

occupation of Japan, as soon as the arms and the armaments of that country have been seized.

The Transportation Corps of the Army announced on July 31 of this year that 432,258 men had been brought back from Europe between May 12, 1945, and July 13, 1945—that is, within 60 days. Public-press reports stated that 1,000,000 men had been brought back to the country between May 8 and August 8, 1945—that is, within 90 days. So we will see that these men can be demobilized and returned quickly.

It may be of interest to the people to know that in the first part of June this year the Congress by statute directed the Army to open up enlistments to volunteers in the Regular Army up to the maximum peacetime strength Army of 280,000, the figure fixed as a maximum some years ago. These enlistments are to be for 3 years, just as in peacetime.

For some reason which has not yet been explained, the Army waited until August 15, 1945, to open up enlistments even for the Regular Army. This was a delay of 2½ months after the approval of the law, and indicates a reluctance on the part of the War Department to deal with the subject of voluntary enlistment.

It therefore becomes the duty of the Congress to deal with the subject of enlistments in the Army and Navy for their needs during the immediate post-war era; and, as I have stated, such enlistments should be for a period of 1 year.

Induction and the forced draft of men into the armed service were justifiable in time of war, but now that peace has come, and this being a country which finds its progress and achievement as a peaceful nation, we must return to a voluntary basis in the armed services if our people are to remain free and have the choice of such service.

All these things cannot be brought about immediately. That is, they cannot be brought about tomorrow or next week. It will take several months to get such a plan under way and to obtain results sufficient to end the draft. But I do not believe that it is going to take 2 years or more of inductions under Selective Service, nor do I believe that such inductions should be made or limited to 2 years' service, as advocated by the President and the War Department.

We should proceed at once to establish the armed services through personnel of volunteers. In doing so there is no reason whatsoever to delay the return of those who now have seen long service in the armed forces.

If it is found necessary to continue inductions for a matter of months longer until the result of the volunteer service can be ascertained, that can be done; but we should start at once without delay to have a volunteer Army and Navy. The time has come for forced draft and inductions to be considered for the purpose of ending them, not for the purpose of continuing them indefinitely.

Let the young men and the boys of this country have an opportunity to take up again their lives of peace. Permit

them to enjoy the real values of a free people. Reduce armaments to the minimum needed. Sustain our forces through those who choose to join them. The war has ended. Let the people live and choose to live as a peaceful people have the right to do.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Leo T. Crowley, of Wisconsin, and Phillips Lee Goldsborough, of Maryland, for appointment as members of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 6 years from September 6, 1945.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if there be no further business, I move that the Senate adjourn until next Monday at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, September 10, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 6, 1945:

HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Paul V. McNutt, of Indiana, to be United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

Assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons, effective dates indicated:

Robert V. Holman, July 1, 1944.
James R. Hurley, September 12, 1945.
James F. Maddux, July 1, 1945.
Wardell H. Mills, September 14, 1945.
Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr., September 4, 1945.

Richard C. Siders, July 1, 1945.
Surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons, effective August 1, 1945:

Llewellyn L. Ashburn	Hollis U. Maness
Bert R. Boone	Thomas B. McKneely
Don S. Cameron	Carroll E. Palmer
Kenneth E. Gamm	Donald W. Patrick
Alfred B. Geyer	Thurman H. Rose
Clifton K. Himmelsbach	George G. VanDyke
Marion K. King	Victor H. Vogel
Benton O. Lewis	Oliver C. Williams
	William G. Workman

Dental surgeons to be temporary senior dental surgeons, effective dates indicated:

Leonard R. Etzenhouser, May 1, 1945.
Mark E. Bowers, August 1, 1945.
Gordon G. Braendle, August 1, 1945.
John M. Francis, August 1, 1945.
Charles B. Galt, August 1, 1945.
Frank E. Law, August 1, 1945.
Robert H. Moore, August 1, 1945.
Walter J. Pelton, August 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 6, 1945:

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright to be general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

All praise and glory be unto Thee, O God. Love and mercy never pass by the boundaries of Thy heart. As we tread the crowded pathways of life, lead us, we pray Thee, and convert us to humility, to unflinching kindness, and to the love that casteth out fear. Persuade us that the finest type of manhood and womanhood lies not in outward glory and honor but in the hidden soul. No achievement is so great or so high as the creation of character; all else is dim and stationary.

Almighty God, judge of all men, be with the whole race of humankind; cleanse its dark and forbidding passages, bind up its wounds and stop its anguished cries. O come to our own country, to our President, to this Congress; make us abundantly equal to every emergency. Help us to quench the smoldering fires of war with that courage and power that lifts humanity above all wrath and revenge. Put Thy hand upon us, our abilities, and our time, and say to us: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof the world and they that dwell therein." In the name of the Prince of Peace. 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 169):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. HIRAM W. JOHNSON, late a Senator from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That at the conclusion of its session today, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do adjourn.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain

records of the United States Government" for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. National Archives.
7. Office of Price Administration.
8. Selective Service System.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DECLARATION OF RECESS HONORING LIEUTENANT GENERAL WAINWRIGHT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next the Speaker may declare a recess in order that the House may receive Lieutenant General Wainwright at 2:30 p. m.

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

There was no objection.

TREATY OF GREENE VILLE CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER. The Chair, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by Public Law 159, Seventy-ninth Congress, and the order of the House of July 21, 1945, empowering him to appoint commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on July 27, 1945, appoint as commissioners of the Treaty of Greene Ville Celebration Commission the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER] and notified the Clerk of the House of his action.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENT IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Military Affairs has unanimously reported the bill (H. R. 3951) relating to voluntary enlistment in the armed forces. I ask unanimous consent that I, as chairman of the committee, may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report thereon.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, may I inquire what day next week the gentleman intends to call up that bill?

Mr. MAY. I have no definite information as to that. I understand from the Speaker that two other bills will precede it, and it will follow those bills if it is possible to get to it.

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

There was no objection.

SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next it shall be in order to consider the bill (H. R. 3907) to provide for administra-

tion of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator; that all points of order against said bill be waived; and that general debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the reason for waiving all points of order?

Mr. MANASCO. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that there is a provision in the bill for the transfer of appropriations from the jurisdiction of the Board to that of the single Administrator, if the bill becomes law.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It does not require more money?

Mr. MANASCO. Not any more money; no.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The consideration of the bill will be conducted in the usual way, with general debate, and with the bill then being read for amendment if anyone has an amendment to offer?

Mr. MANASCO. The bill will be open to amendments that are in order.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I regret that you have been compelled to cut short your recess period. I know, however, that you have been just as eager as any of us to meet the problems which naturally have crowded down upon us with the surrender of the Japanese.

You have cut short a well-merited vacation in order to do so. I hope that the American people realize as fully as I do, that from the very first days of the emergency, the Congress has most energetically and patriotically devoted its time, energies, and capabilities to the immediate problems of war and to the long-range problems of peace. The legislative branch of the Government is entitled to its full share of credit and glory for the victory of the Allied armies. I wish to take this opportunity on behalf of the Nation to congratulate you on the great victory which has been won—in which you played so important a part.

The Congress reconvenes at a time of great emergency. It is an emergency about which, however, we need have no undue fear if we exercise the same energy, foresight, and wisdom as we did in carrying on the war and winning this victory.

The sudden surrender of the Japanese has not caught us unawares. President Roosevelt, as early as the Fall of 1943, began to set up machinery which he foresaw would become necessary to meet the reconversion period. The Congress in its wisdom has adopted some of that machinery by statute, and has improved and added to it. As a result, Government agencies, for some time, have been able to plan for the immediate and long-range steps which now have to be taken.

As the Congress has undoubtedly noticed, many steps were taken immediately after the surrender of the Japanese. Many more have been taken since.

The process of reconversion will be a complicated and difficult one. The general line of approach to the problem is to achieve as full peacetime production and employment as possible in the most efficient and speedy manner. The following policies have been laid down and will be followed:

(1) Demobilize as soon as possible the armed forces no longer needed.

(2) Cancel and settle war contracts as quickly as possible.

(3) Clear the war plants so as to permit contractors to proceed with peacetime production.

(4) Hold the line on prices and rents until fair competition can operate to prevent inflation and undue hardship on consumers.

(5) Hold wages in line where their increase would cause inflationary price rises. Where price ceilings would not be endangered, collective bargaining should be restored.

(6) Remove all possible wartime government controls in order to speed and encourage reconversion and expansion.

(7) Keep only those controls which are necessary to help reconversion and expansion by preventing bottlenecks, shortages of material, and inflation.

(8) Prevent rapid decrease of wage incomes or purchasing power.

The major objective, of course, is to reestablish an expanded peacetime industry, trade, and agriculture, and to do it as quickly as possible.

Obviously during this process there will be a great deal of inevitable unemployment. What we must do is to assist industry to reconvert to peacetime production as quickly and effectively as possible so that the number of unemployed will be swiftly and substantially reduced as industry and business and agriculture get into high production.

The Government is now doing what it can to hurry this reconversion process.

Through contract termination procedures it is providing quick payment to contractors.

It has released controls on practically all materials which are necessary for peacetime production, reserving only those few in which there is still a critical shortage.

It has made arrangements for credit facilities for industry.

By plant and surplus property disposal, it is helping private enterprise to get started again.

In the consumer field the Government has released controls over articles which

were needed for the war in such large quantities that civilians had to go without.

For the information of Congress, I am submitting as an appendix to this message a report by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion showing what has already been done by the Federal Government in reconversion.

There is much that the Congress can do to help this process and to tide over the period between now and the time when reconversion is completed and civilian jobs are plentiful in a stable economy that provides full production, full employment, and a high standard of living.

1. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The end of the war came more swiftly than most of us anticipated. Widespread cut-backs in war orders followed promptly. As a result, there has already been a considerable number of workers who are between jobs as war industries convert to peace. Other workers are returning to a 40-hour week and are faced with a corresponding reduction in take-home pay.

This has led to a natural feeling of uneasiness among the rank and file of our people. Let me emphasize that there will be no reason for undue timidity. A vast backlog of orders may soon make possible the greatest peacetime industrial activity that we have ever seen. But this can happen only if the Congress and the administration move vigorously and courageously to deal with the economic problems which peace has created. Then there need be no reason to fear either the immediate future or the years that lie ahead of us.

Determined action now will create the atmosphere of confidence which is so vital to a rapid reconversion with a minimum of unemployment and hardship.

No matter how rapidly reconversion proceeds, however, no amount of effort or planning will be able immediately to provide a job for everyone displaced from war work. Obviously, displaced war workers cannot find jobs until industry has been regeared and made ready to produce peacetime goods. During this lag the Government should provide help. The cost of this transition from war to peace is as much a part of the cost of war as the transition from peace to war—and we should so consider it.

This course is recommended not only as a matter of justice and humanity, but also as a matter of sound business. Nothing would be more harmful to our economy than to have every displaced war worker stop buying consumer goods. And nothing would be more conducive to a large-scale cessation of buying than the feeling on the part of displaced war workers that all their income had stopped and that their remaining financial resources had to be hoarded.

For one group of those who may become unemployed in the near future—the demobilized veterans—the Congress has already made special provision. Any veteran who has satisfactorily completed 90 days of service is now entitled by law to a weekly unemployment allowance of \$20 for as much as 52 weeks depending on the length of his service.

By contrast, there are more than 15,000,000 workers not protected under

our present unemployment insurance laws. There are many millions more for whom protection is inadequate. Many of these have been unable to accumulate adequate savings.

On May 28, 1945, I recommended to the Congress that the Federal Government immediately supplement the unemployment insurance benefits now provided by the several States. That is the only feasible way to provide at least a subsistence payment in all parts of the United States during this coming unemployment period.

As I pointed out then, the existing State laws relative to unemployment insurance are inadequate in three respects:

(1) Only about 30,000,000 of our 43,000,000 nonagricultural workers are protected by unemployment insurance. Federal Government employees, for example, such as Federal shipyard and arsenal workers, are not covered. Nor are employees of small businesses and small industrial establishments. Nor are the officers and men of the merchant marine who have braved enemy torpedoes and bombs to deliver supplies and the implements of war to our armed services and our allies.

(2) The weekly benefit payments under many of the State laws are now far too low to provide subsistence and purchasing power for the workers and their families. Almost half of the States have the clearly inadequate maximum of \$15 to \$18 a week.

(3) Many of the States pay benefits for too short a period. In more than one-third of the States, for example, 18 weeks is the maximum.

I recommend then, and I urgently renew my recommendation now, that the Congress take immediate action to make good these deficiencies for the present emergency period of reconversion.

Specifically, coverage should be extended to include Federal employees, maritime workers, and other workers not now insured. This additional compensation during the present emergency will have to be financed entirely by the Federal Government, but the benefits should appropriately be administered by the States.

I also recommend, and I now repeat that recommendation, that the Congress provide, through supplementary Federal emergency benefit payments, additional unemployment benefits so as to bring them up to adequate standards in all the States. All payments, however, should be made through the existing unemployment compensation machinery of the several States.

During this emergency every eligible worker should be entitled to 26 weeks of unemployment benefits in any one year. The maximum weekly payment for those workers whose previous earnings were high enough, should be not less than \$25 per week.

If the Congress decides to take this very necessary step, it will also wish to reconsider and increase the unemployment allowance provided for veterans.

There has been so much misrepresentation about this temporary proposal that I think I should categorically state what the bill does not do.

It does not give everyone \$25 a week. Under it, an applicant must be ready, willing, and able to work and must have earned wages high enough so that the percentage rate will yield this maximum figure.

It does not federalize the unemployment compensation system. It leaves it with the States.

It is not intended to take the place of the permanent amendments to the unemployment compensation system which are now being studied by the Congress. It is an emergency measure designed to expand the present system without changing its principles. It is designed only to meet the immediate pressing human problems of reconversion.

This recommendation is not to be confused with the broader question of extending, expanding, and improving our entire social-security program of which unemployment insurance is only a part. I expect to communicate with the Congress on this subject at a later date. But I sincerely urge that we do not wait for consideration of such a complex question before enacting this much needed emergency legislation.

2. FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

In addition to those workers who will temporarily lose their jobs, there will be millions of others whose incomes will fall sharply with the end of war production. These will be added to the several million wage earners who even now have hourly earnings much below what is necessary for a decent standard of living.

The inadequacy of these wages, in many cases, has been temporarily concealed by wartime increases in take-home pay resulting from overtime work. As these props to income are removed, however, low-wage earners will be hard pressed to feed, clothe, and house their families. This flies in the face of a sound public policy. Failure to correct this situation will slow down, if it will not actually stop, our drive toward an expanding market for business and agriculture.

The foundations of a healthy national economy cannot be secure so long as any large section of our working people receive substandard wages. The existence of substandard wage levels sharply curtails the national purchasing power and narrows the market for the products of our farms and factories.

In the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Congress adopted a program intended to provide a minimum wage standard for a large number of American workers.

In that statute, the Congress declared it to be our national policy to eliminate, from interstate industry, wage levels detrimental to the maintenance of minimum standards of living. The establishment then of a minimum wage of 25 cents per hour represented a first step toward the realization of that policy. The goal of 40 cents per hour, which under the act was to be made effective by 1945, was actually made fully effective more than a year ago by the voluntary action of the industry committees.

I believed that the goal of a 40-cent minimum was inadequate when established. It has now become obsolete.

Increases in the cost of living since 1938 and changes in our national wage

structure, require an immediate and substantial upward revision of this minimum. Only in that way can the objectives of the Fair Labor Standards Act be realized, the national purchasing power protected, and an economy of full production and abundance preserved and maintained for the American people.

The high prosperity which we seek in the postwar years will not be meaningful for all our people if any large proportion of our industrial wage earners receive wages as low as the minimum now sanctioned by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I therefore recommend that the Congress amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by substantially increasing the minimum wage specified therein to a level which will eliminate substandards of living, and assure the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers.

The scope of the Fair Labor Standards Act also should be clarified and extended. In view of changes which have occurred since 1938, I believe it is no longer necessary to exclude from the minimum wage program the large number of workers engaged in agricultural processing who are now excluded. There now exists a twilight zone in which some workers are covered, and others, doing similar work, are not. Extension of coverage would benefit both workers and employers, by removing competitive inequities.

Our achievements in this field during the last seven years of establishing minimum wages have been gratifying; but we must continue to move forward, step by step.

I urge that the Congress act promptly. The wage structure on which business men may make future plans should be settled quickly.

3. WARTIME CONTROLS

One of the outstanding achievements of the war has been the success of the Government in holding the line against inflation. This is the first time in any major war that the United States has been able substantially to stabilize its economy.

That fact now permits us to enter into the difficult period of readjustment without the threat of a disastrous price collapse.

For this result much credit is due to the Congress, which in the face of great insistence from many interested pressure groups refused steadfastly to take the easy way.

Great credit is due to the Office of Economic Stabilization, the War Labor Board, the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, the War Production Board, and the other stabilization agencies. Despite great pressure and often unjust abuse, they continued to hold the line for the benefit of the great mass of Americans.

And above all, great credit is due to the people of the United States, the great body of average citizens, who, for four difficult years and with only a few exceptions, subordinated their personal interest to the long-range interest of the Nation as a whole.

Many of the demands of the war for commodities have now decreased. They will decrease further during the initial

period of unemployment which will come with the cancellation of war contracts. As a result, prices of some commodities are bound to soften. But if that happens in the next few months, we cannot allow ourselves to be misled. We must keep in mind the experience of the period immediately after the First World War. After a lull of a few months following the Armistice of 1918, prices turned upward, scrambling for inventories started, and prices soon got completely out of hand. We found ourselves in one of the worst inflations in our history, culminating in the crash of 1920 and the disastrous deflation of 1920 and 1921.

We must be sure this time not to repeat that bitter mistake. When reconversion really gets under way, and men go back to work, and pay rolls increase, and the pent-up demands of the war years at home and abroad for peacetime products begin to make themselves felt, we shall face the same scramble for goods, the same speculative excesses that developed in 1919. We must be in a position to overcome that danger if we expect to achieve an orderly transition to peacetime levels of full production and full employment. However, we must not allow inflationary dangers to obscure our vision of the possibilities of lower incomes and widespread unemployment. Our policy must guard against both contingencies.

Immediately after the Japanese decision to surrender, the Office of Price Administration moved promptly to eliminate rationing on gasoline, fuel oil, stoves, and processed foods.

During the transition period the Price Administrator, of course, will eliminate rationing and price controls on one commodity after another just as soon as supply comes into balance with demand. At the same time he will make whatever price adjustments are required to facilitate rapid reconversion and reemployment.

However, it will be necessary for him to continue to resist unreasonable pressures for higher prices on some commodities, just as he has resisted them all through the war. In resisting these pressures and in carrying out his difficult responsibilities, I must state clearly that he has both my backing and my confidence.

It will similarly be necessary for the Government to resist pressures for increases in wage rates which would imperil price ceilings.

Without some general stabilization the consumer cannot be protected. Without stabilization, reconversion cannot proceed as rapidly as it should; for stability of cost is indispensable to sound business planning.

The price control and stabilization program has received the backing of the great majority of businessmen throughout the war period. With few exceptions, business groups have realized clearly their own personal stake and the stake of our basic economy in the success of the anti-inflation program.

During the months that lie ahead, however, some groups in business may be tempted to substitute for this long-range wartime thinking, a short-range policy designed to secure prices high enough to

provide immediate profits over and above their temporarily high costs of production due to their initial low volume.

These pressures must be resisted. Prices must be held firmly on reconversion items as well as on cost of living items during the coming months.

The American people are entitled to a firm assurance not only on the part of the Administration, but from the Congress itself, that rents and the prices of clothing, food, and other essentials will be held in line. They are also entitled to buy washing machines, vacuum cleaners, automobiles and other products at prices based on our traditional system of high output and low unit costs.

The promise of good profits for businessmen must not be based on small initial volume. It must be based on the full all-out production which it is my belief that American industry will rapidly achieve.

Because of heavy wartime needs, it has been necessary to allocate available supplies of many foods among various claimants within this country, and among other countries. It has been necessary to set aside large blocks of specified commodities in order to make these commodities available for military and other essential needs. Rationing of food for consumers has been necessary in the interest of fair distribution.

Many of these controls have already been eliminated and all remaining allocations, set-asides, and rationing will be removed as rapidly as the supply situation will permit.

However, supplies of some of our principal foods will continue beyond the end of 1945 to be too small for the demand.

For example, the world will be short of requirements for fats and oils and sugar for some months, and allocations and rationing will probably have to be continued into 1946. We must not move so rapidly as to endanger the orderly distribution of goods on which we have based our living during the emergency.

Let me add that in no case should rationing controls be removed if by so doing we should jeopardize our relief shipments to Europe and other distressed war areas. We have a moral obligation to the people of these liberated areas. More than that, our own enlightened self-interest tells us that hungry people are rarely advocates of democracy. The rehabilitation of these countries, and indeed the removal of American occupational troops, may be unnecessarily delayed if we fail to meet these responsibilities during the next few months.

During the reconversion period and as long as shortages in certain materials other than food continue, the War Production Board will have to support the stabilization program as it has done during the past four years.

It must be in a position to take action where necessary, to increase scarce materials and facilities, break bottlenecks, channel production to meet essential needs, safeguard the opportunities for small business concerns, and, above all, to control inventories so as to prevent speculative hoarding and unbalanced distribution.

As the Congress knows, the War Production Board has already removed a

great majority of the controls which were in force during the war, and many more will be removed during the next few months.

I trust that the Congress will agree, however, that the controls which still remain and which are still considered necessary by the agency charged with responsibility should not be removed until the need for them disappears. The need to control a few critical materials which the war has caused to be in short supply will continue for some time until adequate supplies are again available. Foremost among these materials are tin and crude rubber.

It will also be necessary for some period to prevent the hoarding of items now badly needed and in great demand for the civilian economy. Many critical shortages can be avoided by the extension of general inventory controls which would prevent the accumulation of unreasonably large stocks in the hands of a few. This will speed the reconversion program and will also greatly assist in avoiding inflation of the price structure.

The extension of one further type of control should have consideration at this time. In the national interest, this Government has made and should continue to make agreements for securing our fair share of materials from certain foreign sources and also agreements for supplying various materials and products abroad. The Government should have authority to assure the carrying out of such commitments.

These production and inventory controls, as well as the allocations of food, set-asides of commodities, and rationing among consumers have been set up under the Second War Powers Act.

Most of the provisions of this act expire on December 31, 1945.

I am convinced that an orderly transition to a peacetime economy will require the use of some of these controls after the first of the year.

I request the Congress, therefore, to extend the provisions of the Second War Powers Act, either in its present form or with appropriate limitations, preserving the powers necessary to achieve the objectives I have outlined.

The Congress has my definite assurance that none of these war powers will be exercised by the executive branch of the Government unless they are deemed essential to the attainment of the objective of an orderly stabilized reconversion. The Congress should, of course, if it extends the statute, reserve the right to terminate it by legislation at any time it deems necessary.

I hope that the Congress will not delay the extension of this authority. Delay would retard reconversion by creating uncertainty on the part of business as to whether necessary controls will be retained or not. Businessmen, in planning for next year's activities, will be assisted greatly by knowing in advance whether or not the Government is going to keep a firm hand at the brakes to prevent inflation.

The termination of the wartime food subsidies, for which a total of \$1,798,000,000 has been authorized for the current year, is one of the important problems in reconversion. Agencies dealing directly with this problem are now meet-

ing jointly to determine in what order and at what time these food subsidies may be eliminated without an undue disturbance to farm income or living costs.

Subsidies for purposes other than food are also being reviewed by the agencies concerned, who are collecting the necessary data for an orderly liquidation at the earliest date compatible with the stabilization program.

Those subsidies which were designed originally to stimulate increased production should not be removed at a time or in a manner to incite inflation and upset our economy.

I have directed that early reports be made on this important problem.

4. WAR POWERS AND EXECUTIVE AGENCIES REORGANIZATION

I should like to bring to the attention of the Congress the legal difficulties that will arise unless care is taken in the drafting of legislation terminating wartime controls and wartime agencies.

I have asked the Attorney General to prepare a report on the principal statutes that confer wartime powers and on the various wartime agencies, with particular reference to the circumstances under which each terminates.

A copy of this memorandum is attached for the information of the Congress. It is an able and comprehensive summary of the applicable laws.

Your attention is particularly called to the statement in the opinion of the Attorney General to the effect that the broad basis of governmental power on which the existing emergency and wartime statutes rest has not been terminated by the unconditional surrender of our enemies.

Certain of the wartime statutes which have been made effective "in time of war," "during the present war," or "for the duration of the war" continue to be effective until a formal state of peace has been restored, or until some earlier termination date is made applicable by appropriate governmental action. Another group of statutes which by their provisions terminate "upon the cessation of hostilities" or "upon termination of the war," will in fact and in law terminate only by a formal proclamation to that effect by the President or by appropriate congressional action.

From time to time action will be taken with respect to these agencies, with the general objective of streamlining the Government into a peacetime organization as quickly as possible.

The time has not yet arrived, however, for the proclamation of the cessation of hostilities, much less the termination of the war. Needless to say, such proclamations will be made as soon as circumstances permit.

It has been necessary during the course of the war to make numerous important redistributions of functions among executive agencies.

This has been accomplished by the President under the authority of title I of the First War Powers Act. This act expires six months after the termination of the war, or at such earlier time as may be designated by appropriate governmental action.

If the Congress or the President were formally to declare the present war ter-

minated, it would automatically cause all the steps taken under the First War Powers Act with respect to the war agencies to expire, and would have the Government revert automatically to its preexisting status six months after the declaration.

If this were to occur, it would cause great confusion and chaos in the Government.

It is the policy of this administration not to exercise wartime powers beyond the point at which it is necessary to exercise them.

Similarly, the wartime agencies of the Government will not be allowed to continue to perform functions not required by present conditions.

Those functions of the wartime agencies which must be retained during part or all of the period of reconversion should be transferred as promptly as practicable to the permanent departments and agencies of the Government. The remaining functions, appropriate only to the crisis through which we have passed, should be terminated in an orderly, systematic fashion as soon as possible.

A program of winding up wartime agencies and distributing their functions on a peacetime basis is now being pursued under the powers vested in the President by title I of the First War Powers Act.

Therefore, I urge that the Congress do not yet adopt a resolution proclaiming the termination of the war or the termination of the emergency or the cessation of hostilities. Such a resolution would automatically cause the death of many war powers and wartime agencies before we are ready.

At the same time I recognize that the Congress may wish to repeal certain specific wartime statutes. If this is to be done, the repeal should be on a selective basis, through the adoption of specific statutes dealing with each wartime power which the Congress decides should be terminated.

In my message dated May 24, 1945, it was recommended that permanent legislation be enacted which would authorize the President to submit to the Congress, from time to time, plans providing for the reorganization of executive agencies, each such plan to become effective unless the Congress should reject it by concurrent resolution.

This type of joint action by the Congress and the President has produced, and will produce, far better results than can be achieved by the usual legislative process in the field of executive reorganization. If proper progress is to be made, it is necessary to permit the President to lay out the machinery for carrying out his responsibility for the conduct of the executive branch, subject to rejection by the two Houses of Congress. Executive initiative, subject to congressional veto, is an effective approach to governmental reorganization.

The responsibility of conducting the executive branch rests upon the President. It is fair and efficient to permit him to lay out the machinery for carrying out that responsibility.

The means for doing this should be generally along the lines of the Reorganization Act of 1939, which gives the initiative to the President, but reserves

power to the Congress by a majority vote to nullify any action of the President which does not meet with its approval.

Considerable progress was made in efficiency of government under this Reorganization Act of 1939. I recommend that such powers be made of permanent duration and that the legislation be sufficiently flexible to permit any kind of adjustment for which necessity may arise.

It is clear to all of us that the Government has a difficult and important task in the years which lie ahead. Our Government belongs to the people and the people have a right to expect from their Government the greatest possible efficiency in carrying out its task.

Our Government has never been as efficient as we should like to see it. To some degree this may be charged to the size of some of the tasks assigned to it. To some extent, it is also due to the lack of trained Government personnel and the low salaries paid to Government officials.

There is no question that the war has taught us a great deal about Government administration. There is still, however, much room for improvement.

I have undertaken directly through the members of the Cabinet and also through the Directors of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and the Bureau of the Budget to emphasize the need for more efficient operation in all the executive branches of the Government. I have requested them to examine administrative procedures, and to speed up and simplify their operations to the maximum practical degree.

I have also requested the Bureau of the Budget to examine closely with each department and agency head, the actual needs of his office following the surrender of Japan. They have been asked to reduce budgets promptly and fully wherever cuts are indicated. The Bureau of the Budget is now completing studies which will result in reductions of millions of dollars in the expense of operating our Government.

We must continue relentlessly this program for increased Government efficiency. The Congress can depend upon the Executive to push this program with the utmost vigor.

5. FULL EMPLOYMENT

I am confident that, with the cooperation of American industry, labor, and agriculture, we can bridge the gap between war and peace.

When we have reconverted our economy to a peacetime basis, however, we shall not be satisfied with merely our prewar economy. The American people have set high goals for their own future. They have set these goals high because they have seen how great can be the productive capacity of our country.

The levels of production and income reached during the war years have given our citizens an appreciation of what a full production peacetime economy can be.

They are not interested in boom prosperity—for that only too often leads to panic and depression. But they are interested in providing opportunity for work and for ultimate security.

Government must do its part and assist industry and labor to get over the line from war to peace.

That is why I have asked for unemployment compensation legislation.

That is why I now ask for full-employment legislation.

The objectives for our domestic economy which we seek in our long-range plans were summarized by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt over a year and a half ago in the form of an economic bill of rights. Let us make the attainment of those rights the essence of postwar American economic life.

I repeat the statement of President Roosevelt:

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second bill of rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.

Among these are:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops or farms or mines of the Nation.

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation.

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living.

The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad.

The right of every family to a decent home.

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health.

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.

I shall from time to time communicate with the Congress on some of the subjects included in this enumeration of economic rights.

Most of them, in the last analysis, depend upon full production and full employment at decent wages.

There has been much discussion about the necessity of continuing full employment after the war if we hope to continue in substantial degree the prosperity which came with the war years. The time has come for action along these lines.

To provide jobs we must look first and foremost to private enterprise—to industry, agriculture, and labor. Government must inspire enterprise with confidence. That confidence must come mainly through deeds, not words.

But it is clear that confidence will be promoted by certain assurances given by the Government:

Assurance that all the facts about full employment and opportunity will be gathered periodically for the use of all.

Assurance of stability and consistency in public policy, so that enterprise can plan better by knowing what the Government intends to do.

Assurance that every governmental policy and program will be pointed to promote maximum production and employment in private enterprise.

Assurance that priority will be given to doing those things first which stimulate normal employment most.

A national reassertion of the right to work for every American citizen able and willing to work—a declaration of the ultimate duty of Government to use its own resources if all other methods should fail to prevent prolonged unemployment—these will help to avert fear and establish full employment. The prompt and firm acceptance of this bedrock public responsibility will reduce the need for its exercise.

I ask that full employment legislation to provide these vital assurances be speedily enacted. Such legislation should also provide machinery for a continuous full-employment policy—to be developed and pursued in cooperation among industry, agriculture, and labor, between the Congress and the Chief Executive, between the people and their Government.

Full employment means full opportunity for all under the American economic system—nothing more and nothing less.

In human terms, full employment means opportunity to get a good peacetime job for every worker who is ready, able, and willing to take one. It does not mean made work, or making people work.

In economic terms, full employment means full production and the opportunity to sell goods—all the goods that industry and agriculture can produce.

In Government terms, full employment means opportunity to reduce the ratio of public spending to private investment without sacrificing essential services.

In world-wide terms, full employment in America means greater economic security and more opportunity for lasting peace throughout the world.

These goals and the machinery to carry them out are set forth in legislation now pending before the Congress on which extensive public hearings have been held. The country justifiably expects early action along these lines.

6. FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

During the years of war production we made substantial progress in overcoming many of the prejudices which had resulted in discriminations against minority groups.

Many of the injustices based upon considerations of race, religion, and color were removed. Many were prevented. Perfection was not reached, of course, but substantial progress was made.

In the reconversion period and thereafter, we should make every effort to continue this American ideal. It is one of the fundamentals of our political philosophy, and it should be an integral part of our economy.

The Fair Employment Practice Committee is continuing during the transition period. I have already requested that legislation be enacted placing the Fair Employment Practice Committee on a permanent basis. I repeat that recommendation.

7. LABOR DISPUTES AND WAGE STABILIZATION

Our national welfare requires that during the reconversion period production of civilian goods and services—as

full production as possible—go forward without interruption, and that labor and industry cooperate to keep strikes and lock-outs at a minimum.

Those who have the responsibility of labor relations must recognize that responsibility. This is not the time for short-sighted management to seize upon the chance to reduce wages and try to injure labor unions. Equally it is not the time for labor leaders to shirk their responsibility and permit widespread industrial strife.

With this objective in view, I shall shortly convene a conference of representatives of organized labor and industry for the purpose of working out by agreement means to minimize labor disputes.

In the interim period, pending the convening of the conference, I have called upon the representatives of organized labor and industry to continue their adherence to the no-strike, no-lock-out policy. During this interim period, labor disputes which threaten a substantial interference with the transition to a peacetime economy should be submitted to the War Labor Board. They would there be handled by the Board under existing procedures. The country will expect parties to any such disputes to comply voluntarily with the determinations of the War Labor Board.

The threat of inflationary bidding-up of wage rates by competition in a short labor market has disappeared. Therefore the War Labor Board has removed the necessity of approving proposed voluntary wage increases, so long as they will not be used to obtain an increase in price ceilings.

I have conferred upon the War Labor Board adequate authority to correct maladjustments and inequities in wage rates arising in the reconversion period which will tend to interfere with the effective transition to a peacetime economy.

The Board should be terminated as soon after the conclusion of the forthcoming industry-labor conference as the orderly disposition of the work of the Board and the provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act permit, and after facilities have been provided to take care of the wage stabilization functions under the act of October 2, 1942.

Meanwhile, plans for strengthening the Department of Labor, and bringing under it functions properly belonging to it, are going forward. With the return to a peacetime economy and the elimination of the present temporary wartime agencies and procedures, we must look to collective bargaining, aided and supplemented by a truly effective system of conciliation and voluntary arbitration, as the best and most democratic method of maintaining sound industrial relations.

8. UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE EXTENSION

Placing demobilized veterans and displaced war workers in new peacetime jobs is the major human problem of our country's reconversion to a peacetime economy. It is imperative that this work be done swiftly and efficiently, and that men and women lose a minimum amount of time between jobs.

The next few months are crucial. What we do now will affect our American way of life for decades to come.

The United States Employment Service has an important responsibility in the performance of this task.

At present, this agency operates as a national and centralized system with a free flow of information among its offices. Under the 1946 appropriation act, the offices are to be turned back to the 48 States within 90 days after the cessation of hostilities.

Shortly after the declaration of war, the Government realized that the manpower of the Nation could be mobilized more efficiently if the United States Employment Service were centralized under Federal control. Hundreds of thousands of workers had to be recruited from all parts of the country. Often, they were wanted in regions far from their homes. Certain areas had surpluses of labor; others were desperately in need of more workers. This situation could be met only through a centrally operated employment service that covered the entire Nation.

Now we are faced with this problem in reverse. Hundreds of thousands of men and women will want to seek jobs in towns and cities other than those in which they worked during the war. They may want to return home, or they may want to strike out in search of new opportunities in new surroundings. Millions of veterans also will be coming back in search of peacetime jobs. They will want to know where such jobs can be found, not only in their own areas, but also in other parts of the land.

The task of helping this vast army of job seekers to fit themselves into peacetime economy is fully as difficult as the mobilization of manpower for war. To make any decided change in the machinery to handle this problem now would cause unnecessary hardship to workers and veterans. It would slow down the entire process of reconversion.

I urgently recommend that the Congress do not yet return the Employment Service to the States. Ultimately it should be so returned. However, it should be continued under Federal control at least until the expiration of the War Mobilization Act—June 30, 1947.

I also recommend that its appropriation be increased by \$10,000,000 for the current fiscal year. Prompt action on this matter is especially important since personnel and facilities must be quickly enlarged to handle the rising tide of veterans and war workers who will be seeking jobs.

9. AGRICULTURE

One of the most magnificent production jobs in the war has been done by the farmers of the United States. They have met the unprecedented demands of the war, and, at the same time, have provided our civilian population with more food per capita than during the 1935-39 prewar period.

No other group in America labored longer or harder to meet the war demands put upon them. Food production last year reached a peak more than a third above the prewar years despite the fact that farm population has declined by about five million since 1940.

Fortunately, farmers were aided by better-than-average weather conditions over the country. We cannot, however, count on continuance of better-than-average weather. Therefore, because of the great demands for food that exist in this country and for relief abroad, the Department of Agriculture is planning for another year of full production. This does not mean the same volume of production for each individual crop, because the surrender of Japan has brought changes in the demand pattern. But the total acreage needed for next year will not be greatly different from this year.

The Government now must be prepared to carry out the Nation's responsibility to aid farmers in making their necessary readjustments from a wartime to a peacetime basis. The Congress already has provided postwar supports against price collapse for many farm products. This was a provision of wisdom and foresight.

After the First World War farm prices dropped more than 50 percent from the spring of 1920 to the spring of 1921. We do not intend to permit a repetition of the disaster that followed the First World War. The Secretary of Agriculture has assured me that he will use all means now authorized by the Congress to carry out the price-support commitments.

But there is need for additional measures to strengthen the machinery for carrying out price-support commitments, and for laying the basis for broader peacetime markets for agricultural products.

The Congress already has provided for one such postwar measure that needs now to be adapted to our changed situation. Recognizing that the lend-lease program required greatly increased production and that this increase could not be suddenly discontinued when the program stopped, the Congress wisely set aside \$500,000,000 of lend-lease funds for price support of farm commodities. This money is now available for the purpose for which it was intended, but in order that it may be used most effectively whenever the need arises, I recommend early legislation which would make those funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation on a continuing basis. Such action would reaffirm the specific intent of the Congress as to the use of this money in safeguarding farm prices.

Strengthening the machinery for carrying out price-support commitments is one measure necessary to safeguard farm prices. Stimulation of the export of farm commodities is another. More food is needed in the war-ravaged areas of the world. In the process of meeting relief requirements abroad, we have the opportunity of developing export markets for the future.

The farmer has always faced certain specific problems which are peculiar to his occupation. His crops are at the mercy of the weather.

The factory owner and the worker at the machine have available to them insurance programs which protect them from losses. Our farmers have the right to the same kind of protection. Strengthening and further development of crop insurance for farmers, organized and backed by the Federal Government,

can give them this protection. A well-rounded crop-insurance program, together with the assurance of reasonable and stable farm prices, will go a long way toward meeting basic problems which have plagued farmers in the past.

Much that has been accomplished during the war was made possible by the wise national program in support of scientific research in agriculture and forestry, and by the program for the conservation and improvement of our soil and forest resources. These policies have paid large dividends during the war. We ought to continue and strengthen them.

Within recent years the Congress has enacted various measures which have done much to improve the economic status of this country's farmers and to make rural living more attractive. In enacting individual pieces of legislation it has not been possible to make adjustments in existing measures in keeping with the changing pattern of needs. The Secretary of Agriculture is now reexamining existing agricultural programs in the light of peacetime needs in order that they may make the fullest contribution to the welfare of farmers and the people as a whole. I hope that the Congress also, through its appropriate committees, will give careful consideration to this problem with a view to making such adjustments as are necessary to strengthen the effectiveness of these various measures.

10. SELECTIVE SERVICE

While the cruel lessons of war are fresh in every mind, it is fitting that we now undertake appropriate measures for the future security of the United States.

The times call for a broad and realistic appraisal of our military needs and obligations. This Nation, and the other members of the family of nations, are facing the hazardous transition to a peace economy in a world grown acutely sensitive to power.

We have charted the course to a stable world peace, but that course still remains to be sailed.

We must, of course, plan for the immediate needs of this year and the next. But we would break faith with those who won for us the victory if we should fail at the same time to adopt an integrated and long-range program for the national security.

As a sovereign nation, we must continue to be ready to defend our national integrity by maintaining and manning adequate defense establishments within this continent, at the Panama Canal, and at all our bases overseas. As a member of the Security Council of the United Nations, we have an immediate obligation to bear a share, commensurate with our national standing, in safeguarding the future security of all peace-loving nations. As a victor in the greatest war of history, we are committed now to an armed occupation of the lands of our defeated enemies until it is assured that the principles for which we fought shall prevail in the reconstruction of those lands.

To meet these immediate obligations will require the maintenance for some time of a real measure of our present land, sea, and air power.

XCI—528

And in this first year after victory our people have another obligation, one which is felt in almost every American home. We owe it to those now in the armed forces that they be returned to civilian life with all possible speed.

To provide the personnel necessary to meet these immediate obligations we must obtain replacements for those veterans who have already rendered long and arduous service.

We shall make every effort to raise these replacements by recruiting volunteers. To that end I ask that the Congress consider ways and means to assure the maximum success of the recruiting campaigns which have already been authorized. I suggest that legislation be enacted to remove the present restriction on eligibility for voluntary enlistment and to allow the armed forces to enlist a larger number of volunteers than is now authorized. It is further recommended that, in order to enable the armed forces satisfactorily to compete in the procurement of personnel, the Congress provide suitable inducements for volunteer service in the Army and Navy.

However, in view of our extensive national commitments, I am certain, as are the War and Navy Departments, that we cannot rely on voluntary recruitment as the sole method of procuring the necessary replacements.

I, therefore, urge that the Congress continue inductions to assure replacements for these veterans, in such numbers as are not supplied by volunteers.

An unforgivable discrimination would result if, by suspending inductions now, we should favor those who have had no military service at the cost of requiring continued sacrifice from those who have already done their part.

Our first concern should be for those who have been in the armed forces for several years. They have been separated from their homes and from their loved ones. Many of them have been under constant fire and continuous danger for months and even years. We should try to avoid imposing further service upon them.

The only way that this can be done is to continue the induction of young men who as yet have not served a tour of active duty in the armed services. Only when we find that we are able to obtain a sufficient number of volunteers to fill the necessary quotas for our occupational needs, can we discontinue the Selective Service System.

Of course it is entirely up to the Congress to choose the means by which we will provide and maintain the necessary strength to meet our commitments. The alternatives presented are very simple. There are no others. Either we retain men now in the service for a further indefinite period, or we provide replacements by further inductions.

As you know, I have already directed the Selective Service to cut down the number of inductions from 80,000 to 50,000 per month, and to limit them to the age group of 18 through 25.

It would seem reasonable to limit inductions hereafter to men between the ages of 18 and 25, inclusive, and fix their maximum term of service at two years.

Under the existing statute, inductees can be legally retained only for the duration of the war and a period of six months thereafter. I trust that, in any event, the Congress will not pass a resolution to the effect that the war has terminated for the purposes of this statute. To do so would give to all inducted men and temporary officers of the Army now on active duty the right to civilian status, and would create an impossible demobilization situation.

These are the military steps which it is apparent must be taken at once to meet the needs of the transition from war to peace. First things necessarily come first.

But the full needs of our national security run far beyond this immediate period of transition. We should make timely preparation for the Nation's long-range security, while we are still mindful of what it has cost us in this war to have been unprepared.

It is, therefore, my intention to communicate with the Congress from time to time during the current session with respect to a comprehensive and continuous program of national security, including a universal training program, unification of the armed services, and the use and control of atomic energy.

11. HOUSING

The largest single opportunity for the rapid postwar expansion of private investment and employment lies in the field of housing, both urban and rural. The present shortage of decent homes and the enforced widespread use of substandard housing indicate vital unfulfilled needs of the Nation. These needs will become more marked as veterans begin to come back and look for places to live.

There is wide agreement that, over the next 10 years, there should be built in the United States an average of from a million to a million and a half homes a year.

Such a program would provide an opportunity for private capital to invest from six to seven billion dollars annually. Private enterprise in this field could provide employment for several million workers each year. A housing program of this realistic size would, in turn, stimulate a vast amount of business and employment in industries which make house furnishings and equipment of every kind, and in the industries which supply the materials for them. It would provide an impetus for new products, and would develop new markets for a variety of manufactured articles to be made by private enterprise.

Housing is high on the list of matters calling for decisive Congressional action. This is reflected in recommendations contained in reports recently issued by the postwar committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. While differing opinions may be held as to detail, these proposals for action already developed in the Congress appear to me sound and essential.

I urgently recommend that the Congress, at an early date, enact broad and comprehensive housing legislation.

The cardinal principle underlying such legislation should be that house construction and financing for the overwhelming majority of our citizens should be done by private enterprise.

We should retain and improve upon the present excellent Government facilities which permit the savings of the people to be channeled voluntarily into private house construction on financing terms that will serve the needs of home owners of moderate income.

The present principles of insurance of housing investment—now tested by years of experience—should be retained and extended, so as to encourage direct investment in housing by private financing institutions.

The Government, in addition to providing these facilities to help private enterprise and private capital build homes, should take effective measures to stimulate research in methods and materials of housing construction. In this way, better and cheaper methods may be developed to build homes.

In addition to this type of research, the Government might well undertake to assist communities in making recurrent community studies in matters relating to housing and real estate generally. Such a program would contribute in great degree to the progress of private initiative and private capital investment in housing.

We must go on. We must widen our horizon even further. We must consider the redevelopment of large areas of the blighted and slum sections of our cities so that in the truly American way they may be remade to accommodate families not only of low-income groups as heretofore, but of every income group. We must make it possible for private enterprise to do the major part of this job. In most cases, it is now impossible for private enterprise to contemplate rebuilding slum areas without public assistance. The land cost generally is too high.

The time has come for the Government to begin to undertake a program of Federal aid to stimulate and promote the redevelopment of these deteriorating areas. Such Federal aid should be extended only to those communities which are willing to bear a fair part of the cost of clearing their blighted city areas and preparing them for redevelopment and rebuilding.

The rebuilding of these areas should conform to broad city plans, provide adequately for displaced families and make maximum use of private capital. Here lies another road toward establishing a better standard of city living, toward increasing business activity and providing jobs.

This Nation has recognized the need of using public funds to clear slums and to provide homes for those families who could not otherwise enjoy adequate housing because of the difference between their present earning power and the cost or rental of a decent home. We cannot, and we will not, recede from these purposes.

For those low-income groups, representing but a small portion of the total housing need, our prewar program of Federal aid to communities for low-rent

housing should be resumed. Only in that way can we make progress toward our ultimate goal laid down in the economic bill of rights of a decent home for every American family.

I recommend, also, that we quicken our rate of progress in rural housing. As a general rule, housing conditions on farms and in rural areas are relatively worse than in our cities. In housing, as well as in other benefits of the American system, farm families should enjoy equality with city dwellers.

A decent standard of housing for all is one of the irreducible obligations of modern civilization. The housing challenge is now squarely before us. The people of the United States, so far ahead in wealth and productive capacity, deserve to be the best housed people in the world. We must begin to meet that challenge at once.

12. RESEARCH

Progress in scientific research and development is an indispensable condition to the future welfare and security of the Nation. The events of the past few years are both proof and prophecy of what science can do.

Science in this war has worked through thousands of men and women who have labored selflessly and, for the most part, anonymously in the laboratories, pilot plants, and proving grounds of the Nation.

Through them, science, always pushing forward the frontiers of knowledge, forged the new weapons that shortened the war.

Progress in science cannot depend alone upon brilliant inspiration or sudden flights of genius. We have recently had a dramatic demonstration of this truth. In peace and in war, progress comes slowly in small new bits, from the unremitting day-by-day labors of thousands of men and women.

No nation can maintain a position of leadership in the world of today unless it develops to the full its scientific and technological resources. No government adequately meets its responsibilities unless it generously and intelligently supports and encourages the work of science in university, industry, and in its own laboratories.

During the war we have learned much about the methods of organizing science, and about the ways of encouraging and supporting its activities.

The development of atomic energy is a clear-cut indication of what can be accomplished by our universities, industry, and Government working together. Vast scientific fields remain to be conquered in the same way.

In order to derive the full profit in the future from what we have learned, I urge upon the Congress the early adoption of legislation for the establishment of a single Federal research agency which would discharge the following functions:

1. Promote and support fundamental research and development projects in all matters pertaining to the defense and security of the Nation.
2. Promote and support research in the basic sciences and in the social sciences.
3. Promote and support research in medicine, public health, and allied fields.

4. Provide financial assistance in the form of scholarships and grants for young men and women of proved scientific ability.

5. Coordinate and control diverse scientific activities now conducted by the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

6. Make fully, freely, and publicly available to commerce, industry, agriculture, and academic institutions, the fruits of research financed by Federal funds.

Scientific knowledge and scientific research are a complex and interrelated structure. Technological advances in one field may have great significance for another apparently unrelated. Accordingly, I urge upon the Congress the desirability of centralizing these functions in a single agency.

Although science can be coordinated and encouraged, it cannot be dictated to or regimented. Science cannot progress unless founded on the free intelligence of the scientist. I stress the fact that the Federal research agency here proposed should in no way impair that freedom.

Even if the Congress promptly adopts the legislation I have recommended, some months must elapse before the newly established agency could commence its operations. To fill what I hope will be only a temporary gap, I have asked the Office of Scientific Research and Development and the Research Board for National Security to continue their work.

Our economic and industrial strength, the physical well-being of our people, the achievement of full employment and full production, the future of our security, and the preservation of our principles will be determined by the extent to which we give full and sincere support to the works of science.

It is with these works that we can build the highroads to the future.

13. TRANSITION TAX REVISION

Taxes will play a vital role in attaining a prosperous peace.

I recommend that a transitional tax bill be enacted as soon as possible to provide limited tax reductions for the calendar year 1946. Like the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945, the new bill should aim principally at removing barriers to speedy reconversion and to the expansion of our peacetime economy.

This matter has been under study jointly by congressional and Treasury tax staffs. I am assured that a program will be ready for early consideration by the Congress.

We must reconcile ourselves to the fact that room for tax reduction at this time is limited. A total war effort cannot be liquidated overnight.

It is estimated that war expenditures in the current fiscal year will drop 40 billion dollars below last year, but that they will still amount to 50 billion dollars out of total expenditures of 66 billion dollars. With current receipts estimated at 36 billion dollars, we face an estimated deficit of 30 billion dollars in the current fiscal year. Expenditures, although further reduced, will necessarily continue at high levels in the fiscal year 1947.

In considering tax reductions for 1946 we must not lose sight of the budgetary

situation and our obligations to 85,000,000 bondholders.

After passage of the transitional bill, I hope that the Congress will give careful consideration to the modernization of the Federal tax structure. A major objective of this modernization should be the encouragement of business incentives and expansion, and of consumer purchasing power. In this connection consideration of further tax reductions should have due regard to the level of governmental expenditures and the health and stability of our economy.

14. SURPLUS-PROPERTY DISPOSAL

On July 17 I recommended that the Congress enact legislation creating a single Surplus Property Administrator in place of the board of three which was provided in the statute enacted last year.

I realize that this recommendation came too late to be dealt with prior to your recess, but I strongly urge that you act on it now.

A single administrator can do much to obviate the confusion which still exists in this field, and will be able to expedite the disposal of the many billions of dollars of surplus property.

The disposition of plants and equipment is of particular urgency. They should be disposed of promptly by sale or lease on a basis that is fair to the Government and to industry. Our objectives should be to provide early and continuous employment, and through private production, to supply hungry markets and check inflationary tendencies. Leases may often enable the Government and the operator to determine actual value by actual experience. The sooner we can put plants and equipment to work, the sooner we can discard our wartime controls in the transition from war to peace.

15. SMALL BUSINESS

During the war special attention was paid to small business. The American small business is the backbone of our free-enterprise system. The efforts of the Congress in protecting small business during the war paid high dividends, not only in protecting small-business enterprise, but also in speeding victory. In spite of the fact, however, that many businesses were helped and saved, it is true that many thousands of them were obliged to close up because of lack of materials or manpower or inability to get into war production.

It is very important to the economy of the United States that these small businesses and many more of them be given opportunity to become a part of American trade and industry. To do this, assistance should be given to small businesses to enable them to obtain adequate materials, private financing, technological improvements, and surplus property.

While some special facilities for small business are required, the greatest help to it will come from the maintenance of general prosperity and full employment. It is much more difficult for small business to survive the hazards which come from trade recessions and widespread unemployment. What small business needs chiefly is a steady supply of customers with stable purchasing power.

I am sure that the Congress will see to it that in its legislation adequate pro-

tection and encouragement will be given to the small business of the Nation.

16. VETERANS

It has been a fundamental objective of the Congress and of the administration to make generous provision for those who have served the Nation in its armed forces, and for the dependents of those who have died in their country's cause.

Although a full list of what has been done toward this objective would be entirely too long to enumerate here, it might be well to list some of the major steps already taken:

(1) Adoption of a National Service Life Insurance Act under which about 17½ million insurance applications have been approved, resulting in insurance coverage of more than \$135,000,000,000.

(2) Provision of increased compensation or pension for disabled veterans.

(3) Extension and expansion of hospital benefits.

(4) Vocational education and training for veterans having a service-connected disability constituting a vocational handicap.

(5) Mustering-out pay ranging from \$100 to \$300 dependent upon length of service and rate of pay.

(6) Education or training for any veteran whose education or training was interrupted by entrance into the service.

(7) Guarantee of loans to veterans for the purchase of a home, a farm, or a business.

(8) Legislation to protect the veteran's right to reemployment in his preservice job, if desired.

(9) Provision of unemployment allowances for veterans who become unemployed at any time within two years after discharge, of \$20 per week for not to exceed 52 weeks.

(10) Civil-service laws to insure preference to veterans in governmental service.

(11) There has also been instituted in each State pursuant to law an efficient system whereby the counseling and placement needs of veterans will be the responsibility of veterans appointed for that special work.

The transition of veterans from military to civilian activities cannot be accomplished satisfactorily by the Federal Government alone or the States alone, or, indeed, by both. Government can help chiefly through organization and over-all planning. But the real work must be done in each community, through cooperation of the industrial, labor, and civic organizations interested in the welfare of the community and of the veterans.

There have been established information centers in all the field activities of the Selective Service System, United States Employment Service, and Veterans' Administration totaling more than 8,000. Veterans may there obtain information on any question of interest to them.

Also, the Retraining and Reemployment Administration in cooperation with the leadership of local communities has established approximately 1,450 community information centers. There are therefore 9,000 information centers of all types throughout the country avail-

able to veterans for information purposes. With respect to agricultural interests, use has been made of county committees.

Broad and generous as this legislation for veterans has been, there will be need of amendments and improvements. I recommend that the Congress give prompt consideration to the recommendations which have been made by the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of clarifying and liberalizing the provisions relative to hospital and medical care, to vocational training under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and to education and training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. I also urge consideration of the suggestions made by the Veterans' Administration with respect to the loan guarantee features of the latter Act, to amendments clarifying and liberalizing the National Service Life Insurance Act, and those which would increase the rates of compensation for specific injuries including multiple amputations.

I have recommended that the Selective Training and Service Act be continued; but if the Congress determines to the contrary, I urgently recommend that it clarify the provisions thereof which specifically deal with the right of reemployment.

Favorable consideration should be given by the Congress to Federal reclamation projects as outstanding opportunities for returning veterans. The great Columbia Basin project in the Northwest, the projects in the Missouri River Basin, and others of equal significance will bring into existence many thousands of new family-size farms upon which returning veterans can secure a livelihood for themselves and their families and create new wealth for the Nation. A number of farms can be made ready for veterans rapidly if legislation now pending is enacted without delay. This legislation would authorize necessary and proper assistance to veterans who seek to develop farm homes on irrigated lands in Federal reclamation project areas.

I also recommend that the Congress expedite legislation giving veterans social-security coverage credit for the period of their service in the armed services.

The latest available statistics in the Veterans' Administration shows that pension payments in varying amounts are now going forward each month to approximately 600,000 veterans of World War II and to the dependents of more than 100,000 deceased veterans of World War II.

Insurance claims under the National Service Life Insurance Act have been allowed in a total of 361,000 cases involving insurance of approximately 2½ billion dollars.

More than 200,000 World War II veterans have already been afforded hospital care in Veterans' Administration facilities.

At the time of Pearl Harbor, the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization had under way a hospital-building program which by 1949, the estimated peak of needs for World War I veterans, would have provided a total of 100,000 beds for hospital

and domiciliary care. Since Pearl Harbor the hospital-building program has been expedited.

The Veterans' Administration now has approximately 82,000 hospital and 14,000 domiciliary beds. Thirteen thousand beds are now under construction, and funds are available for 15,000 more.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act authorizes appropriations to the extent of \$500,000,000 for the construction of veterans' hospitals and also the transfer to the Veterans' Administration of suitable facilities of the Army and Navy after the end of the war, when surplus to their needs. The program of the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization contemplates keeping abreast of developing needs through such transfers and additional construction. To this end a plan has just been approved for construction of 29,000 additional beds.

Since World War I there have been more than 3,000,000 hospital admissions in veterans' facilities—and most of them since 1925. Considering that the total number of veterans of World War I and all living veterans of prior wars did not exceed one-third the number of the veterans of World War II, it can readily be seen how important it is to provide hospital privilege. The subject is one which should receive the most careful consideration from the point of view of the extent and quality of facilities to be provided and maintained.

In the last analysis, if we can insure the proper economic conditions, we may be sure that the genius and initiative of Americans who met successfully all demands of the greatest war in history, both on the fighting front and on the production front, will make certain the reintegration of veterans into an expanding civilian economy. Anything less would not meet the country's obligations to its veterans.

17. PUBLIC WORKS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

During the war years we have expended our resources—both human and natural—without stint. We have thrown into the battle for freedom everything we had.

Thousands of our finest young men—our best human resources—have given their lives. Additional thousands have been injured so that they may not be able to realize their full promise. The education of millions of young men and young women has been disrupted. At best, the Nation will be deprived of the full benefit of their services as scientists, doctors, technicians, lawyers, and educators for 3 to 5 years, or even longer, while they complete the preparation which the necessities of war interrupted.

The depletion of our natural resources is even more startling. We have torn from the earth copper, petroleum, iron ore, tungsten, and every other mineral required to fight a war, without regard to our future supplies. We have taken what we needed. We were not able to, and we did not, take account of tomorrow.

At the same time, our splendid prewar program to build up our national resources was sharply halted. The diligent and constant search for additional deposits of minerals was almost abandoned in favor of a frantic effort to discover

and make possible the production of the materials of war.

The long-range programs to conserve the precious inches of topsoil which, in many parts of the country, lie between plenty and poverty were necessarily interrupted. We had neither the manpower nor the materials to spare for projects to prevent the ravages of floods which constantly despoil our land. We had neither the men nor the facilities to continue a large-scale program of reclaiming land and of bringing new land into cultivation.

With a few exceptions, we were forced to suspend the program to which this Nation is committed of harnessing the waters of our great rivers so that they may become vehicles of commerce, beneficent producers of cheap electric power, and servants of the Nation instead of instruments of destruction.

In brief, although during this war this Nation has reached the apex of its power—a peak of greatness and might which the world had never seen—our national capital account has greatly suffered. We must proceed with all possible diligence not merely to restore these depleted resources to their prewar standards but to make them greater and richer than ever before.

We must make a diligent effort to discover new deposits of the precious and indispensable minerals upon which our national life is founded.

We must develop for the use of industry new technologies so that the vast deposits of low-grade ores that have not heretofore been considered usable may be put to work for the good of all of us.

We should build and improve our roads—the arteries of commerce; we must harness our streams for the general welfare; we must rebuild and reclaim our land; we must protect and restore our forests.

This is not only to provide men and women with work, it is to assure to the Nation the very basis of its life. It is to play the part of a good businessman who insists carefully on maintaining and rebuilding his plant and machinery.

We know that by the investment of Federal funds we can, within the limits of our own Nation, provide for our citizens new frontiers—new territories for the development of industry, agriculture, and commerce.

We have before us the example of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has inspired regional resource development throughout the entire world.

We know that we have programs, carefully considered and extensively debated, for regional development of the Columbia River in the great Northwest, the Missouri River, the Central Valley of California, and the Arkansas River.

In the Columbia Valley the first major step has been completed for the reclamation of barren land and the production of enormous quantities of power. The waters of the Missouri and the Arkansas and the rivers of California can be put to work to serve the national interest in a similar fashion.

If these rivers remain scourges of our Nation, it is only because we do not have the prudence to harness them for the benefit of our people. If there are

among us for any period of time farmers who do not farm because there is no suitable land available to them; workers who do not work because there is no labor for their hands, we have only ourselves to blame so long as we fail to make available to them the opportunities before our very eyes.

I hope that the Congress will proceed as rapidly as possible to authorize regional development of the natural resources of our great river valleys.

It should be unnecessary to say that the conservation and development of the national plant must proceed according to an intelligent and coordinated design. The watersheds of this Nation are not utterly independent, one of the other; our irreplaceable wealth of minerals, land, and timber is not composed of segments which can effectively be dealt with separately. Any program of public works must have as its unifying purpose the greatest possible contribution to the wealth of the Nation and to the wealth-producing capability of the Nation.

It is necessary that we proceed as speedily as possible to set up machinery to make an inventory of our national wealth and our basic resources, and to test the suitability of plans and proposals for public works in light of this purpose. An agency of this sort could provide us with consistent direction toward the goal of rehabilitation and improvement of our basic national resources.

Shortages of materials and manpower made it necessary in the interests of the war effort to suspend many public works which might otherwise have been undertaken. Now that materials and manpower will become more plentiful, we should be prepared to undertake a program of useful public works, not only to improve the physical plant of the United States but to provide employment to great masses of our citizens when private industry cannot do so. Only such public works should now be undertaken, however, as will not compete with the use of materials and manpower by private industry. Plans for other public works should be perfected and put in reserve.

In this connection I have several recommendations:

(1) During the war the construction of Federal public works has been restricted to those necessary for national defense and the prosecution of the war. Projects which normally would have been constructed were deferred, and a large backlog of needed construction has accumulated. Plans for some of these projects—specifically those relating to reclamation, rivers and harbors, flood control, and the conservation of our natural resources—are now ready, and their construction can go forward when funds are provided and materials and manpower are available without competing with private industry. Plans for other Federal projects are being prepared through the use of funds wisely appropriated by the Congress for advance preparation. Additional funds are needed for this purpose, and I urge that the Congress provide them.

(2) I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing additional construction of certain Federal buildings. A portion of this program has already

been authorized but has been held up by reason of cost limits imposed upon the buildings which cannot now be met because of increased needs and costs.

(3) I recommend that the Congress release the funds for the highway program authorized under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (Public Law 521, 78th Cong.). Under this act \$500,000,000 has been authorized for the first year and \$500,000,000 for each of the two succeeding years, making a total authorization of 1½ billion. With the States' share of the cost included, this would provide a total highway construction program of \$3,000,000,000 for a 3-year period.

(4) I recommend that the Congress appropriate \$25,000,000 to continue the construction of the Inter-American Highway through the Central American Republics to the Canal Zone.

(5) I recommend that the Congress enact legislation to provide the necessary airports and airport facilities to serve the great needs of an expanded postwar air transportation and commerce. A well-planned airport program would improve transportation, amplify the usefulness of the airplane, and contribute to a healthy aircraft manufacturing industry.

The Congress now has before it a survey of the present and future needs for airports in the United States prepared by the Secretary of Commerce. This report indicates the necessity for approximately 3,000 new airports and for improvements to more than half of the existing 3,000 airports. The report recommends that the program be spread over a period of 10 years and that the cost be shared equally between Federal and non-Federal governmental agencies. I recommend passage of appropriate legislation to implement this program.

(6) States and local governments should be encouraged to construct useful public works of the types that must necessarily supplement and go along with the private construction of homes and industrial facilities. If private construction is to move forward at a rapid rate, it is vitally important that local governments promptly proceed with the construction of such facilities as streets, sewers, water supply, hospitals, airports, schools, and other necessary public facilities. Such projects should be undertaken at this time where they supplement and encourage private construction, not where they compete with it for manpower and materials.

The Congress has already authorized under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 appropriations for advances of Federal funds to State and local governments to assist them in the preparation of detailed drawings and specifications for their public works. The appropriation thus far made is entirely inadequate and I shall request additional funds in order to speed up this important activity during the reconversion period.

The majority of State and local governments are awaiting a decision concerning Federal assistance. In order to get needed public facilities started promptly which do not compete with private construction, I recommend that the Congress give early consideration to grants for such public works under conditions that will insure that each level

of government, Federal, State, and local, shall make its appropriate contribution.

(7) The Congress has also been giving consideration to legislation with respect to the construction of hospitals and health centers throughout the country. During the war the Government, through the Federal Works Agency and the Public Health Service, has assisted State and local governments and nonprofit organizations in the construction of such facilities. The beneficial results of this program are well known. The Federal Government must continue to recognize its obligation to maintain and improve the health of the Nation by providing Federal grants where necessary for the construction of hospital and health centers.

Programs of internal improvements of a public character—Federal, State, and local—must preserve competitive bidding, guarantee collective bargaining and good wages for labor, utilize the skills of our returned veterans to the fullest extent, and effectively prevent discrimination because of race, creed, or color.

18. LEND-LEASE AND POSTWAR RECONSTRUCTION

With the arrival of VJ-day lend-lease aid has practically come to an end. It was always understood that it would come to an end at that time. Immediately after Japan accepted the terms of unconditional surrender, I instructed the Foreign Economic Administrator to advise promptly all governments that deliveries of supplies under lend-lease would cease on VJ-day.

I also directed the Administrator in advance of the actual termination of lend-lease deliveries on VJ-day to enter into immediate negotiations with the receiving governments for the purchase of all goods in the pipe line or in storage. These negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily.

In due time we must consider the settlement of the lend-lease obligations which have been incurred during the course of the war. We must recognize that it will not be possible for our Allies to pay us dollars for the overwhelming portion of the lend-lease obligations which they have incurred. But this does not mean that all lend-lease obligations are to be canceled. We shall seek under the procedure prescribed in the Lend-Lease Act and in subsequent agreements with other governments to achieve settlements of our wartime lend-lease relations which will permit generally a sound world-wide economy and will contribute to international peace and our own national security.

We must turn from economic cooperation in war to economic cooperation in peace. We have taken steps to carry out the Bretton Woods proposals for an international monetary fund and an International Bank. We are preparing to extend the operations of the Export-Import Bank. Our objective is to enable the peace-loving nations of the world to become self-supporting in a world of expanding freedom and rising standards of living.

Further legislation is also necessary. If we are to avoid the maintenance of governmental monopoly of international credit, the Johnson Act must be repealed. Private loans on a sane basis are an es-

sential adjunct to the operations of the Export-Import and International Bank operations.

I am directing the executive agencies to give full weight to foreign requirements in determining the need for maintaining domestic and export controls and priorities.

We have already solemnly stated that we will do all that is reasonably possible to help war-torn countries to get back on their feet. I am sure that the Congress will wish the Government to live up to that pledge.

Further legislative action is needed in connection with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I recommend that the Congress fulfill the commitment already made by appropriating the remaining \$550,000,000 granted by the Congress for United States participation.

The Council Meeting of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration has just been brought to a successful conclusion. At that meeting our delegate found the need for an additional contribution from all participating countries, to enable the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to complete its work in Europe and Asia. On his motion, the Council voted to recommend to member countries a further contribution. Our own share will amount to approximately \$1,350,000,000. I am confident that you will find this request for an additional authorization and appropriation fully justified, and I ask for prompt examination and consideration of the request.

In meeting the needs of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, surplus military and lend-lease goods will be used to the fullest possible extent.

Finally, I foresee the need for additional interim lending power to insure a rapid and successful transition to peacetime world trade. Appropriate recommendations will be made to the Congress on this matter when we have completed the exploratory conversations already begun with our associates. We wish to maintain the flow of supplies without interruption. Accordingly, I have directed the executive agencies to complete their conversations and studies at the earliest possible moment. I ask the Congress for speedy consideration of the recommendations when they are made.

19. CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Now that restrictions on voluntary salary increases have been removed, I hope that the Congress will take action soon on the salaries of its Members.

My experience as a Member of the Senate has given me a very keen appreciation of the quantity and quality of the work of the Members of the Congress. They are called upon to carry great responsibility and make important decisions in a multitude of matters involving the welfare of the Nation and of the world. Their tasks continue day in and day out. They have increased in number and in importance year by year.

There is no doubt in the mind of any thinking American that Members of the Congress are grossly underpaid and have been for many years. I think that they

are entitled—and have already so expressed myself—to a salary anywhere from fifteen to twenty-five thousand dollars a year. I recommend that the Congress enact legislation providing that the salaries of its Members be increased to twenty thousand dollars per year.

At the same time I recommend the repeal of the provision now applicable to the House of Representatives for an additional expense allowance. There should be a straight, out-and-out salary increase for all Members. We should make service in the Congress of the United States available without hardship to ordinary citizens who have to look to the salary for their sole support. I also recommend that an adequate retirement system should be provided for the Members of the Congress who have served for a long period of years.

This should be the first step in creating a decent salary scale for all Federal Government employees—executive, legislative, and judicial.

The most important impediment to obtaining efficient administrative officials in the Federal Government has been the pitiful wage scale. During the war many able and experienced men were obtained for Federal service on purely patriotic grounds. Some of these men who are unable to continue at the present salary scales would be willing to remain at adequate salaries.

In most of the various classifications of Federal employees, the wage scales, with few exceptions, are obsolete and inadequate. This is particularly true of the Federal judiciary.

I sincerely hope that the Congress will take early steps to provide decent wage scales for its Members and for the executive and judicial branches of the Government.

20. SALE OF SHIPS

Prompt resumption of the normal operation of our merchant marine to expedite the reestablishment of our foreign trade is a major part of general reconversion from a wartime to a peacetime economy. The Maritime Commission has already received numerous inquiries and applications from potential purchasers of ships at home and abroad for private ownership and operation.

It is recommended that suitable legislation to permit such sales be expedited so that the uncertainty about the disposal of our large surplus tonnage may be removed. In this way, American shipping companies may undertake commercial operation as rapidly as ships can be released from Government control, and the foreign market can also be used for selling those vessels which are in excess of the needs our postwar American merchant marine and national defense.

21. STOCK PILING OF STRATEGIC MATERIAL

One of the costliest lessons of our unpreparedness for this war was the great danger involved in depending upon foreign sources for supplies of raw materials necessary in times of national emergency. The United States should never again permit itself to be placed in a position where its defense may be jeopardized by the fact that it has been cut off from the source of strategic raw materials.

I recommend that the Congress enact legislation to bring about the acquisition and retention of stock piles of materials in which we are naturally deficient but which are necessary to supply the needs of the Nation for its defense.

I shall shortly communicate with the Congress recommending a national health program to provide adequate medical care for all Americans and to protect them from financial loss and hardships resulting from illness and accident. I shall also communicate with the Congress with respect to expanding our social-security system, and improving our program of education for our citizens.

In this hour of victory over our enemies abroad, let us now resolve to use all our efforts and energies to build a better life here at home and a better world for generations to come.

The Congress has played its full part in shaping the domestic and foreign policies which have won this victory and started us on the road to lasting peace.

The Congress, I know, will continue to play its patriotic part in the difficult years ahead. We face the future together with confidence—that the job, the full job, can and will be done.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 6, 1945.

NATIONAL PATENT PLANNING COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Patents and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Third Report of the National Patent Planning Commission.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 6, 1945.

FINANCIAL CONTROL OF CORPORATIONS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 339, Rept. No. 942), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3660) to provide for financial control of Government corporations. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today

after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders previously entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes, and to include in my remarks certain letters received in my office.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of Florida) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Baltimore Sun of September 5.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions adopted by the State of New York.

Mr. BENNET of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions adopted in New York State.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Julius Klein and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three other subjects.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein text of State Department report on protests against atrocities committed by the Japanese, together with newspaper report entitled "Doolittle Flyers Describe Hell of 40 Months as War Prisoners."

I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$218.40, but this matter is so important that I ask unanimous consent that it be included notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, while I was at home I had the opportunity to discuss certain problems with many of the men who have come back as veterans of this war. One of the most serious problems discussed was the difficulty many of these men are experiencing in finding houses to live in.

I am introducing a bill today to try to help solve their problem. The bill would amend title VI of the Federal Housing Act by striking out the word "defense" and substituting therefor the word "veterans." In other words, it would continue the program under which a great many homes have been built for war workers but would turn that program to the speedy construction of homes to be rented or sold to veterans.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

POSTWAR POLICY

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we are facing the future. The question is, Shall we face the future with a progressive mind, having in view what the future will hold for us and what effect different things will have, or shall we play to the galleries with our operations? At the present time our national debt has reached the enormous figure of \$275,000,000,000. Perhaps it is more than that, because there are so many unliquidated obligations. It will probably run beyond \$300,000,000,000 before we get to the point where we are rid of the war liabilities. It is absolutely necessary that we conserve our expenditures in every possible way. There has already been presented to the Congress a budget estimate calling for the reduction of certain appropriations and contract authorizations totaling three and one-half billion dollars. Frankly, from an examination of the Budget estimate I believe that we can greatly increase the repealing of those appropriations because they have not taken into account any savings that might result from the cancellation of contracts for things which are under way. We are at present demobilizing the Army and the Navy very slowly. We are at present cutting down on our wartime employment and still there is a tremendous shortage of labor in almost every part of the United States. There is not so much need for unemployment insurance on any basis beyond what has already been provided because at the present time we have 418,000 German prisoners at work here who can be shipped back any minute the need is gone. We have 100,000 foreign farm and other workers who have been brought in under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture by resolution which was brought in here early last winter providing for something like thirty-five or forty million dollars for that purpose. I cannot remember the exact figure. Those men can be released and taken back just as quickly as we have workers of our own to take their places. There is a tremendous deferred building pro-

gram. There are deferred repairs upon private buildings, especially painting and carpenter work. There is an enormous amount of street repairs and maintenance work that has to be done. There is an enormous amount of sewer repairs necessary in every community. There is an enormous amount of country road repairs that has to be done as anyone who has been obliged to travel over the roads through his district knows.

Some of the things that we have to consider in addition to that are these:

There is a great shortage of automobiles, of washing machines, of refrigerators, and of farm machinery that will keep the factories running and the wheels turning for months and months. Employment problems are not so great as the danger that by foolish things, by crowding a lot of made work onto our people at this time, we will create a terrific inflation. We must not fool ourselves. We have already provided a terrific inflation. The paper money inflation has risen from six and one-half billions to over twenty-seven billions. What have they done with that increase in the paper money inflation? That is the way the price of Government bonds has been maintained, by the purchase of Government bonds when the market began to drop, with the funds that were created as a result of that inflation. If we go ahead and embark upon a large program of loaning money to foreign countries for the purpose of their buying machinery and other things of that character from us at this time, at a time when great shortages exist here, when every factory in the land can be kept busy day and night supplying our own shortages, where are we going to be when we get through with that operation? When we have reduced the tariff so that they can send everything they make in here and have cut off our own employment at the end of the period as a result of that inflationary operation, at a time when we do not need it, what will we do? We will be up against a buzz saw. We will not have jobs, we will not have any backlog or anything.

I appeal to the Members of Congress as they approach these problems to have the facts of this situation in their heads, to go carefully and not do the foolish things that will create inflation and leave us out on a limb after we get through. I want to see things done which will give us a stable economy, which will increase the standards of living of our people. I want to see things done that will permit people to go ahead.

It is true that as a result of inflation and the increased cost of living we have had we cannot expect to get back to the wage scale that was paid before the war. We cannot do that. The cost of almost every single thing has gone up. We cannot reduce those costs without reducing wages. Therefore, we have to keep our economy on the level it has now attained. But we must not by foolish operations do things that will create more and more debt and keep the day of a return to a sound economy farther and farther away. We must reduce governmental expenditures to a point where we are able to meet them by taxes and pay a little on our debts. We must not be nig-

gardly in our treatment of those who are in distress.

On the other hand, we must not try to do things for them that they should do and are able to do for themselves. We should think this thing out. We should move carefully and not go wild. I hope that as the Congress faces this situation it will meet it in a fair and vigorous spirit with a thought for the American taxpayer and with a thought for the American working man so that he may have a chance to survive in these days that are to come. Every dollar that you save the working man in his tax bill means that he has just that much more to build up and maintain the standard of living which we want for the working man, the farmer, and the rest of the people in America.

PEARL HARBOR

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested by the newspaper reference this morning to a statement of our distinguished Speaker who was reported to have said that he wished we could forget Pearl Harbor, but obviously we cannot. I do not mention this now to criticize the Speaker. On the contrary, I merely wish to bring to the attention of the House the fact that so distinguished a leader in his party as the Speaker recognizes that we just cannot forget about Pearl Harbor. Even if we tried to do so, the people of the United States would force it upon our attention. Even if we succeeded in evading the responsibility now, history would dig it up. And when history tells the story of Pearl Harbor, I for one do not want to be charged with the incredible ineptitude of ignoring my duty on this question.

Just now I do not want to take any part in charges or criticisms of anyone for the disaster at Pearl Harbor. The Roberts Commission indicted Admiral Kimmel and General Short. The Army board adds Admiral Stark to the list. The Navy board affirms the indictment of General Short and includes General Marshall and certain subordinate officers. Articles have appeared declaring the late President of the United States was responsible. And President Truman puts the blame on all of the people of the United States. Nobody is satisfied with the investigations that have been made. I was greatly surprised to note on reading the recently released reports that certain parts of the Roberts report had been omitted before it was given to the public. I was startled to note that over 50 pages of the Army board report had been deleted. There may be good reasons for this. But I do not think we can blame Congressmen and newspapermen and critical citizens for feeling that something is being withheld from them—however good the reasons may be. The Secretary of War has criticized the report of his own Army board. The Secretary of the Navy has expressed some reservations about the Navy board. The President of the United States has added criticisms.

I think it all arises from the fact that all these investigations were made while the war was on and it may well be that high officials had reasons which may have seemed sufficient to them for holding back some of the facts. It would be

strange if the decisions of judges were not also colored by the war psychology.

Furthermore, you cannot get a sound conclusion out of an inquiry that investigates merely the Army's part in the disaster or that investigates merely the part of the Navy. Too many agencies of the Government—military and civilian—were involved in the whole episode to permit of any such piecemeal inquiry and appraisal. There is only one body in existence that can make a full investigation of this matter and that is the Congress. It has the authority. It is made up of men of all parties and of all shades of opinion. An investigating body will include men on both sides of the House and the Senate. We can be sure nothing will be hidden, nothing will be ignored. I do not wish to appear as the advocate or prosecutor of anybody. I want to see the truth brought to light—fully, fairly, and without fear or favor. And a congressional investigation is the only way in which this can be done.

We owe this to General Short and to Admiral Kimmel who have remained under indictment now for nearly 4 years without a trial. We owe it to Admiral Stark. We owe it to General Marshall, who has led the Army throughout this war and is entitled to see every fact bearing on the charges against him brought to light. We owe it to Secretary Hull. We owe it to the 3,000 men who died that day as a result of somebody's bungling. We owe it to all the tens of thousands of men who died in the terrible war of the Pacific to win back the islands that fell so quickly to the Japanese as a result of this disaster. We owe it to the Army and the Navy which has just brought to us victory in this terrible war. We owe it to the people of the United States who have a right to the facts. We owe it to history and to the honor of this Congress. And when history sets about the task of writing its record of these times—woe to the name of the man who may stand out in the record as attempting to hide any longer the truth about Pearl Harbor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the Appendix of the Record; first, to include a radio address, and second, to include a portion of a letter addressed to him by one of his constituents from Lynn, Mass., who is overseas.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 5 minutes following the special orders heretofore entered today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the President, in the message which

has just been read to the House, opposed the adoption of resolutions proclaiming the termination of the war or the cessation of hostilities. But he specifically approved the repeal of irksome wartime restrictions which Congress might wish to terminate.

Of all the irksome restrictions incident to the war none were more objectionable than those imposed by the so-called Daylight Saving Act, of January 20, 1942, arbitrarily moving the clock forward.

It should be the first of the artificial war expedients to be removed. It is bringing about wastage of manpower on the farm and absenteeism in the factory. It is contributing immeasurably to loss of farm products and loss of efficiency in industrial plants. It increases the consumption of power and light in every home and place of business without corresponding advantage. It has contributed directly to juvenile delinquency and to assaults on women on their way to employment in the premature darkness of the morning. It has increased the number of traffic accidents on darkened highways and accelerated the wear on motor vehicles. It is sending millions of children into the darkness and cold to await school busses on remote highways and unguarded streets in every community in the Nation. It has deprived millions of an added hour of sleep on sultry nights and has increased mortality and illness rates through exposure and exhaustion. It has interfered beyond the point of tolerance with the business and social economy of both urban and rural communities.

My bill to repeal the Daylight Saving Act and return to standard time was the first bill introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It met with universal approval. I have yet to find a single Member of the House who opposes it. But the War Production Board urged delay in its enactment on the ground that war time was saving power and fuel. In response to the request of Chairman Krug and in deference to WPB, I refrained from pressing for earlier action on the bill.

But now the war is over. The War Production Board has formally withdrawn its opposition, and in response to the Nation-wide demand for return to standard time, I am asking for immediate repeal of the act of January 20, 1942, instituting daylight saving. The widespread interest in the restoration of sun time is indicated by the number of Members of the House who have joined in the movement for repeal by introducing bills for repeal yesterday and today. They include the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ROE], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMBAUGH], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], the gentleman from Oregon

[Mr. ANGELL], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

I hope to get immediate action on this much-needed legislation and invite the cooperation of all Members of the House in securing prompt disposition of the matter this week in order to insure its becoming effective by the opening of the school year.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. I suggest that he call it up next Monday and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I do not believe there would be a single Member who would object to it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I much appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman, and am glad to assure him that arrangements have been made to call the bill up early next week. We have the assurance of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in charge of the bill, that he will report it out in the next 2 or 3 days. There will not be a vote against it when it comes up in the House. And I am advised by those in a position to know that it will be promptly passed by the other body and transmitted to the President in time to become effective September 30. The expectation is that the clocks will be turned back Sunday, September 30, 1945. Let us hope it will never be necessary to legislate wartime again.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think one reason we should give it immediate consideration is because the country schools start shortly, and the school children are probably suffering more from the present legislation than any other group?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman refers to one of the most urgent reasons for early action on the bill. The return to standard time is of more immediate importance to school schedules and school children than to anyone else. It is more urgently needed in the next few months, than at any other time in the calendar year.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree with the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that we should abolish war time and get back to God's time. There is another thing I should like to ask my chairman about. Of course, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that the American people are now wondering when we are going to start recapturing a lot of these appropriations we have made, or at least a part of them, and possibly canceling out some of them. I wonder when we could expect our chairman to call a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations to discuss those different problems, as to how we can cut down and recapture a lot of this money we have

already appropriated for the present fiscal year.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman from Iowa approves my action in beginning hearings this week with that in view.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. I heartily concur in your idea about abolishing daylight-saving time. Being one of those who handed in a bill, I earnestly hope that by October 1 we can get back to standard time. It means a great deal to the farmers in the eastern section. I certainly hope you will do everything you can to have this law repealed by October 1.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to have the gentleman's cooperation. I am certain he expresses the general sentiment of the House and the country.

The rapidly rising tide of sentiment in favor of repealing this troublesome restriction, and returning to regular time, is indicated by the flood of letters and telegrams received by all Members of the House. They are from all sections of the Nation, both rural and urban, and from all classes and professions. Here are excerpts from some of the letters coming to my office.

Here are letters from physicians:

CARRUTHERSVILLE, Mo.

Please rid us of this farcical and nonsensical regulation, the so-called daylight-saving time. This attempt to regulate our personal lives, by moving the clock up an hour, is one of the damndest fool things ever forced on the general public. To me, a public health officer, the greatest objection comes from the standpoint of the school child in the rural districts.

Certainly in the administration of any public health program, there can be no excuse for arousing 6- or 7-year-old kids at such an early hour and exposing them to the elements, while they are still half asleep and unable to protect themselves. The wait in the cold until the bus arrives is not conducive to the prevention of diseases brought about by exposure, to which this age child is very susceptible.

FRED L. OGILVIE, M. D.,
Medical Director, Pemiscot County
Health Unit.

MEXICO, Mo.

Get this nonsensical "daylight savings" repealed. Not one reason for it and many why it should be abolished. Get this job done and earn our undying thanks and gratitude.

R. S. WILLIAMS, M. D.

EUREKA, Mo.

Do away with this useless and most harmful "war saving daylight time." I have talked with many people in this part of the country and they are all for going back to our regular time.

It is time that the parasitic "time" bug that got in someone's bonnet was squelched.

JESSE S. SARGENT, M. D.

COLUMBIA COUNTY, GA.

Let us return to standard time. This war time has caused so much unnecessary confusion, loss of time, expense, and suffering.

Yours truly,

J. L. WEEKS, M. D.

Letters from clergymen and pastors of churches:

UNION, Mo.

In the morning paper I notice there is a bill before Congress to change the time back to the standard schedule.

I do not know how much the time affects business and the farming industry, but I feel sure the change of time had mitigated against the work of the churches, and that I am voicing the reaction of many other pastors. So I am sincerely hoping to see the change back to the standard time.

The St. Louis Globe Democrat made a favorable comment on the proposal on its editorial page this morning.

R. A. HUTSON,
Pastor, First Baptist Church.

BOYD, MINN.

We have had too much tinkering by New Deal theorists with the calendar, the clock, and the unchangeable law of supply and demand. To say the least, the war time is a nuisance in farming communities. Get us back to safe and sane government before we have complete regimentation.

ST. JOHN'S LUTHERAN CHURCH,
A. W. FUERSTENAU, Pastor.

ST. JOHN'S RECTORY,
Summerville, S. C.

Work to have a bill passed so that the Nation can return to rational clock time and get away from this abnormal way of living.

I have written our Senator relative to the bill and will be pleased if all Congress will make it so we have normal conditions and do away with all this tampering with old institutions that have served this Nation all these hundreds of years.

JAS. A. McELROY,
Pastor.

PERRYVILLE, Mo.

Bravo—set the clocks back. None of our people here like it in wintertime.

Rev. F. G. WIEBERG,
Pastor, St. Boniface Church.

PLAINFIELD, N. J.

Mr. Robert Garland, of Pittsburgh, was, as you know, the prime mover in the agitation that resulted in the national adoption of this fast time in 1918. He is generally regarded as the father of daylight-saving time in the United States. Last winter I wrote to him and asked him if he approved of it for winter and as well as summer. He wrote back:

"Please understand that I never advocated a change of the clock in wintertime. This simply amounts to a change of the clock and cannot properly be called daylight saving time."

You say it helps factories in defense work by saving 500,000 kilowatts a day of electric power needed by the factories. But as they are now working 24 hours a day, the advanced time does not give them 1 minute more to make ammunition to smash Hitler. While the defense work is going on without stop, it is not hastened by the different shifts of men coming in and going out an hour earlier. The work is being done regardless of who does it and regardless of whether the clocks on the wall are right or an hour fast.

Consider another proof of the truth of Mr. Garland's declaration that "a changing of the clock in wintertime cannot properly be called daylight-saving time."

Representative J. W. WADSWORTH, of New York, says that recent estimates of power authorities showed that only 2 percent of electrical energy could be saved by advanc-

ing the clocks during the winter. And that, he says, does not take into account the extra voltage used by farmers in the very early morning hours. Hence, the saving is less than 2 percent.

In view of this negligible amount of electric energy saved by this device—less than 2 percent—there is no justification for the cruelty inflicted on people by this so-called winter daylight saving.

The effect of this scheme on the morale of the people is bad, and morale is a tremendous factor in winning the war. Why cruelly compel those who must rise at 5 o'clock on a cold, dark winter morning to rise at 4? Or those who rise at 7 to get up at 6, still cold and dark and lonely? The best rest and sleep come to us in the early morning hours, and being compelled to get up a full hour before we normally have to get up unfits one for the day's work.

You say that if an air raid and consequent black-out came in the early evening, the fast time would enable folks to get home before the alarm. But an air raid might as well come in the dark early morning. No one can tell when the planes will come. We have to take our chances at both ends of the day.

The people will gladly make all necessary sacrifices, but please don't ask for unnecessary ones.

CHARLES HILLMAN FOUNTAIN, D. D.

Letters from schoolmen:

HANNIBAL, Mo.

Eliminate daylight saving time. Restore the country to standard time and sanity. I have yet to find one person who can present one probable argument that daylight-saving time is any advantage whatsoever or that it contributes in any way to winning the war. I hope the Congress passes this bill and thus eliminates one of the most asinine pieces of legislation that has been thrust upon a helpless public.

A. E. PRINCE,
President Hannibal-LaGrange College.

TROY CENTER SCHOOL,
Columbia City, Ind.

I am principal of a school which embraces the entire township. Every child is transported by bus. We are forced to take up school one-half hour later because our children are having to stand at ends of lanes or major road connections waiting in the dark for the bus. Then again, we're losing an hour of rest because who wants to go to bed at 8 or 8:30 when it isn't even dark, but the clock necessitates getting up that extra hour in the morning. Farmers to transact business in town must stop work and go early in the afternoon or everything is closed.

ROXIE BARCUS,
Principal.

FULTON, Mo.

Much gratified to note from the newspapers the introduction of the bill to change the time back to the old basis. I greatly approve.

H. L. SMITH,
President, William Woods College.

CANTON, OHIO.

Wars aren't won by twisting the hands of a clock.

Sentiment here is almost unanimously in favor of a return to standard time.

L. S. HOPKINS,
Dean, Culver-Stockton College.

BONNOTS MILL, Mo.

We don't like the system of daylight-saving time.

The daylight-saving time keeps farmers from accomplishing a full day's work.

If the time goes back to central standard time, many people will be pleased. I know our teachers will be.

SCHOOL SISTERS OF ST. FRANCES,
Frankenstein High School.

QUINCY, ILL.

Return to original time. As a teacher, I realize the disadvantages to children during the winter months. It is better also for our rural population and our churches. I cannot see that daylight-saving time is of any advantage to industry during the winter months at least.

MARY B. INGMAN,
Teacher, Quincy Senior High School.

Organizations and officials are represented:

ARKANSAS CITY, KANS.

I am enclosing a copy of an editorial which we had written in one of the local papers, also a sample petition which has appeared in both newspapers. We have asked the citizens of Arkansas City to sign these petitions and send them to the schoolhouses where they are collected by the different P. T. A. units.

Steps have been taken to contact our Congressmen and Senators and ask them to support your bill.

Needless to say, we are very anxious that your bill receives enough favorable support to pass it.

MRS. E. S. BERRY,
Chairman of Committee on Time
Change, Parent-Teacher's Associations.

ERWIN, TENN.

I am very much interested in House Resolution 4428, to restore standard time during the months of January, February, November, and December.

In my opinion the standard time should be restored during the entire year, but if that cannot be done I am heartily in favor of your resolution and hope it will pass.

Yours very truly,

JAMES J. McLAUGHLIN,
General Solicitor, Clinchfield Railroad Co.

GRAFTON, N. DAK.

Board of governors, Grafton Civic Club, supports eliminating daylight-saving time. This board definitely approves action that Nation's time return where belongs. The rural people want to avoid time arguments with townsmen when daylight-saving time is an injustice and handicap to farmer and labor problems of this great Northwest, especially among potato, beet, grain growers. We Americans of standard quality should abide by standard time. Therefore approve measure and accordingly likewise request our Representatives in Congress.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
GRAFTON CIVIC CLUB.

ATLANTA, GA.

I saw an article this morning in the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution where you had introduced a bill to eliminate daylight-saving time and restore the country to standard time. In other words, to return to "horse-sense" time. I am 100 percent of anything to abolish these "crack-pot" laws and ideas that have been forced on the people. More power to your undertaking.

N. L. CAMPBELL,
Editor and Manager, the Railroad Journal.

Have Congress set the timepieces back to standard time. We lumbermen cannot have electric lights in the woods, and still they work on this fool time, so we have to get along the best we can in the dark.

Hoping you all will have some sense and do the right thing is the prayer of committee A of the Lumbermen's Association Eastern States.

EVERETT, WASH.

Whereas the daylight-saving time has been tried and never found to serve the purpose; does not save fuel, light, or other claimed savings; has worked a hardship on the farm-

ers of the United States of America, and the farmer loses by trying to feed earlier: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we go on record as opposing the daylight-saving time and petition the President of the United States and all public officials to restore standard time as soon as possible.

JOHN VAN METER, Master,
FRANCIS R. BALES, Secretary,
Sunnyside Boulevard Grange.

OFFICE OF THE CITY COMMISSION,
Dayton, Ohio.

There have been much confusion and dissatisfaction within the State of Ohio each spring and fall because of the recurrent time change.

Within our own city there is a very large segment of the population who find through experience that the so-called fast time accomplishes nothing for the war effort, but proves to be, according to their conviction, a definite drawback. Factory workers complain to us that they are not able to get their required hours of sleep during the summer months when we operate on fast time. Farmers in our vicinity make similar complaints against fast time. As a consequence of loss of sleep, defense workers tell us that production suffers.

The city commission has unanimously authorized me to write that the situation in our city would be better by the enactment of the bill.

OSCAR F. MAUCH,
Clerk of the Commission.

Letters from attorneys at law are included:

LON B. ROGERS, ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Pikeville, Ky., April 5, 1944.
Congressman CANNON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice in a paper, under an Associated Press date line, that a bill is pending to restore standard time in the United States.

We discussed this matter at the board of directors' meeting of our local Kiwanis Club just before we saw the clipping mentioned, but felt there was nothing we could do about it. If there is anything we can do about this, I feel sure that our club would be glad to help in any way possible.

LON B. ROGERS.

STUEBENVILLE, OHIO.

Put the clocks back on standard time. This tinkering with time twice a year is certainly a nuisance.

FRED M. COLEMAN.

INTERNATIONAL FALLS, MINN.

I note that a measure is under consideration to restore the country to standard time and to eliminate the so-called daylight-saving time under which we have been operating recently.

This measure meets with hearty approval. I can see no useful purpose served by the present time arrangement. It is not suited to this part of the country at all.

I trust Congress will be successful in eliminating this nuisance.

M. M. ABBOTT.

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO.

I know of nothing in the New Deal propaganda that has caused more trouble and inconvenience than this war time. We cannot begin work earlier than daylight. Our help does not start any earlier and wants to go home after 5, which is only 4 p. m. standard time, the middle of the afternoon. I will be surprised if we do not have a shortage of many farm crops and if weather happens to be against us it might be serious.

GEO. WHITING.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Change this war time. Last summer I was in a hospital, had an operation, and you can well imagine the long evenings till dark.

Mrs. DAISY FREIER.

GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.

There are lots of nonsensical things to come up, but this war time leads all. Agriculture works from daylight until after dark at all seasons and if the city guys want more time off they can start an hour earlier in the morning and not have to disrupt the whole fabric of time by the foolish idea of setting the clocks forward 1 hour.

I have never yet talked to a single person who could see any sense in it.

H. O. LAMBETH.

GRASS LAKE, MICH.

The clocks must go back to standard time in order for the farmers to raise food for the nations.

F. J. HELM.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Dayton is to change time April 30, to eastern war time, and I surely don't approve of it. It seems like getting up in the middle of the night and retiring when it is still daylight.

More electricity will be consumed when we are told to conserve it.

MISS VERNA GLUECKERT.

HILLSBORO, TEX.

We, the pupils and teachers of Union Bluff School, Hill County, Tex., would like to add our names to the long list having already asked that our clocks be set back to standard time. We find that it works a great hardship, particularly through the winter months, to go to school before it is light.

UNION BLUFF SCHOOL TEACHERS AND PUPILS.

BALTIMORE, MD.

We of this community have twice voted down the so-called daylight saving. All winter long we get up in the cold, bleak predawn hours, and all summer we fight the youngsters to get them to bed in broad daylight. It is a vile and abominable arrangement.

E. N. HUTCHISON.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The time has worked great hardship on working people and farmers, not only in loss of rest and sleep, but in added dollars of expense for heat and electricity used. Please get us back to God's time.

M. J. H. HUBER.

RICHMOND, VA.

I read with a great deal of pleasure of your proposed bill to restore standard time in the United States of America, and I surely hope you will be able to get it to become law.

In this section of the county it is hard to find any daylight saved by this so-called daylight-saving time between the months of October and March. We arise before daylight, often in the cold rain, snow, and sleet, and have to burn lights which could be unlighted if we were allowed standard time.

(Mrs.) GERTRUDE WILKINSON.

DAYTON, OHIO.

The men and women of our city and county are wrought up over the confusing time, changed every 6 months, for what purpose no one seems to know. It serves no real purpose. It is detrimental to farmers, war workers, and industries. Last week our city commission passed an ordinance advancing the time 1 hour for the summer. Today, labor unions and others are circulating referendum petitions to have the voters rescind this action.

JOHN F. AHLERS.

PINE BLUFF, ARK.

I am a railroad shop worker. Ever since the change, or most of the time, we are required to start working at 6 o'clock sun time—7 war time—and working only 8 hours a day we get off at 3 sun time—4 war time—in the evening, which is about the middle of the evening. It forces us to get up 2 hours before daylight, burning electricity, get to our jobs an hour before good daylight, and burn electricity another 1½ to 2 hours until it gets light enough to see how to work, and then quit work when the sun is 2 to 3 hours high in the evening.

We ought to elect a Congress that has sense enough to let God's sun time alone.

M. M. HAMILTON.

During the winter months I go to work in the dark and return in the dark, where if we were on standard time I would go to work in daylight.

We were told that it was done to conserve electricity, but such statements are not borne out by the facts.

J. S. HOLMES.
Albany, N. Y.

GEORGETOWN, TEX.

This law is one of the worst blunders our representatives in Washington have made. If you will trace just how and where this idea started, you will find it was in some of our large plants where the office personnel and the golf players wanted more time in the evening for sport. Small plants have to work at a loss in this way; they have to go on peak load in the early morning hours, where formerly they usually are able to reduce their power and loads by, say, 12 o'clock midnight or even much of the time can start cutting down the loads by 10 p. m. Millions, with school children to get off to school, have to get up as early as 4 a. m. I firmly believe four-fifths of our people would vote for a repeal of this law, and the same with the soldiers that are in training. I heard a man say the other day his boy writes he has to get up at 4 a. m. Just take a look at this and see if you can find any class of our people that this law really benefits and helps in any way.

W. I. STUMP.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

This new time is most inconvenient, confusing, demoralizing, and depressing. How we look forward to eastern standard time once more.

A SOUTH CAROLINIAN.

MAUMEE, OHIO.

In a 59-mile radius from here we have to contend with three different times.

Have noted a good many railroad accidents. Could we not suppose these employees working by one time, they and their families living by another, could cause accidents; clocks in hotels with two time hands, one city time, one railroad time? Then here is the home life—twice a year the thousands of babies must be adjusted to change of another time, plus habits of adults.

Let's get back to sane living conditions.

H. T. HATTON.

TREMPEALEAU, WIS.

In operating a large farm and hiring considerable help, I have found this "Roosevelt time," as we call it, the worst handicap that could be imposed on me. Millions of hours of manpower time have been lost on account of this foolishness, as a farmer's work must conform quite closely with sun time.

W. NICHOLLS.

NEW FRANKLIN, MO.

We don't mind working hard and long hours on standard time and doing the best we can. Where we have to pick up extra help, which is hard to get, and they work

daylight saving, and our regular help work standard time, it upsets things and is very unsatisfactory for us.

And for the country children standing on the roadside in the cold and darkness, waiting for a school bus, it is very unsatisfactory.

I have talked to many people in different lines of business and I have yet to find anyone that favors daylight saving time.

C. ALBERT SMITH.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Since the advent of the so-called contradictory daylight saving, I've never heard one person approve it.

It—the daylight saving—is not a saving in any sense of the word, at any time of the year, only a drain on one's health and nerves, to say nothing of the increased fuel and electric bills when it is preached on all sides to conserve both.

During the administration of President Harding, so strong were the protests against daylight saving here in Washington, he said never again would there be daylight saving in the District of Columbia.

EDITH M. GALLANT.

WARASH EMPLOYEES' HOSPITAL,

Decatur, Ill.

Hospital days start at 7 a. m. under this silly wartime. Nurses and other hospital employees get up, have breakfast, and walk to work before dawn, about 8 months of the year. During half the year there is a tremendous waste of electricity while the morning work is being done. The long afternoons are not a boon, as supper in hospitals is early.

RUTH E. ROBERTS,
Registered Nurse.

ESSEXVILLE, MICH.

Eliminate daylight-saving time and restore the entire country to standard time. We are entirely in favor of setting the time back.

N. F. BEECKMAN.

MANAKIN, VA.

We have never liked daylight-saving time and have never been able to see how we saved anything by it. The truth of the matter was, we had to burn lights much longer in the morning, still they preach, save electricity.

L. C. CLARKE.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Put forth every effort to see that the bill is passed. Daylight saving was never designed to be helpful to working people; it means their getting up in the dark early hours of the morning and going to bed during daylight.

For anybody who can sleep late or for those who have leisure for playing golf, daylight-saving time is a great boon; but the majority of Americans are working people, and should be considered. They were certainly overlooked when this bill was made effective. They were punished (penalized) by the passing of this wartime measure. Please do something about it real soon.

HELEN BRELSFORD.

DALLAS, TEX.

This daylight-saving time has been a terrible mistake and ought to be abandoned. If this bill is brought to the attention of enough voters, the reaction will be overwhelmingly in its favor.

M. H. GUILLOT.

CULPEPER, VA.

To eliminate daylight-saving time has appealed to the heart of every farmer and school child in Virginia. Children are compelled to rise before daylight and stand by the roadside, in all kinds of weather, awaiting a bus to take them to school. Children 6 and 7 years old have to submit to such cruel treatment.

A MOTHER.

LOVETTSVILLE, VA.

Restore standard time. I trust efforts will be successful. I have written my Representative to support the measure.

HARRY C. FILLER.

PACIFIC, MO.

Remove this eclipse that has obscured our normal course in life for the past few years, namely, the so-called daylight-saving plan. This annoying regulation never had any merit and has cost us heavily.

JAMES McCAUGHEY.

MILLERSVILLE, MD.

Small city houses are almost uninhabitable in summer till 10 or 11 p. m. sun time. An hour's sleep in the cool of the morning is worth more than an hour for amusement in the evening.

MARIA BALDWIN.

HOLLY HILL, FLA.

Let us have God's time again in this beautiful world that man has almost ruined. The harm it has done children. Save electricity; what a joke that is. The cost is just the same no matter what the clock says.

Mrs. J. H. ARMSTRONG.

BLUEMONT, VA.

I wish to endorse bill to restore standard time; the present fast time is a sample of the laws sponsored by the New Deal.

WALTER I. PRIEST.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

May I, too, add my protest against daylight saving? It is one of the worst things people have had to endure outside of the war. I am the mother of several children—some of whom go to school. I get them up in the dark; they eat their breakfast in the dark; go to school in the dark.

Mrs. BUTLER.

BELLEVILLE, ILL.

Keep the clock where it belongs and not an hour ahead, as it is with the present crazy idea of daylight saving time which does not save a thing, and we have to use electricity to see to wash our faces. That's one of the craziest ideas and was originated for the benefit of the golfers. Daylight-saving time does not save a darned thing. What a crime to have to stop work at 3:30 p. m. instead of the correct time, 4:30 p. m.

G. J. HEINTZ.

BUTLER, OHIO.

War time is a mistake. Rationing may be a nuisance but as a handicap to the producing farmer it cannot compare with war time.

Farming is tied to the sun. It cannot be otherwise. The nearer a standard time can be to sun time the better. The net effect of war time is you start on sun time and quit on war time. We lose that hour.

War time is a handicap to farming and benefits no other producing industry.

Do your darndest to get the bill through.

PAUL D. LEEDY.

LAWRENCE, KANS.

We in the Middle West want the clocks set back to where they should be.

Yours truly,

L. B. READ.

DAYTON, OHIO.

As a war worker in the city of Dayton, and one who sees so many disadvantages of fast or war time, I heartily approve of the bill for establishment of standard time for the Nation. About 95 percent of the employees where I worked are against war time.

HAROLD DAGANHARDT.

GRAY SUMMIT, MO.

We live on a large farm and are willing to help in any way we can to help win the war,

but feel that daylight saving time has worked unnecessary hardship on the farmers and school children. Children have to meet the school bus at 7 o'clock. The farmers need all the help they can get this year. Setting our clocks back will help a lot.

MR. AND MRS. WILFRED BEUMER.

PACIFIC, MO.

In advocating the change of time I am voicing the sentiments the businessmen, farmers, and laborers in this community.

We hope and pray you will accomplish this move. It has been one of the most detrimental and inconvenient laws ever enacted.

L. A. BROWN.

COLUMBIA, MO.

I have lived in St. Louis, which is one of the big cities supposed to be affected favorably by the use of the extra hour of sunshine, and have lived in smaller towns, and as yet I fail to see the benefit of it. Certainly there are inconveniences. Everyone does not get up at 7 a. m. (or later) and for the ones (most people, I think) who get up between 5 and 6, a light has to be burned in the morning 365 days of the year. On the other hand, before the daylight saving time there are a few months of the year when one can get up and do without lights if we use the "Lord's time" for our clocks.

MRS. C. H. PRAGER.

NEW HAVEN, MO.

Set our clocks back to the old time. We are 100 percent for the bill.

OSCAR RUEEGE.

WENTZVILLE, MO.

This so-called daylight saving time is certainly a disgusting thing.

Just because the clocks are pushed up an hour is no sign that the dew will be off our crops an hour earlier. When we hire help they want to quit for the day when the sun is still way up and when we have business which needs our attention in town we must go in the middle of the day or else everything is locked up way before the day is past.

We're using more oil for lights than before just because we have to be up in the morning long before daylight.

EDWARD SCHROEDER.

[Telegram]

[The filing time shown in the date line on telegrams and day letters is standard time at point of origin. Time of receipt is standard time at point of destination]

PADUCAH, KY., March 29, 1944.

We heartily endorse efforts in regard to the time bill. We farmers have been heavily handicapped by this war time.

J. A. COLE.

FREDERICK BEYER.

HARVARD ROTTGERING.

HARRY ROSS.

BOSTON, MASS.

I was delighted to read in the newspaper that you had introduced a bill in Congress to eliminate daylight-saving time and restore the entire country to standard time.

Daylight saving is the most ridiculous, useless, inconsistent, and irritating law Congress ever thought up to plague us working folk.

At first it was stated that on account of the war plants it was necessary. If the war plants are working 24 hours around the clock, then how could daylight-saving time be necessary or consistent?

Later it was stated England was on this time and therefore it would be best for us to be on the same time. How long since the United States has had to do as any other foreign power? We Americans have always in the past given an i done for England but why should we copy her? Are we not capable of running our own country without any advice from outside?

Thirdly, why change the clock? If certain business desires to open an hour earlier all well and good, but what is to be gained by forcing others to change their time?

Fourthly, electric-light bills are far higher since the change, as for 7 months those of us who rise at 5 a. m. standard time leave home when dark and arrive home when dark. Also, in the North, most apartment houses do not have the heat on so early and, of course, there is no sun to help warm up.

It's most difficult for one to live most of their life on standard time and suddenly change over to life an hour or two ahead without physical discomfort. Those of us who may suffer from sinus, asthma, or bronchial ailments find the early morning air an aggravation to those symptoms.

Yours for repeal of daylight saving time.

RUTH LOUISE LEIGHTON.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

The bill to set the Nation's clocks back to where they were before all this silly meddling with daylight-saving time, deserves prompt enactment into law.

Because school children here had to get up in the dark during the winter months the State of Ohio compromised the time back and forth. We now go back to some other time tomorrow, April 30. We have railroad time, city time, daylight time, and State time. For sheer nonsense and utter confusion this variable time business is about the most stupid mistake that could be inflicted on the Nation. All talk about saving electricity is just poppycock. What you save in the evening you burn in the morning.

C. STEVEN GOBY.

HAGERSTOWN, MD.

Eliminate eastern war time and go back to standard time.

We have saved no electricity and can see no value whatever in doing away with standard time.

C. HARRY KELLER.

EDINBURG, IND.

Changing of time to fast time costs us hundreds of dollars. It is just another New Deal brainstorm. Men want to get up on old time, quit at noon on new time, and quit in evening on fast time.

Mrs. HENRY E. BREEDING.

NORMAN, NEBR.

We are interested in having the Nation's clocks set back again. Do all you can to bring this about.

RAY E. NEEDHAM.

WALTER J. SCHMIDT.

PERRY BECKER.

EARL WOOLEVER.

ALBANY, N. Y.

I was pleased beyond words when I read an article on setting back the Nation's clocks. It's tough to get up and out in the pitch dark in the cold. The earlier it is the colder it is, and the school kiddies are out all winter at 8 o'clock in the pitch dark in wintry weather. If there were one ounce of sense to the measure or it kept boys from suffering over there we wouldn't mind. But it's no sense at all. It doesn't even save electricity, as it was supposed to. All the houses are lighted up till 8 and 8:30 on dark mornings.

I do hope with all my heart the clocks will be set back and let's have the ordinary time we always had.

This new time is just about as sensible as if we wanted to lengthen a skirt, so we cut some off the top and sew it on the bottom.

Mrs. FLORENCE B. WILSON.

ATTICA, IND.

The farmers will owe a debt of gratitude that can never be paid for your efforts to set the blocks back. Let us say the clock says 7

p. m.—the time really is 6 p. m. Farmer goes to milk and cannot milk because the flies are so bad. It is 8 p. m. by the clock and I go to shut up the chickens so we can go to church; they won't go in because they know it is only 7 p. m. I could go on and on—you just have no idea the nuisance it is.

MARY SHUPP.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Please eliminate daylight-saving time. It is silly, unnecessary, and profits no one. Do help us get rid of it forever.

ELISABETH V. CLARK.

GRAND HAVEN, MICH.

It is about time you fellers down there waked up to the fact that there is no use setting the clocks ahead. It is bad for the farmers and for outside workers, such as carpenters, bricklayers, and painters, and for school children. In the summer it is light until 10 o'clock and the children want to stay out until it is dark and it is about 11 o'clock before they get to bed and that is not enough sleep for them; in the morning it is so wet the farmers can't get to work on time; the only ones it is any good for is the golf players and that don't earn the common man a living; and the sooner the clocks are put back to central standard time where it belongs, the better.

DIRK VAN DOORME.

ABILENE, TEX.

I cannot resist writing to encourage the move to return our clocks back to normal. I am so thankful someone in Washington has realized the terrible disadvantages of this thing, we cannot see that changing our time has helped the war effort in one single instance. Instead it has proved to be only an irritant.

The time has come when even cowhands quit work according to the clock. Many good daylight hours are wasted in these abnormal afternoons. The sun is high when they stop. It is the same thing when we try to harvest wheat.

We were told in the beginning that it was necessary to change clocks to conserve electric power in cities. Now, when we know factories are run 24 hours daily, swing shifts, and so forth, we wonder, where is the saving of electric power? Certainly not in our homes. We retire an hour early by the clock, but next morning, because it is still dark, we burn lights an hour. There is no difference.

But I am writing to present the difficulties of mothers and school children, particularly.

With two boys in grade schools, consider my plight. Especially the 9-year old son. He needs 10 hours sleep each night. So every night it is a struggle with frayed tempers resulting, to make him come in from play, with lots of pleasant daylight playtime left, and command him to go to bed. Next morning, he has to be awakened while it is still dark to reach school on time. For the 3 winter months, what's worse, he has to go to school in the dark.

We Texans like to think we are as patriotic as the next ones. If we could see that all this worry and trouble were actually helping the war effort we would never complain. But for 2 years of it now, we fall to see any good at all. May the bill be successful and soon.

"Thanks for listening"—

Mrs. H.

PERU, ILL.

About daybreak usually occurs the minimum temperature during the 24 hours; therefore, we may deduce that Nature herself attaches significance to that time of day.

Consider (December, 1942-January, 1943) clocks reading 8:18 a. m. at the hour of sunrise. This necessitates consuming electricity or using other means of artificial lighting.

The writer finds himself at a loss to understand why avoidably consuming electricity

for this purpose, can effect a saving for war effort; or any other use.

The sun does not shine through (December, 1942) until nearly 9:00 a. m. Clocks indicate noon hour only a few hours after actual daybreak.

Changing the setting of clocks will not disrupt Nature nor cause her to change the cycle of daylight and darkness.

At any rate, this winter is proving unsuitable for this situation that has been arbitrarily created necessitating having artificial light. And which latter could otherwise have been avoided.

LISZT LENZEN.

DES MOINES, IOWA.

In these trying times, why must we have unnecessary hardships heaped upon us? Setting the clocks ahead is an unnecessary hardship and a detriment to us at all seasons of the year.

If setting the clocks ahead in any small way helped the war effort, everyone would be resigned to the change, but it does not help the war effort. All war plants work the clock around, three 8-hour shifts.

I have talked with dozens of women about their gas and electric bills and all agree that never in the history of their housekeeping have the gas and electric bills been so high.

We are burning lights hours longer each month than is necessary on account of setting the clocks ahead, and it is a deplorable condition to have our children going out into the darkness to school all fall and winter.

In the summer the nights are hot and it does not cool off much before midnight. The early morning is cool enough so one can sleep but if we are forced to retire before it has cooled off, and forced to get up while we could sleep, think how little real sleep and rest we have had to start the grind of a hard day's work.

I want you to know how very much I, and my family, and my neighbors, and friends appreciate the effort to restore standard time. We thank you from the depths of our hearts.

Mrs. JOHN L. MORTON.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

Glad to note in our papers for the 27th the introduction of a bill for return to standard time.

Believe this would be generally helpful to industry and to the country at large.

ISLAND CREEK COAL CO.,
JAMES D. FRANCIS,
President.

SHENANDOAH, IOWA.

I'm sure if I had the time to visit my Iowa farm friends I would get 100 percent vote for your measure. I have never heard anyone claim any advantages in favor of wartime.

Mrs. A. L. RODGERS.

COATS, KANS.

I am a wheat and stock raiser. Have six tractors and understand the help problem. In the busy farming season we try to use all our daylight but what a curse it is for our boys to switch the tractors off when the sun is high, the moisture rapidly leaving your soil and telling you to please remember the shows and other attractions all start on war time. In harvest the dews keep our combines out of field in morning and with war time our help just won't stay with us late in evenings because it makes too long a run. In the schools in winter our kiddies go to school before daylight, study in their classrooms by artificial light, using our electricity, then in order for our children to get their needed rest we must send them to bed in daylight, but neither we, Congress, nor Roosevelt can make them go to sleep.

Restore the Nation to standard time.

BEN SCHREPEL.

DAYTON, OHIO.

This business of changing the time is a pain in the neck and not only that but in the summer when a hard-working man is able to get a little sleep in the morning when it's cool up comes this ridiculous business of changing the time so that when it's hot in the evening the workingman must go to bed in order to get sleep; next morning finds himself tossing all night because of the heat.

Being a workingman in a factory, I am asking you to see that bill No. 4489 be passed.

M. VIDA.

ELLINWOOD, KANS.

Time of day is by the sun, and you cannot do anything to change the sun, and I don't think anything should be done to change the time, and I hope it will be changed back. I have talked to dozen, and none like it.

I have three sons in the service. All in the Navy, and I sure want this war to get over. I just feel that changing back to God's time will help.

Mrs. GEORGE CECIL.

PIGGOTT, ARK.

We farmers of this community will surely welcome the day when Congress sees fit to turn back the clock to where it belongs—with the sun. It does work a hardship on farmers who are trying to help feed the Nation.

MATTIE KERSHAW.

GALVESTON, TEX.

We hail with delight and approval the bill to set the Nation's clock back 1 hour and once more, recognize the fact that it is the sun and not the law that fixes the time.

The effort to adopt the so-called wartime to our private lives and business has produced only confusion and inconvenience.

Our schools had to change the hour of opening during the winter because it was not yet good daylight when the children reported at schools. Our merchants changed the hour of store openings.

While the inconvenience and confusion due to the change has been great, there has been positively no real benefit. It was in line with changing Thanksgiving Day.

E. R. CHEESBOROUGH.

DAYTON, OHIO.

The result of this change of time as experienced last year is very confusing.

I am in sympathy with the bill calling for establishment of standard time throughout the Nation. I have written our Representative urging him to use his influence so that the bill will be passed.

CHESTER STIDHAM.

PLATTSBURG, MO.

I am certainly glad that some person in Congress at last appreciates the need for a return to standard time. The present arrangement works a hardship on the farmer, lessens production, increases the use of electricity, and makes it difficult for children to catch a school bus at 6:30 a. m.

Don't give up; we are for you.

R. A. SHOEMAKER,
County Chairman, Clinton
County Finance Committee.

PADUCAH, KY.

This daylight saving time is such a nuisance half of the people have never pushed their clocks forward. Farmers can work only by sun time.

The Catholic school here which has a large attendance goes by the old time. Their studies begin at 9:30 new time. So please do everything you can so our light bills will be less.

Mrs. J. B. SMITH.

FAIRFIELD, OHIO.

According to a 3 to 2 vote of the commissioners of Dayton, Ohio, the time will be advanced 1 hour April 30, 1944, and turned back October 1, 1944. The result is very confusing.

You recently introduced bill No. 4489 in the Federal House of Representatives calling for establishment of standard time throughout the Nation.

I believe we should all be on standard time and I have written our Congressman to do what he can to see that the bill will be passed.

DUFF G. ROMSPERT.

MIDDLEBROOK, VA.

Nearly everyone in this section has expressed dissatisfaction with this war time, and wondered how to best start a move to have the clocks set right.

If there is anything we can do, please let us know how we can help.

Mrs. L. A. TYLER.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

Please do all you can to get all the States back on eastern standard time.

A. D. W.

AUGUSTA, KANS.

Put the clocks back where they should be. Congratulations, thanks, and the best of luck. I'm glad someone is making a fight on this sort of foolishness. The Nation has never gained 5 cents from it.

EARL W. WOLF.

EMPORIA, KANS.

Congratulations on the bill to eliminate war time. This should not have been passed in the first place. Return to eastern standard.

LEONARD G. FORT.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Set the clocks back to standard time. If you succeed in getting it through, you will have earned the eternal gratitude of the people of the Nation.

It is not only a menace to farmers and country people but to city dwellers as well. All this winter children were starting for school long before daylight. There is no light saved by this practice. What little is saved in the evening is used up in the morning.

If some like to get up early so as to have time off in the afternoon, their work schedule should be advanced so as to suit them; but they should not expect the whole Nation to be inconvenienced because they so desire. The powers that be who make these changes do not have to leave their beds until the sun is well up; but they seem to care nothing for the annoyance and trouble they cause others. For a long time I have hoped that someone would bring this matter to the attention of Congress.

KATHERINE R. AMES.

CARROLL, IOWA.

The bill to change the clocks back is in full accord with the wishes and desires of all midwestern people. Eliminate daylight saving and restore the entire country to standard time.

A. J. HODGES.

STACEYVILLE, IOWA.

Set the clocks back. It is a handicap for farmers.

With the help as short as it is, we lose one hour on quite a few days in the year. We all stand back of the bill to get our standard time again. With the manpower shortage, we need all the sun hours we can get.

BERNARD J. MAY.

EOLIA, Mo.

I notice from my paper that you have proposed a bill in the Congress of the United States. We are very much pleased that there is someone in Washington who is interested in setting the clock back. That has always been an inconvenience to us farmers of this country, and if it doesn't interfere with the war effort we can assure you that we are in accord with you in regard to this bill. So I hope you will be successful in passing it.

With best wishes for you and your family.
Yours very truly,

ROBT. L. BERRY.

WELLSVILLE, Mo.

Of all the wartime controls, this so-called daylight saving has been the most senseless and disastrous. The average person has never seen where it helps to win the war.

ROGER Q. SHAW.

DAYTON, OHIO.

We favor the bill to put the country back on standard time.

L. G. SCHNEBLE.

CHICAGO, ILL.

The daylight saving law is really nonsensical. It saves nothing. It affects the health of the people. Changes habits of going to sleep and to work. We are 1,000 percent for standard time.

A. C.

DAYTON, OHIO.

I cannot for the world understand how we can save electricity by changing the time to an hour ahead. Taking, for instance, a worker leaving for work at 6 in the morning must at least get up at 5 or 5:30. Where is he saving electricity; it is still dark? If there are four or five people in the household going to work at that time, there will, at least, be four to six different rooms lighted, including the kitchen.

I cannot agree with the people who play golf, etc.; there is a war on and who should be given the right to have some rest in the summer morning when it isn't too hot to sleep. Let the golfers, etc., sacrifice their recreation. We workers are not having much and we're not squawking, therefore I am asking you to see that the Cannon bill No. 4489 is passed.

Mrs. M. VIDA.

RICHMOND, VA.

The so-called daylight saving law was enacted for the intent and purpose of using less artificial light, thereby saving electric current. Having kept tab on this during the First World War, I found there was a definite loss instead of a saving for 7 months, and during the other 5 months, there was neither gain nor loss. Of course, we only had it in effect then from the first Sunday in March until the last Sunday in October, and all of us were glad when it was over. Our present law being a year-round proposition, the loss is greater and the aggravation worse.

No businessman can roll out of bed and take a seat at his desk in his office; no workman can roll out of bed and take his place at his bench or lathe in the factory. Someone must be up an hour ahead of him to prepare his breakfast and his lunch to take with him, but more than this of the attending disadvantages, I found during the long days in the middle of the period, there was a long afternoon of idleness, which filled the highways with joy riders and dissipaters, and filled the alleys with crapshooters, idlers, loafers, and troublemakers. The records show that the above condition during that period resulted in a substantial increase in accidents and crime. I find the fewest number of people wanted this condition thrust upon us, and nearly the whole population is looking eagerly forward to its discontinuance.

We do not want any amendments. We want a repeal; we want a national observance of standard time.

A RICHMOND BUSINESSMAN.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG., March 29, 1944.
Representative CANNON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I was so happy to see that Congress is considering abolishing that—most of all, diabolical laws, known as daylight saving. It has worked a hardship on both old and young, and has done no good anywhere. In the North and West it is very cold to get up an hour earlier, and sit around waiting for it to get light enough to see how to work. In the South the dew is so heavy they cannot even pick cotton till the sun comes out. I have been a southern Democrat for 60 years. But too many unnecessary things have been meddled with. Set our clocks back so we will not have to prepare dinner in the middle of the afternoon, the hottest time of the day.

Mrs. FRANCES MACKAY.

CHARLESTON, W. VA.

Change the time back to its original setting. This change in time has cost most building contractors money on all their work. The standard time of work is from 8 a. m. to 4:30 p. m., and with the change of time it is generally too dark in the winter to start work at that time in the morning unless you have facilities for lighting. Therefore, it is necessary to start between 8:30 and 9 a. m. If you set your time at 9 a. m. and the quitting time is 4:30 p. m., this requires the workmen to work till 5:30 to make the 8-hour day.

Further, it is a cost to communities, for schools, and people. They have to light and heat buildings earlier when the weather is colder in the mornings and carry on to later in the evening when most personnel works a little later. Families have to heat and light their homes longer hours and use more fuel.

With some States on regular time and others with advanced time it is confusing to everyone. I have never seen any good come of it since it has been in effect.

W. A. ABBETT.

WILLARD, Mo.

Of all the silly things that I ever heard of, I believe daylight saving is the worst. We dairy farmers were asked to save on electricity, yet when they moved the clock up an hour we were forced to burn from 1 to 3 more hours of electricity.

If I had the gas to get around, I could get several hundred farmers that would sign the petition to turn back the clock, so do the farmers a favor by getting the job done.

H. E. BRAY.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Speed the day when House bill No. 4489, calling for the establishment of standard time throughout the Nation, can be brought to a favorable vote. War time has been a sad mistake. No one has ever been able to show enough saving to make up for the inconvenience and the confusion it has caused farmers and war workers.

CARLOS D. CARNEY.

HILLSBORO, OHIO.

Let us have standard time for Nation.
Let's go back to the old time.

HENRY B. WILLIAMS.

SOUTH BEND, IND.

Please add my protest against this fast time. It brings undue pressure and a nervous tension which is undesirable in war time or any other time.

Mrs. LOREN SCHAFER.

SHELBYVILLE, IND.

I am very much in favor of your measure going back to regular time. The law is a great hindrance to the farmer and the man who labors from daylight until dark.

SYLVESTER TOWNS.

SANTA FE, MO.

Turn the Nation's clock from daylight saving time back to God's time. Of all the rations and war worries we've had there is none that compares with this daylight savings time. It has cost us a greater fuel bill; also kerosene bill for our lighting. And above all has been nerve wracking. I sincerely hope the time will be set back.

Mrs. EUGENE SHARP.

DAYTON, OHIO.

The bill calling for standard time throughout the Nation is 100 percent correct and should be passed as quickly as possible.

D. D. CERRETA.

SOUTH CHARLESTON, W. VA.

Daylight-saving time has disrupted practical working hours for the entire country. It has not saved or gained anything. Many plant workers live many miles from their places of employment and therefore must leave their homes at an unreasonably early hour to get to work.

The darker hours are simply moved from the evening to the morning, so there can be no saving of electric power. Most plants are operating on a 24-hour basis anyway. Those who promulgated this change in an age-old custom perhaps go to work at a late hour while most wage earners go to work at 7 or 8 a. m.

J. W. KEADLE.

GURDON, ARK.

Restore standard time. We have been handicapped too long with this senseless war time. Am truly glad others have the grit and good sense to try to have standard time restored.

S. E. SIMONSON.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Discontinue war time. I can understand how the bureaucrats need some impetus to get them to work an hour earlier, but we don't need it out here. War time has only meant confusion and unnecessary hardship.

S. H. ANKENY.

ARDMORE, OKLA.

I have heard more complaint on the daylight-saving time than any other one thing connected with the war. These complaints come from every place. People who work in rural districts, especially, claim that any entertainment in the towns under daylight-saving time forces their hired help and themselves to quit work so early that it is almost impossible to get in a day's work. Especially is this true when there is a heavy dew.

Please do all you possibly can to get this bill through and have at least that much of our life normal.

J. L. MURPHEY.

CULLISON, KANS.

Change the time back to where it should be. I haven't words in my vocabulary to say what I think of this war time, and if I did I would ruin the English language.

WARREN E. MILLS.

BALTIMORE, Md.

Our whole organization, as well as our friends, would like to have standard time back again.

ROBERT C. SHADDICK.

BALTIMORE, Md.

Certainly hope we can get standard time back again as we would like to have an extra hour in which to rest.

Z. WHITEFORD.

DEERFIELD, MICH.

Set the clocks back. In the spring when a farmer is putting his crops in, the ground is frozen till about 9 o'clock; then when you harvest you can't combine till about 10 o'clock. Then everybody is ready to stop work in the middle of the afternoon.

FRED McMAHON.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Abolish this nonsensical, idiotic, and utterly useless war time forced upon us 2 years ago by somebody who doesn't have to go outside their door for one earthly thing, who have lovely electric lights inside and out at all and any hour.

We farmers have to till our land by God-given daylight that comes and goes at the same time it has for ages, regardless of how you twirl the hands of the clock.

It is my fervent prayer and hope that the bill will be approved.

(Mrs.) CLARA JAMES EBY.

HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

Representative CANNON of Missouri,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am glad to see that Congress is considering a bill to relieve the country of one of the worst curses that has been forced upon us during this crisis, the so-called daylight saving time. The public did not want this in the beginning and have never been satisfied with it, but have been forced to abide by it, though it has never been of advantage to the country or any class of business. You can see all types of industry going to work in the morning under a flood of electric lights, in order to finish their day's work little past the middle afternoon.

W. A. DAVIS.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Please get the daylight saving time changed back to the old schedule. While I am a city dweller, I find it a great disadvantage to me and my business.

LOUIE REESE.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Aside from the fact that advancing the clock has increased the use of electricity by at least 10 percent it has deprived hard-working war workers of hours of much needed rest thereby contributing to absenteeism. It depletes the strength of the women causing many of them to withdraw from war work. I do not know of a single woman who does not find it necessary to work at home as long as there is daylight. No wonder the women are breaking down under the strain.

GLADYS STREENZ,
War Worker.

BOYDTON, VA., March 30, 1944.

Representative CANNON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Rid the country of the so-called daylight saving time. It has always been an absurd thing. It interferes with our whole economic system.

Let us get away from the fallacy of daylight saving. There is no truth in it—never has been and never will be.

J. H. BAPTIST.

PADUCAH, KY.

How happy you would make us people here if we could get Congress to set the time back.

In the winter we get up in the middle of the night, and in summer go to bed with the sun shining. We have to burn lights half of the morning. The farmers don't like it either. Cattle go by the sun and they can't change them. I am just one in this town who is dissatisfied.

Mrs. NEVA LEIBEL.

FORT WORTH, TEX.

Please eliminate daylight saving time and restore the country to standard time.

TOM CHAPMAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

If you can get Congress to see the folly of this daylight saving nonsense it should call for a medal of highest honor. I am confident our Senator TRYBING will back you up on that. He's level headed.

PERRY F. SKINNER.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Please, I beg of you, to make the Congressmen understand that we are not saving any electric power by the clock being 1 hour fast here in Minnesota. My light bill is twice as high; it's a very expensive act for the laboring class. So please give us back our standard time.

Mrs. WM. ROCK.

PLATTSMOUTH, NEBR.

I read in the Omaha World Herald, and also heard on the radio, that a bill has been introduced to abolish daylight-saving time. I wrote to a State representative a year ago and he said that law was useless, but was made in Washington and would have to be changed there. I don't know why they keep it up, for the help don't like it either.

Mrs. JOHN McLELLAN.

BAY CITY, MICH.

Of all the foolish ideas, changing the time of day is one.

Here it has caused many a hardship on people, young and old. It was perfectly terrible. It did not save any time or electricity either, as the lights were burned in the morning way up until 10 and 11 o'clock in lots of offices and factories, so instead of making things better it made them much worse.

Mrs. GEORGE DAVIS.

PANA, ILL.

Daylight-saving time is so uncalled for. Our children had to go to school in the dark, and these old men that work at the mine had to go to work in the dark, and our greenhouse workers couldn't go to work till 8 o'clock because they have no lights. If a petition will do any good, we will send one. The whole town is for the old time. We are so glad somebody has taken it up.

Mrs. C. A. WRIGHT.

SYRACUSE, N. Y.

By all means turn back the clocks to standard time. The world has been all wrong since we had daylight saving.

D. C. W. V.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

The undersigned, all residents and qualified voters in the Birmingham area, use this method to convey to you that we are desirous of a bill being passed by Congress that would return the country to standard time.

(Many signatures.)

MECHANICSVILLE, MD.

The quicker daylight saving is abolished, the better. The time we have now does not accomplish anything but confusion and annoyance.

BENJAMIN C. WOOD.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Putting the clock back to normal would certainly be a godsend to people in Missouri where it is so hot in the summer.

Mrs. CORA J. HELTZELL.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Three cheers for the bill to set the time back to standard, as it makes it very bad having to go to work in the wee hours of the morning. One of the girls was knocked unconscious and her purse taken away from her coming to work. If this bill passes there will be many grateful women.

VIRGINIA MARSHALL.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Repeal the Daylight-Savings Time Act. Since its enactment I have talked with people in all walks of life and all agree it has not benefited them. My friends who operate a farm in Illinois have also expressed their disapproval of it.

Today the St. Louis Globe-Democrat in an editorial said it was a globe move and that it was nonsense to pass it in the first place.

JOHN J. JARVIS.

CLIFTON SPRINGS, N. Y.

Restore the clocks to standard time. That would be one of the best things that could be done. People will tell you their electric bill is higher than ever before. And there are so many accidents with people going to work before daylight.

P. LINEHAN.

MORRISON, ILL.

Abolish daylight saving. I trust the bill will receive favorable consideration. Thanks and God bless you.

ALBERT O. OLSON,
An old ex-marine.

TEXARKANA, ARK.

Am glad to know this crazy time we have had for the last year or so bothers other people beside hundreds of people down here. Please help us out.

D. G. BURCH.

DALLAS, TEX.

This is to voice hearty approval of the steps being taken to have the time set back to normal.

Considering the adjustments we are constantly called upon to make at a critical time like this that are vital, such an absolutely worthless change has been the height of folly.

CAROL COX.

MEXICO, MO.

Work is done all around the clock in essential industries, so why tamper with time? The sun pays no heed. And we must work by the sun.

Here's hoping everyone will vote to turn back the clocks and get along with the war.

Mrs. Z. E. TATON.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

By all means end this fool daylight-saving time.

C. E. BROWN.

LOUISIANA, MO.

In order that we may get the work done on the farms, and produce the crops essential to winning the war and to relieve the shortage of farm labor, get central time restored and our clock set back 1 hour to the old time.

P. E. RICHARD.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Give us back our real time once more. We believe in running America the American way and not the way of England. Those responsible for this should hear the complaints from these people. Let's have standard time.

A. B. WILLIS.

BALTIMORE, MD.

Keep the good work up. Rule out this daylight law.

JOE CARTER.

HERMANN, MO.

Set the Nation's clocks back to God's sun time. It cannot be estimated in dollars how much it will help to produce and save crops. The same is true in town. It is waste instead of saving. From October to February the homes burn 1½ hours electricity to get breakfast and be ready at 7 for shoe-factory advanced time when it really is only 6 and the factory burns another hour of electricity.

If we have to face another manpower shortage on the American farms this year, it will

be an immeasurable salvation of time if the clocks are put back to sun time.

G. GUMPER.

DAYTON, OHIO.

There are thousands of war workers here in Dayton, including factories and the two airfields, and we certainly want the slow time, our usual time, instead of the fast time which makes us get up in the dark and go to work in the dark, go to bed in the summer in the heat of the evening, and burn more electricity all the time.

CHAS. C. GRAY.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

Abolish war time and restore standard time. It is important.

As a letter carrier in the post office in New York, war time presents a number of problems during the winter months. In New York we commence work at 6 a. m., and in the residential areas we letter carriers leave for the first delivery at 7:15 a. m., a time when the streets are totally dark. Because mail boxes in apartment buildings are in many instances located near the street, it is difficult to see these mail boxes in the darkness in order to effect delivery of mail.

Keep up the good work to the end that war time shall be abolished and eastern time restored. As previously, each State will decide for itself as to how many months of daylight time it desires.

LEON SAMIS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

I do not know when I have read anything that pleased me so much as the bill to set our clocks back.

I understand the clocks were advanced 1 hour to save electricity. I want to tell you how it worked in my home this past winter. As you know, Ohio went back to central time. My daughter would sit up from 1 to 2 hours after I retired, studying her school work, then I got up 1 hour and 30 minutes before she did in order for me to get to work at 8 a. m. on the railroad (fast time), while she went to school (slow time).

This ran my electric bill up about 65 to 70 kilowatt-hours a month. To save electricity, restore the clocks to normalcy.

I pray that the bill will go through.

L. B. CAILEY.

RICHMOND, VA.

I was gratified and pleased to read in the morning paper of a bill to eliminate daylight saving time and restore the country to standard time. For the South, particularly, the daylight-saving time has been a menace to health for children as well as grown-ups—the bedrooms not cooling off until after midnight. Then in winter it is so dark at 8 a. m. (really 7 a. m.) that women are afraid to go to work. It certainly does not save electricity as lights have to be turned on to get breakfast.

MARIANNE E. MEADE.

HILLVIEW, ILL.

School children, farmers, everybody tired daylight-wasting time.

HARRY C. DUFF.

SCHENEVUS, N. Y.

Every farmer and American backs the bill to discontinue war time. The sooner the better.

JOHN WILSON.

JACKSON, MICH.

The most sensible thing I have heard of in a long time was the badly needed bill to put the country back on standard time. I have heard more people complaining about going back to war time than I have about the war. The fast time has never really helped anybody except the soft-ball players and golfers. I think if we were on standard time we

wouldn't have so many young children out on the streets at 11 or 12 o'clock or later, because if it got dark earlier the children would get sleepy sooner and go to bed at 8 or 9 o'clock—when they should—instead of staying out till all hours of the night. Please put this bill through.

MARION D. MCCLURE.

RAHWAY, N. J.

Please add our names to those protesting daylight-saving time. It has been a real hardship. It has been the cause of waste of fuel and electricity during the fall, winter, and spring months. Please end this unnecessary inconvenience.

(MRS.) MARY M. BROPHY.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

I have just read an article in our local paper on a bill to put the Nation back on standard time. Regardless of the importance of the many war measures before Congress, this is one of the most sensible things I have heard yet. In all my years I cannot recall any measures passed by our Congress that have upset the American apple cart so much as this thing called saving time, daylight.

EDWIN J. DREISEBACH.

BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICH.

I hope you will press this bill with all your might.

In the Detroit area we were told that eastern war time would be a valuable contribution to the war effort, in that it would cut down on the use of electric power. What a fallacy. In our household we arise at 6 a. m. and in winter our lights have to be on until at least 9 o'clock.

Our electric bills for power have been double that of previous years. I checked with the Edison Co. on this.

In war plants the lights are left on all day, regardless of the time, so there is no saving of power there.

On the side of health, the condition is not normal. In summer, to be sure, we do have daylight until about 9 o'clock, but after men and women have put in 8 hours of hard work in a war plant, they are not physically fit to use the hours in which they should be getting adequate rest in other pursuits. You know, and medical men know, that a working man or woman cannot do good work without sufficient rest. The additional daylight offers a great temptation to many to add strain upon their physical strength, with the result that they get but 5 or 6 hours' sleep. The result is a lagging of production, and a much greater incidence toward accidents. I think if a check could be made on this in war plants it would give you a powerful argument for the return to normal time. From my own standpoint I find no argument whatever either from a saving standpoint on power or health.

(MRS.) MARTIN WENDELL.

AURORA, ILL.

Am so glad to learn of this advanced time repeal.

Am a teacher, and all winter we had to burn electricity from 7:30 to 9 a. m. in our high school. People who come to our high school from the country and smaller suburbs are just full of grief about the hardships this advanced time causes. Dairy farmers cannot get men to do their work because of the early milking time when the milk must be cooled before it can be set out for collection at 6 a. m. The milker really has to milk about 3 to 4 a. m. and the cows do not respond. Do push the bill hard so we will again be able to operate on time suitable to man and animals.

Schools will do much better on standard time. Children do not go to bed in daylight, and are out just that much sleep, and are drowsy next morning in classes.

(Miss) CLARA BOHNSTENGEL.

St. LOUIS, Mo.

Bill to return to standard time a good one. Sure hope Congress puts it over. We have had enough foolishness for awhile.

J. S. ROBERTSON.

KEWANEE, ILL.

I am very much interested in the movement to return to standard time and hope that you will be successful.

The present arrangement has no advantage over standard time in our effort to produce more manufactured goods or farm crops. Farmers are compelled to conform to it by circumstances over which they have no control.

Manufacturers gain nothing, in fact, they lose by the daylight saving, or I should say daylight "slaving," because most factories have men who are over 40 years of age and to deprive these older men of that extra hour of rest in the morning is a terrible strain on their tired bodies. Younger people can stand the strain for awhile, but the older men and women cannot.

For people who can stay in bed as long as they care to it doesn't make any difference what time is used.

Victory gardeners will be able to accomplish more in their gardens because they will not be so tired. We raised good gardens before we had daylight slaving.

Like the Jap general who said that his men knew how to sleep, what he wanted was to teach them to stay awake. That is what our Government is trying to do us.

ROY L. WOOLHEATHER.

DANVILLE, VA.

Was so pleased to see from the paper yesterday that Congress is considering a bill to do away with daylight-saving time. It is such a foolish measure. As much light is used in the dark mornings as would be saved at night. If the administration would use more time for constructive things and less in upsetting old-established customs, they might be more pleasing to the voters.

Mrs. J. E. PERKINSON.

BENNETTSTVILLE, S. C.

The bill to go back to standard time is highly approved by us.

"Fast" time never has suited this area. We waste more electricity than we save.

H. D. HARRALL.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

It's good to know that somebody has courage enough to try to give back the old time.

We hope the next Congress will not try to change everything, including the sun.

D. D. METCALF.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

There are 6,500,000 Texans besides myself who approve the bill to do away with this ungodly daylight savings and hope it will go through at the earliest possible moment.

Of all the damnable, inconvenient, idiotic legislation that was ever foisted upon a suffering humanity this is about the worst that ever happened. The instigators of this inane and childlike legislation ought to be boiled in oil. Instead of saving anything it has doubled our light and heat bills and caused an untold amount of profanity.

W. B. WILSON.

PROSPECT, N. Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN, SENATORS, PRESIDENT, TOO: Give ear to a pitiful rhyme. And pity the farmers that fell in the soup when the Government doctored the time. I'm a man of few phrases, me learnin' is scant, and I'm longin' to make meself clear. It's bad in the summer, it's worse in the spring, and it's fierce in the fall o' the year. In balmy September I rise from me bed and I dress be the light o' the stars. And I finish me dreams as I wait for the cows, with me head hangin'

over the bars. The cock on the roost sees me lantern go by, and he thinks it the morning's first gleams. But e'er he's done crowin' he's left in the dark, and the chickens all laugh in their dreams. Me pigs are repositin' on pillies of mud, and me horses are sprawled in the stall. And I question the wisdom that sent me abroad an hour too soon in the fall. I'd willingly go to me bed with the birds and be up with the song o' the lark, but curs'd be the notion of savin' the day by blundrin' about in the dark. I hope when the guilty one knocks at the gate, for Peter to open the lock he'll say: "Step aside; you've an hour to wait. You're the buckoo that twisted the clock."

J. WARD WILLIAMS.

HAWK POINT, MO.

Every citizen in this community is opposed to daylight saving time. It is a nuisance. It is wasting time.

County school children have been forced to stand in darkness, shivering in the cold morning hours, waiting for a bus. Day workers are forced to do the chores around home in darkness before going to work. Farmers find it inconvenient from every standpoint.

A. K. Schaper, cashier, Peoples Bank of Hawk Point; Otho Barley, Joe Tomek, W. H. Dunard, Ed Kliene, Oscar Beck, Charles J. Brozi, Sr., C. H. Prior, R. G. Logan, directors.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

May I add my thanks and hope for success in the good work in trying to abolish the silly winter daylight saving? It is the greatest minor inconvenience of the war. (I have a son in the Navy—I'm not talking about major troubles.)

EDITH LAVELL.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

I wonder if you can realize just how great a thing you are doing for humanity in introducing a bill to set the clocks at their regular time? After all, 24 hours a day divided into three shifts are 8 hours each, and while setting the time ahead really couldn't benefit most of us it just gives the reckless, adolescent age an earlier start by 1 hour on their never-ending quest for thrills and excitement and parents past their 60 years who have to arise and prepare their household for war industries—some of whom must travel 36 to 40 miles—arise at 4:30 a. m. (while in reality is only 3:30) more fuel, more light, more effort—and for what?

It is really hardest in the cold winter months. We would gladly accept this war time if it really pertained to the war effort.

I have five sons out fighting for right and freedom—one has made the supreme sacrifice last November; no sacrifice is too great for our country—but while we all wish to do the necessary sacrifices required of us, it is unnecessary to set the clocks ahead that 1 hour.

MAUD B. ALLEN.

BLUFFS, ILL.

We farmers will certainly welcome the return of sane standard time and appreciate your efforts and wish you every success.

ROYAL OAKES.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

California on three occasions has voted against the adoption of daylight-saving time, or, in other words of burning the candle on wrong end.

W. B. VAN HORN.

PORTLAND, OREG.

War time is the biggest farce ever put over, and there are thousands of people who see and admit that this measure is becoming more and more unpopular and that it has rendered no service whatever, but, in fact,

has been and is now a decided detriment in every respect in the Nation's effort to win this war. Please return us to standard time.

S. G. HELMER.

ALLENTOWN, PA.

Do away with daylight saving. I hope and trust you will be successful in your venture to do away with what we think is the most unjust piece of legislation ever shoved upon the Nation. There is no reason whatsoever to force the public to unnecessary expense by burning electric lights from 4 a. m. until 8 a. m. The children are only half awake when called for school. Our farmers must all wait until 10 a. m. before they can enter a field to work. In fact, there is absolutely nothing gained by daylight saving. It is a detriment to the whole Nation. If it took the Nation 2,000 years to see the advantage by turning the clocks ahead 1 hour then I feel they are very slow in learning a lesson on the downgrade.

JOHN L. ENGLERT.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

As a Government worker who must be at the office at 8:15 a. m., which means I must dress in a cold apartment, struggle in the dark for transportation, and work in the dark for at least an hour during winter months, I certainly hope your bill restoring eastern standard time will pass.

FLORENCE WHITTEMORE.

WOLLASTON, MASS.

I would like to voice my sincere approval for the abolition of daylight saving for all future time.

It would be one move to normal times.

W. F. PIKE.

OLEAN, N. Y.

I have been reading about the resolution to put the country back on standard time, and heartily agree, and know of a great many others who are of the same opinion but are so busy they find it difficult to express themselves on the subject.

There definitely is nothing saved by daylight saving; and, in fact, the time is wasted. Children refuse to go to their much-needed sleep and continue to walk the streets aimlessly as daylight lasts so long—and who wants to go to bed while it is still daylight? This seems to be one of the greatest contributory factors toward juvenile delinquency.

I can't see where electricity or anything else is saved. Some people must arise before daylight to be at a war plant early and must burn lights.

I certainly do wish something could be done about the time, as this daylight business is a pain in the neck to the working class of people.

MARY C. LIPMAN.

OLEAN, N. Y.

I was very happy to learn that you are working to abolish daylight-saving time. We've given it enough time to work, but it is a miserable failure. Let's go back to "God's own time."

Our neighborhood is full of children who will not go to bed because of the added 1 hour of daylight. But they must arise to be to school at 8:25 a. m. They lose 1 hour of much-needed rest.

Mrs. C. E. ISAMAN.

LEESBURG, VA.

I do hope you will not only bring up but succeed in efforts to restore the sun's time. If any business requires the starting of an hour earlier, let them do so; but that the whole Nation is routed out of bed in the cold and dark to stand on street corners, without even the privilege of seeing the sun come up is barbarous.

Not only is electricity wasted, but coal and all heating affairs. At night the house is

heated. School children going along country roads, some with flashlights, some candles, and some matches, and then waiting in the cold dark for busses. Nine o'clock is only the sun's 8, and the sun is not up during all winter months until 7:30 sun's time. Think of the mothers who have to get up to get the children, their husbands, and possibly themselves off to work. Quite possibly most of the tubercular cases can be attributed to the meaningless hours.

PAULINE D. CASTLEMAN.

STEVENS POINT, WIS.

You can do no greater benefit for the farmers than restore standard time. We farmers never miss any daylight, anyhow. You cannot begin work till the dew dries; especially in haying and threshing is this true. Then to quit at 5, or about the middle of the afternoon, sun high in the sky—it just don't work.

We are sick of this freak time. Do everything you can to set the clocks right.

Mrs. DAMON.

BONNOTS MILL, MO.

The school faculty and pupils, too, are more than pleased with the repeal bill. At present we are handicapped rising early and returning home late from school.

Returning to natural time will help thousands of farmers. They will be able to work longer in the fields and thus raise more needed raw materials. Food is essential to win this war and we are all anxious to do our best.

CAROLINE ALTHEUSER.

MOUND CITY, ILL.

Re: Befuddled clocks in United States.

Have just noted a resolution in Congress to abolish now and forever, I hope, that infamous, diabolical concoction known as daylight-saving time, the most insane proposition ever foisted on the American people.

Just who got the notion that he had been divinely commissioned a modern Joshua is not stated. But evidently, unable to maneuver the sun, he beguiled himself by spinning the hands of the clock into the belief that he had actually done that very thing.

Accept my commendation, and here's wishing your resolution forthwith adoption and approval.

J. KELLY SMITH, Attorney.

PADUCAH, KY.

I want to send you the piece out of our Sunday paper. At least we have it in the press. They tried the daylight time here a few years ago (before it was Nation-wide) and the people were up in arms about it, so it didn't last. Now it's a law like some of the other crazy things they pass and we can't do a thing.

Mrs. NEVA LEIBEL.

PADUCAHANS REPORTED IRKED ABOUT DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Some people in Kentucky appear to be irked about the hour-fast war time. Several have written to have war time abolished and clocks turned back an hour to standard time.

From messages entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Paducah seems most sore about the time situation.

"In the winter we get up in the middle of the night," complained Mrs. Neva Leibel, 713 Kentucky Avenue, Paducah, "and in summer we go to bed with the sun shining. We have to burn lights half of the morning.

"The farmers don't like it either," she declared. "Cattle go by the sun. I am just one in this town who is dissatisfied."

The Kiwanis Club at Likeville has had the matter up before its board of directors, Lon B. Rogers, an attorney there, wrote, "If there is anything we can do," he added, "I feel sure that our club would be only too glad to help in any way possible."

A telegram saying "we farmers have been heavily handicapped" came from J. A. Cole, Paducah, Frederick Beyer, Howard Rottgering, and Harry Ross, all farmers of near Paducah.

And Mrs. J. B. Smith, of Paducah, route No. 2, said "half the people" in her town "have never pushed their clocks forward," including the Catholic school which operates on old standard time though the kids start classes at 9:30 a. m. by the new time. She regards war time as a nuisance.

A Sun-Democrat reporter who interviewed most of those quoted above as opposing daylight-saving time found them standing firmly by their statements.

Harry Ross, who lives near Lone Oak, said that he and the three other farmers sent their telegram after discussing the matter at a chance meeting. He thinks daylight-saving time is strictly against the laws of nature. Here's the way he puts it:

"We have to get up an hour earlier—in the dark winter months it is a long time turning light—and quit an hour earlier to conform with members of our families who work in the city.

"Cows and chickens don't get up before sun-up and it causes a lot of confusion when it comes to feeding time for them. Roosters still crow at the same time.

"Besides that," he continued, "it just isn't natural to get up in the middle of the night and promenade around with a lantern on one arm so we can see our way to do chores."

One of the strongest contenders for the hour set-back is Mrs. Leibel, who complained that people here have to go to bed with the sun shining in the summertime. The Paducah housewife doesn't like it because she says the new time was arranged to save electricity and she has to keep her lights burning until well into the day under the present situation. And then again, as she said, she just doesn't like it.

The director of both the Catholic schools in Paducah and McCracken County—St. Mary's Academy and St. John's—said that the schools operate on war time, opening at 8:30 a. m. daily. If the pupils go to mass they are sometimes late but never later than 9 o'clock, they said.

PATERSON, N. J.

Change the time back to standard time please. Folks work 24 hours and it has an effect. It is especially harmful to patients in the hospitals. It disturbs conditions, for we know the time is camouflaged.

Let us have something natural in this world. Please give us the old time back.

MRS. JAN ELLENOFF, R. N.

WINTER PARK, FLA.

Abandon war time. You are worthy of greatest commendation for courage in attempting to have this nuisance abolished.

We were on central standard time. The clocks were set ahead for daylight saving and never set back. When the directive—was it—was issued for war time, they were set ahead another hour. Need I add that we now have an oversupply of daylight saving.

GEORGE SCHWAB.

STAR CITY, ARK.

Change war time back as it was before the set-up.

More things should be changed for the convenience of people who are doing their best at home for the war effort.

W. R. ALSBROOK,
President, Bank of Star City.

DANSVILLE, N. Y.

I wish to express appreciation of efforts to further action that will get the Nation back to standard time.

Farmers have always been opposed to it and it does seem that, in these times the wish of the people who raise food to eat should be considered.

It is a hardship in many ways for working people. Small school children do not get proper amount of sleep as it is impossible to get children to bed when the sun is still shining.

Keep up the good work.

WARREN S. HOLLIDAY.

CRESTVIEW, FLA.

Am hoping you will succeed in your efforts to abandon war time.

PAUL CONSTANT.

EVANS, MO.

No one likes the new time. Can't see where we save anything as we use it in morning bumping around in dark. This old world moved a long time on the old time.

Mrs. H. BONNICHSON.

BELLEVILLE, ILL.

Enclosed is a copy of resolution in support of the bill introduced by you to end daylight saving.

Sincerely yours,

B. W. TILLMAN,
Farm Adviser, St. Clair
County Farm Bureau.

Whereas the present daylight-saving law is needlessly extravagant in the use of electricity, without any offsetting compensating, economic savings; and

Whereas the system works a distinct hardship on farmers in the employment of farm labor; and furthermore, the farmer often finds it necessary to attend meetings, which under the present daylight-savings system interferes very seriously with his work in food production: Therefore be it

Resolved by members of the Twenty-second Congressional District in business session, That we oppose the present daylight-saving plan and urge a return to the former standard time.

G. G. PAPE,
Edwardsville, Ill.

F. C. GABE,
Nashville, Ill.

LOUIS J. HERTEL,
Millstadt, Ill.

LIBERAL, KANS.

Get standard time restored. It probably will not affect you so much as western Kansans where I live, as by our old time we were 45 minutes behind sun time and with a move-up of another wartime hour we really have lunch by the sun time at 10:15 a. m. Really makes long, hot afternoons. This winter it was not daylight until 9 a. m. war time.

We find there are only 24 hours in a day after all.

FERN P. DONLEY.

HITTA YUMA, MISS.

I am glad someone seems to be thinking on the same lines as I am about the so-called daylight saving time.

Be so kind as to tell me what started that. I know that the President consented to it as a war measure, but I understand that it originated outside of this country.

On hearing from you I will tell you something of what I know about it.

DAME ELLEN PHELPS CRUMP.

SHERMAN, TEX.

Best of luck in getting standard time back. It has always been silly.

H. E. HARDGROVE.

NOVINGER, MO.

Please do everything to get our standard time back. We are farmers and I have to stop my work at 4 p. m. to have supper ready for hands. Wednesday evening I was trying to get my garden in and I quit at 4 to get supper and never got near all planted. The next morning it was raining and has rained ever since. Look at the time we waste when

it is so valuable. We are just one of the many that want our standard time back.

Mrs. BEN BURESS.

AMES, IOWA.

I sincerely hope we can get the time set back to standard and left there. It loses an hour per day working time.

L. M. WESTON.

NORFOLK, VA.

Abandon daylight-saving time. I have always thought that changing the time was a crazy idea and I have not been able to find anybody who could see any sense in changing the time. It puts many hardships on the people, it forces them to get up before daylight to switch on the electric lights and waste a lot of electric power and coal. It deceives the people by pretending that the time is late when in fact it is early. This hurry and rush will soon ruin the nerves of the American people.

We should go on standard time now and forever. If anybody wants to go to work 1 or 2 hours earlier, or later, let that be their choice. Every individual, firm, or organization in the country should be able to select such hours as are best suited to their interest to begin work and everything should be based on standard time.

I hope that Congress will soon pass this bill and may the country soon be back on standard time.

E. B. STACK.

WILLIAMSPORT, IND.

Abolish this crazy war time and return the country to standard time. We wish to congratulate this effort to rid the country of one of the big nuisances of this war. We sincerely hope the bill goes through. We are going to write our Representative and our Senator asking their favorable consideration.

JESSE F. HETRICK.

ORCHARD, NEBR.

Repeal this foolish so-called new time. To most folks it is a waste of time and a waste of money in every respect.

When I saw the notice in the press of this bill, I immediately wrote to our Congressmen and asked them to get behind this move and do what they can to get the matter before the Congress.

Early last fall I wrote and asked them to do something about this fool change of time, but did not receive any consideration. All I got was their old stock answer—it was by an act of Congress, and they doubted if the matter would receive any consideration. But now since you have seen fit to place a bill before the Congress, I trust that you will receive full assistance from those who are hit the hardest—and by those I mean we who live in the central portion of this country. I assure you that everyone with whom I have talked has expressed the wish and desire to get back to standard time at the earliest possible moment.

D. L. FLETCHER, M. D.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

I am interested in the bill to have the time changed back to its right place. I have been in evangelistic work, and much of it has been in the country, and I know what a hardship that it is working on the farmers. Many of the places that I have been to dinner in the country have two clocks—one to run the radio by and another to work by.

My work has also taken me to the small towns and cities, and I have yet to find one person that was in favor of having the clock moved up as it is now. The general feeling is that it does absolutely no good and that it does hinder many things. It was contended that it would save electricity—well, my light bill has been more since it was changed, and that is the fact with everyone that I have talked to.

Primarily I am interested in the work of the churches. I can definitely say that it is a hindrance to the work of the churches, since it forces them to have their evening services so early in the day that the folks do not come. People going to church are like chickens going to roost—they just don't do it until dark; and if you set the time at dark, then it runs the service too late for those who have to get up so early in the morning. Personally, I feel, after talking to hundreds of people about it, that it would be a distinct benefit to our national program at this time. People seem to feel that it was entirely unnecessary to meddle with the time. Please forgive if I have seemed to be very frank, but I have tried to pass on to you what I have heard from the people.

R. G. VAN ROYEN,
*Minister, Baptist General
Convention of Texas.*

KENEDY, TEX.

In turning the time ahead 1 hour of standard time works a real hardship on farmers in small towns and cities and in many of our larger cities. We hear from every side, "I wish they would turn the time back to where it belongs." Church work in our country is so very vital to every interest of our national life that we need to give it every possible advantage we possibly can. It will be necessary real soon to set the time for the evening service to 8:30 o'clock; and, of course, the people complain about the lateness of the hour. We cannot improve on the Lord's time and we certainly trust standard time may be restored.

If there are certain manufacturing sections who want to get out earlier in the afternoon why can't they begin their work at 7 in the morning, lunch at 11, and out at 4, and this will not place such a handicap on the millions of people who would much prefer the standard time.

JOHN K. BEERY,
Minister, the Methodist Church.

CAR FALLS, IOWA.

I am a farmer, and daylight-saving time to a farmer has never been anything but a curse. That afternoon hour is valuable beyond comparison to the so-called saved hour in the morning.

The few instances where daylight-saving time has been twisted around to appear beneficial does not justify cramming it down everyone's neck. Most industries are working around the clock; for them the plan has no benefit whatever. If some group want to start their activity an hour earlier, all right, but leave the rest of the people alone.

HORACE D. DEWEY.

TROY, ILL.

We are watching with much interest the fight to get the daylight-saving law repealed, and we wish it much success, for it is very unpopular around here.

Please do all you can to help us.

VOORHEES CONLEY.

OKLAHOMA CITY.

The attached article was in one of our publications and desired to lose no time in commending you in your effort and assure you it is the desire of Oklahomans to have this, as a vote was taken by one of our daily papers and there were some 4,000 votes for repeal.

Please spare no time and effort in this matter.

The present time is a hardship on old and young alike and has been the past winter very detrimental to the health of the people standing out in the early cold mornings waiting on transportation, as well as an extreme hazard, street lights being put out before daybreak, many streets being poorly lighted, and on the streets with the traffic, the flare and glare of the passing cars, but no steady light to show us the roads and streets after-

ward, made it very unsafe for pedestrians. In the home a greater amount of electricity was used.

One hour later would take care of this difficulty, insure better health, and lastly, would put people in a better frame of mind to enter upon their duties in places of employment.

FRANCES A. STANWOOD.

CRYSTAL CITY, MO.

The daylight-saving time is a thorn in the flesh. If you can get this law repealed, I will support you for any office and on any ticket.

WM. D. WHEATLEY.

TULIA, TEX.

Swisher County Post, No. 214, of the American Legion went on record last night in regular meeting as favoring your proposal to do away with this foolish system of so-called war time. We have never been able to see just why such a scheme was ever inaugurated. Do what you can to put this bunk in the ash-can. We are sick and tired of this regimented bureaucracy.

AMERICAN LEGION,

Tulia, Tex.

H. G. BRIGGS, *Adjutant.*

ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX.

I think you were off a little when you stated only golf players want war time, I think the companies selling power for lights and the like want it, as it makes working people get up earlier, but does not make them go to bed any earlier. In my opinion, if the records of the electric companies could be looked into you would find that nearly every home would show a large increase in their light bills, as here in New Mexico at 8 o'clock in the morning during the winter months it is just coming daylight, and nearly all workers only work 8 hours. Why should they be forced to go to work before daylight? The best of luck in getting us back on standard time.

C. E. ROGERS.

SEATTLE, WASH.

For two whole years now every time I've looked at our clock or my watch it has told a lie. It says it is an hour later than honest time. We go to work in the dark and our children go to school in the dark, and then at night it is time to put the little ones to bed and the sun hasn't set yet.

I could put up with all this if it accomplished anything. But it hasn't even helped win the war like we were promised. Let's face realities. Let's be honest with ourselves and our neighbors. Let's stop kidding ourselves. Get this wrong righted.

W. H. TYER,

*State Manager, Modern Woodmen of
America.*

FERNDALE, CALIF.

I understand you have a bill to put the United States back on standard time. More power to you on this move.

I never could understand how we can save something we have not got. There is just so much daylight, and no decree or document can possibly increase it. Just another noble experiment. I agree with you wholeheartedly it has only brought about confusion, is very impractical, and has hindered more than it has ever helped.

HARRY A. PERRY,

*Third Senatorial District, California
Legislature.*

WASHINGTON, D. C.

How grateful many of us are for your effort. In an upset world why upset the time—one thing that could remain stable? And please try, and keep on trying, to turn the clocks back before the hot weather comes. It is truly awful in summer with no cool evenings.

This is the first time I ever wrote a letter about legislation.

N. V. MYERS.

FORT WORTH, TEX.

I may be permitted to extend sincere congratulations on effort to repeal the alleged daylight-saving time and restore this Nation to its usual standard time.

In my humble opinion this change of time has only added confusion, demoralization, derangement, disarray, jumble, commotion, agitation, tumult, turmoil, bewilderment, and embarrassment, together with any other synonyms that may be known.

More power to you is the hope of millions and millions of citizens of these good United States.

CHAS. T. ROWLAND.

HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

Allow me to applaud the resolution offered to return to standard time, throughout the year, as distinguished from what is erroneously known as daylight-saving time. I hear much favorable comment upon the resolution and much hope expressed that it will be passed.

C. L. WATTS.

ARCATA, CALIF.

Thank God someone has waked up. I lived in Detroit, the first community to fall for the insane idea, when it was put over by a doctor who wanted more time to play golf. Electric bills, both domestic and industrial, increased 10 percent.

New York and Eureka are in the same latitude but due to the Rocky, Cascade, and Coast Mountains, sun rises here at 8:30 a. m., standard time, and in New York at 7 a. m. in midwinter—meaning 9:30 a. m. war time.

A. L. PUTNAM.

KENTON, OHIO.

I am writing you to express my appreciation of efforts to have the clocks turned back to standard time. I farmed 280 acres of land. Most of the time it is nearly noon before grain is ready to combine or hay to go into barn. If I have to go somewhere in evening I must lose an hour. There are more meetings now than before war I must attend, if I want to do my full part in war effort.

You are right about golf players and fishermen wanting war time, because part of farm I rent contains a golf course, and in evening taxis make as high as a dozen trips out and back, and a good many cars find gas and tires to come out and spend their extra hour.

I know of no instance when a man living and working in town has spent his extra hour helping a farmer.

I hope you are successful in righting this wasteful blunder.

JOHN A. WELLING.

[Telegram]

[The filing time shown in the date line on telegrams and day letters is standard time at point of origin. Time of receipt is standard time at point of destination]

BOSTON, MASS.

Highly favor abolishment of daylight-saving time.

THOMAS A. KERR.

UNION, MO.

Put the time back to the old standard time again. This new time is a nuisance. It takes more light and you get nowhere with it.

LELA HUMMEL.

ALBANY, OREG.

We farmers are all for your fight to ban war time and return to standard. It has been a terrific and expensive handicap to us.

C. O. KEESTER.

CUMBERLAND, MD.

I have been reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday 7, concerning the so-called daylight-saving bill. Let me may I have always opposed it. My electric light bills have

been higher instead of lower. I can't see where we save on electricity when we have to have lights in the morning instead of at night. I hope the bill passes.

WM. H. GATHEHOUSE.

XENIA, OHIO.

Just read the evening paper of efforts for congressional action to abandon war time and put the Nation on standard time.

We most heartily approve—let us know if we can assist. We will be under great obligations to anyone who helps to rid the Nation of this great nuisance and inconvenience. It is an imposition upon working people.

LENA GILBERT.

DOVER, OHIO.

To get rid of this war time would be one of the great things to win this war. It is ruining the morale and health of our people and driving farmers off their land. They tell me it is sheer nonsense. I made a survey of this and find the schools, gardeners, farmers, greenhouses, and work people, and the old greatly opposed to it. Power is wasted now more than when we had the slow time. The defense plants are all working 24 hours 8 hours a turn so what difference is it? Plants that work 8 hours a day do not want this time for they do not want their men to work before daylight.

ELSWORTH ALLMAN.

ADEL, GA.

I have just read speech in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, Repeal of Daylight Saving. I wish to express my appreciation and approval and urge you to fight on till this impractical, confusing inconvenience is removed by law.

It does no real good. Any practical man knows what time is saved on one end of the day is lost on the other.

One of the worst effects of it all was to shake the confidence of many people in their leaders. It just don't indicate ordinary, practical common sense in times of stress like these to fiddle away time and cause so much confusion. Moving up the dead hands of the clocks can't save anything. I repeat, it makes us doubt whether we are following leaders of practical sense. Lord knows we have confusion enough in these wartimes that is necessarily so without adding any that is not absolutely necessary.

People very cheerfully do necessary things there is real reason for.

W. D. WELLS.

DES MOINES, IOWA.

I sincerely hope the bill re returning to standard time is passed upon favorably.

CORA LORENZ.

LEXINGTON, VA.

It is with genuine pleasure that I note you taking the initiative in the congressional action toward the repealing of the daylight saving time.

This indeed is a step in the interest of the masses, particularly the workman in plants as well as those conducting their own business. In the next place it is very uneconomical, as from personal experience we consumed more electric current under the present time than we did under regular standard.

I sincerely hope you succeed in getting the measure through and in so doing you will have bestowed a wonderful favor on all working people, and not on the golf players.

D. C. REMSBURG.

LANSING, MICH.

I am very much interested in H. R. 4428 to put the clocks back during the months of January, February, November, and December.

I am very much in favor of this resolution and hope that it will prevail. We here in Michigan are getting a double dose; since 1931

our legal time has been eastern standard time rather than central, in which time belt we are located, so with war savings time we are 2 hours ahead of schedule all of the time.

BERNICE E. THOMAS.

ST. CHARLES, MO.

Glad to see you are trying to have that silly daylight-saving law repealed.

More power to you!

The folks who want that extra hour in the evening can just go to work an hour earlier by nature's time, go to lunch an hour earlier, and quit an hour earlier, and not make the rest of the country suffer such inconvenience for their selfish pleasure.

Push the bill for repeal good and strong.

E. F. BLANN.

PARIS, MO.

Won't you do all you can to change time back to God's time?

ERNEST HARDWICK.

GOVERNEUR, N. Y.

The bill H. R. 4489 expresses the wishes of all dairymen in New York State, and I imagine the United States, in regard to the wasted man-hours on farms during the critical harvest season. First, by losing 1 hour in the morning due to the fact making it most impossible to get to work before 9 o'clock on account of the dew. Second, shortage of labor in the dairy section. Having to quit at 5 o'clock war time, 4 o'clock standard time, for chores, 1 hour is lost in the best part of the day for haying. Thus 2 hours daily are lost. Costs farmers millions. Third, it makes no difference in industry as they are working on 24-hour schedule and industry would not be hampered in any way.

Pass this bill.

JAS. B. THOMPSON.

LINCOLN, NEBR.

I want to commend your stand on the daylight-saving law. If there ever was an asinine law put on the statute books this is it and if you can do something about having it changed, I am sure you will receive the everlasting gratitude of the rank and file of Nebraska farmers.

CHAS. Y. THOMPSON,
President, Nebraska Farm Bureau
Federation.

DOVER, OHIO.

If you can do anything about this time problem I hope you will. Haven't we enough to contend with in this terrible war, and so many heartaches? And our electric bills are just the same. How in the name of common sense does it help?

It is a lot of baloney. Things go too far sometimes. We in Ohio don't like it one bit. Will be watching our paper for results. We are Americans and if our voice is to be heard we ask a fair deal. Please give us back our eastern standard time.

God bless you.

MRS. D. MORRISON.

RANDOLPH, MASS.

Enclosed find article from Boston paper in regard to returning to standard time, something necessary for the health and comfort of the working class and their children.

Of all the stupid laws, daylight saving was the most stupid. Nothing was saved, much electric light used night and morning, according to the season, and mothers' nerves torn and frayed from children refusing to go to bed in the afternoon.

Have never seen any real advantage to it, unless one calls working 18 hours a day an advantage.

GERTRUDE E. SULLIVAN.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

I want to congratulate you on your good sense in asking for the repeal of the law setting time up 1 hour. I think 90 percent of

the people are for it. In my mind, you will make a lot of friends if you push the bill on through.

Sincerely yours,

G. W. WILLIAMS,
Commander, Post No. 222,
The American Legion.

CLARKS SUMMIT, PA.

Very glad to see that others are interested in giving us a break in daylight saving.

Never could see how it applied outside of industry and they were working the clock around anyhow.

Thank you; thank you.

H. A.

JONESBURG, MO.

I see in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat where they are going to try and have the so-called daylight-saving time changed. Hope they can, because I think it is one of the damndest fool ideas that was ever put over.

HERMAN LUDY.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

An article in the Schenectady Union Star said that you are against war time, and going to try and have standard time back the way God created it. That's my belief. It should be standard time.

Here in my city they believe in standard time. If one wants to do anything to accomplish it, let him get up 1 hour ahead. I hate this stinking 1-hour-ahead business. You don't accomplish a damn thing with that 1 hour ahead.

S. C. SKOTARCZAK.

DAYTON, OHIO.

With reference to bill No. 4489, introduced recently in the House of Representatives, calling for the establishment of standard time throughout the Nation, I am very much in favor of this bill and hope that you will vote in favor of its passage.

In my opinion the time should never have been changed. It has worked an unnecessary hardship on all people throughout the country whose work requires their getting up at an early hour, and has caused endless confusion in many other ways. The abolishment of this foolish measure will aid in a small measure to get this country back on a sensible basis.

H. A. GOSCH.

MOODY, TEX.

I want to commend the bill which would put the Nation back on standard time, and I herewith add my name to the list of protesters against fast time, which was imposed upon us at the beginning of the present war. I trust Congress will act to restore standard time.

Our national slogan is "Save and conserve." Fast time forces us to get up 1 hour earlier in the coldest part of the day, thus using an hour more of artificial light and an hour more of fuel. Fast time is a burden on the masses and puts money in the pockets of the few who sell light and fuel. It is inconsistent with the idea of saving and conserving.

To our knowledge, all war plants are running on a 24-hour basis, so how could fast time help there?

It also enhances the hazard of night driving of automobiles, as more people have to drive at night, causing more wrecks and deaths, going to and from work. It uses up more car batteries and light bulbs, which is not being conservative.

CECIL O. GUYTON.

LYONS, IND.

I see they are making a fight to get the time changed—I should have said clocks, I guess—because they can't change the time. It was a very foolish thing to do in the first place.

I don't see where there was any saving in daylight by so doing. Success in getting the change.

H. F. FERGUSON.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Have Congress pass House bill 4489, and abolish war time. Fast time works hardships on the working people. School children have to go to school while yet dark.

No electricity or fuel is saved by war-time schedule. I surely hope we as a Nation can get back to normal time.

JOHN L. SUTTON.

SHELDON, Mo.

The morning press reports redoubled efforts for congressional action to abandon war time and put the Nation back on standard time.

There has never been any occasion for this funny time. I have lived in Chicago, Kansas City, and Tulsa, etc., and have worked in offices with many different starting times, but there has never been anything practical about the current daylight-saving time.

Old Greenwich has been our standard for hundreds of years.

With the necessity for very accurate navigation and aviation, I sometimes wonder if our Army, Navy, and Air Force doesn't just ignore the current legal time and go by standard. Otherwise there must be beautiful confusion with the intermingling of the forces of the various nations.

Of course putting Father Time back on his established base will not win the war or save democracy, etc., but it will be a fine start toward unscrambling some of the many useless and irritating fumbblings.

I have talked with over a thousand individuals, and all consider early time as just plain foolish.

W. L. CORRELL.

NEVADA, OHIO.

The enclosed clipping from the Toledo Blade prompts me to say it will do the country a good turn to get us back on proper time. There is actually a waste of power under war time. Everyone's light bills are higher.

Our legislature put Ohio on eastern time several years ago, after we had been on central time ever since it was established over 60 years ago. Now, almost the whole State is on eastern war time though the legislature outlawed it last year. In summertime it is daylight until 10 p. m. and one must wait until the air and houses cool sufficiently for sleep, and it is midnight before that comes. Then, in the morning when it is cool and one can rest we have to get up 2 hours ahead of the proper time.

War plants operate 24 hours a day so there is no saving there. A man with any ambition can maintain a large garden on 1 hour a day. When this crazy time was proposed I wrote, on behalf of my shopmates, in protest against it.

GEO. R. WILLIAMS.

PARIS, Mo.

We are for changing back to standard time. Daylight-saving time has always seemed out of place and we never could understand why people could not go to work an hour earlier if they wanted to without changing the time.

ANDREW D. THURSTON.

SMITHSHIRE, ILL.

I heard over the radio a few days ago a statement in regard to changing back the time. If they would only change it up there at Washington how much better it would be. Country people go by the new time only because there is a war on. Maybe it benefits some but it isn't the farm people.

Mrs. GEO. WEAVER.

BERKS COUNTY, PA.

Am interested in the fight for elimination of daylight saving. I wish to state that we farmers do not wish it, as we have just so much work to do and are restricted in help. Also gasoline rations. How does this daylight help us? This is nonsense. It is time for Congress to pull together and get rid of it.

J. N. EISENHART.

ASHEVILLE, N. C.

I want to voice my hearty approval of the bill to move the clocks back to natural, sensible time. This freak time has given me the jitters and headaches more than any one thing that I have ever had to deal with. In winter, 9:30 a. m., daylight; in summer, 9:30 p. m. before darkness. In winter huge amounts of electric current is wasted. It is worthless, useless, confusing, so this is one wartime headache of which we can rid ourselves without hampering our war effort in the least.

JOHN P. STEWART.

MARTINSVILLE, Va.

Please let me wish success in doing away with daylight-saving time.

How any plan which makes you get up an hour earlier by the sun and burn an hour's more electricity and fuel for 6 months of the year; that makes school children in rural areas walk long distances to catch school busses in the dark, how could time like that benefit anybody?

I hope we will be able to get the Nation back on standard time, and before the hot summer months.

Mrs. ROY G. BURGESS.

NIAGARA FALLS.

I am enclosing copy of editorial in my home newspaper which refers to efforts toward abolishing fast time and restoring standard time.

I wish to commend in the highest terms efforts to abolish a long-standing public nuisance and menace to the country. Common sense teaches that inasmuch as war production is continuous day and night, fast or daylight saving time is a useless factor, and should be abolished.

Fast time is not only a public nuisance but a menace to health in loss of sleep. I am working at Niagara Falls at Bell Aircraft. All through the winter months I have had to get up in the morning to go to work in pitch darkness.

I earnestly hope a majority of sensible Congressmen will vote in favor of restoring standard time.

S. C. LEFEVRE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

I urge you to put all power behind the bill to put the Nation back on standard time. The working people in the cities and on the farms want the standard time. The silly law should be erased from the book. It does more harm than good. If it was left to the people to vote it would be voted down. We, here in California, hate it.

E. A. McNORMAN.

JACKSON, MICH.

Am writing in regard to this "war time." Am glad there is someone to fight for the people of the country and against this terrible time.

In our town or county we were already on fast time, getting up 1 hour before the sun and not it is 2 hours. I wonder how long people are going to keep on kidding themselves.

Persuade the Congressmen to vote this "war time" out.

ANNIE O. PATIENCE.

ELIZABETH, N. J.

Read this newspaper clipping in our evening paper and sure hope the bill wins on the daylight saving question. Our light bill

jumped. It takes longer and more light in the mornings. I never did believe in the daylight saving time. It is only for golfers.

Leave God's work as it was.

Mrs. P. S. WIEMER.

DES MOINES COUNTY DRAINAGE

DISTRICT No. 7,

Oakville, Iowa.

Place the Nation on standard time again and remove one of the greatest handicaps to wartime food production.

Last spring we were delayed by rain during the month of May and could not plant corn until around June 1. Our help refused to work beyond 6 o'clock by the watch and I am quite sure that considerable land was not farmed because the war time was out of joint with regular standard time, and thus threw our farm operations out of gear.

NOAH SCHROCK,

Chairman, Board of Trustees.

SPRING VALLEY, OHIO.

Put the Nation back on standard time. We farmers and grangers all hope that bill goes through. After all man can't change the sun nor the habits of animals, and we farmers have to work by the sun and with animals. It is a terrible hardship for the farmers and I haven't talked to anyone in the city—teachers, professionals, mothers, housewives, etc.—that are in favor of fast time. Please put the Nation back on standard time again and we will be rid of one bad mess at least. I talked to a Dr. Mon and she said it was the most senseless thing she knew of to set the clocks ahead. You may be sure you have a lot of backing on this whether they write or not.

H. L. GERHART.

OSWEGO, OHIO.

Keep up the good work to abolish daylight-saving time.

J. H. TAYLOR.

MAUMEE, OHIO.

Daylight saving means nothing to the farmer except inconvenience from all angles. The railroad man working by one time and his family living by another may be a means of fewer accidents if we were back to sun time.

As a commercial man this past year have had to contend with three different times in Michigan, and two places in Ohio. Both attorneys general of Michigan and Ohio said changes were unconstitutional. This legislation has been one of confusion.

H. T. HATTON.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

I appreciate efforts in behalf of setting the clock back 1 hour as my wife was nearly killed by a colored thug taking advantage of the extra darkness to attack women on the streets of Washington.

J. H. N.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The short article in today's Washington Star about daylight savings noted.

For about 25 years this has been a humbug put over on the population of the United States of America. The quicker it is discontinued the better.

H. B. STACKHOUSE

BOSTON, MASS.

In the Boston Post of today appeared a front-page story of efforts to restore standard time. Bring before the people of our Nation a realization of what a humbug is this cock-eyed dislocation—called daylight saving. It is one of those hysterical devices that has helped juvenile delinquency and nervous break-downs. The great bulk of our people will be with efforts to restore standard time. If anyone wants to set their clocks an hour fast—O. K.—but not by law.

F. E. BENTLEY.

LABOR, Washington, D. C.

Thank you very much for copy of extension of remarks on daylight saving. I am with you 100 percent. It's not so bad in the summer, but it works a lot of hardship during the rest of the year.

EDWARD KEATING,
Manager.

FLORENCE, S. C.

I note with a great deal of interest a bill in Congress restoring war time to what it was before we entered the conflict. Such a bill meets with my hearty endorsement, and why our Senators and Representatives in Washington have not urged the passing of such a bill long before now is beyond my comprehension, as the present daylight-saving time, particularly for the southeast section of the United States, has, in my opinion, handicapped rather than helped the war effort.

Please accept deep appreciation of efforts in connection with this matter.

C. W. STIKELATHER,
Vice President and Treasurer, Peoples
Federal Savings and Loan Association.

MARYSVILLE, OHIO.

More power to the effort to repeal the War Time Act. Fast time is doing as much to sabotage agriculture and industry in our war effort as any device that could have been put over on us by the enemy. Let us know if we can help.

CHAS. F. TOSSEY.

BONNOTS MILL, MO.

Our entire school is pleased with the bill to repeal daylight-saving time. If it is passed, it will make a great improvement in our daily routine. The teachers of our school also heartily approve bringing back the old standard time. Many children of our school are obliged to leave home in the dark and return in the dark. Of course, the previous statement is due to the transportation schedules, which cannot be changed without the consumption of more fuel and rubber—a thing we would not do.

I do not know to how many people this will be of an advantage, but I do know it will please the majority.

Since the clocks have been functioning an hour earlier, everything has been unnatural. If the clocks were again to resume their regular time, it would contribute to health, comfort, and production.

IONA KOENIGSFELD.

PERRY, MO.

I note in today's St. Louis Globe-Democrat a bill to abolish daylight-saving time. This is the right track. We Ralls County people hope that it will be successful. If this so-called save daylight has done anyone any good in this section I fail to know about it.

GILL RICHARDS.

MONROE CITY, MO.

I am very much interested in the resolution to abolish daylight-saving time.

Quitting in the middle of the evening when we should be working, putting my sheep and stock up at 5 o'clock when they want to stay out and graze 2 or 3 hours longer, is ridiculous.

CHAS. L. ELZEA.

TROY, MO.

I have been listening with interest to the discussion about changing the time which Charlie Stooke is putting on over the radio. I am heartily in favor of changing it back. If anyone wants to go to work an hour earlier and get off an hour earlier let them settle that, but let the Nation be run by standard time.

E. B. HARDY.

FULTON, MO.

The old time is more acceptable to the farmers and all others. Give us the old time. Give us the 1 hour back.

JOHN DAY.

FARBER, MO.

I was at a club meeting one evening last week and heard the daylight-saving time discussed. Almost everyone present expressed the hope that we'd go back to the old time.

LILLIAN CROW.

SHELBYVILLE, MO.

I've talked to many people, and I felt sure you would like to know how very much they endorse your bill to do away with daylight-saving time. I'm shocked at the many hardships it causes in rural communities.

I'm actually saddened by reports of this regulation, which has served no purpose whatsoever, except to add to the break-down of health and morale of the Nation.

I should like to see the General Federation of Women's Clubs endorse this bill in convention.

Mrs. ERNEST W. HOWARD.

COATS, KANS.

May I resent your term "daylight saving"? In my opinion, there is nothing that has done more toward wasting daylight than the present set-up. Best luck and thanks a thousand.

BEN SCHREPEL.

NEW LONDON, MO.

Keep up the fight to get rid of war time, daylight saving, which is a darn nuisance. Those who want to go to work early may do so.

W. W. CROCKETT.

NEW HAVEN, MO.

This and other communities would certainly appreciate if daylight-saving time could be abandoned. It handicaps production. This especially holds true on the dairy farm. We must get up earlier and milk because the truck comes earlier, then to keep from throwing the milking schedule way beyond reason we must milk too early in the evening to get the benefit of a full day's work in the field.

If there is any benefit in having factories start earlier there is no reason why the clock should be tampered with and handicap the farmer, who certainly has plenty of difficulties without adding to them unnecessarily.

WILBERT J. ROHLFING.

PORTLAND, MO.

Good luck these troublesome times. Get the time changed back to the old way. The present time helps no one.

H. V. BAKER.

PERRY, MO.

I don't like the daylight-saving time, it makes things out of balance for the farmer.

DAN T. TICE.

MCCREDIE, MO.

Get daylight-saving time changed back to sun time. This 1 hour per day per man, when multiplied by all the thousands of laboring men on farms in the United States, will amount to thousands of bushels of grain and food for our fighting forces.

RALPH WILKINSON.

MARTINSBURG, MO.

This daylight-saving time is a big nuisance. It is no longer necessary to get people out in the dark and cold to make them war conscious. In the rural districts we have been having daylight saving all through the years. In June, July, and August we have had our church services an hour earlier to escape the heat. If we had school during those months, the classes would have started an hour earlier, too. The only ones who benefited by the war time are the few metropolitan plutocrats who used to get to their office at 10—now get there

at 9—standard time; and had an extra hour in the afternoon to play golf—which they couldn't do 12 months in the year, either. If some of the city factories and places of business would start an hour and a half hour earlier, that would relieve congestion on streetcars and busses. But that is the mayors' business. Relieve a war-confused people of this altogether unnecessary, irritating, and costly burden that has been saddled on them.

H. FREESE.

NEW PHILADELPHIA, OHIO.

Return our Nation to standard time. This daylight saving has created confusion worse confounded. One must use electricity more by beginning a day on eastern war time. Executive decree could govern working hours, but the sun still rises on God's time, which is even one-half hour later than standard. Most sincerely we hope the time bill will prevail.

EDNA M. SOUERS.

SANDY POINT, TEX.

It was an imposition on farmers to have ever had sun time changed. The average farmer can't produce as much with the new time. I have quit farming and don't expect to have another animal harnessed until the commonsense hours are restored. There was never any sense in changing the time. It seems that every nonessential rule those bureaucrats can devise is put into a law or rule. If there was any advantage in the change, it would be O. K., but there was never any need of it. I've discontinued 150 acres, and will never resume until the proper hours are reestablished.

H. L. TRAMMELL.

OUAQUAGA, N. Y.

Do away with this everlasting torment of war time. If golfers want to play, let them get up, and for heaven's sake leave the clocks alone. I am for America first, then pro-English from head to foot, but that don't mean we have to do like the English and set clocks 2 hours ahead. Let us have the time that has always been ours until some "brain truster" down at Washington came along to tell the common herd what's good for them. Success in getting our clocks set to standard time.

F. MERN.

IRWIN, OHIO.

Allow me to express my approval of efforts to restore the Nation to standard time. This idea of daylight saving, etc., is one of the most nonsensical things ever heard of. The return to central standard time in this section would greatly increase the efficiency of farm labor at a time when it is most necessary.

G. G. McILROY,
President, Farm Management, Inc.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The attention of the board of directors of this organization was called to a news dispatch which stated in effect that a bill had been introduced to return the United States to normal time.

California farmers have found that the so-called war-saving or war time has been a war losing time in their operations. Thousands of hours are lost from day to day because farm work cannot start in the morning until the dew has dried from the fields and trees.

It is apparent that American agriculture will see a greater shortage of labor in 1944 than at any other time during the recent years. It will be difficult at best to plant and harvest our crops.

In view of these circumstances the board of directors of this organization has formally endorsed the proposed legislation.

ASSOCIATED FARMERS
OF CALIFORNIA, INC.,
By S. H. STRATHAM,
Executive Secretary.

WALLOWA, OREG.

I am in accord with the repeal of daylight saving, cutting out all red tape, etc. I have been trying for some time to get one of the Oregon Congressmen to present a bill for repeal.

Here's hoping it carries in a big way.

H. M. THOMPSON.

PINE BLUFF, ARK.

Rid the country of the war daylight-saving time, which benefits no one. This law saves nothing in the way of electricity or gas, and we will be very glad to see the law repealed and let God take care of the daylight.

If there is anything we can do to help along the repeal of this fool law command us.

Mrs. MAUDE S. FLYNN.
Mrs. TRACY MILLS.

MOBERLY, MO.

I hope the bill to establish standard time all over the United States will be enacted. The so-called daylight-saving time table now in effect is, in my opinion, just one more cockeyed regulation and is of no practical benefit whatsoever. In fact, its use entails the use of more electricity in this part of the country.

THOMAS J. TYDINGS.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Please do all in your power to put bill 4489 in effect. I am sure the majority of the people of Dayton wish standard time.

LAWRENCE E. MILLER.

ARLINGTON, VA.

The sensible proposal to abolish the non-sense of trying to fool ourselves by monkeying with the hands of our clocks deserves the support of all intelligent citizens. The people deserve to be given the truth, even on the faces of their clocks.

TED SUMMERS.

BOSTON, MASS.

Earnestly endorse the bill to abolish daylight saving and return to normal time. Unfair to the laboring man and wastes electricity and gas and complicates every business and household activity. Let us get back to sun time with which everywhere is acquainted and satisfied.

J. H. CRAMER.

SUGAR GROVE, ILL.

There isn't anything that will help the farmers more than to go back to standard time. They actually have to go by God's time to a certain extent and they are always out of tune with the towns and cities.

City folks complain they can't get the children to bed in the summer so they can get their rest. And all winter they have to get up in the dark.

It upsets the farmers' work in every way. There really isn't one good point in favor of it. It very definitely hampers war production on the farm.

So I am speaking for all farmers in this section of the country when I say we hope fast time goes out fast. We are all hoping and praying for our regular time.

Mrs. OAKLEY MICHHEEL.

BOSTON, MASS.

The country is all upset from daylight saving. The time should be left the way the Lord intended, not what a few want.

(Many signatures.)

DAYTON, OHIO.

I wish to express my desire to return to and keep standard time.

CARL BACHER.

CHARLOTTE, N. C.

People down here in the sunny South certainly hope the bill against the fast time will go over in a big way. We are tired of it.

MARGARET GIBBON.

ENDICOTT, N. Y.

Get rid of the so-called daylight saving. It is the most foolish and one of the dumbest this country has ever had to endure. Let's have standard time.

Mrs. JOHN N. BOWER.

CLARKSVILLE, TEX.

Millions of folks in these United States join in trying to get the new war-saving time repealed and getting back to standard time. This new time has cost the people millions of dollars more for fuel and light bills. This new time has hindered the war effort instead of helping. Do away with this unnecessary war time.

D. J. STANPHILL.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

These are the days of willing and unquestioning sacrifices. These are also the days of agonized pleas for 100-percent efficiency. It is essential that our workers as well as our soldiers and sailors and air force be at their best at all times. It was no trick at all to sell the idea that by tampering with the clock, more money could be made. The world was stunned by the most calamitous war in all history. It was in a condition to grasp at any straw that would help increase production. The idea looked good. It was adopted, first in Europe, then here. Clocks were earnestly turned back and a certain amount of daylight, previously "wasted," was put to work.

The avowed purpose is to save daylight, yet all our munition works and factories, railroads, coal mines, etc., are working continuously 24 hours a day. Every bit of daylight is used and every bit of darkness too. Who wants it? The farmer doesn't, the mother of growing children doesn't, the laborer, the soldier, sailor, and airman don't, the businessman don't, in fact, the vast majority of our population doesn't want it. Only a dwindling handful of golfers get some little light for their pellet chasing while the rest of us are condemned to eat our dinner in mid-afternoon, wasting daylight until after sunset. We get up in pitch-black darkness, turn on artificial light, hurry through our dismal breakfast, stumble out into dimly lit streets, wander into brilliantly lighted offices or work shops where, half asleep and at a dangerously low energy level, we must apply ourselves to precision work at an outrageously accelerated pace for many hours on end, oblivious to whether the sun may be shining or not. That sun is our great health giver, vitalizer, and energy producer.

Absenteeism is on the increase and the toll taken by accidents in war work is mounting at an alarming rate. Efficiency has been lowered and general health menaced in a host of new neuroses and mental complaints due to hypertension. Set the hands of the clock back where they belong. It would increase efficiency and improve general health, although most of those who suffer most from this off-key life are unaware of the underlying cause of their present discontent and chronic weariness.

RALPH DEGOLIER,
Head of Modern Language Department,
Trinity School.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

We heartily concur with you in the effort to get us back to God's time once more. In fact, the people don't particularly care what kind of time it is, just so we adopt one time and stay there.

The writer is a traveling man and covers several of the Midwestern States. Everybody is badly confused with the various varieties of time. Nobody I have talked with can see where it helps the war effort. The old argument about conserving electricity is the bunk. The golf player is the only one that likes it. We go to bed by daylight and get up in the dark.

Anything you can do to get us out of this time mess will certainly be appreciated by a very confused public. The thoughts I have attempted to express here are not all my own but of the many that I come in contact with every day.

C. C. THOMAS.

STOCKBRIDGE, MICH.

Get congressional action to abandon war time and set all clocks of the United States on the true time—standard time based on sun time. We have not gotten very far on war time, so earnestly urge Congress to open their eyes and fall back to God's time. The so-called war time is detrimental to human rights, and our Michigan Legislature voted it down, but the Detroit "Hirohitos" overruled them. In talking with many people I have yet to hear of war time doing anybody any good.

FRED McCONEGHY.

MANSFIELD, OHIO.

This artificial time is most unpopular and certainly wasteful. You would have to live on a farm fully to appreciate the latter. If you want to have a part in any worth-while project in the city, it is necessary to quit your work in the middle of the afternoon in order to have all stock cared for and just routine work done in time to attend the meeting. You can see what that does toward our efforts to raise all the food we can in this time of war, and we are all doing everything we possibly can in this time.

The bill will have the solid support of rural folks.

Mrs. H. J. SEEVERS.

BRYAN, OHIO.

The bill to return the country to a standard-time basis will be greatly appreciated by millions of people, especially the day working class, who must arise around 4 o'clock in the morning, based on the old time, to get started for work. I must be to work at 7:30 eastern war time, as I work on the New York Central Railroad, and must be at the station for a train due at 8:13 a. m. eastern war-time. I have talked with several of the railroad men and they do not like eastern war time. Most of us day men are around 50 to 70 years of age, and we must be to work from 7 to 8:30 a. m. As compared to the old central standard time, we report for work from 5 to 6:30 a. m.

Get the country back on a standard time That is what the people want.

E. A. KASTNER.

STERLING, OHIO.

From my observations, it is my opinion that daylight-saving time or war time is O. K. during the summer months, that is, from around May 1 to October 1, and would be much better for the State of Ohio than the present situation, where we have two kinds of time, but most communities will change to war time again about May 1.

I hope that a compromise will be made between your bill and year-around war time, so that we can have daylight-saving time in summer and the regular zone time in winter.

It sure seems foolish to go to work at 7 a. m. in winter and find it does not get daylight for a couple of hours yet.

G. A. MCBRIDE,
General Secretary-Treasurer,
The Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

OXFORD, OHIO.

I have received many communications from Grange members throughout the State expressing satisfaction over the fact that you have introduced a bill to place the Nation back on standard time. It is the feeling of the farmers that the fast time has not been of any benefit to industry and that it

has been a great handicap to farmers in their food-production efforts.

JOSEPH W. FICHTER,
Master, Ohio State Grange.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Dallas, Tex.

I am enclosing an editorial from one of our leading newspapers regarding the bill to abolish daylight-saving time. It expresses my views and that of everyone else with whom I have talked, except that I would express my objections to the present system more strongly.

I believe that I can conservatively say that 90 percent of our people would like to go back to standard time. We do not object to any inconvenience that is necessary to the war effort; but we do not like to have a lot of what we think are foolish regulations just to make us war conscious. And no one has ever yet explained satisfactorily wherein the present system in any way contributes to the war effort. During the past winter I have seen many women standing in the cold and rain long before daylight waiting for streetcars or busses to go to work. If that helps the war I cannot see it.

JEFF D. STINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Municipal
and Private Corporations.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald of
March 29, 1944]

TURNING THE CLOCK BACK

A Representative has introduced a bill in Congress to abolish daylight-saving time. He would turn the clocks back the hour they were set ahead when the present time system was adopted as a war measure.

It is to be hoped that the Congressman's effort will meet with success.

It may be that the ingenious method of setting the clock ahead an hour to get more work done has produced the desired effect in some portions of the country. It is doubtful, however, that it has produced any such results in places like Texas.

It may be that it has saved some electric power, which was, as we recall it, another of the announced objectives.

Lacking specific figures on both these points, no attempt is made here to pass on them definitely.

But it can be said without fear of contradiction that daylight saving, so-called, has disarranged the lives and schedules of a great many people, who do not like it. They would like to get back to standard time again. It is only necessary to point out that several State legislatures have already taken action for their States, and to look around and listen to the reactions of the average citizen, to prove this.

In the face of such popular demand, it should take a good deal of convincing argument to keep this bill from becoming law.

ELIZABETH, N. J.

I am against daylight-saving time. We middle-class people, who live in the city, get no enjoyment out of it. The sun stays up too late for the rooms to cool off and a workingman has to go to bed in daylight. I say get rid of it for all time.

Mrs. L. GABRIELSEN.

DAYTON, OHIO.

It will be a godsend to war workers and others to eliminate daylight-saving time so it will be effective this month. You are familiar with all the confusion and argument this measure has caused the entire Nation and this letter is merely to add support from this part of the country. Wishing you unlimited success in getting the measure adopted quickly.

D. A. COZAD.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Abolish daylight-saving time and return us all to standard time once more. I fail to see how it can aid in the war effort when most of us go to work in the dark of the morning for so many months in the year. It is bad enough for the few months in the summer, but all year round is harmful.

A great many fatalities, due to heart attack, are due to an accumulation of fatigue produced in the circulatory system, brought about by the loss of sleep occasioned by daylight saving.

Especially is this true in men who are between 40 and 50.

In behalf of the early riser.

N. E. KOENIG.

BINGHAMTON, N. Y.

It isn't fair for 999 people to be forced to get out an hour early so one of each thousand can play golf. These golf players could get up before 8 a. m. and play golf before they go to business at 9 or 10.

Believe me, the first ward of Binghamton, the largest and most populated ward in the city, is against daylight saving. Our councilman can attest to that fact.

JOHN J. SIMECK.

MARYVILLE, Mo.

We have read of the bill to go off daylight-saving time November until February, inclusive. We as an American Problems Class, wish to express our opinion of the bill. Many of our pupils must walk considerable distances before boarding our school busses, which leave the far end of their routes at 7 a. m. in order to be at school at 8:30, our usual starting time. Parents have to arise so early to get their children off to school that there is so much time lost because of their being unable to perform any work before daylight. The pupils have to travel in all kinds of weather and, due to road conditions, it is inconvenient to walk in the dark.

It is the opinion of the class that the majority of the people of the rural sections are in favor of your plan to change back to standard time, especially during the winter months.

AMERICAN PROBLEMS CLASS, HORACE
MANN HIGH SCHOOL,
THE NORTHWEST MISSOURI STATE
TEACHERS COLLEGE.

(Many signatures.)

PALMYRA, PA.

So glad someone is interested in abolishing daylight-saving time. I am sure we do not save any, getting up at 4 in the morning, and I would like to see the man from Pittsburgh who is supposed to be father of daylight-saving time get up that time. I think he is one of those who don't know what hard work is. I would like to see him get up at 4 in the morning, work in the hayfields and, when threshing time, help there. I'm sure he would not need to go on the golf course to sweat. I sure think it was one of the meanest things done. If anyone cares to get up an hour earlier let him do so and not compel others. Why not let the time as it was. Man cannot change the moon, stars, or sun. Hope we will win; here's luck.

Mrs. R. C. BOWMAN.

FRAMINGHAM, MASS.

Please give the daylight-saving bill an extra kick for all time when it comes up for repeal. We are a patient, long-suffering people, but when it is 5 o'clock, it is not 6; why allow ourselves to be fooled. Don't forget to knock it out for good.

A. H.

JACKSON, TENN.

We, in our city, are very pleased over effort to get back to God's time. Please work a little harder and know all the housekeepers

are with you, for it's been a terrible trial on us.

Thank you.

LOIS SAUNDERS

BARRY, ILL.

Abandon war time and put the Nation on standard time.

It would be one of the finest things that could be done for the betterment of our country.

I have never been able to see where this war time does anyone any good at all. I could think of hundreds of reasons why it should not have been done.

I hope we get the time changed.

G. N. REDMAN.

EVERETT, MASS.

I have read with interest the April 7 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and want to take this opportunity to commend your stand in this "crackpot" idea of tampering with the Nation's time.

Every citizen of this country is good and sick of this tampering with the clocks, and it is high time we got back to sanity.

EUGENE BERTRAM WILLARD.

TACOMA, WASH.

I was very glad to read that Congress will soon start hearings on the bill to put the country back on standard time.

I have never been able to figure out how daylight saving, or war time, has been of sufficient benefit to even offset the confusion and inconvenience it has caused. I sincerely hope Congress will see fit to repeal it.

ALMA MADSEN.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

I want to express my appreciation of the bill to eliminate daylight saving from November 1 to March 1.

It's just a pain in the neck to get up and go to work in the dark in the wintertime. And, judging from Pepco's reports, I can't see where it saves any electricity, because what you don't burn in the evening you burn in the morning, and vice versa.

CLIFFORD E. SHULTZ.

LISCOMB, IOWA.

Enclosed find a petition in favor of restoring time back to standard, or sun, time.

This was signed by two Christian churches here.

Nobody refuses to sign, and I could get a thousand signers if I would get out and canvass.

The sun time suits us so much better, and hope you can get it restored to where it should be.

G. S. NUGENT.

(Seventy-eight signatures.)

FORT WORTH, TEX.

Please change the clocks back pronto. Get rid of this confusing mistake. It was well intended but has turned out to be a sad mistake. I hope Congress will never again tamper with the time.

M. F.

BROOKLINE, MASS.

I wish to commend abolition of daylight-saving time.

This is the wish of thousands in this section. Best of luck in the matter.

N. E. BARNES.

ARLINGTON, CALIF.

We in the rural districts of the State of California are, indeed, interested in efforts to repeal the daylight-saving law and put the Nation back on standard time.

The Governor, as well as the California State Grange, have gone on record as being in favor of the restoration of standard time.

The act has not accomplished its purpose and is causing vast inconvenience.

T. L. COWDEN.

ARLINGTON, CALIF.

Efforts in regard to the abolishment of the wartime daylight saving have not gone unnoticed by the farmers of California. As you know, the farmer lives and works by the sun, so any legislation to change that is entirely without purpose.

Our Governor Warren has come out strongly in favor of rescinding this bill and we are all firmly behind any action which will restore standard time.

RACHEL G. ORCIERE.

CASEVILLE, ILL.

I want to add all possible help to efforts to get this country back on standard time. I work shift work, but fast time is as much a detriment to me as to the farmers and other people.

When on the day shift it means getting up an hour earlier, which in the wintertime takes more fuel and electricity and in the summertime robs me of an hour's sleep in the cool of the morning when I could sleep. It means dangerous hardships for most school children starting to school in the dark. If I need to work in the garden, I would much prefer doing it before going to work instead of in the midafternoon in the heat of the day. Very few people will even play golf then, let alone working at anything else. On the midnight to 8 shift I get very little sleep in the daytime and could get another hour before going to work if we were on standard time. Most war plants are on 24-hour schedules, so changing the clock cannot possibly benefit them. I know of no advantage in fast time to anyone, but certainly am aware of its disadvantages.

CARL W. CLAY.

EDMONDS, WASH.

I would like to see our clocks set back where they should of been left. It was never anything but a silly idea at best.

JENNIE L. ANDREWS.

DAYTON, OHIO.

I am in favor of bill H. R. 4489, to restore standard time.

The present arrangement gives us a very unpleasant rearrangement of time that is harmful rather than helpful in the war effort.

M. J. GIBBONS SUPPLY CO.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Abolish war time. I am not only speaking for myself but for hundreds of my fellow men at the L. & N. R. R. shops here, as being in favor of standard time, all the time.

WILLIAM H. PERKINS.

PASS CHRISTIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

Pass Christian, Miss.

I am directed to send you a copy of the enclosed resolution introduced by Mr. Robinson on September 2, 1943, at a regular meeting of this body.

MYRTLE S. McDERMOTT,
Secretary.

Whereas the existing daylight-saving law is causing unnecessary and wasteful use of electricity and imposing hardships and expense on many people during the long nights of the winter season; and

Whereas no such conditions existed during the First World War, when daylight saving was observed during the season when the days were long and the nights were short; and

Whereas there is no reason why the daylight-saving hours observed during the First World War should not be put into effect now, thus causing less expense and bring more satisfactory results; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Pass Christian Chamber of Commerce, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and urged to amend or change the existing law so as to provide that the period of daylight saving shall begin on the third Sunday in April and end on the third Sunday in September each year at hours to be fixed by law, and continue in operation until the end of the war.

GRAY SUMMIT, MO.

I want to tell you how pleased everyone was with the bill to change back to standard time. Please can you get that bill through in a hurry?

MILFORD T. OMOHUNDEO.

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,

Leesburg, Va.

Several weeks ago there was an article in the Washington papers stating that you had introduced a bill in Congress for the repeal of the daylight-saving time.

The employees of the highway department in Loudoun County are very much in favor of your bill and we would like to know what progress has been made toward getting this bill passed.

G. P. BOZEL, Resident Engineer.

MASSACHUSETTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE POST.

Sir: The article on page 1 of a recent edition of the Post setting forth that at last Representatives are coming out for a repeal of the so-called daylight saving is sure good news to all of us workers.

Must we go through another winter with this crazy set-up? Why has there not been something done before this to put us back on our regular time? Farmers, workers, and especially mothers have been clamoring for the turn-back to normal time and no one has done a thing about it. When this thing was put over it was just for one reason, but like many other things that have been put over on a gullible public, it has remained until we are all fed up on it.

Please, will some of the politicians do something now?

F. D.

CLARENCE, MO.

I noticed in paper a bill to change from war time to old time.

We are farmers, operating about 800 acres of land, and are interested in having time changed. Have talked to a number of good farmers and all have expressed themselves that they would like to have the change.

When we are putting up hay, harvesting oats, wheat, and soybeans, or plowing corn early the dew ordinarily makes it very bad getting started on war time. Then when 6 o'clock comes the greater part of labor wants to quit and at that time it is best part of time to work in farming season.

Then in winter when days are short and you get out at war time you have to get stock up, and we don't think that good in feeding stock.

We are interested in food production and doing our part in winning the war in the best way to our best judgment, and the number we have talked to feel it would be best to have time changed back.

McCARTY BROTHERS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Abandon war time and go back to standard time.

I don't believe one watt of electricity was saved by this war-time policy, and I believe it is much nicer to go out in the evening when it's dark. The days are long enough in the summer without trying to make the evenings longer.

Here in Los Angeles before the war this change of time had been voted down by the people several times.

So here's hoping we can return to normal standard time soon.

RAYMOND McLAUGHLIN.

WINTER PARK, FLA.

I have thought that no one in the United States disliked this stupid war time as much as myself. In winter it is dark here until after 8 a. m.; breakfast has to be prepared and eaten by artificial light—though we are urged to save electricity. It is too wet to work in one's garden. Country children have to take the bus, if they live any distance from it, in the dark. In summer it is not so bad in the morning but one has to water the garden while the sun is quite hot. I should think golfers would not be able to play until 5:30 p. m. at least.

If it were intended for workers in munitions factories, I fail to see the need of it because there is a night shift anyway. I hope Congress will succeed in going back to standard time.

MARIAN S. FRANKLIN.

HUMBOLDT, TENN.

I am glad to find someone whose views coincide with my own on the subject of war-time or daylight-saving time, as it is erroneously called.

Daylight-saving time is the greatest misnomer, in fact, so great as to be rank folly. I have yet to see one person but that says to have the clock an hour ahead of the sun causes them to use much more current for household and business alike. It causes the man of small or average income to pay extra light bill, for he must have light 2 hours on the average every morning, while if the clock were with the sun he would have to use artificial lights only 1 hour.

Defense workers who are on the daylight (8 a. m. to 4 p. m.) shift must get out of bed and make all preparations for the day in pitch darkness and go to the bus lines and stand there in blackness of early morning waiting to catch their bus. This from November to April at least. Frankly, I see not even an atom of common sense in such an arrangement.

Mrs. R. C. BETTS.

LITTLE FALLS, N. Y.

Abandon the war time and put the Nation on standard time.

Having the clocks ahead of standard time this past winter was nonsense and no saving as far as electricity was concerned, and many here think it lowered physical resistance.

E. F. J.

CANANEA, SONORA, MEXICO.

I noticed in a Douglas, Ariz., newspaper congressional action to abandon war time and put the Nation back on standard time.

I have noted the effects of time in various parts of the Nation from coast to coast and have made a thorough study of our time system. The sun, after all, governs daylight and railway junctions do not.

During the short days of winter nearly half the population go to work an hour before daylight, and the other half quit work an hour after dark. Such a situation does not help the war effort or save electrical energy.

Your proposal is something that is vital to every American.

JERE CHAMBERLAIN.

[Telegram]

ELKO, NEV.

Fight the silly daylight-saving law. I heartily endorse your stand. More power to you. I think—and so do thousands of others—that this law is about the most foolish and unnecessary one ever written and enforced. There is no saving of anything; in fact, it requires more electricity most places,

as 8 a. m. is actually 7 a. m. and barely daylight inside of houses and stores. There is only 24 hours in a day and a man or woman can only do so much in 8 hours whether the day starts at 8 a. m. or fictitiously at 7 a. m.

The people that want to get up early and start Victory gardens, etc., will do it anyway at whatever time they please regardless of the time of day, and if everyone was doing their bit for the war effort they wouldn't need time in the afternoon for golf—they could be better employed helping in some local service that was short-handed on account of the war. There is entirely too much regimentation by Washington trying to tell all the people what they must do, and passing a law telling us when we must start the day, etc., is just much too much. Kill this daylight-saving foolishness.

CARROL H. PARSONS.

ESTHERVILLE, IOWA.

For God's sake do all you can to put the clock back to the right time. It is driving us all nuts and we are all losing money by this war time. The war is bad enough with out putting up with the wrong time. Put it back to the standard time and help win the war.

ALLEN SMITH,

For all the people of Estherville.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Do something to get off this daylight-saving time. I don't see where there is any saving in the new time. I'm speaking from experience, and really I feel worse since the war time has been into effect, as I don't get enough rest. Hoping the new time will be changed and you succeed in getting the clock on standard time soon.

Mrs. E. L. BURFORD.

WEBSTER, N. Y.

After reading a news item regarding efforts to abolish war time, I wish to emphatically state that I am heartily in favor of the bill. In my opinion this turning back the clock has done nothing. It has saved neither electricity nor the people's patience and is just another example of foolhardy legislation.

LOUIS F. KOLB.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

I am glad to know someone in Congress doesn't favor daylight-saving time.

For working people who have to get up at 4:30 or 5 a. m. and some even earlier, it is cruel.

The idea that it saves electricity is worse than foolish. People all over the Nation getting up earlier burn a lot more electricity and use their automobile lights. In the summer it is too unbearably hot to go to bed at the accustomed hour so people lose that extra sleep.

I'm positive the people who thought up this abominable idea do not get up early every morning, winter and summer. They would be the first to complain.

Mrs. W. G. BROWN.

CAMPBELLSPORT, WIS.

It is with great interest that I and millions of other people of this Nation have been reading and hearing over radios of the fight in Congress for sensible standard time. It's been a big disadvantage to everyone except playboys, night-spot patrons, and golfers, and we the people who are so necessary to the war effort and working for the good of the Nation in every way would like Congress to show us where that caliber of people are so important to the Nation, that Washington should cater to them.

Millions of us in every State are so thankful for the bill to abolish war time. Our earnest wishes are that it will be brought about. The sooner the better for this Nation.

Keep up the fight for us.

E. F. MESSNER.

VACAVILLE, CALIF.

Just a brief note on the bill to eliminate the silly "crackpot" ruling or act called daylight saving which saves nothing and does no good. All its bad features you already know, so I will not take up your time in a tirade against the childish act. It is in a class with tin pennies and other well-meant moves produced by war hysteria. We have too many serious things before us these days without so many trivial things. We, the people, are not complacent. We are worried, some of us grief-stricken, all with some fear. We could hardly be complacent and there is no sense in daylight saving. If you could interview 129,000,000 of us, you would find that many against the act.

M. SHARPE.

MOBILE, ALA.

Repeal daylight-saving time.

That will be one of the best things that can be done. I do not see where we save any time, men come to work and have to wait for daylight to go to work.

Keep up the good work and repeal it.

STUART C. STEINER.

UNIVERSITY CITY, MO.

Do all you can to abolish daylight saving. We save nothing. The disadvantages are a hundredfold greater than the advantages. It has caused hardship to 90 percent of the people in our country. I never could understand why any person should want to tinker with Father Time.

F. ROY DEAN,

Member of General T. J. Wint Camp
No. 14, Department of Missouri,
United Spanish War Veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a reporter asked me a few moments ago what I thought of the President's message to which we have just listened. I was greatly impressed with this message. Although it was a long message, I listened to it attentively. I cannot comment, of course, on much of it here and now, but I have it before me, and I want to make some comments with regard to section 17 of the message.

We have it on good authority that "without vision the people perish." I think that applies to any and all nations and peoples, regardless of time or place, if there is lack of vision on the part of the rulers, the governors, the administrators, and other public officials. From the tone and wording of this message it is evident we have vision in high places. For this I am thankful.

Never was there a people, never was there a nation in such a state or condition where vision was more necessary than with the American people, our Nation, at this hour. I saw in this message great vision.

If my emotions now would permit—and my emotions will not permit—me to comment on what the President said here with regard to husbanding our human resources, I would like to do that, but I cannot. I do want, however, to refer to his suggestions on these natural resources.

I, too, was born in the State of Missouri, and I can understand the President's historical point of view. I have often said to my fellow Missourians that

that centrally located State is indeed the mother of empires. I went from Missouri into the Southwest over the Santa Fe Trail. I recall that it was Senator Thomas Hart Benton of Missouri who promoted the fur trade out in the western country long before it came under the American flag. I remember that it was General Kearny and General Doniphan, from Missouri, who carried the American flag down into the Southwest, and I remember that the Pathfinder of the Rockies, John C. Fremont, himself was able to do what he did as Pathfinder of the Rockies because of his wife, Jessie Benton, the daughter of Thomas Hart Benton. It was farseeing Missourians who acquired the West.

I remember that the first military governor of New Mexico, including at that time the present area of Arizona, was Sterling Price, a Missourian. I remember that the first civil Governor of New Mexico was a former mayor of St. Louis; indeed, not only did Missourians pour over the Santa Fe Trail down into the lower part of the Southwest, but they poured over the Oregon Trail into the Northwest. Missourians of a former generation looked beyond the borders toward the West and helped to develop it so that today there are proud commonwealths, not only in the Great Plains and in the intermountain region, but also on the Pacific coast, that were promoted by Missouri statesmen of another generation. It delights me to see that our President also looks toward the West with an understanding and appreciation of its vast possibilities.

The President in his message mentioned the reclaiming of desert lands, the harnessing of the rivers, and named the Columbia Basin and the great California Central Valley and rivers of the West that ought to be harnessed. I heartily approve of that idea. Our debt-burdened country may yet be saved by the youngest members of the family of States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to this fact, that after every war of the past our people in reconstruction days have looked to the West. After the Revolutionary War they looked to the Ohio Valley, which was West in those days. They went out and sought land in humid sections where a man could make a living on 160 acres.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to recall to you that after the War Between the States the men who wore the blue and the men who wore the gray went west. They were still in the humid section west of the Mississippi. After the First World War veterans tried to go west in our country to make a living, and did go, but by the turn of the century all the good land had been taken and only desert lands remained. It is true we did liberalize the homestead laws, we did make it

possible for veterans to have a little preference by going out in the desert and taking up 640 acres; but they could not make a living there on desert land without water. I saw many pitiful cases of men who tried to make a living on the desert without help after the First World War. We have said that thing must not happen again; and now after this war hundreds of thousands of veterans are trying to get a piece of good, well-watered land on which to live some place in the West. Of course, all over the country veterans ought to have a place to live, but I agree with the President that in the West they are beckoned, and we must provide for them. Suitable adventure awaits them and good health will be restored to them.

The President, in his foresight, looks to the great West as a new frontier. He perceives that the great debt which hangs over us as a result of this war must be financed by the fullest possible wealth-creating expansion and he perceives that the West affords that opportunity of expansion. This is plainly evident when he calls our attention to irrigation and reclamation and the development of our western rivers, and particularly in regard to our further exploration of our mineral resources.

The President is right when he speaks of the war's heavy drain upon our strategic minerals and metals. He means by that that we have drawn heavily upon our previously known operating mines and upon our definitely known mineral deposits. However, he also knows of the existence of great deposits which have yet to be explored and opened up. If we will exert a fraction of the energy in finding and bringing forth the needed minerals and metals for peacetime use that we have exerted to bring them forth for wartime use, there will be much employment furnished in the mining West and in the fabricating industry of the East. Certainly the President is right when he urges us to provide stock piles of the critical and strategic minerals and metals so that we may never again be caught short as we were at the beginning of the First and of the Second World Wars.

Mining is one of the great basic industries of the country. It has furnished use the wherewithal to conduct this greatest of all wars in this machine age. We are more and more moving into the age of metals, not only in regard to war but in regard to peace, and it is heartening to see that the President of the United States appreciates the possibility of development of domestic mining and earnestly urges Congress to make the most of it. The mining of gold and silver from Nevada and California has played a mighty part both in war and in peace in American history, but the newer metals are destined to play a greater part in our future industrial growth than that played by the precious metals. This is one part of the message I hope we take to heart.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Times, also an ad-

dress by Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller and an article from the Reader's Digest by the Honorable James A. Farley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TAKE THE RATION POINTS OFF BEEF RIGHT NOW

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the subject I wish to discuss this afternoon may sound provincial. All I want to do is to take point rationing off of beef and I want it taken off right now. I make this request very humbly and I think the Congress should demand the removal at the present time.

There are some very definite reasons why this should be done. The first is that we should provide the necessary nutrition, the necessary animal proteins, for the children and for the old people of this country which they have been unnecessarily deprived of long enough. They have eaten all sorts of concoctions and all the vegetable protein fillers they need. The elderly people and the children of this Nation are today being deprived of a food that they should have.

It will do little good to come in here with a school-lunch program and shed tears about how badly the children are fed when millions of children in America today are being deprived of animal proteins that they should acquire through meat.

I would extend this to other foods if it were not for the fact that they come under a different category. I want to confine the discussion today purely to beef.

Mr. Speaker, the necessity for rationing beef no longer exists. Very few people realize that at the beginning of this war we had more dairy cattle in the United States than we had of the so-called beef cattle. At the present time they are about in equal numbers. The dairy cattle furnish a large part of the meat that goes into what we call soft meats, such as bologna and also hamburger. These dairy-cattle owners are going to be the victims of a situation that should be corrected, and corrected right at the present time.

Along about this time of the year the dairymen start culling their herds. They send the surplus to the markets. Large numbers of range cattle also go to market in the fall. We then have these dairy cattle going to the market. Call them what you want to canners or cutters. The packers change the classification. When there is an abundance of cattle, they are called canners, but when there is a shortage they do dignify a part of them by calling them cutters. The price of this class of cattle is depressed in the fall and early winter. Plenty of range cattle are going to market, remember, to furnish the quality beef. The food producers deserve some protection under the 90-percent parity floor during the war and for 2 years after the war. That guarantee does not help the cattleman however very much. The reason it does not mean much to the beef industry is because of the low price of beef that prevailed during the period 1909 to 1914. The price of beef at that

time was so low that all this 90-percent parity guaranteed floor, so far as beef is concerned, is just simply so many words.

What is happening? Here is this beef from the dairy herds coming to market the same time the cattle from the range are marketed. Remember, it is a class of meat a large majority of the people of this Nation eat. The prices are depressed and will continue to be depressed. In other words, 90 days ago they brought about one-half more than they will from now until January 1. Now what do you really think is going to happen when the fat cattle come in from the ranges?

Between 30 to 40 percent of the beef marketed during the year is marketed the last 3 months of the calendar year. Anyone in Washington can predict more beef soon because it always has been marketed in large quantities in the fall. This surely is a safe prediction.

Then we have poultry coming to market in the fall. We have the spring crop of pigs, and it will be an easy matter to furnish meat from now to the first of the year.

The Small Business Committee met yesterday and they said, "Oh, we think we will be able to take this off by the first of the year." Sure they will, because they will have so many cattle to kill. They refuse to let people kill and consume them now, so a surplus can be expected. But why not avoid this situation? What irritates me is to see these bureaus keep their clutches on the people when there is no justification nor reason for doing it. They should give the great bulk of the American people at least the hamburger instead of giving a few the sirloins of the choice corn-fed steers.

I wish the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] would take notice. His committee will no doubt continue to bring in appropriations in the name of agriculture. Millions will be involved. The Congress could avoid millions in losses to farmers if they would take the strait-jacket off from food producers as far as rationing of foods is concerned. Farmers will sell millions of cattle between now and January 1 and will sell them \$5, \$10, \$15, \$20 and up to \$40 per head less than they should obtain for them. It will be similar to the 25 cents per hundredweight reduction in the price of milk going to producers of milk for evaporated milk and then pay a subsidy of 25 cents per hundredweight and then try to make the farmer believe someone in Washington had given him something.

Let us tackle the problem in the economic sense and insist that the rural people of this country are a part of the reconversion program. Every time we read an article in the paper we see, "we will have a meeting of Government, labor and industry." Why not include the other big segment of our population, the farmers, because upon their prosperity depends jobs and depends the prosperity of all the small towns and businessmen in America. Why is not this an appropriate time and place to begin agricultural reconversion?

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am very happy to hear this fine statement coming from my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, who, of course, is considered one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Agriculture. I am sure he will be interested to know that down in my section of Oklahoma where we raise this beef that the next day after the war with Japan was over, I mean, long before the surrender, an organization which has recently been formed down there known as the Northeastern Oklahoma Cattle Raisers Association unanimously recommended to the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States that the red points on beef be removed at once. I think the gentleman should go further in his recommendations. It will not do so much good to get the red points off unless we get some of the slaughtering restrictions which have been put on removed also. I do not mean the restrictions for cleanliness, but there are other restrictions, as the gentleman well knows, that should be removed.

The gentleman is exactly right. There is plenty of beef now; there is plenty of beef coming in. There is more than a steady, normal flow of fat beef coming from the grass from Texas. Oklahoma and Kansas going on the market now. There is no need for keeping these red points on and they ought to be removed at once.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. Surely the slaughterer should be allowed to slaughter all that the markets demand. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell me why a great deal of the beef going into certain areas is not of the best quality? Is it because the best beef is going to Europe?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts may I say that a small percentage of the beef produced in the United States is really corn-fed choice beef. There is not enough of this kind to fill the demand. I am asking that the average citizen be provided the cheaper meats. You may remember that a year ago one could get all the grade C beef one wanted. One could go into any shop and get one pound or a hundred pounds and take it home. It was all right, because we were told we had plenty of it. Now today, after the war with Germany is over and VJ-day has come and gone one cannot even get a pound of grade C meat without having ration points. If anyone can tell why this situation exists, I am sure we will all be glad to get the answer. Do you have the answer? Do you know of anyone in Government or out that can give a valid reason for rationing beef at this time? If you cannot the quicker these restrictions are removed the better for all concerned.

The reasons, then, for removing beef from the list of rationed foods are:

First. To provide the necessary nutrition especially for children and elderly people.

Second. To avoid a demoralized beef market for the cheaper grades when the range cattle come to market.

Third. To furnish employment for labor in processing the meat.

Fourth. To see a policy of abandoning the rationing of food when there is no shortage of a food and no earthly reason for rationing it. Let us hope that common sense will prevail and that rationing of beef will be discontinued at once.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorandum on the political status of Puerto Rico.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

POSTWAR POLICY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was not asked what I thought about the message from the President that required an hour and three-quarters to read this afternoon and comprised 32 pages, but if I had been, I would have made some remarks similar to this. I have heard a good many messages sent here by the Chief Executive in the last 10 years. They have made promises of all kinds to all the people of this country. I think this was written by a great many of the same writers who have promised the people of this country practically everything. This was in this one message, where heretofore we would get in three, four, or a half dozen messages containing the same promises to the American people.

I am very much interested in the American people and the American form of government. The message today stated that we would go in the red this year about \$30,000,000,000. At the present time, as of August 31, we have an indebtedness of \$263,534,678,194.99, according to the Treasury statement. If we go in the red \$30,000,000,000 more this year, I wonder how the President can honestly promise to the American people all the things he is promising we are going to do for them, unless there is a day of reckoning coming. The day of reckoning is coming just as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow morning, and the sun will rise tomorrow morning. How are we going to accomplish all the things we promise without very much effort on the part of the American people to get all those things?

I come from the old school that believes you are supposed to work and earn and save if you want to get ahead. I do not yet know the mystery of the New

Deal. I cannot fathom it. It is couched in flowery promises on easy terms.

So much for that message. Now I want to comment on the statement that was made by the President the other day, when he cut lease-lend off quick. Personally, I think the President did a fine thing in doing that, because lease-lend was to continue only for the duration of the war and it was enacted only for that purpose, winning the war. The war is over. I am glad that I never voted for it, and I want that understood first, because I did not believe in any such legislation as that. The Members of Congress figured that lease-lend was a gift and have always acted under that assumption, at least a great majority of the Members. The American people now have the bill to pay.

That has gotten us to this point. The Johnson Act is still on the books. The President says he wants it annulled. I want to vote for that when the time comes for it, because I want to do business with foreign nations and with all the people on a good, sound basis, an honest-to-goodness sound business basis. I want our people to have plenty of food, clothing, good housing, much pleasure—good education, recreation plenty—but I want them to have jobs to earn a good livelihood. I still believe in work and earn and save as a sound policy for our needs. I want our people to have medical attention, but I am not ready to socialize medicine. I want them to have unemployment compensation, but only when they cannot get a job. I am not for having jobs for people then having them refuse to work and be on unemployment insurance. That hurts the individual, makes him indolent. It raids the Treasury, and it places a burden on the taxpayer. Work for all and then let us stay on the job and earn good pay.

It so happens we have given under lease-lend about \$42,000,000,000. According to our books to other peoples we have received in return about \$5,500,000,000. We have given to Great Britain \$29,000,000,000; to Russia, \$10,000,000,000; to France, \$510,000,000; to China, \$362,000,000; and to other countries about a billion dollars. It was said, and I believe that the President enlarged on it in his message today, that we are going to cancel those debts. I do not believe in any such business of that kind. I do not believe in trying to be mean or to stint where foreign countries are concerned, but I want to look after America and look after America first. That is my duty as a Member of Congress. I do not want to see Mr. Churchill, who condemned the President very much because he cut off lease-lend, condemn the President. I do not think the President deserves any condemnation for that. He did the fine and right thing. Now let us get on a sound business basis and deal with Great Britain and these other foreign countries. I remember, and I think all loyal Americans will not forget, Winston Churchill told William Griffith, the editor of the New York Inquirer, in 1936 that the United States should have minded its own business and kept out of the World War. That was World War I. We went over there and got into this war

as much because Winston Churchill tried to get us into the war and we have helped Great Britain win it. He complains today as well as Mr. Atlee about us stopping hand-outs. We do not owe Great Britain anything, but Great Britain owes us a great deal, and these other nations owe us a great deal. Therefore, let us try in settlements to look after America. Get on a business basis and get there quick. Great Britain may not be able to pay us back in dollars or in kind, but Great Britain has a lot of things that she can give to America before we settle our claims with her or with Russia or any of the other nations. I want to say again, I am for America and I want to do the things in a good business-like way for the benefit of America and American people.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In reading the message of the President today with respect to lend-lease, I got the distinct impression that his idea is to make settlements of the lend-lease obligations in a manner which will promote a general and sound world-wide economy and which will contribute to international peace and our own national security, and that in that language he proposes to make additional obligations on our part, not that we will receive something back from these countries but that we go even further in extending financial and material aid and moral encouragement. Therefore, I would not gather from that message today any idea whatsoever that we are going to collect anything from those countries.

Mr. RICH. Well, I want to impress it upon the minds of the Members of Congress that before any complete settlements are made, the Members of Congress ought to have something to say about it and that it should not be left to the Chief Executive nor to the members of the State Department. Congress ought to give consideration to these settlements. Congress should be represented from here on in giving gratuities to all people all over the world. Remember our taxpayers are going to have to foot the bills; our people now think they have enough and too much taxation. Can you lighten their burden by increasing their obligation more and more? Certainly not.

We must have a lot of good sound common sense from here on in our lawmakers if we are to survive. If we are to be happy as a nation we must be wise, prudent, industrious. Labor and capital and agriculture working together. Not striking, for when we strike all lose. We must arbitrate our differences and remember the Golden Rule if we have happiness and contentment in America.

Let us work together, let us live together—in peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include therein a poem on Ernie Pyle written by an associate employed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, concerning the President's message which took so long to read, which our colleague was just talking about, in the language of a plow hand, which I was for so many years, I just have this to say, that it was pretty far to the haw side. I mean to the left.

The President spoke about everything under the sun in that speech. One of the first things I want to comment on is this full employment about which he is so much concerned. I think generally we are making a mountain out of a molehill concerning unemployment at the present time. I recall that in one of my local plants they laid off 3,800 men 2 weeks ago and in another plant they laid off half that number. Yet every daily newspaper in the district has pages full of advertisements that men are still wanted. The community is still rated a critical labor area. "Men are still wanted." And a recent survey by the chamber of commerce revealed that 4,000 people are now needed in the hotels, offices, restaurants, and so forth, in that city. It is a fact that many people, about a million and a half women, are in industry, who were driven there through patriotism and high wages, who expected and wanted to get out.

There were about 2,000,000 men from 50 to 80 years of age in industry for the same reason, looking forward and hoping that the time would soon come when they could get out. So there are other groups. Add to them the 2,000,000 men who were idle before the collapse in 1929 and who they said never did work, and you will have eight or nine million people, and that is about the number that certain hell-raisers of the country are shouting about and weeping for today. I think if we have just a little patience we will find those people are drifting out and being absorbed, and this will not be nearly as bad if we only have sense enough to be honest and deal with it on the same basis on which it exists.

The President talks about selective service and wants it continued. Certainly selective service should be terminated. Drafting these 18-year-old boys should stop at once. I am afraid the brass hats are leading us unconsciously into compulsory military training. Several county superintendents called me up last week, as well as mothers and students. They say, "Next Monday my high-school term opens. In 2 weeks I will be 18. Am I to go into the Army or go to high school?" Certainly it ought to be stopped. If they need men for replacement, let them take these 2,000,000 men who have been in uniform and

several hundred thousand officers who have had a lot of fun during this war; let them take them over there and give them some foreign service. But do not ask these boys to go, because none of them will ever complete his high-school work. Yet, we have men in the country who declare that a boy without a high-school diploma will never have a chance. And I think they are right.

The President speaks of tax revision. Certainly there should be tax revision and it should be in the interest of the man whose wages are going to be cut. The exemption of the lower-bracket taxpayers should be raised to \$1,000 for the single man. A man with a family should be raised to \$2,000 or \$2,500. Give the poor man a break. This thing of tax revision for the big fellow does not mean anything. We certainly ought to help the man who they say is ill-housed and ill-fed, even if he is not, if he belongs to the low-income or wage-earning class. That is the man we should be helping.

Then they speak about small business and the veteran. I know a man who was a welder in a shipyard and he wanted to go into the ice-cream business. He was denied the privilege of going into business because he was not in business in 1941. Is that the kind of help the administration is going to give the returning veteran, the shipyard worker? Simply say to him, "You never were in business before and so you cannot go into business now," and "instead of that, we will appropriate money to give you a dole." This man said, "Well, I must support my family, so, if I cannot go into the ice-cream business I will go into the liquor business; I know I can get a liquor license." I said, "George, do not do it. You are not that kind of a fellow." But that is the attitude he took, and I cannot blame him. We must meet this issue just as it is, and give these young fellows a break. The shipyard worker, the man in the steel mill, the man in every other mill who worked overtime and worked and worked, still served his country. Now, if the Government wants to help anybody, let them let those fellows help themselves, and the taxpayers will not have to help them.

Then the President wants to forgive the lend-lease debts. My God! What are we coming to when we are going to cancel out a debt of \$42,000,000,000 to foreign countries and in the same breath provide to lend them more money without interest, and then charge the veteran interest on money which he borrows, when you know he is going to pay it back? What are we coming to? If we are going to be led down a blind alley by this long speech which the President sent in, it will do more to turn us farther to the left than anything that has happened in this country up to this time. We will land just where they landed in Russia and in other places.

Last week a Russian came into my office. He could speak a little English and he could write his name. He said, "I want to make my will." I said, "Who sent you here?" He said, "Nobody, but you are the Congressman." I said, "Well, what have you got?" He told me he

had been working here for 31 years; had never been naturalized; he drank up all of his money for years, but lately had started to save, and he had \$1,700 in Government bonds. He had a right good piece of property and he had money in two banks. If he lives a few more years he will have \$10,000.

I said, "What do you want to do with this property after getting it together?" "Oh," he said, "I want to give it to the Government of the United States."

I said, "Now, why do you want to give it to the Government of the United States?"

He lit up like a Christmas tree and said, "Oh, just to work in America! Just to live in America!"

And I said, "My God! A man who will save his earnings from work in a stone quarry for 31 years and then light up like a Christmas tree and say 'I want to give it to the Government, just for the privilege of working in a stone quarry for 31 years in America.' We ought to begin to appreciate what we have here; we ought to preserve our country and our way of life so that our children will have something in the years to come; we ought to cut out this damnable foolishness of giving everything away. If this administration cannot offer us anything better than is in this speech, I just want to say, 'My God! Where are we going from here?'"

PEARL HARBOR INQUIRY

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished reading the Army and Navy Pearl Harbor reports. These reports are not completely satisfactory, even though extremely meritorious investigations were made, in that they raise in my mind questions which, I think, must be answered. After going over these reports, it is my impression that no one knows all the true facts, and that they will never be known unless all the individuals involved are given the right to a full hearing.

The findings indicate a disagreement between the Army and Navy boards, and also, based on other conclusions, with the heads of their respective departments as well. This certainly should satisfy no one. The accused, as a matter of simple justice, must be given an opportunity to defend themselves. The findings of the latest investigation of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe will not satisfy those who must have someone to crucify. Nor will it meet with approval of those who want a complete whitewash. The only way that I can see whereby justice can be accorded to all concerned is through a thorough inquiry so that all the facts can be made known to the public. Half truths help no one, and because we do not know all the factors, it will be to the best interest of the Nation to unearth them in the bright light of publicity at the earliest possible moment.

After reading the reports, the question of a unified command comes to the forefront because it would appear that the Kimmel-Short relationship in Hawaii was, at best, only a social one and not the kind of compact which the leading military and naval commanders there should have had. There was a lack of integration in pooling of knowledge on the part of Kimmel with Short, and there was a lack of real coordinated teamwork between the Army and Navy in Washington. The statement that General Short received no communication from the Chief of Staff and War Department G-2, Intelligence, between November 28 and December 6, 1941, inclusive, would indicate that Washington was at fault and not General Short—Army report, page 226. The fact that Short did not have the proper kind of alert—page 177—regardless of his orders or lack of orders from Washington, plus the fact that he had not developed a coordinated effort in the Hawaiian Department covering dispersion of ammunition—page 177—a real accord with Kimmel—Army report, page 205—and a fine functioning intelligence staff in the Hawaiian Department—pages 73 and 74—would indicate that Short was at fault. The fact that Admiral Kimmel had the portion of his fleet then at Pearl Harbor set up in perfect array—like sitting ducks—even though he had received war warnings on December 3, 4, and 6—pages 137 and 138—would indicate that he was at fault. Furthermore, Kimmel must have known that a Japanese midget submarine had been sunk off Pearl Harbor at 6:30 a. m. on December 7 by the U. S. S. *Ward* and a naval patrol plane some minutes before the plane attack on Oahu—page 86—and that he did not notify Short, likewise would indicate that he was at fault as would also the fact that Kimmel knew a Japanese task force was in the Marshall Islands on November 25, which information he failed to impart to Short—Army report, page 85.

The fact that we exercised no control over the communication facilities such as radio, telegraph, cable and telephone of the Japanese Consul General at Honolulu and of 200 Consul agents in the Hawaiian Islands would indicate that Congress in passing regulations forbidding the tapping of potential enemy lines of communication, was at fault. The FBI and Army and Navy Intelligence could have done this but were forbidden to do so by law—Army report, page 23.

Furthermore, the Army report states that from February 19 to December 7, 1941, Short tried to secure approval for money for improving the defense of Hawaii, but was turned down by the War Department "because of lack of money in connection with permanent installations"—Army report, page 67. This would indicate the difficulty of getting the necessary appropriations from the Congress.

The National Park Service also hindered, perhaps to a slight extent only, the establishment of an aircraft-warning service on lands under its control—Army report, page 69. The War Department use of commercial radio, the RCA, rather than personal telephone or Army, Navy

or FBI radio, in transmitting a tremendously important message to Short on December 7 is indicative of its fault. This message stated that Japan not only had delivered an ultimatum, but that the Japanese were destroying their code machine. This message, sent by commercial telegraph, reached Short after the Japanese attack was over—Army report, pages 138 and 139.

Lt. K. A. Tyler was at fault in telling Privates Elliot and Lockard, who spotted approaching Japanese planes 132 miles away, "to forget it," when they made their radar report to him—Army report, pages 144, 145, and 146. However, it should be stated that a group of B-17's from Hamilton Field, Calif., was due in Oahu about the same time—they actually did arrive during the attack—and this might account, in part, for Tyler's negligence—Army report, page 146.

There are questions in the report raised in connection with Gen. Leonard Grew, Chief of War Plans Division, and Col. Bedell Smith, Secretary to the General Staff, which will merit further investigation—Army report, page 160. There are questions relative to parts played by various individuals in the War Department in connection with the message which Colonel Bratton, then Chief of the Far Eastern Section, G-2, tried to reach the Chief of Staff with—Army report, pages 160, 161, 162, 228, and 229.

The great landowners in Hawaii, according to this report, have to bear their share of responsibility because of their refusal to allow their lands to be used for gun emplacements and positions—Army report, pages 175, 176, and 177. There are other questions in my mind based on the Army report, but I should like to make some observations. It would appear that the real reason for the Pearl Harbor attack lies in the faulty assumption by the War Department that Japan would not attempt to do what she did at Pearl Harbor, but first she would attack the Philippines, Guam, and southeast Asia points—Army report, page 202.

I would agree with the statement made in the introduction to the Army report that—

In 1940 and 1941 . . . there existed much confusion of thinking and of organization, of conflict of opinion and diversity of views. The Nation was not geared to war, either mentally or as an organization. It was a period of conflicting plans and purposes. The winds of public opinion were blowing in all directions; isolationists and nationalists (internationalists?) were struggling for pre-dominance; public opinion was both against war and clamoring for reprisal against Japan; we were negotiating for peace with Japan and simultaneously applying economic sanctions that led only to war; we were arming our forces for war and at the same time giving away much of our armament. The administration, State, War, and Navy Departments were likewise being pushed here and there by the ebb and flow of war events, public reactions, diplomatic negotiations, and newspaper attacks.

We all have better hindsight than foresight and we all make mistakes. With that statement in mind, I should like to record the following conclusions arrived at after reading the Army report:

First. There was, before Pearl Harbor, a distinct need for unification of the armed forces. That need still exists.

Second. There was faulty reasoning on the part of the War Department in Washington and the Hawaiian department, that is Washington expected the Philippines to be attacked first; Hawaii looked for trouble from within.

Third. Our forces were too scattered in view of the emergency situation. There were too few planes in Hawaii and there was a dispersion of our fleet in the two oceans.

Fourth. A big question in my mind is why the Philippine Islands—24 hours later—were caught in such difficult straits that our planes there were lined up, as in Hawaii, and mostly destroyed on the ground by the Japanese air attack. This question revolves on the command of the Philippine department.

The Navy report, which is not as thorough and detailed as the Army report, does, however, raise some questions. It brings out the transferring of part of the Pacific Fleet in May 1941 to the Atlantic—Navy report, page 1—and it states that the United States was then at peace with all nations—Navy report, page 3. This, I believe, is not accurate, because, while there was no declaration of war at this time, there were certainly skirmishes between American warships doing convoy duty in the north Atlantic and German submarines as in the cases of the U. S. S. *Greer*, U. S. S. *Reuben James*, and U. S. S. *Kearny*. On January 24, 1941, the Secretary of the Navy addressed a letter to the Secretary of War, in which he expressed his belief that "in case of war with Japan, hostilities might be initiated by surprise attack upon the fleet or on the naval base at Pearl Harbor," and it might come either by air bombing or air torpedo-plane attack. This indicates a keen appreciation of what might happen by the Navy Department at a fairly early date. Both the Army and Navy reports bring out the system of alerts used by both services, but that each differed radically—Navy report, page 17. The Navy report states that the Navy's condition of readiness on December 7 "was best suited to circumstances." They must have meant Japanese circumstances, because the fleet in the harbor offered a perfect target to the enemy. Admiral Stark, according to this report, warned Kimmel of the unfavorableness of Japanese-American relationship on November 24 and November 27, and also cautioned him about the possibility of a surprise attack on the Philippines or Guam. This would indicate that both the War and Navy Departments in Washington felt that a first blow, if struck, would be in the region of the Philippines. There is a statement in the Navy report that information received by the Navy Board has not been discussed or analyzed as "the court having been informed that their disclosures would militate against the successful prosecution of the war"—Navy report, page 38. The war is over.

The Navy report is, in my opinion, very incomplete and is not to be compared with the Army report for thoroughness and detail. The results of my reading

would indicate errors in judgment in Hawaii and in Washington, and it brings out very strongly in my mind the need for a unified command.

The way the debate is shaping up concerning these Pearl Harbor reports—and the previous one—it would appear doubtful if any final definitive report will ever develop. I do think, though, for the sake of all involved that they should have their day in court so that they may answer in their own defense any charges or aspersions made against them. I do not believe the full story has been told, and I would like to see this inquiry carried through to the end so that the full story may become known and, if possible, the final responsibility fixed. With the war over, there is no need for secrecy. It is my firm opinion that the American people, who have shouldered the burdens of this war, should know all the facts now, and I am of the further opinion that the only way to know them is for a special investigation committee to be authorized for this specific purpose. This committee should be made up of our best brains to ascertain the truth regardless of whom it may hurt or what department it may affect, and to utilize it as a basis for valid recommendations as to future policy. I am urging an investigation because a matter of principle is involved. The Pearl Harbor incident, until cleared up, makes for distrust and, until it is settled definitely, that feeling will remain.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include as a part thereof the very fine speech made by General MacArthur on the occasion of the surrender of Japan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CARE OF THE RETURNING VETERAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe those who read the very fine report of Mr. Bernard Baruch on the subject of the future care of the returning veterans will agree with me on the added need of changing the Veterans' Administration to a Veterans' Department, with its administrative head carrying the rank of a Cabinet officer. I believe this is necessary for him to make effective the recommendations in Mr. Baruch's report. Mr. Baruch's report was written with the heart as well as the head. Mr. Baruch has made an exhaustive study of veterans' problems and I hope everyone in the United States will read his suggestions. Today I described a 7 weeks' delay in a veteran's matter that should have been settled 7 weeks ago. A Cabinet member can get quicker and better results. His requests are granted.

In order effectively to carry out the recommendations of Mr. Baruch's report I firmly believe that the head of the Veterans' Administration should have Cabinet status. This is necessary to give him the power and the dignity needed to accomplish what should be done for the veterans. They deserve the best; we must give them nothing but the best. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] has promised me a hearing upon a bill which I introduced to create a Veterans' Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

QUICK DISCHARGE OF ELIGIBLE VETERANS

Mr. BENDER. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, all eligible servicemen now in the United States awaiting discharge should be furloughed home and recalled to separation centers when the center is ready to act on their discharges.

This process would give servicemen an opportunity to investigate business opportunities, make plans for further education, and be reunited with their families.

THE POLITICAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. MARCANTONIO. 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. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the solution of Puerto Rico's status is rapidly reaching a climax. The only solution is independence. This issue can no longer be evaded. The enemies of Puerto Rico independence are vainly attempting to confuse the people of the United States. Therefore, for the purpose of clarification I ask unanimous consent to include herein as part of my remarks today a statement of the Puerto Rico Pro Independence Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF THE PUERTO RICO PRO-INDEPENDENCE CONGRESS IN RELATION WITH SENATE BILL 1002, PRESENTED BY A COMMISSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF PUERTO RICO

At a time when the guns have been silenced and the blood has ceased to flow in Europe, the solution of the political problem of Puerto Rico is being fully examined by the Congress of the United States of America.

While the United Nations are building in San Francisco an international organization designed to control narrow self-interest and ambition in order to prevent aggression and create a world in which peace and civilization will be guaranteed, Puerto Rico has arrived at the most important step of its history. Faced with this reality, the Congress for the Independence of Puerto Rico desires to make

this statement to our people, appealing to their indisputable maturity of thought—a product of their suffering, their collective difficulties, their long history of political inferiority throughout many generations, their spirit of peace, and their efforts toward making a reality, through democratic processes, of their desires and their destiny.

This is not the time for narrow thinking, of petty self-interest, of the interests of political parties nor selfish groups. This is a time for national unity, in which every Puerto Rican must consider the problem of this people above all else, with deep respect for the suffering of former generations and of our right to the exercise of sovereignty by ourselves and our posterity.

Without belittling in any way the importance of the fact that the legislative commission has acted unanimously to protest the existing colonial regime in Puerto Rico and to ask that the problem of status be solved by the free vote of our people, every Puerto Rican has the unavoidable obligation to analyze the actions of the legislative commission intelligently and dispassionately and to pass judgment on those actions with all impartiality.

The Congress for the Independence of Puerto Rico, a civic organization which has a strictly patriotic mission to fulfill, has assumed from the beginning an attitude above all party consideration. With these high purposes in mind, we feel obliged to publish this analysis for public benefit, to enable our people to form sincere, patriotic, and intelligent opinions, and in order to eliminate confusions which might block the path of our people and retard the solution of the problem of our sovereignty.

It is with these sincere purposes and uninfluenced by the interests of selfish groups or other motives that we ask all Puerto Ricans to consider seriously the following points.

STATEMENT OF MOTIVES

1. The actions of the Legislative Commission of Puerto Rico in Washington give the impression that it has repudiated the colonial system of government in Puerto Rico.

2. The written memorandum and the oral testimony of the legislative commission before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs give the impression of the desire to solve the problem of political status on the basis of sovereignty and of democratic procedures which recognize the people of Puerto Rico as the final arbiters of their own destiny.

This impression disappears however as soon as mention is made of the concrete means by which this sovereignty would be achieved, and of the limitations imposed by those who have assumed the representation of this dependent people. The acceptance of any inevitable limitation which would aid in bringing about our sovereignty should not be confused with the premature relinquishment of that sovereignty or any part thereof by the Puerto Ricans themselves.

3. The written memorandum, as well as the oral testimony of the legislative commission, give the impression that there is a desire to assure the well-being of the Puerto Rican people and the success of the government which it will elect to govern its destiny, with minimum economic guarantees.

This aspect of the actions of the legislative commission gives the impression that in relating hunger and death to the question of political status, it was considered that the political problem and the problem of our economic relations with the United States were one single problem.

The Congress for Independence considers that the problem of sovereignty and that of commercial relations are two different problems which will have to be solved simultaneously, and that once the first is solved, the second will also have an adequate solution. We will attempt to prove hereafter that such minimum economic guarantees suggested by

the legislative commission are inferior to the economic guarantees proposed to the Senate Committee by the Congress for Independence.

This statement of motives is based exclusively on the official testimony of the legislative commission, as it is recorded in the documents mentioned—the memorandum submitted and the stenographic record of testimony before the Senate committee—considering these documents as a whole and interpreting the basic ideas which are inferred therefrom.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN CONFUSIONS

On the basis of the motives described above, let us analyze the work of the legislative commission, in order to dispel certain confusions. The legislative commission in its memorandum established four minimum conditions as economic guarantees under any one of the three alternative solutions proposed—Independence, statehood, or dominion. These conditions are:

(1) Free trade between Puerto Rico and the United States, limited from time to time by bilateral agreement.

(2) Exemption of Puerto Rican exports to the United States from internal revenue taxes, provided that Puerto Rico collects export taxes on such products at the same rates that the United States imposes or may at any time impose on such products.

(3) Maintenance during a suitable time of conditions for cane farmers now established by United States law.

(4) Temporary continuance of other grants and aids to Puerto Rico, these to be discontinued as productivity and commerce reach certain agreed levels.

Free trade: It is obvious that the most important of these minimum economic guarantees is the first, that of free trade, limited from time to time by bilateral agreement. Bilateral agreements are nothing more than treaties between two nations. The members of the legislative commission know that a State of the United States cannot make treaties with the United States, and even less can it limit free trade under statehood.

We do not wish to offend the legislative commission nor anyone who is aware of this elemental reality by affirming that such a condition has been proposed through ignorance. The members of the legislative commission must also be aware that any Senator or Representative of the American Congress knows that such a condition is impossible under statehood. To establish this condition along with the other three as indispensable under any of the three solutions proposed can only create great confusion, and to submit it to the Congress of the United States can only weaken the moral force of the people of Puerto Rico.

Internal revenues: The second condition is limited to the internal revenue taxes imposed by the United States on Puerto Rican products sold in the American market. It is proposed that Puerto Rico collect these duties, in return for which the United States will refrain from collecting them in its own market. From the point of view of the United States, this is not a concession regarding tariff duties which might be made in favor of any country, including the United States, for the purpose of developing foreign trade, establishing in this manner distinctions between independent countries which are permissible under the Constitution. Instead, this is concerned with internal revenues, subject, within the United States, to constitutional provisions designed to eliminate differential treatment within the Nation itself.

It is impossible to conceive that a bottle of rum produced in Florida could be sold in the American market on payment of an internal revenue tax, whereas the same bottle of rum produced in Puerto Rico could be sold in the United States without paying this tax. There are lawyers in the legislative commission who know that this condi-

tion is legally impossible under independence and that not only is it impossible, but also inconceivable under statehood.

In analyzing this aspect of the problem, we have not been able to avoid the idea that one cannot deceive himself, and that therefore we are unable to grasp the causes for this legal absurdity. In justice to the intelligence of our fellow citizens of the legislative commission in accepting such conditions as the first and second, both of which are incompatible with statehood, their attitude may be reasoned as disputable proof that they are convinced statehood is impossible, both from the Puerto Rican as well as from the American point of view. Although respect for their intelligence is thus saved, there still remains before public opinion in Puerto Rico a great shadow of confusion, and in the minds of the Members of Congress, unfortunately, a sign of the weakness of the legislative commission.

Fortunately for Puerto Rico and for the United States, once the confusion has been cleared up, we can congratulate the legislative commission for having made it possible for the Congress of the United States without conflicting in any way with its international diplomatic problem, to formally eliminate statehood on the basis of the very reasoning of the legislative commission itself.

The sugar industry: The third condition, which refers to the protection of sugar growers, as cited above, includes the retention of the conditions of that industry as they are now established by law. Nevertheless, in section 208 of title II of the bill presented by the legislative commission, the protection of sugar growers is limited to the sugar quota, and the benefit payments or subsidies included by implication in this third section as a final recommendation of the commission have been eliminated.

It is true that in section 213 of the legislative commission's bill the payments of benefits or subsidies to sugarcane growers are included under the name of "agricultural adjustment," but this is only done on a temporary basis, as if it were an economic aid to be later eliminated. The legislative commission neglected to consider the economic principle that benefit payments or subsidies are given by governments to equalize as far as possible the value of certain given products with the value of the other products.

In the case of our sugar, even counting the subsidies, it cannot be considered to have a price in the domestic market of the United States in the same degree as other articles of national consumption. This means that if the reduced and ineffective economic guaranty offered by the legislative commission for the protection of the farmers and farm laborers of our sugar industry and its subsidiaries is accepted, there would come a time when, using the value of our sugar without benefit payments or subsidies to buy in the United States market, we would be acquiring goods bought at the high prices of the domestic market without receiving for our sugar its corresponding relative value.

This would be a great injustice to our people. We cannot believe that the legislative commission had that purpose. We patriotically reject that idea, but we wish to bring to public attention the fact that according to the amendments proposed to the Tydings bill, the Congress for the Independence of Puerto Rico took as a basis the assumption that such benefit payments or subsidies are, in final analysis, part of the price of sugar, and are used to reasonably equalize the price of this product with the prices of other articles in the same national market. In other words, if Puerto Rico invests the value of its sugar in the American market, it is only just that Puerto Rico receive the full value that sugar has in the same market. This is then not a question of aid or charity, as the legislative commission has conceived it, but rather a question of impartiality, justice, and

reciprocity, as the Congress for Independence considered it.

Let this contrast be fully appreciated. While the legislative commission presents the supreme question of liberty in terms of misery, hunger, and death, the Congress for Independence bases it on principles of justice, mutual benefit, and reciprocity convenient for both countries.

Military relations: Giving the impression of its adherence to the principles of impartiality and reciprocity, in its statement submitted to the Senate Committee on Territories, in which the necessity of minimum economic conditions is emphasized, the legislative commission declared:

"We equally recognize that if the legitimate interests of the United States are to be fully protected, military establishments and rights must be permanently enjoyed by the United States in Puerto Rico."

The Congress for Independence recognized the same just principle of reciprocity when it submitted to the committee an amendment to the independence bill providing that such military relations should be established by treaty. We are sure that the Puerto Rican people wish to offer the fullest possible cooperation to the people and Government of the United States, but cooperation should be given through measures which lend dignity to such relations and which leave no room for the interpretation by other countries that the United States is at any time coercing the people of Puerto Rico. Such an interpretation would be fair neither to the people of Puerto Rico nor to the people of the United States.

However, the legislative commission, in an effort to bring together the mutual interests of both peoples, tends to permanently commit the position of Puerto Rico by means of the following clause:

"In any war in which the United States is involved, the Republic of Puerto Rico shall be an ally of the United States and shall give all cooperation to the war effort within and without the territorial limits of Puerto Rico."

That disposition, interpreted together with the others dealing with this aspect of the question, only signifies a request made in the name of all Puerto Ricans that the United States establish military slavery for all time in our island.

In order to establish cooperation it is not necessary to impair the self-respect of a people. National defense and continental defense of both peoples, the democratic interests of the United States, those of Puerto Rico, and the potential democratic interests of the entire hemisphere all justify the present and permanent existence of such cooperation. But the greatness of that agreement should not be weakened by the total surrender of one of the parties to it, because this would give the impression that the United States cannot have confidence in Puerto Rico. Once such impression is given, then cooperation cannot be sincere, nor can it be based on principles of justice, nor inspire confidence in both peoples.

It is understandable that in striving for liberty we may accept limitations, which might be wrongly imposed in a given set of circumstances, for the purpose of removing obstacles to the ultimate recognition of full sovereignty, since in the future, as events occur and as each of our peoples grows to know the other better, such limitations will either disappear or will become academic. It would even be justified if the people of Puerto Rico, by its own will and by means of a mandate democratically given, established such a condition. The people of Puerto Rico, however, have directly or indirectly authorized no one to establish a priori perpetual military servitude. Even though such servitude be academic because of the principles which should govern the relations between the United States and Puerto Rico,

it would show a lack of self-respect on the part of Puerto Rico, and would expose the United States to criticism in its position as a leader of world democracy.

It might be said that we are reducing this problem to a question of form. To this we must answer that questions of the spirit cannot be submitted either to calculations or to formulas, and that they are as capable of depressing or exalting human personality as any of the physical factors necessary to a better civilization and to greater public welfare. This whole question would undoubtedly bring confusion to Puerto Ricans if light were not thrown on it, and it would weaken the moral force of the legislative commission in the minds of the Members of the Congress of the United States.

DOMINION STATUS

In the memorandum submitted to the Tydings committee by the legislative commission, dominion status is suggested as one of the three solutions to the general problem of political status, in the following words:

"Broadly speaking, the forms of political status that have support in public opinion are independence, statehood, and a form of dominion government based on full and final political rights."

In the first place, the statement that in Puerto Rico there is any support from public opinion in favor of dominion status is false and confusing. That is the private formula of a limited group of persons who have no following among the masses of our people. But even if that formula had some support from public opinion, its inclusion in the plebiscite bill of the legislative commission would be a means to retard the solution of the political problem of Puerto Rico. That formula has no place within the American constitutional system and would only be a means to perpetuate the colony in Puerto Rico.

Even the relationship which exists between Canada and the United Kingdom, which might be used by some as a possible political guide for Puerto Rico, is impossible within the present constitutional structure of the United States. Let us not forget that we are concerned at this moment with the approval of a statute of emancipation for Puerto Rico by the Congress of the United States. If Congress were to approve an organic law similar to that which governs Canada, the effect would only be a new and fresh reaffirmation of the colonial status which we all repudiate.

The reason is simple. The basic authority of Canada does not emanate directly from law written by the British Parliament, but rather from practice contrary to the written law. For this reason, while the organic act of the Dominion gives the King of England the right to appoint a Governor General, and he in turn is authorized by that statute to veto the laws passed by the Canadian Parliament, the political practice in the Dominion, after long years of struggle for freedom, has reached the point where the Governor General, as the King of England, is reduced to a mere symbol of the solidarity of the British Commonwealth, a simple figurehead "who rules but does not govern." The veto right has vanished, in spite of the permanence of the written law.

These are things very characteristic of the English spirit, but foreign to the American spirit, for whom written law is supreme and must be respected. The written constitution of Canada remains colonial, while practice has in fact nullified it. But if it were necessary to reenact this statute to make it conform to today's political reality, the English Parliament would be enacting a law of independence for Canada.

The term "dominion" is a new one which has now been added to the extensive vocabulary of our colonial politics. All these new names for things—as if independence were

an ugly word—are only sources of popular confusion. It is the influx of bureaucracy and of reaction determined to hold on to the colonial regime. According to the textual words of the legislative commission, Puerto Rico needs "full and final political rights." The Congress for Independence holds that the formula proposed under the name "dominion" would achieve no such thing, even if the organic act of Canada were copied word for word.

Neither would it be achieved by the formula written into the bill, for that formula contains clauses which specifically restrain Puerto Rico in the exercise of its full and final political rights. The United States Congress, under the Constitution, cannot give irrevocable final powers to a Territory. Nor can it give full powers (sovereignty) under any form of status except independence. Nor is it sensible to expect that the United States will be willing to give a Territory fundamental powers which even the States, whose representatives in Congress would be called upon to approve those powers, do not have. Only independence—why use any other name?—can give our people full and final political rights. Therefore, of the three formulas proposed by the commission as solution to our political status, there is in truth only one, independence.

INDEPENDENCE OR COLONY

As the farmer separates the chaff from the wheat, so must Puerto Rico, through analysis and reasoning, separate the useless and superfluous in this problem, and search for and find among the actions of its legislative representatives the inevitable support, perhaps timid or weak, but support nevertheless, for the independence of Puerto Rico. In a sense we must not dispute this minimum of recognition of their actions as political leaders. Rather we must frankly point out that if they had acted on an exclusively patriotic level, above party interests, the position of our legislative commission would have been clearer, braver, and more effective not only as regards the orientation of our own people, who need that clarity, but also as regards the impression which the legislative commission would have made in Congress.

It is well to emphasize at this point that as a result of these circumstances the bill submitted by the legislative commission has not been introduced in Congress as a bill of Senator TYDINGS, as a large number of Puerto Ricans have been led to believe. It is rather a bill of the legislative commission, introduced by petition by Senator TYDINGS, as the title of S. 1002 makes clear. The original bill introduced by the Senator from Maryland, with independence as the only solution to our status, is still pending consideration.

The other bill was introduced as an act of courtesy and in accordance with the usual practice in democratic legislative bodies.

The possibilities of approval of the Commission's bill cannot be judged exclusively on the basis of its having been introduced in Congress, but rather on the merits it may have in relation to the solution of the colonial problem in Puerto Rico, both from the point of view of our country and from that of the United States.

If the classic concept of statehood and the concept of dominion are impossible solutions, as has been indicated here, the problem is reduced to one simple alternative: Independence or colony. That is the choice confronting the people of Puerto Rico. That is the grain of wheat which we have left after discarding the chaff. Those are the simple and bare alternatives that Puerto Ricans have to consider. And if independence is truly the only solution possible, then this choice will be made as it should be by a people conscious of its responsibility to the present and the future.

ECONOMIC GUARANTEES

From what has been said, the problem of sovereignty is beyond discussion. What must be analyzed is how sovereignty can be implemented economically. In this analysis the people of Puerto Rico should know and compare the economic measures offered for independence by the Legislative Commission with those offered by the Congress for Independence.

Economic guarantees proposed by the Congress for Independence

SEC. 7. As soon as the constitutional convention meets to draft the constitution, it shall designate a committee specifically charged with the duty of negotiating a commercial treaty between Puerto Rico and the United States. The committee thus designated shall carry out the negotiations with the Department of State, which shall follow such procedure as the Secretary of State shall provide with the approval of the President. Treaty relations shall be drafted according to the following provisions:

(a) All goods now imported into the United States from Puerto Rico, or which may in the future be imported in accordance with treaty regulations, shall be admitted free of all duties into the United States market up to the same amount in dollars as articles imported in Puerto Rico from the United States shall be admitted free of all duties. The necessary rules shall be established in the treaty for the effective enforcement of the foregoing provision, whereby, and supplementing other rules that may govern the commercial interchange between both countries, the mutual debits and credits resulting from other considerations shall be settled and any balance which may result in any year shall be carried over to the next year for the settlement of the accounts thereof, so that the exchange of values be maintained upon a basis of strict mutuality. Values of import and export shall be computed at prices prevailing in the domestic market of the United States.

(b) The treaty shall be drafted in such terms that in the economic relations between the United States and Puerto Rico, the volume of commerce now carried on, measured in dollars, shall not be reduced by the exclusive will of one of the parties.

Such volume of trade, measured in dollars, shall be established in the treaty and computed on the basis of a period of representative years of normal relations agreed upon by both contracting parties. However, this rule shall not prevent any one of the two countries, if it be possible to obtain in the other country any goods different from those specified in the treaty, from eliminating one or more items from the list of goods approved in the treaty, if the amount in dollars be substituted with other items. *Provided, however,* That items figuring in the treaty under the designation of "Fixed imports" will not be subject of elimination or change unless by mutual agreement of the parties. Any other item or items of importation not figuring in said list of fixed imports may be eliminated at will by either importing party if provision is made by the importing party to the end that the corresponding amounts in dollars is substituted by other item or items figuring in the export trade of the other party. *And provided further,* That when a fall in the prices of the goods figuring in the export list of either party takes place in the market of the other importing party, the exporting party may decrease the mutuality basis by decreasing the importation of goods from the other party in an amount equivalent to the decrease in the selling prices of the goods of the exporting party, due to such fall in prices.

(c) Any subsidy or benefit payment which is at present provided by any one of the two governments, for the benefit of producers of any item of commerce between the

two countries, whether such subsidy or benefit payment be to promote agricultural or industrial processes, shall be counted as a part of the selling price of the article and shall be paid by the government which makes the concession through the government of the country the producers of which are entitled thereto.

(d) All rights and benefits acknowledged to Puerto Rican citizens under the laws of the United States by virtue of their status as veterans of war and by virtue of their status as retired employees of the Federal Government and all rights and benefits acknowledged under the laws of Congress to families or relatives of Puerto Rican veterans of war and of Puerto Rican retired employees of the Federal Government, shall be entirely maintained and respected by the Government of the United States. Said rights and benefits are considered "vested rights" and deemed as additional compensation due for services rendered to the Government of the United States of America. The payments which are to be made by the Government of the United States for said consideration either directly or indirectly, shall be made through the Government of the Republic of Puerto Rico up to the complete settlement according to the aforesaid laws and are not to be accounted for in relation with the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section. The same responsibility shall be assumed toward the Treasury of the United States by the Government of the Republic of Puerto Rico, in order to give adequate protection and enforcement to the rights and benefits which have been acknowledged to continental citizens of the United States by similar laws of the Legislature of Puerto Rico which are in force at the time of the approval of this act.

(e) During the period of the effectiveness of the first treaty, and during not less than 10 years after the proclamation of independence, provisions (a) and (b) under this section shall govern the commercial relations between both countries, provided that at any time after the expiration of such period, or extensions of such period agreed thereto by both countries, the said provisions (a) and (b) of this act, unless modified by treaty agreement, shall continue in force with the exception that substitutions of items of commerce as provided in paragraph (b) shall not be binding for either party, and elimination of items shall be governed by the following rules. Items of commerce may be eliminated by any importing party from the exporting list of the other party totally in 1 year, or by equal parts among a number of years according to its importance in value as compared to the total amount of imports, thus:

(1) If the item to be eliminated does not exceed 5 percent of the total amount of imports, it can be eliminated totally in 1 year;

(2) If it exceeds 5 percent and does not exceed 15 percent, it can be eliminated in 3 years;

(3) If it exceeds 15 percent and does not exceed 30 percent, it can be eliminated in 6 years;

(4) If it exceeds 30 percent and does not exceed 50 percent, it can be eliminated in 8 years; and

(5) If it exceeds 50 percent, it can be eliminated in 10 years.

The reciprocal rights of both parties may be effectively exercised by either party pursuant to official notice served to the other party at least 180 days before the first day of the business year when such elimination is to take place.

Liquidation of tax privileges and elimination of Federal appropriations

SEC. 9. All tax privileges and concessions granted to Puerto Rico under existing laws and all Federal appropriations regularly in force and applicable to Puerto Rico by action

of Congress, shall be liquidated or eliminated, as follows:

According to the amendment submitted in this section, all tax privileges, concessions, and appropriations from Federal funds shall continue in force during the first 5 years after the proclamation of independence, and will be reduced until totally discontinued at the rate of one-fifteenth the first subsequent year, two-fifteenths the second, etc., during 15 additional years.

Economic guaranties submitted by the legislative commission May 7, 1945

Basic Economic Relations After the Independence of Puerto Rico, Section 203

(a) No duty shall be levied by the United States upon any article imported from the Republic of Puerto Rico and none levied by Puerto Rico upon any article imported from the United States except by mutual consent of the two governments and upon such terms and conditions as they may agree.

(b) The United States shall not impose or collect any internal revenues on products of Puerto Rico imported into the United States: *Provided,* That the Republic of Puerto Rico shall impose and collect on such products an export duty not less than the internal revenue collected by the United States on similar products.

(c) Importation of Puerto Rican sugar into the United States shall continue on a basis not more restrictive in principle than that which has prevailed during the last 5 years in which a quota was imposed under United States law.

Temporary and Diminishing Economic Aids to the Republic of Puerto Rico

SEC. 213. Until such time and in such manner as hereinafter provided all Federal aid heretofore extended to Puerto Rico in the nature of, but not limited to, agricultural research and extension, school, college and vocational education, public roads and highways, social security, unemployment and work relief, agricultural adjustment, farm security, soil conservation, food relief, public health, nonmilitary work projects, reconstruction finance, disaster relief, farm credit, Federal works, Federal housing and slum clearance, and tenant purchase shall continue.

SEC. 214. The aid provided for in the preceding section shall be gradually reduced. Such reduction shall be carried out on the basis of indexes of economic progress to be determined by a commission of three economists designated by the President of the United States and two economists designated by the Chief Executive of Puerto Rico, and upon proclamation from time to time by the President of the United States.

The people of Puerto Rico should study these two sets of economic measures and judge impartially which are the most effective by reason of being more specific and complete. The United States Congress will determine which of the two proposals is the most beneficial and just to protect the legitimate economic interests of the United States without prejudicing Puerto Rico's exercise of the necessary authority regarding its own market, in accordance with the principles given earlier, and act freely in all aspects of production and commerce outside the bounds of treaties.

It should be noted that the economic guaranties proposed by the legislative commission on May 7, 1945, are similar in principle to those which had already been submitted by the Congress for Independence 2 months earlier. It should also be noted that those of the legislative commission have been drafted in such form that some are not specific, others are incomplete; and still others conflict with American constitutional principles.

That economic guaranties, to assure the better success of an independent Puerto

Rico, are attainable can be gathered from reading the stenographic record of the hearings on the Tydings bill. We cite as an example from page 625, volume —, during the testimony of Senator Luis Muñoz Marin:

"The CHAIRMAN (Senator TYDINGS). We do not want to leave a condition here of an economic nature that does not reasonably give the people of Puerto Rico a chance to be free and independent, to live without having a perpetual civil war in Puerto Rico. It would not be any credit to anybody, including the American Congress, if we permit that situation to happen."

And on page 618 of the same record, Senator TYDINGS declared categorically:

"In my opinion, to submit independence to the Puerto Rican people without giving them a reasonable chance of survival would be a crime against humanity. We have got to do that if we are to make a success of it."

BE ON GUARD

We should not bring this statement to a close without calling attention to certain economic forces which, although formerly separated, may at any moment draw close in order to weaken our struggle for freedom. We wish to call attention to the fact that the governmental bureaucracy has been for some time separated from the small reactionary minority which has benefited from the colonial regime in Puerto Rico. This separation came as a result of the people's mandate in the last two elections, out of which came the enactment of legislation to bring greater justice to the people and apply the principles of economic liberalism.

Nevertheless, since the instinct of self-preservation is strong not only in the biologic but also in the institutional realm, it is very possible that these bureaucratic groups may make common cause with reactionary forces that benefit from the colonial regime, since independence is not considered desirable by either of these two groups.

In this sense the people of Puerto Rico are innocent bystanders who have in recent years maintained close relations of friendship and cooperation with bureaucracy, but who now are faced with the possibility that the reactionary minority may attempt to make use of the people's forces against the people themselves.

This is not an attempt to denounce a conspiracy. It is only intended to point out forces which although antagonistic on questions of social justice, may still make contact and cooperate to impede the liberation of our people.

Be on guard, fellow citizens. We are at a cross roads in the history of our native land, and we have a great responsibility. Let us not make hasty judgments concerning events. Let us analyze the fact without prejudice. Let us shoulder our responsibilities, demanding that our representatives in elective positions respond to the genuine interests of the people, so that the people will be respected in this fateful hour.

For the executive committee:

ANTONIO SANTAELLA,

Acting President, Congress for the Independence of Puerto Rico.

JESÚS BORDONADA,

Secretary.

BALTÁZAR QUIÑONES ELÍAS,

Chairman, Committee on Reports.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 230. An act to amend Public Law 518, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 504. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to that certain unconfirmed and located private land claim known as claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13, in Cosby and Skipwith's Report of 1820, certificate 749, and being designated as section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg Land District, Livingston Parish, La., on the official plat of said township; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution providing for a study by a joint congressional committee of educational facilities, living quarters, and other matters relating to pages employed by the two Houses of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 10, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

At 10 a. m., on Wednesday, September 12, 1945, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a public hearing on the bill (H. R. 3750) to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941. The meeting will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a public hearing before the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 10 a. m., on Thursday, September 13, 1945, in the committee hearing room, 247 Old House Office Building on H. R. 1653 by Representative HENDRICKS and H. R. 2073 by Representative LUDLOW, bills to extend benefits to veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their dependents.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

666. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a list of all War Department contracts in excess of \$150,000 undertaken during the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

667. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a list of the Selective Service registrants occupationally deferred by the local boards of the System as of April 1, 1945, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

668. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a communication from the Speaker of the House of Commons of Northern Ireland, offering congratulations on the victory and completion of the campaign in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

669. A letter from the Director of Budget and Reports, Navy Department, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned from civilian life into the United States Naval Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, during the period June 1, 1945, to July 31, 1945, inclusive, who have not had prior commissioned military service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

670. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service from the period June 1, 1945, to July 31, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

671. A letter from the Administrative Officer, the White House, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, representing the estimated personnel requirements for the White House Office for the quarter ending September 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

672. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Smithsonian Institution for the quarter ending September 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

673. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Economic Stabilization for the quarter ending September 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

674. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 339. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3660, a bill to provide for financial control of Government corporations; without amendment (Rept. No. 942). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3951. A bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3882) granting an increase of pension to James L. Huston, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MAY:
H. R. 3951. A bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:
H. R. 3952. A bill to repeal the automobile-use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH:
H. R. 3953. A bill to restore standard time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD:
H. R. 3954. A bill to effect a reduction in the individual income tax by increasing the normal tax exemption and the surtax exemption from \$500 to \$1,000, and by increasing

the exemption for dependents from \$500 to \$800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 3955. A bill to establish the peace force and to stimulate volunteer enlistments for occupation duties; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3956. A bill to repeal the act establishing daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3957. A bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3958. A bill to continue in effect the reemployment rights of veterans after the termination of other provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 3959. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American soldier who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3960. A bill to adopt generally September 16, 1940, date of enactment of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as the beginning date of World War II for the purposes of all benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3961. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to widows of individuals who died before January 1, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 3962. A bill to establish a Division of Printing Control in the Office of the Bureau of the Budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 3963. A bill to make the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code granting percentage depletion with respect to fluorspar permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3964. A bill to amend Public Law 403, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3965. A bill to amend the National Housing Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution for acquisition of British islands in the Caribbean and British Honduras; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution for the acquisition of French islands in the Caribbean and the North Atlantic Ocean; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to provide for termination of the act of January 20, 1942, providing for daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution to repeal Public Law 403, and reinstate standard time provided in the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution setting the date for the discontinuation of daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. Res. 337. Resolution inviting Lieutenant General Wainwright to appear before a joint session of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 338. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1862, a bill relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the National Constituent Assembly of El Salvador, expressing its joy over the victory, and hopes for the establishment of a lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of Colombia, sending greetings on the occasion of a new anniversary of the glorious independence of the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House of Deputies of Peru, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to the Government of Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of Peru, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to the establishment of diplomatic and commercial relations with the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, expressing joy over the unconditional surrender of Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Congress of Costa Rica, expressing satisfaction at the cessation of hostilities; 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. BUNKER:

H. R. 3966. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands situated in Clark County, Nev., to the Boulder City Cemetery Association for cemetery purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 3967. A bill for the relief of Ahto Walter, Lucy Walter, and Teddy Walter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3968. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles W. Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3969. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Barry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 3970. A bill for the relief of John Hames; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 3971. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Clark; 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:

1120. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 4858 of Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging retention of steel plants on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1121. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the South Dakota Reclamation Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the land and water resources of the Missouri River Basin, and other pertinent

projects; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1122. Also, petition of the American Legion of Kings County, Department of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the reemployment of World War II veterans, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1123. Also, petition of the president, chamber of commerce, Houston, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the amendment of H. R. 3603; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1124. Also, petition of the board of supervisors, Kern County, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to continued operations of steel plants on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1125. Also, petition of the South Central Jurisdictional Council of the Methodist Church, Texarkana, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their protest to the passage during the war of universal compulsory military training as a peacetime measure; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1126. Also, petition of the Tennessee Business Men's Association, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1127. Also, petition of the Illinois State CIO Political Action Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security bill, and other pertinent legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1128. Also, petition of Mrs. Blanche Tucker, Burwell, Nebr., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bills 2229 and 2230 and Senate bills 690 and 809; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1129. Also, petition of the Peace Campaign, Mount Vernon, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a Christian peace in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1130. Also, petition of Local 72, United Automobile-Aircraft-Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the contribution by the Federal Government to the social-security fund of moneys equal to earnings of \$50 per week for the period of all enlistments, inductions or commissions in the armed forces of the United States in time of war, to include the present conflict; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1131. Also, petition of the board of water commissioners, Denver, Colo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their disapproval of House bill 555; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1945

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

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the glory of this shining hour as the mute gates of torture and tyranny are battered down and, leading captivity captive, men of valor return in honor from pagan lands of living death. Our glad hearts rejoice that each new day the speaking air records the reign of ruthless invaders ended, ancient liberties restored, and prostrate peoples standing once again on their feet.