridas to American sovereignty did not occur until July of 1821, as some time was required for Spain to evacuate her troops and work out the details incident to withdrawal. President Monroe, meanwhile, had appointed Andrew Jackson military governor of the territory. Thus Florida became a possession of the United States of America, never to be disputed again. After Jackson retired, leaving the affairs of the State in the hands of his two secretaries for the period of almost a year, the President in June 1822 appointed William P. Duval the first civil governor of the Territory of Florida.

The first legislative council, comprising 13 men, met in Pensacola in the summer of 1822; the next year it convened at St. Augustine. The legislators grew tired of having to assemble in various parts of the Territory and authorized Governor Duval to appoint two commissioners to select a site for a permanent capital. The commissioners reported in favor of the Tallahassee Indian fields, whereupon Duval, in March 1824, proclaimed that the future capital of Florida would be located upon this site. The Territory, manifestly stabilized, now received a large influx of immigrants from other States. From an estimated number of 6,000 in 1821 the population grew to 30,735 in 1830.

The progress of the Territory received a severe set-back upon the outbreak of the second Seminole War, which lasted from 1835 to 1842. The Seminoles, whose name means "separatist" or "runaway", were a hybrid race, consisting of Creek and other Indian elements, as well as a large number of Negroes who had escaped the domination of both white and red masters. After 1700 this motley group pushed over into Florida, but it was not until Revolutionary times that they received the appellation of "Seminole."

When the Americans started settling Florida they found the Seminoles occupying choice lands and harboring runaway slaves. Agitation for their removal soon developed, culminating in certain treaties and agreements under which the Seminoles were to be moved to South Florida. The Indians were dissatisfied with the agreements and refused to move, after which the Americans tried to get the Indians to move out of Florida, but they refused to do this. More treaties were made and repudiated. The

government tried to enforce the treaties and war resulted in 1833. This war was to be the most savage and costly of all the Indian wars in which America has ever engaged.

The most prominent chief of the Seminoles at the time was Osceola, who was captured in the Fifth Congressional District under a flag of truce and imprisoned in Fort Castillo de San Marco at St. Augustine. Refusing to try to escape or to negotiate for his release because of what he protested as the dishonest manner in which he was captured, Osceola finally died. The war, however, was carried on and Col. Zachary Taylor in December 1837 defeated the Seminoles at Lake Okeechobee. However, the Seminoles refused to give up and it was not until 1842 when Gen. W. J. Worth offered them a reservation in South Florida, including territory in the Everglades, that the Seminoles came to terms. It may be added here that the Seminoles have never been completely subjugated and have never signed a peace treaty with the United States. They remain on their reservation living a peaceful and Bohemian life today.

Meanwhile, Florida had advanced toward statehood. In 1839 the people ratified a State constitution. Petitions were then presented requesting Congress to admit Florida into the Union. Admission, however, was opposed in northwestern Florida and in the region west of the Apalachicola. Spokesmen for the northeast advocated the division of Florida into two parts, each to be admitted at a subsequent date, with the Suwannee River as the dividing line. The Apalachicola opponents of statehood hoped to have their region annexed to Alabama. Many persons throughout the Territory, however, supported statehood, asserting that such a move would improve economic conditions, which had sunk precipitately after the crash in the late 1830's of the Territorial banks. The collapse had been the result of unrestrained speculation following a boom occasioned by the greatly increased immigration.

The most influential advocate of statehood was David Levy (who later had his name changed to David Levy Yulee), Territorial delegate to Congress. Levy pointed out that upon admission the State would receive from the Union the means to effect great internal improvements. Even more important in the successful fight for statehood than Levy's eloquence was the realization, shared by Congress and the Territory alike, that Florida's admission would balance that of Iowa, which was clamoring for admission as a free State.

On March 3, 1845, President Tyler approved the bill making Florida a State. Two months later the Florida Legislative Council called for a State election. As a result William D. Moseley became Florida's first State Governor. Florida was now on the comeback trail. Cotton goods, shoes, cigars, lumber, and naval stores were turned out in considerable quantities. In the years immediately preceding the War Between the States Florida's prosperity was more evenly distributed than at any other time before or since.

Like the other Southern States, Florida's newly won prosperity was to be destroyed by the fratricidal strife of 1861-65. Florida was one of the first to answer the challenge of Lincoln's election. In January 1861 a secession convention overwhelmingly approved an ordinance providing for the withdrawal of Florida from the Union.

Florida's role in the war was both vital and unique. The State produced enough food in 1 year to sustain a quarter million of soldiers for 6 months. In 1865 Florida contributed 2,000 head of cattle every week to the boys in gray. The State's actual fighting contribution was just as impressive. More Floridians, in proportion to population, served under the Stars and Bars than did men of any other State. It should be remembered, too, that Tallahassee was the only rebel capital east of the Mississippi which successfully defied capture throughout the war. Some of Florida's greatest heroes were Maj. Gen. Edmund Kirby Smith, the last Confederate Army commander to surrender; Maj. Gen. J. Patton Anderson; Gen. Joseph Finegan; Gen. William Miller; Gen. Sam Jones; and Capt. J. J. Dickson.

For the next 12 years glory was about all that Florida, again like the other Southern States, lived on. During the period 1869-71, especially, certain counties were subject to a reign of terror. A considerable measure of prosperity was ushered in with the governorship of William D. Bloxham, who served from 1881 to 1885. His administration covered such events as the sale of 4,000,000 acres of internal improvement lands, the beginning of a great era of railroad construction; the remarkable enterprises of H. B. Plant and Henry M. Flagler, who were initially responsible for the tremendous development which south Florida was to enjoy; the betterment of educational conditions; general municipal growth; and the unparalleled expansion of the citrus industry. Bloxham has been the only man ever to serve two terms as Governor. His second administration was from 1897-1901.

The opening years of the twentieth century were a happy augury for the future. Florida's progress could readily be seen in statistics. State tax assessments jumped from \$85,158,523.63 in 1896 to \$154,553,078 in 1907. Public-school costs rose during the same period from \$660,249.62 to \$1,351,652.74. It was truly a time of progress for education. The creation of a State university and a women's college was provided for in 1905 by the passage of the Buckman bill.

During the last quarter century the pace of progress has been phenomenal. Since 1910 the population has increased by over 100 percent. Citrus production has more than quadrupled its 1910 figure. Public-school expenditures have multiplied. The State has become one of the world's most renowned meccas for seekers of health and pleasure. Yet, Florida has only begun to realize upon her vast potentialities.

During the long and glorious history of the sun garden of America, the 12 counties now comprising the Fifth Congressional District of Florida have played an important part. The first to be cre-

ated was that of St. Johns. The history of this county is the most significant of any in the State. For more than three-fourths of a century after the founding by Menendez of a colony at St. Augustine in 1565, this city, the oldest in the United States, was the most important bastion held by Europeans north of Mexico. No other county can boast of connections with so many illustrious men during the colonial period of American history. Here, too, in St. Augustine, is the justly celebrated Fort Castillo de San Marcos, for a while called Fort Marion, which no besieging army has ever been able to capture. Aside from its shrines, St. Johns is interesting today for its agricultural produce. Hastings has developed into the largest producer—1938 figures—of Irish potatoes for the spring market in the United States.

Marion, in 1844, was the next county to be created. This county embraces a large part of the area within which the treaty of Moultrie Creek placed the reservation for Seminole Indians. It was at Fort King that Osceola is said to have thrust his knife into a table and snarled that that was the only treaty he would ever make with white men. Marion was one county the progress of which the War Between the States did not greatly affect, largely because the citrus industry supplied the wants of an ever-increasing number of people in many different areas.

The establishment of the remaining counties in the fifth district was spread over a period of some 70 years: Orange, 1845; Putnam, 1849; Sumter, 1853; Volusia, 1854; Brevard, 1855; Citrus, 1887; Lake, 1887; Osceola, 1887; Seminole, 1913, and Flagler, 1917.

The fifth district is the locale of many stories written by the popular authoress, Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings, and read by millions of people. Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings is a native of the District of Columbia, who has adopted Florida as her home State and knows the native of Florida, his weaknesses and virtues more intimately, I would say, than anyone in the State. She has lived with them until she is a part of them. She knows the beauties and the values of this tropical garden. She has written many stories of the State, a few years ago writing the Pulitzer prize winner, the Yearling, and most recently a best-seller, Cross Creek. She gives a vivid picture of the greatest and most delicious citrus fruit, the Florida orange, in her story, Golden Apples. I wish at this time to let Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings speak for Florida in an affectionate tribute to the State and I quote:

FLORIDA

AN AFFECTIONATE TRIBUTE FROM MARJORIE KINNAN RAWLINGS

My good friend, the Honorable JOE HENDRICKS, has, with a politician's naive and simple approach to art, asked me, quotes, "to describe the beauties of Florida, the lakes, streams, trees, flowers, birds, etc., in just a brief story." I myself have already written six full-length books in such an attempt, and the total volumes of this inexhaustible subject, in the more than four centuries of Florida's chaotic history, must be of almost equal bulk to that of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yet it can be said, and briefly, too, that Florida is unique among States in that her history is founded on that very beauty. Other States grew for reasons of agriculture, of forests and of gold; were sought out in search of political or religious freedom. But from the moment of Ponce de Leon's dream of the Fountain of Youth, to the same dream today in the heart of the graybeard who totters or is wheeled to the sun of St. Petersburg or Miami, men have sought Florida out of the purest and most aesthetic human impulse, the love of beauty. Like her sister, California, and that sister's, shall we say politely, fatherless child, Hollywood, Florida's stock in trade is glamour. And her glamour does not depend on the ephemeral flickering of the silver screen, but on the timeless, again to quote the Honorable Mr. HENDRICKS, "lakes, streams, trees, flowers, birds, etc."

Much of Florida is unchanged down the ages, and the ancient Spaniards came on the same wonders as delight us today. Pine forests, half shadow and half sunlight, like cathedral aisles, stretch for miles. The pines break, and there is hammock land, black of soil, lush with magnolia, sweet gum, bay, holly and live oak. The live oaks are pendulous with gray Spanish moss, stirring in the wind like the beards of long forgotten gods. The hammock breaks, and the orange groves lift their bright balls of light to the good sun. The golden apples of the Hesperides, the golden apple of Atalanta, were the orange. Limes and lemons, mangoes and papayas—all the rich fruits of the Tropics and the subtropics, offer their succulence. Everywhere are the palms, shaggy-topped and noble. And scattered throughout, like necklaces of diamond, of aquamarine and amber, are the lovely lakes, and cypress-bordered magic rivers run shining to the sea. Some of these rivers have their source in fabulous underground springs. Silver Springs, near Ocala, are the proved inspiration for Coleridge's famous poem Kubla Khan, in which "Alph, the sacred river, ran, through caverns measureless to man, down to a sunless sea." Lakes and rivers and offshore waters teem with fish of every variety.

Redbirds and mockingbirds, rustling jorees and sweet-calling wood ducks, snowy egrets and tall blue cranes, limpkins, and baldheaded eagles, the true American eagle, move and cry and sing through the dense green growth. White-tailed deer crop the myrtle buds, are startled and are gone; black bear lumber through the swamps, wildcats and panthers stalk their prey, and countless small woods creatures—raccoons, possums, foxes, scamper by night or day about their business.

And now, in spring, the yellow jessamine fills the air with spicy sweetness, and the orange groves are in bloom, their perfume almost unbearable through the long nights of moonlight. To the south, the bougainvillea and the hibiscus are flamboyant, and such an array of garden flowers and of garden vegetables is ready for man's delight as to make one wonder why the capital of the United States was not placed in the Floridian Eden instead of in Washington, D. C. And the climate! Take the lies of California, and in Florida, they are truth.

If human wantonness and human greed have here and there destroyed Arcadia, with the careless cutting and burning of forests, the useless and destructive draining of lands that were refuges for all the wild things; with the erection of billboards and transient camps; if avid purveyors to Florida's great cash crop, the tourist, have a little soiled the beauty and overcharged the seeker of loveliness, lay the blame fairly where it belongs, as all such things as greed and war and man's general inhumanity to man, must be laid, on the frailty of human nature, and not on Florida, great and gracious tropical queen. She waits, as she has done through the centuries, to be all things to all men.

Madam Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

FLORIDA

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, there has been arranged in the Library of Congress a display of historical documents relating to the history of Florida. It will be on display for several weeks. It is a very good exhibit and I invite all of my colleagues to see it.

Prior to 1845, the history of Florida had been full of action and had seen the flags change from time to time. I am indebted to the Honorable T. J. Brooks, Assistant Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Florida, for the following historical data in the publication *Know Your State*, published by the State Department of Agriculture:

HISTORY

Florida has a background of more than four centuries of colorful history since the coming of the white man. Indian races, extending into the dim shadows of the forgotten past, roamed its hills and shores. Explorers and settlers from Spain, France, and England have left their imprint. Some of the most interesting incidents in the history of the American Nation have to do with the old and the new land of Florida. Over its soil a prehistoric people roamed (the mound builders), then the Indian. The first flag waved was the royal banner of Spain; next the lily-spangled flag of the Kingdom of France; then the British Union Jack, the Stars and Stripes, the Stars and Bars of the Southern Confederacy, and again Stars and Stripes of our own United States.

Florida has had a very interesting and varied history. It has the oldest permanent white settlement in America, St. Augustine, but for various reasons it has developed more slowly than the other States.

On March 27, 1513, Ponce de Leon of Spain discovered land near what is now St. Augustine and landed on the 2nd of April, taking possession of the country in the name of the King of Spain. Of course the inhabitants that he found here were Indians. Much of the 35,000,000 acres of what is now Florida was a vast and lonely wilderness, but parts of it were settled by tribes of these primitive people, of whose history little is known.

Ponce de Leon landed on Easter Sunday, called in Spanish Pascua Florida, or the Feast of Flowers, and he gave the name of the day to the new country. From this has come the present name of the State. He spent some time in a fruitless search for gold and returned to his native country, but 4 years later he came back to Florida and looked for gold and precious metals again. In the meantime another Spaniard had brought an expedition to Florida and had begun trading with the natives.

In 1517, 1527, and 1539 other Spanish expeditions came to the country, the last one being the ill-fated caravan of Hernando de Soto. Each of these in turn met with failure and disappointment. All of them were searching for gold and fabulous riches which they believed to be hidden in the interior of the new country.

Traces of occupation by all of these people come vividly before us as we tour the State. The ruins and monuments of the early colonists; Indian settlements; battlefields; these mingle with modern structures and engineering feats. The past and the present combine to interest all observers.

In 1562 Jean Ribault, a Frenchman, visited this land and made a glowing report of what he saw. In 1564 French Huguenots under the leadership of Rene de Laudonniere established a colony named Fort Caroline near the mouth of the St. Johns River.

A Spanish settlement under Pedro Menéndez de Avilés was established at St. Augustine

in 1565. This settlement has had an unbroken history to the present day. Menéndez's first task was the destruction of the French Fort Caroline, with the slaughter of its defenders. A French fleet under Ribault was wrecked on the coast and its survivors were captured and slaughtered by Menéndez's soldiers. This ended the first period of French contact with Florida, although an avenging expedition in 1568 destroyed the Spanish garrison which Menéndez had established on the site of Fort Caroline.

The stone ruins of missions are to be found in many places today—missions established among the Indians by Spanish priests. The Spanish also established a settlement at Pensacola. Many of these early buildings and forts still stand at Pensacola, St. Augustine, and other places.

In 1696 Pensacola was settled by the Spaniards and later all of Florida passed into the hands of the British. Both French and Spanish, however, retained claims to parts of the large territory then known as Florida, and it changed hands several times before it finally became a possession of the United States through purchase from Spain in 1821. Andrew Jackson became the first Territorial Governor of Florida, and in 1824 Tallahassee was selected as the seat of government.

In 1763 Florida was ceded to England and remained loyal to that country during the Revolutionary War. Up to 1784, when Florida was ceded back to Spain, the English established many fine plantations in Florida, and more than 15,000 English families left Florida when their flag ceased to fly over its territory.

Spain sold Florida to the United States in 1821 for \$5,000,000. Florida was 1 of the 11 seceding States in 1861, and her citizens played a prominent part in the war.

In 1835 a war between the Seminoles and the United States began, resulting in much bloodshed and continuing at intervals until 1842. Few Indians remained in the State at that time, and these retreated into the Everglades, where they still live peaceably.

In 1842 the first capitol building at Tallahassee was completed, having been begun in 1826. It has since been remodeled and additions have been made.

In 1845 Florida was admitted to the Union as a State, and in 1876 its active development began. It has had a highly interesting and varied history.

HISTORICAL DATA CONCERNING FLORIDA

Period of exploration

1497: Sebastian and John Cabot, under Henry VII, of England, sail and probably mapped the entire Atlantic coast from Labrador to Mexico. First voyage of Americus Vesputius along the same route.

1502: Ponce de Leon sails with Ovando for Hispaniola (Hayti). Date of the Alberto Cantino map—first map of Florida.

1513: Ponce de Leon embarks for Bimini March 3 in search of the Fountain of Youth; discovers land March 27, on Easter Sunday (Pascua Florida), christens it Florida, the Land of Flowers; landing a little north of St. Augustine April 2. Shortly returns to Puerto Rico after discovery and charting of islands and parts of the coast.

1521: Ponce de Leon's second voyage to Florida; wounded by an Indian arrow, is carried to Cuba; dies there, and buried in his castle in Puerto Rico.

1528: Narváez's expedition embarks for Florida, landing near Tampa.

1539: De Soto lands at Tampa and marches to Anhaquea (present Tallahassee), where he spends the winter.

1540: De Soto travels on north to the headwaters of the Savannah River and thence west.

Period of colonization

1556: Elaborate expedition planned in Spain to colonize and Christianize Florida, Don Tristan de Luna chosen to command.

1559: De Luna's departure from Mexico to Florida and landing near what is now Pensacola. Hurricane destroys his fleet.

1562: Ribault's first voyage to colonize Florida. Discovers the River May (St. Johns), establishing colony of 30 men near Port Royal, and returns to France.

1564: June 22, René Laudonniere arrives on the Florida coast at the River May (St. Johns), builds Fort Caroline, and explores the country generally.

1565: September 6, St. Augustine established with great pomp and ceremony and temporary fortifications built. September 18 and 19, Menéndez marches with 500 men to Fort Caroline, capturing it September 20, with great slaughter.

1566: Menéndez returns to Spain and receives royal welcome. Small colony, including 14 women, sent from Spain to St. Augustine.

1568: De Dourges arrives at the St. Marys River and proceeds south to the St. Johns and destroys Fort San Mateo and garrison, avenging his countrymen; returns to France.

1569: Menéndez returns from Spain, rebuilds San Mateo, destroys St. Elena, then returns to Spain.

1578: St. Augustine and Florida's importance stressed at the Court of Spain and appropriations made for same.

1584: Marked influx of missionaries to Florida from Spain.

1586: Drake destroys St. Augustine and loots its treasury.

1587: St. Augustine rebuilt and much improved, with funds from Spain.

1612: Eleven convents reported flourishing and active in Florida.

1615: Probable date of building mission near St. Marys. Walls still standing.

1645: Probable date of building fort at Matanzas.

1649: Great activity in mission work and success reported in Christianizing Indians.

1665: Centenary of the establishment of St. Augustine by Menendez. The English freebooter Davis destroys the city.

1686: British succeed in conquering all Spanish territory to the north of St. Augustine and driving Spaniards out.

1696: D'Ariola founds Pensacola.

1718: First account of any settlement at St. Joseph's Bay, first by the French and later by the Spaniards.

1719: Flags changed four times this year at Pensacola, from Spain to France and vice versa.

1722: Pensacola and West Florida returned to Spain by France.

1739: England declares war on Spain. Oglethorpe instructed to harass Spanish possessions in Florida.

1740: Oglethorpe proceeds to Picolata, Fla., and besieges St. Augustine.

1742: Spanish expedition from Havana and Florida attack Oglethorpe in Georgia. Defeated at the battle of Bloody Marsh Island near St. Simons.

1743: Oglethorpe's second expedition to Florida.

1755: Fernando de Herreda appointed Governor of Florida; great building activity.

1756: Castle of San Marco in St. Augustine completed in this year after 118 years' work on same.

1763: Havana restored to Spain in exchange for Florida.

1764: Great English immigration to Florida, mills and plantations started, great industry and activity.

Changing flags

1776: Year of Independence. Florida remains loyal to England.

1779: Invasion of West Florida threatened by Spaniards in Louisiana.

1780: Don Galvez and Admiral Solana concentrate their forces to attack Pensacola.

1781: Forts at Pensacola, under Col. Campbell (British), surrender to Spanish attack.

1783: Florida exchanged for the Bahama Islands.

1795: Treaty between the United States and Spain as to Florida's western boundary.

1800: Spain, by secret treaty, cedes Louisiana to France. Part of Florida seems to be included.

1803: The purchase from France of Louisiana for \$15,000,000 giving the United States control of the Mississippi Valley. Boundaries between this territory and Florida again questioned.

1808: Fernandina declared a free port; became a rendezvous for much questionable trade.

1809: Napoleon, having conquered Spain in Europe, claims all her colonies, Florida included. This was stoutly resisted by the United States and later in 1823 became elaborated in the Monroe Doctrine.

1810: Republic of West Florida organized September 10, at Pensacola, to control disputed territory. Dissolved after an existence of 53 days by orders from Washington, without trouble.

1812: June 18, war declared on England by the United States. Organization of Republic of Florida.

1814: Fierce engagement off Cape Canaveral, Fla., between British and American war vessels. British troops occupy Pensacola, speedily driven out by Andrew Jackson.

1818: Jackson's second invasion of Florida.

1819: Treaty drawn up in Washington for Florida's transfer to United States.

1821: Transfer of west Florida accepted by Andrew Jackson.

Territorial period

1821: July 21, St. Johns and Escambia created counties, and municipal government established in St. Augustine and Pensacola.

1823: Second legislative council held in May, in St. Augustine, and decision made that a central point of meeting be chosen for future legislation. First treaty made, September 18, with Florida Indians at Moultrie Creek, signed by 32 leading chiefs.

1824: Dr. Simmons and John Lee Williams select Neomathla's village near Tallahassee for future State capital.

1825: Appropriation of \$23,000 by the legislative council to build road from Pensacola to St. Augustine. Congress voted \$200,000 to Lafayette and 23,000 acres just east of Tallahassee, Fla. Later settled by immigrants from France.

1826: Congress grants to Florida the elective franchise for their representatives in Congress and State legislature.

1828: Judicial district formed for the whole of south Florida. Court to sit at Key West. First bank organized in Florida at Tallahassee.

1829: Privilege extended to elect all officers for Florida except the governor, he being appointed by the President. Commencement of era of wildcat banking and boom towns in Florida.

1831: Bank of St. Augustine chartered.

1832: Jacksonville's first charter incorporation.

1835: Beginning of Indian war. Dade massacre, December 25. Osceola becomes a prominent leader in Indian affairs.

1837: Osceola's capture and imprisonment.

1839: Constitutional convention held at St. Joseph adjourned, having given Florida its first constitution.

1841: Closing scenes of the Indian war. Coacoochee captured and deported.

1842: Armed Occupation Act.

1844: Preparation to enter statehood.

As a State

1845: March 31, Florida and Iowa become States by the same act. Dr. John Gorrie, of Apalachicola, discovers process for making ice.

Reestablished in the Union

1868: Civil government reestablished July 4.

1877: Federal supervision of Florida affairs ends and reconstruction times closed under President Hayes.

1879: First telephone installed in Jacksonville.

1881: Sale of 4,000,000 acres of State-owned lands to Hamilton Disston and associates.

1882: Establishment of Institute for Deaf Mutes in St. Augustine, and Academy established in DeLand by H. A. DeLand.

1889: Discovery of phosphate.

1891: Subtropical exhibition opened in Jacksonville, doing much to advertise Florida's products.

1892: Flagler railroad construction reaches Titusville and work proceeds down the east coast.

1895: Severe frost, in February, destroys practically the entire citrus production of Florida for some years to come.

1896: Railroad reaches Miami June 26.

1897: Activity in railroad building on the west coast of Florida.

1898: Spanish-American War gives Florida great impetus.

1899: Fire destroys Miami.

1901: May 3, 466 acres in Jacksonville laid waste by disastrous fire, with some loss of life and untold value in records, etc.

On March 3, 1845, President Tyler signed the act which admitted Florida to the Union. The preamble and certain sections pertinent to our State are as follows:

Statute II, March 3, 1845, chapter XLVIII, an act for the admission of the States of Iowa and Florida into the Union, (a):

Whereas the people of the Territory of Iowa did, on the seventh day of October, eighteen hundred and forty-four, by a convention of delegates called and assembled for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution and State government: and whereas, the people of the Territory of Florida did, in like manner, by their delegates, on the eleventh day of January, eighteen hundred and thirty-nine, form for themselves a constitution and State government, both of which said constitutions are republican; and said conventions having asked the admission of their respective Territories into the Union as States, on equal footing with the original States:

Be it enacted, etc., That the States of Iowa and Florida be, and the same are hereby, declared to be States of the United States of America, and are hereby admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatsoever.

Sec. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That said State of Florida shall embrace the territories of east and west Florida, which by the treaty of amity, settlement and limits between the United States and Spain, on the twenty-second day of February, eighteen hundred and nineteen, were ceded to the United States.

Sec. 6. *And be it further enacted*, That until the next census and apportionment shall be made, each of said States of Iowa and Florida shall be entitled to one representative in the House of Representatives of the United States.

Certain excerpts from the Congressional Globe showing the proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Congress, second session, will be of interest and I include same herein:

[28th Cong., 2d sess., Jan. 7, 1845]

Mr. A. V. Brown, from the Committee on the Territories, reported the following bill:

H. R. 497

A bill for the admission of the States of Iowa and Florida into the Union

Whereas the people of the Territory of Iowa did, on the 7th day of October, 1844, by a convention of delegates called and assembled for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution and State government; and whereas the people of the Territory of Florida did, in like manner, by their delegates, on the 11th day of January 1839, form for themselves a constitution and State government, both of which said constitutions are republic-

lican; and said conventions having asked the admission of their respective Territories into the Union as States, on equal footing with the original States:

Be it enacted, etc., That the States of Iowa and Florida be, and the same are hereby, declared to be States of the United States of America, and are hereby admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatsoever.

Sec. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That the following shall be the boundaries of the said State of Iowa, to wit: Beginning in the middle of the main channel of the Mississippi River, opposite the mouth of the Des Moines River; thence up the said River Des Moines, in the middle of the main channel thereof, to a point where the northern boundary of the State of Missouri (as the same may be finally established) strikes said river; thence west with the said northern boundary (as the same may be finally established) to the middle of the main channel of the Missouri River; thence up in the middle of the main channel of the river last mentioned to the mouth of the Sioux, or Calumet River; thence in a direct line to the middle of the main channel of the St. Peters River, where the Watonwan River (according to Nicollet's map) enters the same; thence down the middle of the main channel of said river, to the middle of the main channel of the Mississippi River; thence down the middle of the main channel of said river to the place of beginning.

Sec. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That said State of Florida shall embrace the territories of East and West Florida, which, by the treaty of amity, settlement, and limits, between the United States and Spain, on the 22d day of February 1819, were ceded to the United States: *Provided*, That whenever the Federal population residing east of the Suwannee River shall amount to 35,000, all of said country lying east of said river may be erected into a separate State, to be called East Florida. But no act of the Legislature of Florida, providing for such division, shall be passed, except with the assent of the majority of the senate and house of representatives, east as well as west of said Suwannee River; nor shall such new State be admitted into the Union until it shall have form a constitution republican in its character.

Sec. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That until the next census and apportionment shall be made, each of said States of Iowa and Florida shall be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives of the United States.

Sec. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That said States of Iowa and Florida are admitted into the Union on the express condition that they shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the public lands lying within them, nor levy any tax on the same whilst remaining the property of the United States.

[House of Representatives, Tuesday, February 11, 1845]

RESOLUTIONS OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. Levy presented resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Florida, instructing their Delegate to urge upon this House the admission of Florida and Iowa into the Union of States.

ADMISSION OF IOWA AND FLORIDA

The question being taken, after some conversation, the motion of Mr. Levy was agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. J. W. Davis in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill providing for the admission of Iowa and Florida as States into the Union, with the pending amendment thereto of Mr. Duncan and Mr. Relfe.

There was a filibuster at one time. On a motion to adjourn, the vote was yeas 69, nays 84. At another time the vote was yeas 72, nays 80. On motion for the committee to

arise the vote was 76 in the affirmative and 76 in the negative, and the Chair voted in the affirmative.

[House of Representatives, Thursday,
February 13, 1845]

ADMISSION OF FLORIDA AND IOWA

On the motion of Mr. Pettit, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. J. W. Davis in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill for the admission of Florida and Iowa into the Union.

Mr. Cobb moved the previous question on its passage.

Mr. Sample appealed to Mr. Cobb to withdraw the demand for the previous question in order to enable him to move to commit the bill with certain instructions, which were read by the Clerk, as follows:

"To report separate bills for the admission of Florida and Iowa into the Union as States, with the same boundaries for each as are contained in the present bill as amended in Committee of the Whole; and in the bill for the admission of Florida no provision shall be inserted for the formation hereafter of two States out of her Territory."

Mr. Cobb declining to withdraw,

The demand for the previous question was seconded, and the main question was ordered.

Mr. Dickey asked the yeas and nays; which were ordered.

The question was taken, and decided in the affirmative—yeas 145, nays 46, as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Anderson, Arrington, Ashe, Atkinson, Barringer, Bayly, Belser, Bidlack, Edward J. Black, James Black, James A. Black, Blackwell, Bower, Bowlin, Boyd, Brinkerhoff, Brodhead, A. V. Brown, Milton Brown, W. J. Brown, Burke, Burt, Caldwell, Campbell, Shepherd Cary, Causin, Reuben Chapman, Chappell, Chilton, Clinch, Clingman, Clinton, Cobb, Coles, Cross, Cullom, Daniel, Garrett, Davis, John W. Davis, Dawson, Dean, Dellet, Dillingham, Douglass, Dromgoole, Duncan, Ellis, Farlee, Ficklin, Foster, French, Fuller, Goggin, Willis Green, Grider, Hale, Hammett, Haralson, Hardin, Hays, Henley, Holmes, Hoge, Hopkins, Houston, Hubard, Hubbell, James B. Hunt, Charles J. Ingersoll, Jameson, Cave Johnson, Andrew Johnson, George W. Jones, Andrew Kennedy, John P. Kennedy, Kirkpatrick, Labranche, Leonard, Lucas, Lumpkin, Lyon, McCauslen, Maclay, McClelland, McClermand, McConnell, McDowell, McKay, Mathews, Edward J. Morris, Joseph Morris, Isaac E. Morse, Murphy, Newton, Norris, Owen, Parmenter, Payne, Peyton, Phoenix, Pollock, Emery D. Potter, Pratt, Purdy, David S. Reid, Reding, Relfe, Rhett, Ritter, Roberts, Rodney, Russell, St. John, Saunders, Senter, Thomas H. Seymour, Simons, Simpson, Sildell, John T. Smith, Thomas Smith, Robert Smith, Steenrod, Stephens, Stiles, James W. Stone, Alfred P. Stone, Strong, Summers, Sykes, Taylor, Thomasson, Thompson, Tibbatts, Tucker, Weller, Wentworth, Wethered, John White, Benjamin White, Woodward, Joseph A. Wright, Yancey, and Yost—145.

Nays: Messrs. Abbot, Adams, Baker, Barnard, Brengle, Buffington, Carroll, Cranston, Richard D. Davis, Deberry, Dickey, Fish, Florence, Foot, Giddings, Byram Green, Grinnell, Edward S. Hamlin, Harper, Hudson, Washington Hunt, Irvin, Jenks, Perley B. Johnson, Preston King, Daniel P. King, McIlvaine Marsh, Freeman H. Morse, Moseley, Paterson, Elisha R. Potter, Robinson, Rockwell, Rogers, Sample, Schenck, Severance, David L. Seymour, Albert Smith, Caleb B. Smith, Tilden, Tyler, Vance, Vinton, and Winthrop—46.

Mr. Slidell moved the reconsideration of the vote on the passage of the bill; and on this demanded the previous question; which was seconded, and the main question was ordered, and being taken was rejected. So the bill was finally passed.

[In Senate, Friday, February 14, 1845]

IOWA AND FLORIDA

A message was received from the House, accompanied by the act for the admission of the States of Iowa and Florida into the Union; which were read twice, with the view of commitment.

[In Senate, Monday, February 24, 1845]

FLORIDA AND IOWA

Mr. Berrien, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back without amendment and favorably to its passage, the bill from the House for the admission of the States of Iowa and Florida into the Union.

[House of Representatives, Friday, February 14, 1845, p. 275, Congressional Globe, 28th Cong., 2d sess.]

Mr. Levy rose only for the explanation of certain facts connected with this particular subject, and not for the purpose of replying to the gentleman who preceded him. He should avail himself of some other opportunity of replying to the objections of the gentleman from New York, when some other gentleman should make a specific proposition. In reference to the objections that had been made to the provision that Florida, when possessed of the requisite population, might be divided into two States, he should, without touching on the question of the balance of power between the North and the South, refer the committee to the facts necessary to be considered in the settlement of this question. By the treaty by which Florida was ceded to the United States, it was provided, not that one territory and one people should be admitted into the Union, but two territories and two peoples. For the economy and convenience of the Government of the United States, Florida was organized into one territorial government; but it previously existed as two separate provinces of Spain, and under two separate governments. It was delivered to the United States as two separate governments; and was in fact, held for a year as such, until, by the organization of the present territorial government, it was consolidated into one. As far back as 1764, the Floridas were erected into two separate governments, East and West Florida, by a British edict and when they came into the possession of Spain, they were held as two governments till ceded to the United States. And there was good reason why there should be two governments, instead of one. Its geographical position and shape was such that one government would be exceedingly inconvenient. (Mr. L. here held up a map of the United States, showing the long peninsula of Florida, running out between the Gulf and the Atlantic, and having a considerable western territory, which might properly be said to belong to the valley of the Mississippi, so that, instead of adding to the power of the Atlantic States, it would give one State to the western, and the other to the Atlantic section.) He then contended that this government was bound in good faith to carry out the stipulations of the treaty by which the Floridas were ceded to the United States, by admitting them as two entire States, and argued that it would be a flagrant breach of trust, as well as a cruel piece of injustice to those people, to violate the treaty in the manner proposed by the gentleman from New York.

[In Senate, Saturday, March 1, 1845]

ADMISSION OF FLORIDA AND IOWA

On motion of Mr. Allen, the Senate took up the bill to provide for the admission of the Territories of Florida and Iowa into the Union as States.

The bill was considered by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Evans said that as the bill now stood, he could not vote for it. He was under instructions from his constituents on the sub-

ject, and he hoped the bill would be so shaped as to meet the views of the people he represented. The constitution of Florida, moreover, was formed in 1838, and he did not know that the present people of Florida were in favor of it.

Mr. Berrien said that it received the sanction of a majority of the last legislature of Florida.

Mr. Evans said that might be very true, but the constitution should receive the sanction of the people of Florida. That constitution gave the legislature the power of passing laws which his constituents felt to be a grievance. He referred to the laws enacted in some of the Southern States for the arrest and imprisonment of free people of color. The operation of these laws was harassing to the people of the North. He had known voyages to be broken up by the desertion of colored seamen, who would not submit to the danger of imprisonment when they found out that the vessel in which they shipped was destined for a southern port. The public sentiment of the North was unanimous on this subject.

Mr. Evans read the resolutions of the legislature of Maine upon this subject and argued against the constitutionality of the clause in the constitution of Florida prohibiting the emancipation of slaves, and prohibiting the immigration, or discharge from on board of vessels, of free persons of color into Florida.

THE NEW STATES OF IOWA AND FLORIDA

On motion by Mr. Allen, the consideration of the House bill for the admission of Iowa and Florida into the Union was resumed—the question pending being on the amendment offered by Mr. Evans.

Mr. Choate being entitled to the floor, addressed the Senate for about an hour.

He expressed a strong wish that there had been a division of this subject, and that a bill for the admission of each State, separately, had been presented instead of a joint bill making the admission of the one dependent upon that of the other. To say the least of it, this joint legislation, under the power of Congress to admit new States, was of an extraordinary character. For the first time in the history of the exercise of that power, this mode of proceeding was now adopted. This was a peculiar circumstance, to which he wished to call the attention of the Senate and of the country.

He was unwilling that hereafter, when the stand taken by her representatives, and all trace of their reasons and objections shall have passed away, Massachusetts shall be cited, as she was through mistake the other day, as the unvarying opponent of the admission of new States into this Union. It was on that account that he submitted to the Senate the remark that there was great injustice in this mode of admitting two States by one and the same bill; yet he said this, not as meaning that it was intentional injustice, but that, practically, injustice was the consequence of this mode of proceeding.

Mr. Woodbury said that he should vote against the amendment of the Senator from Maine; but, in doing so, he protested against the conclusion that his vote was given either for or against the constitutionality of the laws enacted by some of the southern States, of which Senators had complained. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. SIMMONS] had said that if we thought the provision in the constitution of Florida unconstitutional, we should strike it out. Now it was well known that Congress did not overhaul the constitutions of other States when they were admitted; and certainly they should not overhaul the constitution of Florida. That was the duty of the judiciary, and not of Congress. The only doubt he had about the matter rested upon the rights which the citizens of one State had in another State. By leaving the constitution of Florida as we found it, we did not delegate any power to

the legislature whatever. It was the people of Florida, and not Congress, who bestowed power upon that body.

The question was then taken on Mr. Evans' amendment, and decided in the negative, as follows: Yeas 12, nays 35.

Mr. Berrien said there had been some doubt about the population of Florida on the part of the Judiciary Committee—the census not having been taken generally in 1840 owing to the disturbed state of the country. The delegate from the Territory, however, had appeared before the committee and satisfied it that the population of the Territory was more than 90,000. In relation to the boundary difficulties between Missouri and Iowa, they had been obviated by provisions inserted in the bill.

After some remarks from Mr. Woodbridge in opposition, the bill was reported back to the Senate and ordered to a third reading.

It was then passed by the following vote:

Yeas: Messrs. Allen, Archer, Ashley, Atchison, Atherton, Bagby, Barrow, Bayard, Benton, Berrien, Breese, Buchanan, Cloquitt, Crittenden, Dickinson, Dix, Fairfield, Foster, Hannegan, Haywood, Henderson, Huger, Johnson, Lewis, McDuffie, Mangum, Merrick, Morehead, Niles, Semple, Sevier, Sturgeon, Tappan, Walker, White, and Woodbury—36.

Nays: Messrs. Choat, Evans, Francis, Huntington, Miller, Phelps, Simmons, Upham, and Woodbridge—9.

[House of Representatives, March 3, 1845]

IOWA AND FLORIDA

A message was received from the Senate by Asbury Dickins, esq., its secretary, announcing that the Senate had passed the bill for the admission of Florida and Iowa into the Union.

(Cries of "Good! That makes 29 stars.")

FIRST DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Madam Speaker, the First District of Florida has a population of 439,985. It includes the counties of Hardee, Hernando, Highlands, Hillsborough, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, Manatee, and Sarasota. It is truly first in many ways—the first in population—it has within its boundaries the county mining the largest amount of phosphate in the world—the largest sponge fisheries in North America. The county producing the greatest number of hand-made cigars—the county producing the most oranges and grapefruit. De Soto landed here—de Narvaez landed in this district—Fort Dade, Fort Brooke, Fort Bassenger, Fort Meade, Fort Frazier, Fort Hannum, and many other old forts were within its boundaries. It was in this district at the Gamble mansion that Judah P. Benjamin, secretary of state of the Confederacy, stayed just before his departure, and from which he left this country. Gasper, the pirate, sailed its shores. Weedon Island culture of Indians had its birth here. The Seminoles hid in its swamps and forests—but where Indians once roved and pirate ships sailed, farms, cattle ranches, groves, and industries flourish, and fishing vessels and mighty ships now operate. One hundred years has seen the State grow to a total official population of 1,897,414, but in fact a much larger population than this. In the season 1943-44 Florida produced 80,800,000 boxes of oranges, grapefruit, and tangerines. The bank clearings in 1943 from January to July, were \$1,115,409,150; an estimated gross value of \$160,000,000 for citrus;

\$84,000,000 for vegetables, and \$2,833,200 for noncitrus. The Federal income tax paid by Floridians the year June 30, 1943, totaled \$110,070,864; next to Massachusetts Florida produces more seafood than any State on the Atlantic seaboard. Army and naval bases, stations, and air fields are throughout the State.

When the message came to the House from the Senate, reporting the passage of the bill in the Senate, there were cries of "Good! Good!" in the House, and it was truly good.

The income tax which she pays into the Federal Treasury each year is more than the entire amount paid for the purchase.

Florida, the winter garden of the world, furnishes life-giving vitamins to the rest of the Nation in its fruits and vegetables sent to a snow-covered northland. Phosphorus from its phosphate rock enriches the soils of worn-out lands. Its cattle and fish furnish food to many. Its products, many and varied, are a part of the national economy. Ships built in her yards ply the seven seas.

Our men and women are occupying all ranks from private to general, and seamen to admirals and have displayed fine bravery in every battlefield.

A State rich in tradition and history; a State rich in resources and products; a State still richer in possibilities of its undeveloped resources. Old in history—yet young in opportunity.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] such time as he may desire.

TERRITORIAL FLORIDA AND ANDREW JACKSON

Mr. SIKES. Madam Speaker, the story of Florida is not complete until we chronicle the part played by Andrew Jackson. Historically, the fortunes of Florida in the early nineteenth century were lighted by the trail of glory which Jackson blazed across the American horizon. His turbulent career was closely interwoven with the history of Florida. His Florida campaigns helped to make his reputation as a soldier, they insured his standing as a fearless leader. In the acquisition of the territory of Florida, and its development toward statehood, the influence of Jackson was seldom absent. By strange coincidence, his death came soon after Florida was admitted to the Union in 1845.

Before 1810, Spanish Florida extended across a narrow strip of the Gulf Coast all the way to the Mississippi. In that year, despite Spanish protests, President Madison proclaimed American authority over the section of Florida between the Mississippi and Perdido Rivers, using as his justification the purchase of the Louisiana territory, whose boundaries were none too clearly defined. By that action, the Perdido River became the western boundary of Spanish Florida and of Florida as we know it today.

After 1814, Spain divided what was left of Florida into East Florida and West Florida, making the Suwannee River the dividing line. In subsequent years, declining Spanish interest and authority made of the peninsula, outside the few fortified towns, a haven for runaway

slaves, pirates, thieves, and renegade sailors.

It was about this time that the paths of Andrew Jackson and of Florida merged. Jackson had been judge, Congressman, United States Senator, and major general of militia, and was already one of Tennessee's immortals. But he had been by-passed and denied an active command in the War of 1812 through War Department politics. In 1813, the news of a Creek uprising and the massacre of 250 persons at Fort Mims, gave Jackson his chance. The Governor authorized an expedition by the militia, and Jackson, still weak from a grievous wound received in one of his numerous affairs of honor, led the expedition.

There was much more in Jackson's mind than his Governor or the War Department might have suspected. He intended to destroy the Indians along the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers, then push on to Mobile, opening from Tennessee to the Gulf a highway which would be of much importance to the United States. After this was accomplished, the crowning stroke would come. He would invade Florida and seize Pensacola, thus eliminating the influence of Spain, silent ally of Britain and supporter of the Creeks. Such a bold undertaking could well end in failure or court martial for a lesser man.

Jackson crushed the Indians, and the Nation's acclaim for its one general who had shown an ability to win battles caused him to be made a major general of regulars and to be placed in command of the military district embracing Tennessee, Louisiana, and the Mississippi territory. Now Jackson was ready to move. Pensacola was next in his mind. Clothed with new authority, Jackson asked the War Department for tacit consent to stamp out the troubles which were being stirred up in west Florida. A letter which could be interpreted either as giving or withholding that consent was dispatched to him. It did not reach him until after the war. But Jackson did not wait. The British were moving into the Pensacola defenses in force, and their campaign against Mobile and New Orleans was beginning to take shape. On November 3, 1814, Jackson stormed the works at Pensacola and immediately thereafter the British blew up Fort Barrancas, which they held, and withdrew in their ships. The glory subsequently won by Jackson at New Orleans and the national standing which followed for him are familiar history.

At the close of the War of 1812, Pensacola was returned to Spain. Jackson, though still a major general in command of the southern district, went into semi-retirement at his Nashville Hermitage. However, there was constant trouble with smugglers, Indians, and runaway slaves along the Georgia-Florida border, and there was little doubt that Spanish policy and British agents encouraged these disturbances. Then in 1817, Indian War flared again.

Jackson promptly assumed command of the forces opposing the Indians. The annexation of Florida had never left his mind. His communications with Presi-

dent Monroe and with Secretary of War Calhoun left no doubt of this, or of his intentions regarding Florida if given sufficient freedom of action. His orders as he left the Florida border were very broad. They said:

Adopt the necessary measures to terminate the conflict.

And again:

The movement against the Seminoles * * * will bring you to a theater where you may possibly have other duties to perform * * * Great interests are at stake * * * This is not a time for repose * * * until our cause is carried triumphantly through.

The vagueness of Jackson's instructions caused him no concern. They were sufficiently clear for his warlike mind. He had plainly asked for authorization to seize Florida, stating that he would require no direct orders but would need only indirect sanction. Nor does there appear to have been any doubt in official Washington about Jackson's intentions. The Secretary of War wrote Governor Bibbs of Alabama, "General Jackson is vested with full power to conduct the war as he may think best." Calhoun knew perfectly well what Andrew Jackson thought best for Florida.

In March 1818, Jackson's troops moved into Florida. He took St. Marks without resistance, then made a forced march to the Suwannee River, 107 miles to the east, in an effort to smash Chief Billy Bowlegs. Warned of Jackson's approach by British agents, that wily chief scattered his forces and kept them out of Jackson's reach. Returning to his base of operations at Fort Gadsden on the Apalachicola, Jackson moved westward on Pensacola in May. Some of the trees along his line of march still carry the three blazed marks which characterized Jackson's Three Notch Trail, and in the clear streams of the Choctawhatchee forest are yet to be seen some of the old bridge timbers put down by Jackson's people for the crossing of their wagons and artillery.

On May 28, he received the surrender of Pensacola. He appointed one of his colonels as civil and military governor, and declared the revenue laws of the United States in force. He had no desire to linger. On May 30, he departed for Tennessee. The acclaim of the frontier States followed him homeward. His work was done. The rest was up to the diplomats, and theirs would be no easy task.

In Washington, the Spanish Minister roared his nation's indignation. The American cabinet was divided. After 4 days of argument, the Government announced that it would return the forts to Spain, but that it would not censure General Jackson. In the meantime, negotiations were kept in progress for the purchase of Florida, and finally on February 22, 1819, representatives of the two governments signed a treaty ceding Florida to the United States for \$5,000,000. However, it was not actually ratified until early 1821. President Monroe promptly offered Jackson the governor-

ship of the new territory. He accepted, and on July 17 in that year, the formal transfer of the territory took place in Pensacola. It was the third time Jackson had seen the flag of Spain replaced by that of the United States in Florida. This time his great dream had really come true. Florida was ours.

Not for 24 years would statehood come, but preparations were slowly being made toward that event. J. N. Hernandez served as the first territorial delegate to Congress. He was succeeded by Richard Keith Call, whose name was to become one of the most illustrious in early Florida history. A close friend of Andrew Jackson, he was later brigadier general of Florida Militia and Governor of the Territory.

The first legislative council convened on July 22, 1822, at Pensacola. The difficulties of conducting the State legislative assemblies alternately at Pensacola and at St. Augustine, and of carrying on the State's business across 300 miles of wilderness, brought about the selection of a central seat of government. The Indian village of Tallahassee became the site of the State capitol, and soon the fertile lands around it attracted a swarm of settlers. Middle Florida, as the area was known, for a time outstripped both the older sections in growth.

In the 1830's a new Indian war consumed the time and energies of the territory. It finally dragged to a successful conclusion, with the Indians being moved bodily to western reservations or driven into the Everglades.

New counties were constantly being formed. By 1835, eight of the sixteen counties which now make up the Third District had been formed. All of north Florida had shown substantial development, but the peninsula remained largely an unexplored wilderness.

Through all of this the steps toward statehood were progressing. Article six of the treaty of cession of 1821 provided that Florida should be admitted as a State in the Union "as soon as may be consistent with the principles of the Federal Constitution." There were retarding factors. The population was below the number of 30,000—later 47,500—required for any State coming into the Union. Florida was split by intraterritorial sectionalism. So great became the differences between east and west Florida that the question of annexation of west Florida to Alabama was seriously considered. A bill to authorize the annexation was defeated in Congress in 1840.

Meanwhile the legislative council had taken steps to solidify statehood feeling within the territory. It passed an act on February 2, 1838, calling a convention to meet at St. Joseph—now Port St. Joe—"to adopt a bill of rights and constitution and all needful measures preparatory to the admission of Florida into the National Confederacy." The convention was held in December 1838 and January 1839. A constitution was adopted and the question of ratification

was submitted to the people. It was ratified by the very close vote of 2,070 to 1,975. Throughout 1840 and 1841 the debate over statehood raged. Congress was confused and took its time deciding the issue.

Finally public opinion in Florida for statehood apparently solidified under the leadership of Gov. John Branch. Early in 1845 the legislative council petitioned for the admission of Florida into the Union. A bill for the admission of Florida and Iowa into the Union was submitted and on March 3 it became a law. One hundred years ago on March 3, Florida took her place as a great American State.

In connection with Florida's centennial, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most interesting booklet, published by the Florida Historical Society. It is entitled "Then and Now, Florida in 1845 and 1945." For the wealth of material assembled, credit is given to the committee on information and historical data: W. T. Cash, chairman; Kathryn Abbey Hanna, Julien C. Yonge, Dena Snodgrass, David O. True, and T. T. Wentworth.

THEN AND NOW—FLORIDA IN 1845 AND 1945
GOVERNMENT TERRITORIAL OFFICERS AT TIME OF
ADMISSION TO UNION

<i>Governor</i>	
John Branch.....	\$2,500
<i>Secretary of Territory</i>	
Thomas H. Duval.....	1,500
<i>Treasurer</i>	
Henry L. Rutgers.....	300
<i>Auditor of public accounts</i>	
John Miller.....	300
STATE OFFICERS IN 1845	
<i>Governor</i>	
William D. Moseley.....	\$1,500
<i>Secretary of state</i>	
James T. Archer.....	600 and fees
<i>Comptroller</i>	
Nathaniel P. Bemis.....	800
<i>Attorney general</i>	
Joseph Branch.....	500 and fees
<i>State treasurer</i>	
Benjamin Byrd.....	800
<i>Register of public lands</i>	
John Beard.....	1,000
<i>Commissioner of agriculture</i>	
(None.)	
<i>Superintendent of public instruction</i>	
(None.)	
STATE OFFICERS IN 1945	
<i>Governor</i>	
Millard Caldwell.....	\$9,000
<i>Secretary of state</i>	
R. A. Gray.....	7,500
<i>Comptroller</i>	
J. M. Lee.....	7,500
<i>Attorney general</i>	
J. Tom Watson.....	7,500
<i>State treasurer</i>	
J. Edwin Larson.....	7,500

Register of public lands
(None.)
Commissioner of agriculture
Nathan Mayo.....\$7,500
Superintendent of public instruction
Colin English.....7,500

STATE FINANCES
Outstanding territorial warrants, July 25, 1845.....\$19,151.69
Amount due Territory from various tax collecting officials, such as tax collectors, auctioneers, and marshals.....\$9,482.22
Receipts of State government for fiscal year ending Oct. 31, 1846.....28,412.29
Expenditures same period (warrants issued).....56,009.57
Deficit for period.....27,597.28
Balance on hand July 1, 1943.....16,534,595.81
General revenue receipts for fiscal year ending June 30, 1944.....17,393,330.21
Miscellaneous revenue receipts warrants.....100,529,115.00
Warrants canceled and restored.....114,773.74

Total receipts available for year.....134,571,814.26

STATE FINANCES
In 1845
Disbursements:
For general government.....\$3,962,357.19
Other regular disbursements.....73,694,738.76
Nonoperation disbursements.....30,215,061.77
Grand total.....107,272,157.72
Balance in all funds July 1, 1944.....27,299,656.54

TAX SOURCES
For neither period is the list of tax sources exhaustive. In each case it is correct in a general way.

In 1845
Poll taxes.
Money at interest.
Bank stock.
Merchandise.
Carriages.
Town lots.
Wharves.
Income taxes on doctors, lawyers, etc.
Land at 3/8 cents per acre.

In 1845
Real and personal property taxes less exemptions.
Racing tax.
Occupational taxes.
Gasoline tax.
Intangible tax.
Inheritance tax, etc.
(Real estate taxes are not used to support State government, only that of counties and their subdivisions.)

POPULATION STATISTICS
In 1845
Entire State.....66,634

In 1845
(Figures used are those of United States census, 1940.)
Entire State.....1,897,414

TEN MOST POPULOUS COUNTIES
In 1845
Leon.....9,612
Gadsden.....7,645
Jefferson.....6,525
Jackson.....5,629
Columbia.....4,084
Madison.....3,762
Duval.....3,511
St. Johns.....3,114
Escambia.....3,056
Walton.....2,619

In 1845
Dade.....267,739
Duval.....210,143
Hillsborough.....180,147
Pinellas.....91,852
Polk.....86,665
Palm Beach.....79,989
Escambia.....74,667
Orange.....70,074
Volusia.....53,710
Jackson.....34,428

FIVE LARGEST CITIES OR TOWNS
In 1845
St. Augustine.....2,459
Tallahassee.....1,616
Pensacola.....1,500
Key West.....1,000
Apalachicola.....900

In 1845
Jacksonville.....173,065
Miami.....172,132
Tampa.....108,391
St. Petersburg.....60,812
Pensacola.....37,449

COMPARATIVE NUMBERS IN 10 DIFFERENT OCCUPATIONS, PROFESSIONS, OR TRADES

In 1845
Dentists.....4
Editors and printers.....39
Carpenters.....543
Teachers.....112
Physicians.....135
Lawyers.....131
Farm laborers.....5,750
Preachers.....83
Musicians and music teachers.....10
Blacksmiths.....120

In 1845
Dentists.....710
Editors and printers (includes authors and reporters).....1,138
Carpenters.....12,514
Teachers.....2,891
Physicians.....1,933
Lawyers (includes judges).....2,663
Farm laborers.....56,151
Preachers.....2,553
Musicians and music teachers.....1,073
Blacksmiths.....35

EDUCATION AND CULTURE¹
In 1845
Number public schools.....58
Number teachers in public schools.....62
Number pupils.....3,000
Annual income of all public schools.....\$14,900
Academies and other private schools.....25
Teachers in private schools.....36
Number pupils.....950
Annual income of all private schools.....\$9,325
Average annual salary of public school teachers.....\$240.32
Average annual salary of private school teachers.....\$259.03
Universities and colleges with 4-year courses.....0
Number students.....0
Number newspapers and periodicals.....10
Estimated circulation.....4,500

In 1845
(White school statistics)
Number school centers.....971
Number principals and teachers.....9,993
Number pupils.....288,071
Total cost of operation of all schools.....\$21,435,013.88
Average annual teacher's salary.....\$1,435.34
Average annual salary of principals.....\$2,604.32

¹ Figures formulated by Dr. E. L. Morphet, Director of Administration and Finance.

(Negro school statistics)
Number school centers.....863
Number principals and teachers.....3,312
Total cost of operating all schools.....\$4,012,269.55
Average annual teacher's salary.....\$942.20
Average annual principal's salary.....\$1,697.26
Universities and colleges with 4-year courses.....7
Number students.....7,900
Number newspapers and periodicals.....218
Estimated circulation.....750,000

RELIGIOUS STATISTICS
In 1845
Churches of all denominations.....120
Number members.....30,230
Value of church property.....\$105,200

In 1845
Churches of all denominations.....2,754
Number members.....875,000
Value of church property.....\$42,000,000

INDUSTRIES
(a) Agriculture and Horticulture
In 1845
Acres of land in farms, improved and unimproved.....500,000
Value of all crops.....\$3,600,000
(These were chiefly cotton, corn, sugarcane, peanuts, sweetpotatoes, and tobacco.)

In 1845
Acres of land in farms, improved and unimproved.....8,300,000
Value of all crops.....\$350,000,000
(Citrus fruits valued at \$202,000,000 constituted more than half, but cotton, corn, sugarcane, tobacco, sweetpotatoes, and peanuts are still produced in large quantities.)

(b) Stock Raising
In 1845
Number horses, asses, and mules.....10,890
Number cattle of all kinds.....196,000
Number hogs.....157,500
Number sheep.....17,500

In 1845
Number horses, asses, and mules.....55,000
Number cattle of all kinds.....1,250,000
Number hogs.....653,000
Number sheep.....26,165

(c) Manufacturing
In 1845
Total value of all manufactures.....\$150,000
(Chiefly lumber, wagons and carriages, brown sugar, brick and lime, coontie starch and meal.)

In 1845
Total value of all manufactures.....\$325,000,000
(Exclusive of war industries, which more than double the above figures.)

(d) Mining
In 1845
All mineral products.....\$10,000
(Chiefly clay for bricks.)

In 1845
All mineral products.....\$21,500,000
(Includes phosphate, limestone, Fuller's earth, titanium, coquina, and others.)

(e) Fishing
In 1845
All sea products.....\$150,000
(Mainly food fish and oysters.)

In 1845
All sea products.....\$25,776,000
(Mainly food fish, shell fish, sponge, and those used in making fertilizer.)

(f) Commerce

In 1845

Chief exports—cofton, lumber, beef cattle, hides.

In 1945

Chief exports—citrus fruits and fruit juices, lumber, naval stores, phosphate, kraft paper, early vegetables, cotton, tobacco, cigars, and sponges.

CHIEF TRADE CENTERS

In 1845

Apalachicola, Pensacola, St. Marks, Key West, Jacksonville.

In 1945

Jacksonville, Tampa, Miami, Pensacola, Panama City.

(g) Tourist Industry

In 1845

Number of tourists.....	550
Hotels and apartment houses.....	9 hotels
Annual tourist income.....	\$60,000
Investment in amusements and recreation features.....	\$5,000

In 1945

Number of tourists.....	2,500,000
Hotel and apartment houses.....	19,152
Annual tourist income.....	\$300,000,000
Investment in amusements and recreation features.....	\$750,000,000

BANKS

In 1845

Number of banks.....	2
Capital.....	\$3,932,751
Loans and discounts.....	\$2,718,234
Deposits.....	\$46,258
Assets.....	\$5,668,860
Liabilities.....	\$1,542,227

In 1945

Number of banks.....	174
Capital.....	\$26,643,000
Loans and discounts.....	\$143,235,000
Deposits.....	\$1,062,305,000
Assets.....	\$1,125,854,000
Liabilities.....	\$1,125,854,000

The above from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States for fiscal year 1844-45 does not give a true picture. The two banks had a mere nominal existence and the chief excuse for their being kept open was to collect interest.

From report of the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States for year ending December 3, 1943.

COMMUNICATION

In 1845

Telegraph offices.....	None
Telephones.....	None
Radios.....	None
Paved-road mileage.....	None
Miles of railway.....	21

In 1945

Telegraph offices.....	115
Telephones.....	271,960
Radios.....	500,000
Paved-road mileage.....	45,000
Miles of railway.....	7,500

TEN CHIEF POST OFFICES AND COMPENSATION OF POSTMASTER OF EACH

In 1845

Apalachicola.....	\$1,002.37
Pensacola.....	\$873.75
Tallahassee.....	\$870.82
St. Augustine.....	\$716.41
Quincy.....	\$402.92
Jacksonville.....	\$353.63
Marianna.....	\$314.05
Key West.....	\$282.70
Monticello.....	\$196.03
Newnansville.....	\$154.58
Number post offices.....	68
Total receipts.....	\$21,700

In 1945

Miami.....	\$7,000
Jacksonville.....	\$6,000
Tampa.....	\$6,000
St. Petersburg.....	\$4,500
Pensacola.....	\$4,200
Orlando.....	\$4,200
West Palm Beach.....	\$4,000
Lakeland.....	\$3,700
Key West.....	\$3,600
Tallahassee.....	\$3,600
Number post offices (not including branches and stations).....	680
Total receipts.....	\$12,588,208

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Madam Speaker, the history of Florida is long and varied, and there are many events that are woven into its story leading to statehood. Its settlers, from long before the Revolution, were of mixed nationalities, but all were building for a unified existence. Its days of growth moved through turbulent years of political history and intrigues, and one of the most interesting of these is the chain of events surrounding the story of the Republic of East Florida. Extending almost to the Mississippi River from the southeast Atlantic coast, the settlers set up for themselves natural boundaries, and the East Florida of the days before Statehood was almost the same as the Florida of today.

In 1811, when war clouds between the United States and Great Britain were gathering, the United States sent commissioners to Spanish Florida seeking a temporary alliance with the Nation to prevent the British from occupying the territory in case of war. Spain, of course, would not consent to such an arrangement, so other plans were devised. Under the leadership of Gen. George Mathews, the plan was carried out through the medium of a revolution of the inhabitants of East Florida, assisted by the residents of Georgia and by the regular armed forces of the United States. American troops held possession of the province of East Florida, except the fortified town of St. Augustine, from March 1812 to May 1813. This incident is known in Florida history as the Patriot Invasion, as the revolutionists called themselves Patriots in the cause of freedom. A legislative council was set up with John H. McIntosh as the director. Proclamations were issued by the patriots, appealing to the residents, to the people of St. Augustine particularly, urging them to break away from their government and join with the Territory of East Florida.

Immediately following the withdrawal of the American troops in May 1813, another intrigue developed with Gen. B. Harris' friendly negotiations with the Indians. The Indians wished to be at peace with the Patriots, so they readily signed a treaty with General Harris and his Patriots. The intrigue was well planned, for the Indians lost a large body of their best land in what is now Alachua and Marion Counties, and the Patriots' territory was accordingly enlarged.

So successful was the planned revolution and Indian settlement, that the Patriots called their new lands the "Republic of East Florida." The capital was

established at Fort Mitchell, located a few miles east of the present town of Ocala, near Lake Bryant. The legislature for the republic met for the first time on January 25, 1814, with General Harris as its director and influential leader. He addressed the assembly, urging the residents to become more alert to the dangers of Spanish domination. He laid before the legislature a program of action. He urged the Patriots to send a minister to the President of the United States, vested with full and ample powers, to cede this republic to the United States and at the same time to offer on the part of the Patriots their loyalty to the Nation against all enemies.

The Legislature of the Republic of East Florida immediately passed a resolution setting forth the calamities that had befallen the Patriots, and urging the appointment of a minister plenipotentiary from the republic to the Congress of the United States. In all of Florida's varied and assorted history, this appears to be the only minister plenipotentiary on record, even though his mission was an ill-fated one.

Early in 1814, the citizenry of the Republic of East Florida drew up a long document petitioning Congress to smile upon them favorably and grant statehood to their republic. Of the 105 names on the documents, many are still perpetuated in Marion and Alachua Counties today.

Wilson Connor, who went to Florida with the Patriots Invasion under McIntosh, was appointed as minister plenipotentiary to convey the Republic's wishes to Congress. Connor also enjoyed the distinction of being the first Baptist preacher on Florida soil, having laid down his sword for the Bible after the invasion proved successful. Armed with the precious documents of the legislature of the republic, and confident of his success in the mission, Connor set out for Washington on February 15, 1814. A month later he appears in Louisburgh, N. C., from where he wrote Secretary Monroe and sent his despatches on by messenger. What personal events may have influenced Connor to discontinue his journey, we do not know, but it appears certain that the affairs of state were more urgent in Washington than in Florida. The American Government at the time was busily engaged in the war with Great Britain; Secretary Monroe undoubtedly discouraged Connor from visiting Washington.

Unlike its sister institution which in west Florida had lasted 58 days, this Republic of East Florida was in existence for 3 years, though it seemed to have functioned in a very haphazard manner and in a state of armed neutrality with Spanish interests. Its leaders were divided into lawless factions, when a surveyor named George Clarke conceived the idea of closing its unsatisfactory existence and enlisted the cooperation of the Spanish Governor Coppinger. Struggles for supremacy, combined with Indian raids, had made life most unbearable for the peace-loving settlers, so the offers of Governor Coppinger seemed very attractive. The Republic dissolved

itself and all returned again to recognize Spanish authority, under which they remained until the establishment of a territorial government under General Jackson in 1819.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Madam Speaker, 100 years ago the great State of Florida was admitted to the sisterhood of States of this Government. Florida, on the 3d day of March 1845, became the twenty-seventh State of this Union, assuming all the duties, obligations, and responsibilities of statehood, having been a Territory since 1821, with Gen. Andrew Jackson as the first military governor of the United States.

The House of Representatives, composed of just about the same type of men as you are, passed the Iowa-Florida bill for the admission of Florida to the Union by a vote of 144 to 48 on February 13, 1845, and the Senate on March 1, 1845, also passed the bill of admission by a vote of 36 to 9, there being a lapse of only 20 days intervening between the passage of the bill by the House and by the Senate, which of course demonstrated speed in legislation. Then on March 3, 1845, President John Tyler approved and signed the bill, thus making Florida the twenty-seventh State of this Union.

You gentlemen might be interested to know that Florida was discovered on Easter Sunday in 1513 by Ponce de Leon, who was not in search of material things but who wanted to be restored to youth and be rejuvenated, and he found the Fountain of Youth which has been a mecca for all Americans and for all of those whose minds dream of youth. They still come to Florida who seek both youth and health, and from the life-giving qualifications of this Fountain of Youth they go away full of youth, health, and vitality, seeing visions of which only they had dreamt.

Florida today occupies the position entirely different in character than that which it occupied yesterday. Florida of 1945 is not the same Florida as existed 100 years ago. It has undergone a series of fundamental changes—changes that are cultural, social, as well as economical. No longer is it an infant State of self-sufficing farmers, of self-contained lumber mill communities, of small isolated tourist towns and cities; it has grown up, it has achieved adulthood; it has become a mature State of independent industries, of interconnected recreational and distribution centers, of interrelated urban communities. This State has obtained high distinction, not only in the South, but also in the Nation. Florida is rich in national endowments and resources. Our geographical location affects our health, our modes of conduct, our attitudes toward life in general, our achievements as a people. In Florida we produce citrus fruits and engage in naval stores production, manufacture paper and other produce, build ships, grow winter vegetables, operate service industries, and direct tourist hotels and facilities, carry on extensive fisheries, drill for oil, and have the largest sponge industry in this country.

Florida occupies a most unique position among the States. It is a distinct commonwealth of water fronts. It has a shore line, exclusive of bays and inlets, of 1,148 miles in length, greater than any other State in the United States. With an area of 58,660 square miles, it is larger by 7,500 miles than the State of New York, and yet it has only one-twelfth of the population of New York. It stands twenty-first in area of any State in the Union and is the second largest State east of the Mississippi, being surpassed only by Georgia. It is blessed both by the size and geographic location; it is bound to progress greatly if physical environment originally endowed with natural resources mean anything in the history of man.

One hundred years ago when Florida was admitted to the Union it had a population of about 40,000, but today her population is approximately 2,000,000. The average number of inhabitants per square mile is only about 34 as compared with 43 for the United States, over 500 for Puerto Rico and 650 for England. Florida could increase its population from 1945 to 1950 at the same rate it increased from 1930 to 1940 and have a density of population slightly less than the present population of the United States.

Florida's future is most alluring. With its peninsula jutting out into the tropical seas it will become the connecting length between the Caribbean in particular and between North America and South America in general; all Central America, half of Mexico, the West Indies, and the northern coast of Colombia and Venezuela are all closer to Florida than Chicago and New York. This entire region may be quickly reached by air by the people of Florida. The whole ground of South America is east of Florida. Jacksonville and Miami are almost on a direct line by air between the densely populated eastern section of the United States and the west coast of South America.

Florida's taxation system is, I believe, unique. We have no State inheritance tax; we have no State income tax; and under the homestead exemption law, no taxes are levied against homes up to the value of \$5,000 except special assessments for benefits—which includes bonded indebtedness—and credit is allowed up to that amount on property valued at more than \$5,000.

While we are proud of the progress Florida has made in the last 100 years, we shall not look backward, but our eyes will point to the future and the development of Florida and its many natural resources.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include therein an article appearing in the Washington Post of March 1 and an editorial appearing in the Evening Star entitled "Rumania As a Pattern?"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 40 minutes.

YALTA—A MORAL RETREAT—POLAND AND SMALL NATIONS CRUCIFIED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, it is my purpose to discuss that phase of the Yalta Conference agreement which deals with the so-called Polish question. The determination by the conferees to settle the boundary lines of Poland before the question was submitted to the people of Poland constitutes a retreat from the high moral ground that we have steadily maintained throughout the war. To say now that free elections are to be held and that Poland will receive a long shore line carved out of Germany, is to rob Peter to pay Paul and is a feeble effort to fool the people.

What I have to say, Madam Speaker, may not be popular; it is entirely possible that I may be charged with fostering disunity among our allies, but, notwithstanding, I feel it my duty to speak, for I am firmly convinced that a great mistake was made at Yalta; yes, a mistake, which, if not rectified, will lead to World War No. 3. I approach my task without rancor; I do so with no bitterness in my heart and with no thought to be unfair, for I fully appreciate the magnitude of the problems confronting the conferees at Yalta. I join with millions of other citizens in acknowledging that some great advances were made there. To me, however, the results of the conference must be tested by their effect upon the inalienable rights of millions of people of the small European countries, who apparently had no spokesman at Yalta.

Madam Speaker, the principles set down in the Atlantic Charter were clear and unequivocal; they were straight from the shoulder, and the world applauded. At Yalta we departed from those principles and a world mourns. Let us refresh our memories; the charter said, in part:

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.
2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.
3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

It is my humble opinion, Madam Speaker, that these principles of the Atlantic Charter constitute the basis and justification for our entry into this war and the unknown sacrifices we make today. We believe them, for they were and are based upon the moral law, and we cannot escape the force of them, nor can we afford to repudiate them if we expect this war to make for a just and lasting peace.

I am reminded, Madam Speaker, of the attitude of our own State Department, when in July of 1940 it condemned in no uncertain terms the conduct of "more powerful neighbors" when the territorial integrity of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia was threatened. I quote, for the record, a part of a press release of July 23, 1940, setting forth a statement of the Under Secretary of State, the Honorable Sumner Welles:

From the day when the peoples of these republics—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—first gained their independence and democratic form of government, the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization—cannot be preserved.

It is difficult for me, Madam Speaker, to reconcile the position of our Government in July 1940 to that now expressed by our representatives at Yalta. Fact is they cannot be reconciled; they are contradictory positions and are geared to different fundamental principles.

From the information presently available, I believe that we have acquiesced in every demand made by Russia; we have agreed to the establishment of the Curzon line as the easternmost boundary line of Poland, which is contrary to an agreement made between Poland and Russia subsequent to the last war and violates the rights of millions of Polish people to self-determination. By this agreement we now know that Russia is to continue to dominate and control the small Baltic Nations of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and we are thereby supporting Russia in its unlawful grab of those countries in 1940. Now we are parties to that unholy crime, notwithstanding the noble pronouncements of our State Department in 1940. So I repeat, that it is obvious that Britain and the United States have acquiesced fully in the demands of Stalin for his self-selected sphere of influence, not only in Poland and the Baltic area, but in the south of Europe also. That, Madam Speaker, constitutes a retreat from the high moral ground we have been resting upon in this war; it can but lead to another war, more deadly, more devastating, more cruel and more costly than this one.

PLEBESCITES—WHAT KIND?

We are advised, Madam Speaker, that we should not be alarmed about this situation, for the conferees have assured everybody that the people of Poland will have the right to a free election; that the elections are to be free and unfettered, and thus are within the spirit and terms of the Atlantic Charter. The question is, how free will the plebescite be? We must keep in mind that the provinces of eastern Poland, between the Curzon line and the western Russian border, had an estimated Polish population before the war of 11,807,000 while the Russians and Ukrainians had less than one-half that number. But to get back to the question of free elections. In

this connection we must remember that Russia is astride of Poland and occupies all of it and is in a position to impose her will—by force as she did with the other Baltic countries. Russia wants all of Poland east of the Curzon line and will keep it regardless of what we do or say; it is in the driver's seat. And the whole scheme has our official blessing. Appeasement—what great and holy crimes have been committed in thy name?

What is the history of plebescites as conducted by Russia in the past? Two rather recent examples will suffice.

In 1939 Soviet military authorities served notice on the people of eastern Poland that elections would be held for the national assemblies. From reports available, it appears that Soviet troops then in Poland were actually employed as agitators in an effort to elect members to the so-called national assemblies favorable to their cause. Local residents were individually visited by members of the Red Army or armed workers guards who tried to persuade them that it was to their interest to vote. An atmosphere of terror was created through arrests and other repressions. In particular, any person acting against the instructions issued by Soviet propaganda agents was exposed to immediate arrest and sentenced for counter-revolutionary activities, and ultimately deported. All cultural, religious, economic, social, and trade unions, both Polish and Ukrainian as well as Jewish and other nationalities, were dissolved and their property handed over to newly created Communist organizations.

It is admitted that but one man was selected to run for each office and the candidate was in each instance a member of the Soviet Party or a citizen who had been selected by the Russians. On election day, October 22, 1939, electors were rounded up in their workshops or dragged out of their homes to the voting places. Each of them was given a card bearing the printed name of this only candidate of the district. Numerous Soviet police agents were present in all electoral premises. Those who wished to vote against the candidate knew that they exposed themselves and their families to inevitable imprisonment and deportation.

Five days after the elections, the representatives of the local population met to attend sessions of the national assemblies and, of course, everything that the Soviets wanted done was fully accomplished. A resolution was adopted unanimously favoring the Russian Government; was this a free election?

Let us now consider the second example of Russian free elections. The case in point is the treatment accorded the Latvian Republic in July of 1940. There, too, under the guise of an election provoked by unsupported charges, an election was proclaimed by the alleged "new government" which had been set up by the Soviets. On that election day the only party admitted to the elections was the pro-Soviet United Workers bloc, which represented only a very small fraction of the electorate. Approximately 80 percent of the Latvian population were farmers and factory workers from

whom less than 3 percent of the population was allowed to vote. In view of that fact and foreseeing that if they ran the election with its own list, the small vote cast for it would make it ridiculous, the Communist Party did not run under its own name but joined the list of the so-called Workers' Coalition. The vast majority of the Latvian population were not permitted to form their own lists, nominate candidates and conduct pre-election campaigns. At the same time, Soviet soldiers and pro-Soviet agents participated in the campaign in favor of the Workers' Coalition. All inhabitants, however, were compelled to go to the polls under the threat that if they failed to have the balloting stamp on their passports they might be considered saboteurs. Here, too, but one candidate stood for each office and he had been selected by the Soviet Party. From this it appears that these so-called free elections sponsored by the Russian Government in both these instances amount to a farce and if we are to have free elections, then it will be necessary to remove every vestige of Soviet influence in the areas where the elections are to be held.

What assurance is there, Madam Speaker, that the coming "free elections" in Poland, or elsewhere, will be conducted in a different manner than those I have mentioned? Let us remember also that arrangements right now for these elections are being made in Moscow.

The history of plebescites is a long one. I shall not take the time to recite it at this time, except to point out that historically they have been ineffective when and where the nation which advocated the principle was in a position to nullify it by the use of force. England, Germany, France, and Russia have at some time or other been for the principle of self-determination, then at other times they have repudiated it. Our own country has, since the days of Woodrow Wilson, openly espoused the principle. Would that he could return today.

On May 27, 1916, in a public address before our entry into war, Wilson said, "We believe these fundamental things: First, that every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live." He was here contending for the principle that change of sovereignty must not be made by conquest. Speaking before the United States Senate on January 22, 1917, he said again:

No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property.

This is a clear and candid statement of an abstract principle of justice which should have universal application. It has, I fear, been ignored by Mr. Roosevelt, who should have known better, for he sat at the very feet of Woodrow Wilson.

And now consider the position of Russia after the revolution and the All-Russian Convention of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies on November 8, 1917. It was after Lenin and his followers had seized control of the Russian Government that the first

official statement of the Soviet Government declared for an immediate peace without indemnities and it was talking to Poland at that time. "Forcible annexation" was defined by them as "the retention by any state of any nation without the latter being given the right of free voting in the determination of the forms of its national existence, under the condition of the complete removal of the armies of the annexing or the more powerful nation." On November 26, 1917, Trotsky, as Foreign Minister of the Soviets, proposed to all belligerents a truce and a democratic peace without annexation and without indemnities, based on the principle of the independence of nations and of their right to determine for themselves the nature of their own development.

At the Brest-Litovsk Peace Conference in December of 1917 the Russian delegates took a strong stand and demanded that peace be made on principles of no forcible union of territories conquered during the war; the evacuation of occupied territories, restoration of independence to those peoples deprived of it during the war; and a guarantee to national groups which before the war were not politically independent of the right of deciding their future sovereignty by a free referendum in which complete freedom in voting to be guaranteed to all inhabitants of the territory in question, including immigrants and refugees. What a change has now come over Russia. Then it was a new Russia pleading for its very life, and that plea found lodgment in the United States. Where? Listen—in the heart and mind of Woodrow Wilson. His voice was again heard in a historic address before the Congress of the United States on January 8, 1918, and after our entry into the First World War. He said:

There is moreover, a voice calling for these definitions of principle and of purpose, which is, it seems to me, more thrilling and more compelling than any of the many moving voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. It is the voice of the Russian people. They are prostrate and all but helpless, it would seem, before the grim power of Germany, which has hitherto known no relenting and no pity. Their power, apparently, is shattered, and yet their soul is not subservient. They will not yield either in principle or in action. Their conception of what is right, of what it is humane and honorable for them to accept, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind, and they have refused to compound their ideals or desert others that they themselves might be safe.

How much like Russia then is Poland today. The eloquent voice of Wilson pleading the cause of Russia in those dark days is the kind of a voice that should be pleading the cause of Poland today; yes, and of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and all the other small nations in a like position.

Can you today hear the plea of that great liberty-loving people as they lie prostrate at the feet of the aggressor, as their sons fight on European battle fronts with our own sons and for the same cause? What a tragedy it is as they plead in vain for help; the voice of Wilson

is silent. But I am satisfied that a just God heareth, for right is ultimately the master of might.

Listen again as Wilson speaks on that same occasion:

The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world.

It is a far cry, Madam Speaker, from the Russians who met at Brest-Litovsk and the Russians who met at Yalta. They have now repudiated the principles announced by that first Soviet conference in 1917, and likewise we have repudiated the principles advocated so vehemently by Woodrow Wilson in 1918. And why? Only the participants at that conference have the answer; historians will judge the validity of their decisions.

Madam Speaker, the position taken by Woodrow Wilson was so effective because it was based on moral grounds, because it was the very essence of truth which cannot be overthrown for it rests upon solid rock. Whereas, expediency and the exercise of force and of power politics are contrary to the moral law and grounded in the shifting sands of skepticism and uncertainty and distrust. No matter how lofty the Yalta statement may be in its alleged adherence to the ideals expressed in the Atlantic Charter, no matter how clear the affirmations to establish a free democratic government by conducting free and unfettered elections, the fact remains that Poland is the victim of territorial aggrandizement, and territorial changes not in accord with the expressed wishes of the people. Unfortunately, Great Britain and the United States are parties to this nefarious act. It serves as notice to all the small nations in the world of a policy that is to prevail in the future. We have now embraced the principles of force and political expediency which constitute a threat to the future peace of the world.

Madam Speaker, David Lawrence, writing in the United States News of February 23, 1945, very well expresses the viewpoint of millions of Americans when he asks: "What did the American people get?"

This is a fair question in view of what has happened. He is referring to the Yalta Conference, and continuing says:

A promise of continued war with heavier and heavier casualties against a stiffened and perhaps fanatical resistance by the German people, who have everything to gain now and little to lose by adopting desperate measures. A promise of a big standing army and compulsory military training for American youth as we furnish men and materials to keep Germany's underground forces permanently disarmed and to suppress rebellions in the liberated countries, while American boys are killed by snipers and guerilla fighters for years to come.

Continuing he says:

This isn't a promise of peace for anybody. This is a promise of more war, because economic anarchy breeds gangsterism and dictatorship and incessant strife.

And again:

We cannot concede that Russia is winning this war alone against Germany and so deserves everything she asks for. If American

lives had not been sacrificed on the western front and if we had not supplied airplanes and other materials under lend-lease, Russia could not have mounted her offensives. The American viewpoint has back of it moral right as well as sacrifices of our manpower thousands of miles away from continental United States.

For American idealism was defeated at Yalta. American constitutionalism was scorned at Yalta, and the pledges given in the Atlantic Charter that no nation—neither Russia, nor Britain nor any other country—will seek "territorial aggrandizement" were flagrantly violated at Yalta.

The statement I have just read, Madam Speaker, is not my own, but that of one of the outstanding journalists of this country. Mr. David Lawrence can never be charged as an isolationist nor do I think he is a partisan in any sense, but he brings to bear upon this great question his wide experience in the international field and his deep and earnest convictions that we have made a mistake at Yalta and that our position is untenable on moral grounds.

Madam Speaker, my plea today is for the recognition of the rights of small nations; we cannot bypass them now by ignoring their rights and expect to have established the basis for permanent peace. Russia is our friend and we have given unstintingly of our resources to her and surely she is amenable to reason. So with our British friends; we are all in this world situation together. I am satisfied, Madam Speaker, that unless we adopt the policy now of no territorial aggrandizement, we are headed for trouble in the future which can only result in another letting of blood when the next generation has reached a military age.

There is a big "if," Madam Speaker, in connection with the promise of free elections in Poland. Reports reach us already that Soviet pressure in Rumania has forced the resignation of the cabinet. It is in line with the same pattern as used already in Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Hence, we are honestly apprehensive about the holding of free elections. There can be no exercise of the right of self-determination unless and until we as a nation guarantee they will be so held. Now is the time to serve notice on the world that the United States intends to stand up and insist that the principles announced by Woodrow Wilson in 1917-18 are just as real today and that we shall adhere to them. There must be no retreat from the moral ground upon which our cause rests.

Madam Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the following newspaper article and editorial:

[From the Washington Post of March 1, 1945]

FREQUENTLY ASSAILED RUMANIAN CABINET QUILTS, RUSSIANS SAY

LONDON, February 28.—The Moscow radio said tonight the resignations of the Rumanian cabinet had been received by King Mihai, who immediately began consultations aimed at formation of a new government.

The resignation of Premier Nicolai Radescu, following a series of bloody demonstrations against his regime, was announced by the Bucharest radio. The Radescu government had been under criticism from Russia.

Earlier dispatches from Moscow had said Soviet Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs Andrei Vishinsky had arrived in the Rumanian

capital for a first-hand inspection of the situation. The dispatch said the recent disorders in Rumania had caused deep concern in Moscow.

The national democratic front has charged Radescu with failure to eliminate Fascist elements from the government and to carry out promised agrarian reforms.

Several outbreaks have occurred recently in Rumania including a clash last Saturday in Bucharest in which there were many casualties. Yesterday Groza and other members of the cabinet belonging to the national democratic front were reported to have presented a virtual ultimatum to King Mihai demanding resignation of Radescu and the arrest and punishment of those responsible for firing on the Bucharest demonstrators.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

RUMANIA AS PATTERN?

The current Communist-led uprising in the capital, Bucharest, and other cities of Rumania against the coalition government headed by Premier Nicolai Radescu climaxes an increasingly bitter quarrel between his regime and the local Communist Party associated with other leftist elements under the title of the National Democratic Front. That would seem to be a misleading title, because what we Americans would consider the most truly democratic elements of the Rumanian people, the National Peasants Party, headed by the celebrated Juliu Maniu, and the Liberals representing the urban middle classes, are in the Radescu government and have strongly opposed leftist maneuvers to bring about its overthrow. The Rumanian Communists are known to be numerically small, and even with their minor leftist auxiliaries the resulting "National Democratic Front" comprises only a fraction of the population. Their armed uprising is thus obviously the attempt of a dynamic minority to gain control of the country by strong-arm methods.

The important question is, to what degree this revolutionary action is either tacitly approved or directly inspired by Soviet Russia, which has been in effective control of Rumania ever since it abandoned the Axis and made a peace which, though ostensibly concluded with all the major Allies, was actually negotiated and signed in Moscow last September. At that time the provisional government which took power after the expulsion of the Germans by Russian armies included virtually all parties opposed to the Axis, including the Communists. By the terms of the peace treaty Rumania was allowed to govern itself subject to the oversight of an allied control commission which, though nominally including Britain and the United States, was effectively dominated by the Russian membership.

However, almost from the first, the provisional government was rent by quarrels between the constituent parties, the sharpest line of cleavage being between the leftists, who soon coalesced into the National Democratic front, and the other elements. Relatively little is known of the details because British and American journalists have not been encouraged to investigate conditions nor have the British and American members of the Allied Control Commission in Bucharest been permitted to circulate freely. Only fragmentary accounts of the current disturbances have as yet emerged from the veil of local Russian censorship, but dispatches from Moscow are more revealing. The official Soviet news agency states that the National Democratic front demanded decisive action against pro-Fascist elements in the government and the dismissal of the Radescu Government, and adds that on the demand of representatives of the Allied Control Commission the shooting of demonstrators (by the Radescu Government forces) was stopped.

All this fits into the pattern predicted by many observers that the coalition regimes permitted by Moscow in the countries overrun by its armies would presently be transformed into governments wherein the local leftist elements would predominate. That transformation has already occurred in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and has been attempted even in Greece and Belgium outside the Russian sphere. What is occurring in Rumania should thus occasion no surprise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LET US NOT, I PRAY, SELL AMERICA
DOWN THE RIVER

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe for one moment that any Member of either branch of the Congress of the United States would ever want, under any conceivable circumstances, to sell America down the river. But I am equally convinced that is exactly what we will be doing unwittingly if we pass the resolution which will soon come before us which proposes to amend the Constitution so that treaties may be ratified by a bare majority of the House and Senate, instead of by two-thirds of the Senate, as required by the existing constitutional provision.

In my opinion, that proposal to change the Constitution involves a threat of great potential danger to our constitutional form of government and to the perpetuity of our free institutions.

The American Government as devised by the fathers is the grandest government that ever existed on God's earth and my deep concern lest something may happen to it that will sap its vitality and perhaps permanently impair it prompts me to make this speech.

I appeal to you, my colleagues, to beware of this resolution, to analyze it with great care, and to consider its implications and its probable effects before you vote on it. I believe that he who supports it will be subject to bitter disillusionment in the years to come. I believe that he who votes for it will cast a vote that he is likely to regret till his dying day. The title of this resolution would be more accurate if it were described as "a resolution to wreck the Constitution of the United States." If ever there was a time when Members of Congress should "stop, look, and listen," now is the time, before we vote to put this measure on the statute books.

In speaking thus feelingly on what I regard as the menacing aspects of this proposal, I wish to make it crystal clear that I have not the slightest criticism of its proponents. They are among the most esteemed Members of this body, and justly so. They are as well meaning as I am. They are as patriotic as I am. They would no more think of doing an injury to our country than I would. They are abler than I am, which makes me marvel that they would endorse such a proposal. I can only conclude that they have not thought the problem through.

DESTROYS CHECKS AND BALANCES

We will get a clearer perspective of this proposal if we will remember that our Constitution is a rounded creation of

checks and balances, and the passage of this resolution would remove and destroy one of the most important checks in the Constitution—the check against Executive usurpation in the matter of treaty making. The founding fathers knew what they were doing when they wrote into the Constitution the provision requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate for the ratification of treaties. It was not haphazard decision on their part. They debated the subject for a long time and came to the conclusion that Congress ought to keep its hand on the making of treaties. It was to vindicate the might and power of the people's Congress that the Constitutional Convention placed in one branch of the Government—the Senate—the right to ratify treaties by a two-thirds vote.

By a strange process of reasoning the proponents of the resolution to provide for ratification of treaties by a majority vote of both Houses, instead of by two-thirds of the Senate, say that the purpose of the resolution is to give Congress authority over treaty making. "Congress ought to have more to say about it," they declare. But this resolution does not give Congress anything. Instead of giving, it takes away. It dilutes toward nothingness the authority which Congress now has over treaties by the operation of the two-thirds rule at the Senate end of the Capitol. The fact that the congressional treaty-ratification machinery is set up by the Constitution at the Senate end of the Capitol makes it no less a part of Congress and no less a bulwark to protect the rights of the people of America than if it were set up at both ends of the Capitol.

TOO MANY BLANK CHECKS

If this resolution passes, we shall witness the amazing spectacle of Congress voluntarily offering to surrender its effective authority over treaty making. We shall witness Congress, which already has given a blank check to the President in almost everything else, voluntarily weakening its power still further by removing the only effective barrier against executive usurpation in respect to treaties, thus giving him what amounts to another blank check. I have a great respect for the office of President and a great affection for the man who now holds that office. But I believe that Congress has surrendered far too many of its powers to the President as the movement toward the centralization of government has gone ahead with dizzy rapidity, and that instead of surrendering more powers we in Congress should be making moves to recapture some of the powers we already have surrendered.

Pass this resolution and you will take away the congressional brakes on treaty making. If you do this you might as well say to all future occupants of the White House: "You may negotiate treaties to your liking and send them up to Capitol Hill with perfect assurance that they will be ratified."

A congressional brake based on a mere majority vote is no brake at all, so great at all times is the power of the administration over Congress in respect to foreign affairs.

For the truth of that statement, I call to witness James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States.

MR. FARLEY SUMMONED AS WITNESS

My memory harks back to turbulent scenes in this Chamber 7 long years ago. I had secured the signatures of a majority of the Members of the lower branch to a petition to bring before the House for a vote a resolution I had introduced embodying the fine democratic principle that unless our country is invaded or attacked, or some other country in the Western Hemisphere is invaded by a non-American nation, the right to declare war shall rest solely with the people of the United States, to be decided by referendum. There was a tremendous national sentiment for the resolution—that is to say, until the administration took a hand. I have no heartburnings over what happened, and I recall the rapidly moving events objectively simply to illustrate what might and no doubt would occur in the future regardless of who may be in the White House, if the ratification of treaties is made dependent upon a mere majority vote. Permit me, in the utmost good humor, to call my star witness, James A. Farley.

Mr. Farley tells the story in his own inimitable way in his book, *Behind the Ballots*, an affectionately inscribed copy of which he sent to me with his loveliest compliments. If you want some interesting reading, turn to pages 361 and 362 of Mr. Farley's book, *Behind the Ballots*. I quote:

Time and again—

Says Mr. Farley—

when Congress has been about to vote on an important measure, I have appealed personally to Members of the Senate and House to vote as the administration wanted them to vote.

I spent an entire day on the telephone asking Democratic Members of the House of Representatives to vote against bringing up the war referendum resolution. Many of them had already voted to discharge the resolution from the committee, the first move in the parliamentary skirmish, thus in effect committing themselves to its passage. Some Members frankly said they were unable to go along with the administration. Other Members said that in deference to my request they would stand by the administration and vote in the negative. This appeal by telephone had an influence in blocking consideration of the resolution.

Mr. Farley's statement that his action on the telephone had an influence in blocking consideration of the resolution expressed it mildly, indeed. The fact is that his action, representing the administration, killed the resolution. Democracy was murdered in the House that day.

It is worthy of note that, although Mr. Farley wore calluses on his ears using the telephone and all the reactionary newspapers in the United States, the President, the Secretary of State, the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the House, and the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps bore down like a mighty avalanche to kill my resolution, its appeal was so great that it was defeated only by a close vote, 187 yeas to 208 nays. A change of 11 votes would have saved it. I have no doubt

that if the administration had not interposed, this principle of allowing the people a vote on war, except in case of attack, would now be a part of the Constitution of the United States. There is, among our citizens, a widespread acceptance of the belief that if we are to have a real democracy, the people's control of the operations of our Government should not stop at the water's edge.

MANY TYPES OF TREATIES INVOLVED

Remove the Senate's two-thirds rule in voting on treaties and substitute a bare majority of the two branches and the years to come will witness many, many repetitions of the scene described by Mr. Farley. In the long range of the future Presidents will submit treaties to Congress and will apply pressure and the opposition will crumble like a house of cards because there will be no two-thirds rule to bulwark it. The adoption of the majority idea would simply mean that in order to give the House a very deceptive and innocuous right to go through the gesture of treaty-making, we would throw away the authority of Congress over the ratification of treaties by scrapping the Senate's two-thirds rule.

What this would mean in the future we can hardly fathom. Treaties of peace are only a small number of the treaties that come before Congress for ratification. There are all kinds of treaties on all kinds of subjects, including trade treaties that are vital to the economic life of our people. Pass this legislation and all of these treaties will in fact be made by the man who happens at the time to be occupying the White House and not in any real sense by Congress.

SACRED RIGHTS OF LABOR MAY BE THREATENED

It is easily conceivable that the rights of American labor may be involved in a very vital way in some future treaty, and if action prejudicial to labor should become frozen in a treaty there would be no remedy. A statute prejudicial to labor can be repealed and gotten rid of, but not a treaty. A treaty is a contract between states and Congress cannot repeal it. So let us remember that in tampering with our constitutional treaty-ratification system we may be tampering with something very sacred to labor.

The proposal before us is very misleading. The idea of giving the House of Representatives, the body traditionally closest to the people, something to say about the ratification of treaties is appealing and on first blush is attracting the commendation of many large voting groups. It is proclaimed as a plan to strengthen the power of Congress over treaties, but what it really does is exactly the opposite of that. It weakens and nullifies the power of Congress over treaties.

WAY TO GIVE THE HOUSE REAL AUTHORITY

There is a way by which the House could be given real authority in treaty-making. That would be by changing the pending resolution to read:

The President shall have power by and with the advice and consent of Congress, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators and Representatives present concur.

To have both legislative branches ratify treaties by a two-thirds vote in-

stead of a majority vote, would indeed make Congress a real force in treaty-making. In the incident related earlier in this speech, Mr. Farley was able to switch over a majority but he could never have switched over two-thirds.

STATE DEPARTMENT NOT ASKING FOR CHANGE

One more point and I am through. The President is not asking for this change in the treaty-ratification process. The Secretary of State is not asking for it. Nobody in the State Department is asking for it. The President is not backward in asking Congress for any authority he thinks is needed looking toward the establishment of the peace of the world, but he has not asked for this. He and Secretary Stettinius were notified of the pendency of this resolution before the committee, but they chose to say nothing in support of it.

I happen to know that the State Department does not intend to ask for its adoption. I have read the 147 pages of committee hearings diligently and I have been impressed more by what the hearings do not say than by what they do say. For instance, there is not a word in the hearings from anyone who is charged with responsibility of the foreign affairs of our Government. In view of the fact that it is possible to make a treaty that would fundamentally and radically change our form of Government and our way of life, I think it is highly important that Congress should keep its hand on the throttle. We hear it charged on all sides that Congress is breaking down. Let us not, my colleagues, be guilty of breaking ourselves down.

The Constitution of the United States, whether we realize it or not, is the cornerstone of our national welfare and the sheet anchor of our liberties. If we lose it, we lose everything. I submit that the best thing we can do with this resolution, weakening congressional control over treaties, is to defeat it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MILK PRODUCTION FROM 1935 TO 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein two tables from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following table shows the milk production by States by years from 1935-45. When one realizes the enormous amount of food produced by this industry in comparison to the total food produced by the few crops enjoying New Deal favor, year after year, it is well to give this great industry some time and recognition. This is all the more apparent when one realizes that the contribution of this industry to the national food supply is not only the dairy product, but in addition the beef supply of the Nation that is derived from the dairy herds of the Nation. On January 1, 1941, there were 36,000,000 dairy cattle and 31,000,000 other cattle in the United States, so it is evident that from 40 to 50 percent of the beef of the Nation is obtained from the dairy industry.

Milk produced on farms during year, by States, alphabetically, 1935-44

(Million pounds)

	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Alabama.....	1,232	1,203	1,178	1,188	1,199	1,143	1,219	1,207	1,309	1,360
Arizona.....	224	228	214	219	235	232	241	253	252	249
Arkansas.....	1,224	1,235	1,321	1,363	1,354	1,355	1,453	1,467	1,411	1,445
California.....	4,151	4,218	4,297	4,454	4,617	4,893	5,091	5,188	5,175	5,479
Colorado.....	912	974	930	972	1,002	1,016	1,067	1,092	1,099	1,056
Connecticut.....	618	625	650	667	673	670	684	717	700	717
Delaware.....	126	130	127	132	139	144	154	157	151	152
Florida.....	290	321	323	322	330	318	343	353	366	437
Georgia.....	1,071	1,054	1,080	1,079	1,122	1,053	1,076	1,120	1,149	1,146
Idaho.....	1,043	1,071	1,075	1,110	1,164	1,228	1,324	1,368	1,367	1,405
Illinois.....	4,873	4,814	4,873	5,056	5,053	5,188	5,453	5,617	5,352	5,503
Indiana.....	3,049	3,013	2,944	3,168	3,180	3,225	3,435	3,557	3,454	3,492
Iowa.....	6,009	6,052	5,919	6,365	6,379	6,611	6,920	6,941	7,071	6,726
Kansas.....	3,075	2,861	2,708	2,869	2,881	2,860	3,172	3,332	3,296	3,172
Kentucky.....	1,946	1,845	1,883	1,955	1,886	1,841	1,995	2,163	2,112	2,147
Louisiana.....	578	598	598	647	664	628	644	667	686	695
Maine.....	632	626	630	638	619	638	641	636	618	654
Maryland.....	772	784	790	831	898	922	960	984	945	961
Massachusetts.....	767	770	783	784	791	810	818	811	757	777
Michigan.....	4,257	4,465	4,470	4,560	4,762	4,949	5,124	5,296	5,333	5,375
Minnesota.....	7,384	7,745	7,646	8,175	8,160	8,405	8,824	8,995	8,872	8,508
Mississippi.....	1,299	1,303	1,312	1,338	1,310	1,195	1,261	1,330	1,342	1,410
Missouri.....	3,363	3,014	3,053	3,270	3,271	3,386	3,631	3,816	3,845	4,090
Montana.....	693	649	623	637	682	688	733	754	760	721
Nebraska.....	2,689	2,623	2,356	2,479	2,618	2,589	2,752	2,969	3,064	2,785
Nevada.....	106	104	104	107	109	105	115	115	113	108
New Hampshire.....	578	372	357	353	354	361	348	348	333	340
New Jersey.....	858	874	903	922	943	969	1,018	1,028	1,010	1,015
New Mexico.....	231	244	245	257	269	287	299	306	300	270
New York.....	6,874	7,213	7,213	7,288	7,508	7,658	7,949	8,107	7,784	7,722
North Carolina.....	1,245	1,274	1,279	1,286	1,310	1,390	1,381	1,024	1,465	1,540
North Dakota.....	1,951	1,919	1,796	1,821	1,906	2,115	2,284	2,325	2,264	2,183
Ohio.....	4,356	4,389	4,434	4,551	4,570	4,617	4,838	5,130	4,976	5,174
Oklahoma.....	2,275	2,186	2,329	2,491	2,487	2,380	2,582	2,713	2,692	2,686
Oregon.....	1,329	1,333	1,336	1,350	1,364	1,394	1,428	1,482	1,468	1,463
Pennsylvania.....	4,472	4,532	4,496	4,523	4,511	4,696	4,869	5,022	4,863	4,976
Rhode Island.....	132	129	131	131	134	136	136	135	128	129
South Carolina.....	538	551	560	545	543	559	569	587	589	604
South Dakota.....	1,603	1,640	1,472	1,570	1,642	1,746	1,827	1,867	1,804	1,710
Tennessee.....	1,754	1,717	1,758	1,850	1,855	1,820	1,941	2,106	2,196	2,252
Texas.....	3,741	4,011	4,139	4,349	4,192	4,192	4,452	4,435	4,389	4,405
Utah.....	494	509	504	522	543	550	569	629	655	709
Vermont.....	1,341	1,362	1,354	1,343	1,348	1,423	1,451	1,466	1,452	1,498
Virginia.....	1,362	1,334	1,397	1,436	1,431	1,512	1,560	1,622	1,626	1,691
Washington.....	1,866	1,903	1,887	1,912	1,942	2,001	2,085	2,159	2,119	2,242
West Virginia.....	838	814	794	807	775	803	831	798	798	834
Wisconsin.....	10,921	11,598	11,378	11,862	11,973	12,665	13,625	14,239	14,334	14,643
Wyoming.....	263	272	259	273	282	292	298	306	306	314
United States.....	101,205	102,410	101,608	105,807	106,792	109,510	115,498	119,240	118,140	118,952

There are many facts evident in this table. One is that the national milk production was higher in 1942 than it has been before that year or since. In other words, an increase in national milk production has not been taking place during the war. The production was the

greatest in 1942, before subsidies were paid than it has been since. Other factors are, of course, involved. You will also note that Wisconsin increased its milk production by some two and one-half billion pounds from January 1, 1940, to January 1, 1945, or an increase which

is more than the total milk production of some 33 individual States.

THE PREVAILING MILK PRICES

The following table shows the milk prices by States by years from 1935 to 1945:

Milk wholesale: Annual average price per 100 pounds received by farmers, 1935-43

State	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944 ¹
Alabama.....	\$1.85	\$2.10	\$2.30	\$2.05	\$2.00	\$2.10	\$2.30	\$2.85	\$3.45	\$3.75
Arizona.....	1.40	1.80	1.95	1.65	1.55	1.60	1.85	2.35	2.80	3.05
Arkansas.....	1.80	1.95	2.00	1.65	1.65	1.80	2.15	2.60	3.20	3.25
California.....	1.70	1.95	2.10	1.80	1.75	1.85	2.30	2.90	3.45	3.60
Colorado.....	1.60	1.65	1.85	1.45	1.35	1.55	1.85	2.20	2.70	2.95
Connecticut.....	2.40	2.55	2.80	2.60	2.60	2.65	2.95	3.40	3.60	3.60
Delaware.....	1.95	2.00	2.25	2.05	2.00	2.05	2.35	2.65	3.40	3.55
Florida.....	3.05	3.05	3.30	3.20	3.15	3.15	3.30	3.95	4.60	4.50
Georgia.....	2.40	2.35	2.70	2.80	2.80	2.85	3.00	3.50	3.85	4.00
Idaho.....	1.40	1.60	1.65	1.30	1.30	1.50	1.85	2.20	2.65	2.55
Illinois.....	1.50	1.80	1.90	1.65	1.55	1.65	2.05	2.40	2.95	3.09
Indiana.....	1.55	1.90	2.05	1.75	1.75	1.85	2.25	2.60	3.15	3.25
Iowa.....	1.55	1.75	1.90	1.65	1.55	1.65	1.90	2.10	2.55	2.70
Kansas.....	1.50	1.75	1.90	1.70	1.60	1.70	1.95	2.35	3.00	3.05
Kentucky.....	1.60	1.90	2.00	1.55	1.50	1.65	2.05	2.45	3.05	3.20
Louisiana.....	1.95	2.10	2.25	2.15	2.05	2.30	2.45	3.00	3.65	3.75
Maine.....	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.10	2.45	2.85	3.40	3.50
Maryland.....	2.25	2.30	2.45	2.30	2.20	2.40	2.75	3.20	3.90	4.00
Massachusetts.....	2.80	2.85	2.75	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	3.45	4.00	4.00
Michigan.....	1.60	1.80	1.95	1.65	1.65	1.80	2.15	2.55	3.20	3.30
Minnesota.....	1.50	1.80	1.80	1.50	1.40	1.55	1.80	2.15	2.65	2.70
Mississippi.....	1.75	1.90	2.00	1.75	1.65	1.80	2.20	2.60	3.20	3.40
Missouri.....	1.65	1.80	1.95	1.75	1.65	1.75	2.05	2.55	3.20	3.25
Montana.....	1.70	1.90	2.15	1.95	1.95	2.00	2.00	2.15	2.55	2.75
Nebraska.....	1.60	1.80	1.90	1.60	1.55	1.70	1.90	2.35	2.75	2.85
Nevada.....	1.70	1.70	1.75	1.85	1.75	1.80	2.00	2.45	2.95	3.10
New Hampshire.....	2.10	2.10	2.00	2.10	2.15	2.25	2.55	2.95	3.50	3.60
New Jersey.....	2.53	2.61	2.73	2.69	2.63	2.50	2.96	3.45	3.80	4.00
New Mexico.....	2.25	2.40	2.50	2.40	2.35	2.40	2.55	2.90	3.65	3.90
New York.....	1.84	1.95	1.96	1.79	1.79	2.02	2.36	2.80	3.30	3.45
North Carolina.....	2.60	2.60	2.90	2.80	2.70	2.80	2.95	3.20	3.85	4.00
North Dakota.....	1.95	1.95	2.05	1.90	1.85	1.85	1.95	2.20	2.55	2.60
Ohio.....	1.65	1.90	2.05	1.80	1.65	1.75	2.25	2.65	3.20	3.30
Oklahoma.....	1.70	1.75	1.80	1.55	1.55	1.70	2.00	2.45	3.20	3.40

¹Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1944-Jan. 30, 1945, Agricultural Prices.

Milk wholesale: Annual average price per 100 pounds received by farmers, 1935-43—Continued

State	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Oregon	\$1.75	\$1.90	\$1.90	\$1.90	\$1.65	\$1.85	\$2.30	\$2.85	\$3.55	\$3.65
Pennsylvania	1.90	2.00	2.20	1.90	1.90	2.05	2.35	2.80	3.40	3.55
Rhode Island	2.75	2.85	2.85	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.95	3.40	3.85	3.90
South Carolina	2.75	2.65	2.75	2.85	2.85	2.90	3.05	3.45	3.95	4.10
South Dakota	1.55	1.65	1.80	1.75	1.65	1.60	1.75	2.05	2.55	2.65
Tennessee	1.90	2.00	2.20	1.80	1.80	1.95	2.35	2.70	3.40	3.55
Texas	2.15	2.20	2.30	2.10	2.05	2.10	2.40	2.95	3.60	3.60
Utah	1.40	1.55	1.60	1.35	1.35	1.45	1.75	2.25	2.80	2.85
Vermont	1.85	1.85	1.75	1.75	1.85	1.95	2.25	2.70	3.30	3.40
Virginia	2.40	2.45	2.75	2.50	2.45	2.55	2.85	3.45	3.90	4.05
Washington	1.60	1.75	1.80	1.40	1.45	1.55	2.05	2.60	3.20	3.15
West Virginia	1.80	2.00	2.20	2.10	2.05	2.15	2.40	2.75	3.35	3.50
Wisconsin	1.32	1.51	1.59	1.28	1.22	1.38	1.84	2.10	2.60	2.70
Wyoming	1.50	1.80	1.75	1.45	1.40	1.50	1.80	2.10	2.75	3.03
United States	1.74	1.93	1.97	1.72	1.68	1.82	2.18	2.57	3.12	3.24

The above table shows the following: Average price of milk in United States and in Wisconsin for years 1935 to January 1, 1945:

Year	United States price	Wisconsin price	Difference
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
1935	\$1.74	\$1.32	\$0.42
1936	1.93	1.51	.42
1937	1.97	1.59	.38
1938	1.72	1.28	.44
1939	1.68	1.22	.46
1940	1.82	1.38	.44
1941	2.18	1.84	.34
1942	2.57	2.10	.47
1943	3.12	2.60	.52
1944	3.24	2.70	.54

This indicates a gradual increase in the differential in amount, but not in percentage of difference.

This table shows the increase in spread between the prices in States like Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin, where the real volume of milk is produced, and the average national price of milk. This spread has increased until in 1944 Wisconsin milk brought 54 cents less per hundredweight than the national average price of milk per hundredweight. In fact the difference or spread between the Wisconsin price and the national was much more than the subsidy paid to Wisconsin producers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. SMITH of Maine for Friday, March 2, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARE, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I do so for the purpose of announcing the program for next week. The Consent Calendar will be called on Monday, after which the rule on the nurses' draft bill (H. R. 2277) will be taken up. That will be followed by general debate on the bill. We hope to conclude debate on Monday and read the first section of the bill when the Committee will rise. We will consider amendments on Tuesday after

the Private Calendar is disposed of. On Wednesday the Commodity Credit Corporation bill (S. 298), and on Thursday the debt-limit bill. Friday is undetermined, pending the disposition of the previously mentioned bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3:00 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 5, 1945, at 12:00 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Brand Names and Newsprint Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Monday, March 5, 1945. Business to be considered: Newsprint.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, March 6, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Wednesday and Thursday, March 7 and 8, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 173, 1548, 1624, and 2256.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

265. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of costs, cancellations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects compiled as of June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

266. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of fiscal affairs of Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

267. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on a survey of the fishery resources of the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

268. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 128 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with

a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

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. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 244. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 43. A bill to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases; with amendment (Rept. No. 245). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2404. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: H. R. 2433. A bill to extend the eligibility for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces discharged or released from active service to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2434. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay not to exceed \$50 to defray the cost of cemetery property for the burial of veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: H. R. 2435. A bill to provide for taxation and assessment of real estate owned by the United States as a housing project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COLE of New York: H. R. 2436. A bill to authorize the transfer of Fort Schuyler Military Reservation, N. Y., to the State of New York for nautical education purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: H. R. 2437. A bill making appropriations for salaries and expenses necessary for wage stabilization program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARDNER: H. R. 2438. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide a dependency exemption for certain foster children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2439. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 2440. A bill amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, providing for deferment of men engaged in coal mining; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2441. A bill to extend the life of national service life insurance policies owned by members of the armed forces to 10 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2442. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to the duty on water-leaf papers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2443. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2444. A bill to exempt pay for service in the armed forces during the present war from the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2445. A bill to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2446. A bill to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 2447. A bill to provide for the issuance by the War and Navy Departments of certificates of death in the case of members of the armed forces who die in service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2448. A bill to reduce the rate of interest on loans secured by United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2449. A bill to amend title III of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to provide certain rights for members of the merchant marine serving during World War No. 1; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution providing for the consideration of treaties by Congress in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 156. Resolution declaring it to be the constitutional right and duty of the House of Representatives to deliberate and act upon treaties in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing

the President and the Congress of the United States to refrain from enacting legislation to draft men for labor in industrial plants; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation for the creation of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes as an integral part of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 2450. A bill for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 2451. A bill for the relief of Charles P. Leek, John E. Leek, and Cecil G. Leek trading under the name of Lower Bank Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 2452. A bill for the relief of Sam Kalak; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TORRENS:

H. R. 2453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Morton; 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:

118. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Senate Resolution No. 95 of the North Carolina 1945 General Assembly, a joint resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation for the relief of counties whose taxable property has been taken over for national forests and parks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

119. Also, Senate Resolution No. 28 of the North Carolina 1945 General Assembly, a resolution relating to payments in lieu of taxes on federally owned property in the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

120. Also, Senate Resolution No. 203 of the North Carolina 1945 General Assembly, a joint resolution memorializing the Members of the North Carolina delegation in the Senate and the Congress of the United States to lend their immediate assistance in obtaining tobacco plant bed cloth for the farmers of eastern North Carolina; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

121. Also, Senate Resolution No. 33 of the North Carolina General Assembly of 1945, a joint resolution urging the Senators and Representatives of North Carolina in the Congress of the United States to use their best efforts to continue the tobacco control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

122. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of the Committee for Defense of Rights of Poland, of Springfield, Mass., registering emphatic protest against the Yalta decisions as affecting Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

123. Also, petition of Rt. Rev. Joseph Lesniak, of Springfield, Mass., condemning the decision regarding the new partition of Poland reached at Yalta as contrary to the spirit of the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

124. Also, petition of Helen S. Kochanek, president of the Polanie Club of Indian Orchard, Mass., protesting the resolutions adopted at the Crimean Conference with reference to Poland as in direct opposition to the ideals expressed in the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

125. By Mr. MALONEY: Petition of Frank S. Caruso and various citizens of the State of Louisiana, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

126. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Isabelle Paterson and 78 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging favorable action on the Peterson bill, H. R. 5477; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 26, 1945)

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

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we invoke the blessings of Thy presence and Thy power as we continue to go forth upon a day laden with tasks and responsibilities which challenge the consecration of our noblest manhood.

We thank Thee for the life and character of Thy servant who walked and worked with us for a little while upon this earth and whose sun went down while it was yet day, only to rise again in heavenly blessedness.

Grant unto the bereaved and sorrowing the consolations of Thy presence and the glad assurance that his name will be forever enshrined among those whose minds and hearts were inspired by Thy grace to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with the Lord their God.

We pray that Thou wilt also so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom, and may we live and labor in faith and in faithfulness for the coming of that day when the whole earth will be illumined with the radiant splendor of the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in the name of the Christ our Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Friday, March 2, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 2, 1945, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of