

storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property and services for use in performing defense contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6618. A bill providing for the temporary service of circuit judges with the Supreme Court of Hawaii in case of vacancies in such court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal Public Law 411, second session, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution, dated February 13, 1942, relative to their support of Gov. Rex Guy Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution, dated February 13, 1942, relative to Governor Tugwell having their support; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (H. R. 6619) for the relief of M. Ray Waldron, which was referred 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:

2443. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Mount, N. Y., opposing any legislation tending to tax municipal securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2444. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 40 members of the Jefferson Center Presbyterian Church, Saxonburg, Butler County, Pa., petitioning the removal of alcoholic beverages from our Army camps and the removal of prostitutes from the community of the camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2445. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Miss A. Campbell, of the Evening and Weekly Mirror, of Hillsboro, Tex., opposing House bill 5781, the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2446. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of Local No. 10, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, urging appointment of all substitute employees to regular positions and passage of salary increase bill; all time over 40 hours weekly to be paid overtime; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2447. Also, resolution of the County Officers' Association of the State of New York, opposing any further attempt to remove tax-exemption clause on municipal bonds heretofore issued or to be issued; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2448. By Mr. MOSER: Resolution of the Council of the City of Reading, State of Pennsylvania, against taxation of municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2449. By Mr. ROLPH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 25 of the State of California, relative to memorializing the Federal Government to survey a water route from the Colorado River to the city of San Diego; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2450. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Ridgewood Unit of Republican Women, Inc., Ridgewood, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the continuation of the Dies Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

2451. Also, petition of the Woodcrest Democratic Club, of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Public Law 411, second session, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1942

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

The Reverend Theodore Otto Wedel, canon chancellor, Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, Infinite Watcher over the children of men, whom our fathers and fathers' fathers worshipped in lands across the sea, whom our children and children's children will worship, seeking to understand the mystery of Thy ways with the sons of men: Grant to us of our generation Thy love and favor. As we walk in the awesome presence of Thy rule over the nations, give us the courage to submit our wills to Thy judgments, our hearts to Thy love, our deeds to Thy kingdom of justice and right. Across the flaming ramparts of our torn and warring world give us sight of Thine eternal purposes through the dark veil of circumstance, humility to repent us of our sins and failures, and renewed strength for enduring the toil of service. May our Nation be the first nation to submit to Thy call to repentance and to Thy healing. We ask it through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, February 17, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on February 16, 1942, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 806. An act for the relief of Carmella Ridgewell;

S. 1523. An act for the relief of the Portland Sportswear Manufacturing Co.;

S. 1945. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, operate, and regulate public off-street parking facilities, and for other purposes; and

S. 2182. An act to provide for temporary promotion in the Army of the United States of officers commissioned in the Air Corps or assigned to duty with the Air Corps.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6611)

making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1133. An act to authorize the transfer of lands from the United States to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission under certain conditions, and to accept title to another tract to be transferred to the United States;

S. 1368. An act relating to lands of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahook-Band of Snake Indians;

S. 1521. An act to provide that the Navy ration may include canned or powdered or concentrated fruit or vegetable juices;

S. 1630. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps;

S. 2192. An act to extend the time for examination of quarterly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Navy;

H. R. 329. An act for the relief of Lulu Heron;

H. R. 446. An act for the relief of the estate of Opal June Lindsay, Luck A. Lindsay, Thelma Louise Lindsay, and Laura Kathleen Lindsay;

H. R. 1905. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Michael Lewenczuk;

H. R. 2724. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary E. Philpot, Sandra G. Philpot, and Mrs. R. L. Keckler;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Dale L. Barthel and others;

H. R. 3539. An act to provide for the deposit and expenditure of various revenues collected at schools and hospitals operated by the Indian Service in Alaska;

H. R. 3542. An act to authorize the purchase from appropriation made for the Indian Service of supplies and materials for resale to natives, native cooperative associations, and Indian Service employees stationed in Alaska;

H. R. 3647. An act for the relief of the San Diego Consolidated Gas & Electric Co.;

H. R. 3823. An act for the relief of Edwin B. Formhals;

H. R. 4179. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States;

H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of John King;

H. R. 4354. An act for the relief of D. H. Dantzler;

H. R. 4773. An act for the relief of Brooks Equipment & Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4831. An act for the relief of Katherine McCue;

H. R. 4998. An act for the relief of Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott;

H. R. 5040. An act for the relief of William Robert Shaneyfelt and Mildred Shaneyfelt;

H. R. 5056. An act for the relief of the Burlington Auto Co.;

H. R. 5206. An act for the relief of Nettie Woolfolk Montague and Jerry L. Woolfolk and others;

H. R. 5280. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5282. An act for the relief of J. W. Daughtry;

H. R. 5387. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna M. Paul;

H. R. 5572. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps

personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Farris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941;

H. R. 5773. An act for the relief of Libby, McNeill & Libby;

H. R. 5984. An act for the relief of Solomon Brown;

H. R. 6145. An act for the relief of Mason C. Brunson; and

H. R. 6225. An act for the relief of certain individuals in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho.

NOMINATION OF PEIRSON M. HALL—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senate Judiciary Committee has received the nomination of Hon. Peirson M. Hall, of California, to be a United States district judge, southern district of California.

As chairman of the subcommittee assigned to consider this nomination, I announce that Thursday, February 26, at 10:30 a. m. has been set as the time for a hearing on the nomination in the Judiciary Committee room, at which all persons interested may appear.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL THEATER AND ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the second vice president of the American National Theater and Academy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the proceedings of the American National Theater and Academy for the calendar year 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

RESOLUTIONS FOR AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD "Resolutions for an American Citizen"—and this means every American citizen—conceived by a Vermonter, Mr. Levi P. Smith, who is president of the Burlington Savings Bank, a patriot who is contributing much to the campaign for the sale of Defense Savings stamps and bonds. If every American would rise in the morning and make these resolutions, I think he would be a much better soldier on the economic front than if he did not do something of that kind.

I should like to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD. They start off as follows—and I think this indicates justification for the printing:

I resolve to remind myself every morning—
That there is a war to win;
That I must be as devoted, diligent, and determined as those who man the guns;
That a glorious heritage is at stake—an ideal worth fighting for; and
That our cause is the cause of freedom everywhere.

And the resolutions continue in that vein.

I think it is well for every citizen of the United States repeatedly to remind himself that we are fighting this war to win it. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolutions are as follows:

IN TOTAL WAR—RESOLUTIONS FOR AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

I resolve to remind myself every morning—
That there is a war to win;
That I must be as devoted, diligent, and determined as those who man the guns;
That a glorious heritage is at stake—an ideal worth fighting for; and
That our cause is the cause of freedom everywhere.

I resolve to dedicate to this cause, anew each day, the zeal, intelligence, and initiative of a freeman fighting for his freedom, a measure and quality of service beyond the power of a totalitarian state to exact of its subjects.

I resolve to pray that the greatness of our cause may drown out doubts, disputes, and questionings;

That it may submerge consciousness of class or race or party; and

That it may lift me out of the littleness of ordinary life.

I resolve neither to be cast down by reverses nor buoyed up unduly by successes, but to see things as they are, with the steady conviction that drudgery and endurance as well as inspiration and heroism will count in the ultimate victory.

I resolve to be cheerful for the effect on those about me.

I resolve to be courageous with the gallantry of those who fight the good fight.

I resolve to take my place in the line as a good soldier—cool and firm and considerate—neither giving way to panic nor crowding for preferment, but content with the privilege of serving so vital, great, and sacred a cause.

MEMORIAL

Mr. CAPPER presented a letter in the nature of a memorial, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Independence, Kans., remonstrating against the imposition of a tax on pay rolls and favoring the imposition of a sales tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, the resolutions, together with copy of a telegram addressed to the President, adopted by the annual convention of the American National Livestock Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, on January 7, 1942, setting forth an important legislative program which their organization is sponsoring.

There being no objection, the resolutions and telegram were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE CONTROL

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has been charged with the responsibility of providing an adequate food supply for the Nation in the emergency that confronts this country today; and

Whereas H. R. 5990, which has passed the House and is now on the floor of the Senate, would grant price-fixing authority on all commodities; and

Whereas price is the controlling factor in production: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American National Live Stock Association in annual convention at Salt Lake City, Utah, January 7-9, 1942, That, insofar as livestock and livestock products are concerned, we urge that the authority to fix price ceilings and compel compliance therewith be delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture or, if this authority be delegated to the Office of Price Administration, it

be with the provision that price ceilings may not be fixed without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

UNNECESSARY EXPENDITURES

Whereas this Nation is engaged in an all-out war which will tax its resources to the limit: Therefore be it

Resolved, That all payments made to livestock producers under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program be immediately terminated; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge and recommend that all unnecessary expenditures of Federal funds be immediately stopped. We list under unnecessary expenditures all expenditures which are not for the prosecution of the war and carrying on absolutely essential governmental duties; particularly we are opposed to any further unnecessary expenditures for relief, believing that all relief rolls should be thoroughly checked by someone other than local politicians in order that the names of all able-bodied men may be removed from such rolls. We ask for the abolishment of Work Projects Administration, Soil Conservation Service, National Youth Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, and extraordinary expenditures in connection with Indian reservations and affairs. We cannot hope to complete a list of these unnecessary expenditures, but we include all of them in our recommendation.

SAFEGUARDING LIVESTOCK HEALTH

Whereas the sudden impact of war has brought the realization of the need for increasing our supply of meat and other essential foods for the United Nations; and

Whereas in order to maintain the production of these increased meat supplies it is now more than ever essential that we maintain every possible safeguard to the health of our livestock herds and flocks: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we insist that there should be no modification whatsoever of our existing embargo against the importation of livestock or dressed meats from countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists; and be it further

Resolved, That because of the close proximity of the island of Tierra del Fuego to infected portions of the mainland and because of the commerce between that island and those portions of the mainland, we urge the Secretary of Agriculture not to modify the embargo now applying to that island until disease-free conditions are proved to exist on the mainland.

DEFERMENT IN DRAFT

Whereas production of food for war is a recognized essential in our war effort; and

Whereas in the beef-cattle industry the volume output of food per man employed is unparalleled by any other phase of agricultural production; and

Whereas work in beef-cattle production is highly specialized, one trained, experienced man being equal to several inexperienced workers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge draft officials to give special consideration to deferment of key men now working on our ranches.

GOVERNMENT BEEF-GRADING PUBLICITY

Whereas the grading of food products of various kinds has been greatly enhanced by the war; and

Whereas we will not have the full benefit that can accrue from a national system of beef grading until adequate advertising is given to the Government beef grades: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the United States Department of Agriculture to give frequent time intervals on its radio Farm and Home

Hour to Government beef grading; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the National Livestock and Meat Board to advertise Government beef grades in the millions of booklets which it publishes annually.

FARM CREDIT

Whereas this association has in the past advocated that the Farm Credit Administration remain a cooperative credit institution under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration in Washington; and

Whereas there is now pending in Congress a bill—H. R. 5336—which proposes fundamental changes in the land-bank system: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association endorse those provisions of the bill which limit but do not entirely remove the financial liabilities of the national farm-loan associations, and certain suggested amendments to the bill which increase borrower control by increasing farmer representation in the district boards of directors and by limiting the authority of the Governor to approve the salaries of officers of district units; and be it further

Resolved, That this association oppose those provisions of the bill which decrease borrower investment in the land-bank system and those which provide for the scale-down of debt.

PENALTY ON WHEAT

Whereas livestock producers of the range States are opposed to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program as it applies to the penalty on wheat grown on our own land and fed to our own livestock; and

Whereas it is not possible to grow corn successfully in most of the area of the Western States; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated by our various State experiment stations that wheat is one of our most valuable feeds to finish our livestock for the market: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask Congress to modify the law so as to allow us to grow wheat free of penalty in sufficient quantity to finish our livestock so that we may be able to comply with the request of our honorable Secretary of Agriculture for additional tonnage of meats for our Nation and those who are fighting by our side during this extreme emergency.

PRIORITIES IN RANCH MACHINERY

Whereas in the emergency orders which have been issued dealing with priorities for various equipment and supplies which are most essential to successful livestock ranching and consequently to the production of meat, it appears that there has been insufficient consideration for the needs of ranchers in this regard; and

Whereas it is most essential that livestock ranching should not be unduly hampered: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Office of Production Management to give greater consideration to the needs of ranchers with respect to farm and ranch trucks, to tires for same, to all machinery necessary for the raising and harvesting of farm and ranch crops, and to various types of equipment such as windmill and pump repairs, all of which are vitally essential to successful ranching operations and meat production.

[Exclusive of the regular resolutions adopted, the following telegram was sent to the President at the express direction of the convention at the opening session.]

Recognizing that this Nation is in great danger as a result of our involvement in war, the American National Live Stock Association in convention assembled at Salt Lake City today, representing principally the

range cattlemen and women of the western States, pledges to you that we will gladly make the effort needed to assure a beef supply for the Nation and willingly make the necessary sacrifices to assure victory in order that we may preserve liberty and freedom in and for our Nation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2282. A bill to provide for the planting of guayule and other rubber-bearing plants and to make available a source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses; without amendment (Rept. No. 1099).

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

S. Res. 225. Resolution for an investigation to determine the cause of the fire on the U. S. S. *LaFayette* (the former French liner *Normandie*); without amendment, and under the rule, referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 17, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1526) to provide decentralization of the issuance of orders authorizing the payment of travel expenses in connection with the transfer of civilian employees from one station to another.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. WALSH introduced a bill (S. 2285) to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers in the Navy, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6611) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. CLARK of Missouri each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H. R. 6446) providing for continuing pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard during periods of absence from posts of duty, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMERICA IS IN DANGER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix a radio address on the subject *America Is in Danger*, delivered by Senator LUCAS at Washington, D. C., Friday evening, February 13, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIS

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator WILLIS before the State convention of Young Republicans at Greensboro, N. C., February 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR McGRATH, OF RHODE ISLAND

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Gov. J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, at the annual dinner of the Providence Chamber of Commerce, February 11, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR DILL ON CONGRESSIONAL RETIREMENT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio address delivered by former Senator Dill, on February 5, 1942, on the subject of congressional retirement, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESSES ON OCCASION OF RECEPTION AND DINNER TO MOST REVEREND THOMAS E. MALLOY, BISHOP OF BROOKLYN

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix excerpts from speeches delivered at a good-will dinner and reception held in honor of the Most Reverend Thomas E. Malloy, D. D., Bishop of Brooklyn, on November 27, 1941, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE NEED FOR REFORM—ARTICLE BY HANSON W. BALDWIN

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article by Hanson W. Baldwin, published in the New York Times of today, entitled "The Need for Reform," which appears in the Appendix.]

A ZIONIST ARMY?—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix an editorial from the New York Times of January 22, 1942, entitled "A Zionist Army?" which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6446) to provide for continuing payment of pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the retired and Reserve components thereof, and civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments during periods of absence from post of duty, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Clark, Mo.	Kilgore
Austin	Connally	La Follette
Bailey	Danaher	Langer
Ball	Davis	Lee
Bankhead	Downey	Lodge
Barkley	Doxey	Lucas
Bilbo	George	McCarran
Bone	Gerry	McFarland
Brewster	Gillette	McKellar
Brooks	Glass	McNary
Brown	Green	Maloney
Bulow	Guffey	Maybank
Bunker	Gurney	Mead
Burton	Hayden	Millikin
Butler	Herring	Murdoch
Byrd	Hill	Murray
Capper	Holman	Norris
Caraway	Hughes	Nye
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	O'Daniel
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney

Overton	Stewart	Vandenberg
Pepper	Taft	Van Nuys
Radcliffe	Thomas, Idaho	Wallgren
Reed	Thomas, Okla.	Walsh
Rosier	Tobey	Wheeler
Schwartz	Truman	White
Smathers	Tunnell	Wiley
Spencer	Tydings	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent in a hospital because of a hip injury.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the pending bill does not require extensive explanation. The purpose of the bill is set forth in its title, which is as follows:

A bill to provide for continuing payment of pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the retired and Reserve components thereof, and civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments, during periods of absence from post of duty, and for other purposes.

The bill now presented in the nature of a substitute amendment to the original House bill, if enacted as amended by the committee, would make suitable provision for the support of dependents of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, including the retired and reserve components of those services, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service, and civilian employees of the various Government departments, who have been reported as missing, missing in action, interned in a neutral country, or captured by an enemy, and who are not presumed to be dead or to have deserted.

In general, the purposes of this bill are to provide authorization for the continued payment or credit in the accounts of the pay and allowances of missing persons for 1 year following the date of commencement of absence from their posts of duty or until such persons have been officially declared dead; the continued payment for the same period of the allotments for the support of dependents and for the payment of insurance premiums, and for regular monthly payments to the dependents of missing persons, in the same manner in which allotments are paid, in those instances in which the missing persons had neglected to provide for their dependents through the medium of allotments, such

payments to be deducted from the pay of the missing persons in the same manner in which allotments are paid.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. How is it to be determined who the dependents are?

Mr. WALSH. The head of the department concerned is given authority to determine that fact. In the case of the Army and Navy enlisted personnel, there is a record of their dependents in every case. If the records are missing or lost, as it is quite possible has happened or will happen in the future, authority is given to the department concerned, without review by any other board, to determine who are the dependents.

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose the soldier or sailor comes in later and says, "I did not authorize you to pay out this money to these so-called dependents." Take the case of a man and his wife who are separated and not living together at all: Is there likely to be any trouble along that line?

Mr. WALSH. That is a possibility, Mr. President; but in the meantime it is felt that the known dependents of persons who it is assumed have dependents, and persons who make claims which after investigation are found to be meritorious, should have the money.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why is it necessary to include retired officers?

Mr. WALSH. There are some retired officers who were in active service and are reported among the missing.

I suppose the Senate would like to know how many persons are already included within the scope of the bill. Of course, the number will increase as time goes on. That information already has been made public. Therefore, it is not divulging a military secret to state it now. The question asked of the naval officer who appeared before the committee was as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Are you in a position to state—would it be contrary to the military policy or the defense policy of the Navy to state—approximately the number of persons who are now missing and would come under this bill?

Commander Biggs. Next of kin have been notified in the cases of 56 officers that are supposed to be prisoners of war. We have no definite information, of course; in addition, there are 5 that are missing in action whose status we have been unable to determine.

The CHAIRMAN. Officers?

Commander Biggs. Yes, sir; and as to enlisted men, we have 30 missing, who we have been unable to establish their status. We have 75 that are probably prisoners of war, and approximately 300 others that we suspect to be prisoners of war.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no way, of course, for these prisoners of war to communicate with the Navy Department?

Commander Biggs. At the moment; no, sir.

The officer representing the Marine Corps was asked the same questions, and he stated that the Marine Corps have 44 officers in Manila and 716 enlisted men. As these men cannot be reached, they are embraced in this bill.

Colonel Curtis then said:

Yes, sir, or a total of 760, and reported missing are 1 officer and 65 enlisted men.

There was some other testimony as to the civilians who were in the employ of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, Treasury Department, and the State Department.

There was also testimony to the effect that a number of marines in China probably have been captured or taken prisoner by the Japanese.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Does section 2 of the bill take care of the civilian workmen who were employed on the captured Pacific islands? For instance, at Wake Island, a number of civilians were taken prisoners, and I understand they are now being held in Japan.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; those civilians who are employed by the various Government departments and serving outside the continental limits of the United States are covered in this bill. Other civilians are taken care of in Public Law No. 438, approved February 6, 1942, which makes provision for payment by the Government to dependents of civilians missing and employed by private contractors on public works outside the continental limits.

This bill and Public Law No. 438, therefore, take care of all classes of civilians missing or imprisoned by the enemy.

There is no provision in the bill for compensation to civilians who were injured. I believe the bill which the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has introduced, and which is before the Committee on Education and Labor, deals with that factor, and that will be handled by the Federal Compensation Board, rather than by the military officials or heads of departments whose employees are missing.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Many civilians on the islands were taken prisoner and are now in prison camps. We do not know whether they were injured or not. What I am wondering is, What immediate provision is made for the dependents of civilian workmen who were taken captive at Wake Island, Midway, and other Pacific outposts?

Mr. WALSH. Provision is made in Public Law 438 for them to be compensated, just as they would be if the work were being carried on and they were not taken prisoners of war.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. That is provided for in the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; civilians directly employed by Government departments are in this bill; other civilians are in the public works bill, to which I have referred.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am somewhat interested in this matter, as is the junior Senator from Idaho, as I have had communications from some of my Wisconsin constituents regarding relatives. They are inquiring about persons who, as I

understand, were engaged in civilian activities on some of the islands which have been taken. I understand that the persons who are eligible for the benefits of the proposed act are defined on page 11 of the present print. It reads:

That for the purpose of this act—

(a) the term "person" means (1) commissioned officer, warrant officer, enlisted person (including persons selected under the Selective Training and Service Act, as amended), of the War and Navy Departments, member of the Army or Navy Nurse Corps (female), wherever serving; (2) commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Public Health Service; and (3) civilian officers and employees of executive departments, independent establishments, and agencies (including corporations) of the Federal Government, during such time as they may be assigned for duty outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

I ask the Senator whether that phraseology would include the employees of any private corporations which were engaged in construction or any other technical activities on behalf of any of the executive departments of the Government.

Mr. WALSH. The bill, H. R. 6333, includes them, and that bill is now the law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That would be the interpretation which the Senator, as chairman of the committee, and speaking for the committee, would place upon this language?

Mr. WALSH. I am very happy to have it recorded that this bill and the previous bill promises pay and allowances for all civilians, including those employed by private contractors.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It seems to me that if there were any civilians in private employ on these islands, although performing Government work, who were captured, they should, under the proposed law, have the same benefits and the same treatment accorded persons in the armed services.

Mr. WALSH. In other words, the Senator is desirous of knowing whether the provision covering the civilian employees of the various Government departments would include civilian employees working under contracts made by the Government. It would. Admiral Moreell testified they were already paying those captured civilians employed on public works and asked for such authority in a recent public works bill, and it was granted in Public Law 438, approved February 6, 1942.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. There is nothing more I care to add in explanation of the bill. Is the Senator from Kentucky ready to proceed?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the chairman and members of the Committee on Civil Service regarding the result of their meeting as affecting the status of the bill to repeal the provision of the Retirement Act applicable to the legislative branch of the Government. Many Senators have asked me whether it is my purpose, or the purpose of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], or of any other Senator, to

offer an amendment to the pending bill repealing that provision of the Retirement Act. I have advised them that I desired to consult the Committee on Civil Service to see what action they have taken, and what action they will take, in order to determine whether it will be desirable to undertake to offer an amendment to the pending bill.

In that connection I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Civil Service that I have no desire to embarrass the committee, or to put them in any situation which would embarrass them. Yet I think the members of that committee will realize that the Members of the Senate are anxious to vote on the repealer bill at the very earliest possible date. I should, therefore, like to be informed by the chairman and other members of the committee what the situation is, and what action is likely to be taken, and when.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, in reply to the request of our distinguished leader, let me say that the Civil Service Committee met this morning and took some testimony, and we will meet again tonight at 8 o'clock. The plan is to wind up the hearings tomorrow and to make a report, perhaps not make a report to the Senate tomorrow, but to close the hearings tomorrow; so that the report will be made shortly.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not a very definite or, to be frank, a very satisfactory solution of the matter. I have been informed by members of the committee that the meeting tonight was to be held for the purpose of voting on reporting the bill which is now pending before the committee. If the Senator from South Dakota is correct in his statement, then the information I have received from another member of the committee is not correct. Tomorrow will be Thursday, and if the committee should meet tomorrow, and should even vote to report the bill, and it were not reported tomorrow, then we would have to go over until Friday, and if the report were not made then, we would have to go over to Saturday or to Monday, and it seems to me we should not be subjected to such a delay in order to get this matter before the Senate.

I reiterate that I am only anxious to accommodate Senators. Many Senators, probably, contemplate leaving the city over the week end because of engagements to speak at dinners, and one thing and another, and if we cannot have this question voted on tomorrow, or at least by Friday, then it will go over until next week, and I do not believe it should go over.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The Civil Service Committee, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] said, met this morning and took testimony from those who desired to appear. The committee decided to meet again tonight, and I am confident that, with the cooperation of the members of the committee, a bill can be reported tomorrow, for action by the

Senate tomorrow. Does the Senator from South Dakota agree with me as to that?

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, I should not say that I agree as to that. We shall do the best we can. Personally, I do not see why the distinguished leader should be in such a hurry. I have not heard of any Representative or any Senator who is contemplating resigning in order to go on the retirement list. Why the hurry?

Mr. President, let me say that this was an administrative measure. The chairman of the Civil Service Committee hesitated for quite a while to introduce it; but the request came from the administration. The measure was passed by a substantial majority of the Senate. It was signed by the President. I cannot see why our leader should become so excited about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not any more excited about it than is the Senator from South Dakota. In reply to his suggestion that this was an administrative measure I would at least correct him to the extent that the provision covering congressional pensions certainly was not an administration measure. The general retirement act applying to all Government employees may have been an administration measure. It originated in and passed the other House. I have no recollection that any recommendation by the President or anybody else in the administration ever contemplated the inclusion of Members of Congress in the retirement act, and, to that extent, I think it is not quite accurate to say that it was an administration measure.

Be that as it may, I am sure the Senator from South Dakota cannot be unconscious of that fact that Senators who voted for the measure, as well as Senators who voted against it, or who did not vote at all, feel that it is a matter which ought to be passed upon without delay. They feel, and they have come to me in large numbers, I will say to the Senator, urging that this matter be voted upon at the very earliest possible moment, and I think it ought to be voted on. I think this controversial question ought to be taken out of the field of controversy and debate here and in the country.

I still adhere to my belief that there is no advice which the Civil Service Commission can give that will be helpful in determining how Members of the Senate should vote, and I personally do not see any reason why there should be any delay.

I realize that the committee probably feels some umbrage at me because I may be accused of putting on a little pressure in order to get some action. I certainly did not put any more pressure on the committee than did the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is a member of the committee; and in doing what I did I was trying to accommodate the Senate, and to remove from the Senate a bone of contention that ought to be eliminated from our consideration of the war situation. It was in that spirit that a week ago I took the matter up and pursued it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, would it be satisfactory to the Senator from Kentucky if the report were made tomorrow?

I feel that, with a night session, if the committee remains in session long enough a report can be made tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, a report, if made tomorrow, could not be taken up without unanimous consent, and if we could not have unanimous consent the matter would have to go over until Friday. I will be perfectly frank to say that if we cannot get action on the matter any sooner, and the committee reports tomorrow, I shall move for a session on Friday in order that it may be taken up.

There is a situation to which I think attention ought to be called. I do not know that it will weigh at all with the Senator from South Dakota, but there is another branch of the legislature which has to pass on this matter, and we know that, under the rules of the House, almost any sort of bill that comes over there must have a rule. Its proponents must appear before the Committee on Rules and obtain a rule in order to take up the bill, otherwise it goes on the calendar, and can only be taken up by unanimous consent, or on some Calendar Wednesday, which would involve great delay.

Members of the House of Representatives are anxious to vote on this question as we are. It was thought not unwise to attach this repealer to some bill which the House had passed so the House could take quick action on it when the bill goes back to it. That may not appeal to anyone here, because that is a matter of House procedure, but we have to cooperate in these matters, and I have taken the liberty to confer with Members of the other branch about the procedure in the House, and I take their statement to be accurate.

Mr. President, no one is going to draw any of this pension tonight. It has been stated that 180 Members of Congress have inquired of the Civil Service Commission as to their eligibility and what they would draw in the event they are eligible. That fact, if it be a fact, certainly shows some interest on the part of Members as to their status under the law; but I take it for granted that no one expects any Member of Congress to draw a pension tonight, or tomorrow, or within the next few weeks. It is not on that account that I am urging action. I am urging action because, regardless of all that has happened before in regard to the measure, it is a matter of controversy; it colors everything we are doing; it is coloring the thoughts of the American people with respect to our acts here in the present great emergency; and it certainly ought to be settled and thrown out as a matter of controversy and a bone of contention both in the House and in the Senate. It is because of that situation that I have been pressing for action.

Mr. BULOW and Mr. LEE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, first, to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, in reply to what the distinguished Senator from

Kentucky has said, it would seem to me that we ought to follow ordinary processes of legislation. We ought not to become excited and disturbed. Whether the law is repealed this week or next week does not, it seems to me, make any material difference. In my judgment, the Civil Service Committee ought to be given an opportunity to obtain some reports, give careful consideration to the legislation, and then do what it thinks best in making its report to the Senate. I wish to assure the Senate that we will expedite the matter as much as we can, but I think the committee ought to have an opportunity to hold such short hearings as it desires to hold. We will wind the matter up tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Can the Senator assure us that the committee will make a report tomorrow on the bill one way or the other?

Mr. BULOW. No; I cannot say that I can do so. I am only one member of the committee. If we wind up the hearings to the satisfaction of the rest of the membership, that will be all right with me. The Senator from Kentucky feels that he does not need any information. It is unfortunate that the chairman of the Civil Service Committee is not so well informed.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I meant is that, regardless of any information that may be submitted to the committee on the question, it is a matter of policy. My mind is made up. I know how I feel about it; and I think many other Senators are in the same situation. Whether the cost would be \$100,000,000 or \$3 a year, it would not make a bit of difference to me as to how I shall vote. Whether two Members of the Senate or the House, or all of them, are eligible for retirement privileges, I am not to be controlled by that fact in the vote I shall cast. That is what I mean when I say that no information as to the number of Members who would be eligible, the cost, or the amount anyone would draw, would in the slightest degree influence my vote. I do not know what information would be submitted to the committee except along those lines.

I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who, as we all know, has been active in this matter, and who is a member of the committee, what his views are.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think that with the cooperation of the Senator from South Dakota, chairman of the committee, the bill can be reported to the Senate tomorrow. I understand that he is in favor of making a report tomorrow. We shall have a night session, and, if necessary, we shall stay in session all night. Certain members of the committee think that witnesses should be heard. Personally the Senator from Virginia does not think it is necessary to hear a great many witnesses. The matter is understood and has been discussed, but in order to preserve the ordinary procedure I hope an opportunity will be given, at least until tomorrow, for the Civil Service Committee to make a report. I am convinced that, after due and proper hearings, it can make a report by noon tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator from South Dakota, the Senator from Virginia, and other Senators whether there would be any objection if I should ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate from today until noon tomorrow the committee be given the right to make a report if it is ready to do so.

Mr. BYRD. I thoroughly approve the suggestion.

Mr. BULOW. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that way we could take up the bill at once and dispose of it. I now make that request—

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment; let me make the request.

I ask unanimous consent that, during the recess or adjournment of the Senate from today until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, the Committee on Civil Service be authorized to make a report on the bill repealing the Retirement Act, insofar as it applies to Members of the legislative branch of the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I see no reason in the world why we should not act on this matter today, or else have a definite agreement that the bill will be reported tomorrow. The question is not on the merits or demerits of the act. The majority leader has made that plain. We are in disagreement as to the merits or demerits of a particular part of the act. Whether it is good or bad is a controversial question; but there is one proposition on which we are agreed, and that is that at this time such a provision is unwise and is destroying the unity of the country, and therefore should be repealed at this time. Every day it continues there is that much more damage to national unity and to the morale of our people. That does not have a thing to do with the merits of the provision itself. It is a matter of policy and of the timeliness of it. On that question we are agreed. All the testimony and experts in the world would not change that situation, and would not change the attitude of the people.

The sooner the mistake is corrected the better. When we make a mistake the proper thing to do is to admit it and correct it as quickly as possible. We never decrease trouble by postponing it. I do not see why we cannot act on the matter today. We have a bill pending. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, in charge of the bill, is agreeable to having the repealer attached to the pending bill in order that it may go over to the House. The parliamentary situation would be such that the House could take it up and act upon it immediately, and this irritating thing could be taken out of the national picture so that we could proceed with the war effort. This thing, and a few other irritating things, including a dancer, overshadowed the fall of Singapore; and yet we hesitate to remove the cause of the irritation.

I hope the majority leader will stand his ground and either obtain a definite agreement to vote on the question tomorrow, or go ahead with the plan to attach the amendment to the pending bill. I much prefer that we follow the latter course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—which I hope I shall not have to do—I should like to state to the Senate and to the majority leader that I have already informed the Civil Service Committee that it is my intention to present to the committee some sort of an amendment for a general pension law as a part of the procedure which is now taking place before the committee.

It is also my intention, if the Civil Service Committee shall not accept such an amendment, to try to find some relief for 1,500,000 elderly people who are admitted by all the social agencies to be in misery and destitution. For many months I have sought some appropriate moment to present this subject to the Senate. I consider this to be the most appropriate day I shall ever have. If I can be assured that, under the existing parliamentary situation—and I am frank to state that I do not know what it is—I shall have the opportunity to present my amendment, I shall raise no objection. Otherwise, any objection that is within my parliamentary arsenal will certainly be availed of.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, of course I do not know what sort of an amendment the Senator from California intends to offer before the Civil Service Committee to the bill which it is now considering; but let me say to the Senator that if he should offer an amendment providing for any form of pensions which requires the raising of revenue, the Civil Service Committee would have no jurisdiction over that subject. If such an amendment were offered on the floor of the Senate to a bill which was not a revenue bill, it could not be adopted by the Senate, because all revenue-raising measures must originate in the House. Such an amendment would not be in order on any bill in the Senate unless it were a revenue-raising bill, which the proposed repealer is not.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that the bill I am proposing is not a revenue-raising measure. It is a measure providing an authorization for the payment of a certain amount of pensions to our elderly people who are in destitution and misery. It is not a revenue-raising measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I cannot predict what the Senator will do.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am telling the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I submit my request.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LEE. If the unanimous-consent request should be agreed to, would the majority leader then either insist on a definite promise from the chairman of

the Civil Service Committee that the bill will be reported tomorrow or else go ahead with the plan to attach the amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think in all frankness I ought to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I doubt whether the chairman of the Civil Service Committee can give assurance that his committee will act either tonight or tomorrow. There are 10 members of that committee. Eight of them are now present in the Chamber. I doubt whether the Senator from South Dakota can promise what the committee, by majority vote, will do either tonight or tomorrow. All I can say is that if the bill should be reported tomorrow, and if the agreement I am asking should be entered into and the committee should report the bill tonight, it would be on the calendar tomorrow, and we could take it up tomorrow. If it should not be reported tonight, it would not be on the calendar tomorrow, but we could take it up by unanimous consent. I do not think I should be justified in trying to exact from the chairman of the committee the assurance that the bill will be reported by tomorrow.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me make a parliamentary inquiry. In the event the Senate should agree to the request made by the majority leader, would House bill 6446 also automatically go over until tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, indeed; the request has nothing to do with the bill now under consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. Does that mean that if we pass House bill 6446 today, then, if the Civil Service Committee reports its bill tomorrow, we shall vote separately on that bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a matter of procedure that will have to be determined later. We can either do that, or it will be in order to offer the repealer as an amendment to any other bill which may be taken up.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reason I ask the question is that it seems to me, in view of the parliamentary situation in both Houses, if I correctly understand the parliamentary situation, that the repealer ought to be attached to some measure in order that a direct vote may be had on it in the other House. If I am correctly informed, if we should pass the measure just as reported from the Civil Service Committee, it would mean that no record vote in the House would have to be held.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I am not concerned about whether there is a record vote in the House. That is a matter for them to determine, although I think it would be desirable to have such vote by the other House.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that, from the standpoint of unity in the country, there ought to be record votes both in the Senate and in the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no right to speak for the House, but I have every reason to think there will be a record vote there on the measure. I do not think it can be avoided.

Mr. LUCAS. It means a special rule from the Committee on Rules in the House, so I am informed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I have stated that it would be more convenient all around to attach this proposal to a House bill which is on our calendar, so that when it goes back to the House they can vote on this question directly. That, however, is a matter of procedure for the House. I doubt whether we can outline here what the House shall do in regard to it.

This, however, is a parliamentary situation which may have some influence over us as to how we shall send the measure back to the House. I have been rather busy about this matter for some time, trying to get a vote on it. I do not think I have to explain that. However, I can assure all Senators—although I do not know that I have to give assurance—that, so far as I am concerned, I will do everything within human reason and parliamentary power to bring this matter to an immediate vote in the Senate. Of course, I realize that any Senator may now offer this repealer as an amendment to the pending bill. I may do so; the Senator from Oklahoma may do so; the Senator from Virginia may do so; any other Senator may do so. It is in order on the pending bill.

The only question is whether the repealer should be offered now, in view of the committee's action and their advice that they are meeting tonight on the matter. They have hastened their consideration over and above what it was yesterday, when they put this matter over to next Tuesday, and they have shown at least a willingness to consider it at once.

I do not think there is any doubt that we can get a vote in the Senate this week—tomorrow, or certainly by Friday, and I should prefer tomorrow. If I had my way, I should prefer to do it today. In view of the situation before the committee, however, the assurance that they are meeting even tonight, and that the Senator from Virginia thinks they will make a report tomorrow. I myself do not feel called upon to offer an amendment to the pending bill today, although I had intended to do so, or the Senator from Virginia had intended to do so, or a number of us thrown into the basket here together had intended to do so, if we did not get some assurance of action on this question at once.

What I shall do has no influence on other Senators, but I feel that we can wait until tomorrow to see whether the committee reports; and if it does not report tomorrow, and if there is any disposition unduly to delay the matter, we shall be in session, there will be House bills up for consideration, and the repealer will be in order as an amendment to any bill that is not a general appropriation bill.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I have said all I wish to say. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. I desire to ask the Senator further questions. In regard to allowing the matter to go over and having the

committee to sit all night, what is there that could possibly change the situation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I do not think that would change a vote in the Senate.

Mr. LEE. Exactly; and it would not do anything at all so far as saving a bad situation is concerned. If the members of the committee feel that we are rushing them, of course, I do not want to do that. I am sympathetic with them. They have been a good committee. They have worked hard. They have been on the "up-and-up," and everything of that sort. Nevertheless, here is a situation that is damaging the country. Since there is no possibility that what the committee may do in their meeting will change anything, I desire to say that I shall offer the amendment to the pending bill if the majority leader does not do so, and I shall do everything I can do to have the amendment acted on today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Am I to understand that the Senator from Oklahoma objects to my request?

Mr. LEE. I cannot see—

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not ask the Senator if he could see. [Laughter.] I asked if he objects to my request.

Mr. LEE. I started to say that I cannot see that letting the committee sit all night will help or hurt. I was turning over in my mind the question whether allowing the matter to go over would prejudice the amendment which I hope to have offered from the floor.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico. I do want to hold the floor, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky still hold the floor?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am still attempting to do so. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, whether the so-called pension repealer is voted on today or tomorrow, Representatives and Senators will not in the meantime get any retirement benefits under the Retirement Act. It seems to me that the important thing is the pending bill. I think it is more important than the possible effects on our political welfare of voting today or tomorrow on the so-called pension repealer.

The pending bill is a bill to provide for continuing payment of pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the retired and reserve components thereof, and civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments, during periods of absence from post of duty, and for other purposes. According to the information given by the chairman of the committee, certain of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians are now prisoners of war in Japan. Their dependents are relying upon the enactment of the pending bill to provide them with means by which to exist. Civilians who were captured at Wake Island and other places are dependent upon the enactment of the bill. Yet here we are, debating an entirely separate matter. We talk about unity; we talk about making efforts for prosecuting the war and for winning the war; and yet we are arguing whether

Senators will be deprived of retirement benefits today or tomorrow.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; if it is my right to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. With all the talk and expressions of emotion about getting agreements and promises, I wish the Senator would get a promise from the press that it will say, first, that the Senator from Texas was in the Senate Chamber at the time when the pension bill was considered; and, second, that being here at that time, he voted "nay." I cannot get that information back to my constituents. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky will further yield to me, I shall be through in a moment.

I am sure the press will comply with the request of the Senator from Texas; but I feel that the important thing now is the passage of the pending bill. Who would suffer if we should not repeal today the provision under which Members of Congress might receive retirement payments of \$30, or \$100, or \$500? Some persons will suffer, however, unless the pending bill passes and becomes law.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. Before I yield to the Senator from California, I desire to say that of course the truth is that if some of us who were not here had been here, and if some of those who were here had displayed the same enthusiasm against this proposition that they now display, the bill would not have passed, and we should not be in this mess. [Laughter.] We are in it, however, and I think we shall have to consider how to get out of it in the most dignified way possible without appearing to be too excited or panicky with respect to it.

As I said awhile ago, no one will draw any of this pension money tonight, and no one will draw any of it tomorrow. In my judgment, there is no question that we shall get a vote on the matter tomorrow. There is a certain amount of consideration to which the committee are entitled. I think they are making an honest effort to report on the matter; and, although I am not a member of the committee, I have no doubt in my mind that they will report, and that they will report in favor of repealing the provision.

Although I had given notice that I should offer the amendment on any bill on which it might be permissible, nevertheless, in view of the present situation, I myself do not feel that I ought to offer the amendment at this time; and I will go still further, and say that under the circumstances I do not feel that I ought to vote for any amendment of the kind which may be offered to the pending bill while the committee is practically in session preparatory to reporting to the Senate, and under the circumstances I will not vote for any amendment on the subject which may be offered by any Senator. I believe we will get a vote on the question tomorrow, and that is the fair

and orderly way, it seems to me, in which to do it. We can offer a repealer as an amendment to some other bill that has got to go back to the House of Representatives, or we can pass it as an independent bill and let the House decide on their own parliamentary procedure as to how they shall consider it. I feel that I have got to be entirely consistent and frank about it, because, if I felt like voting for an amendment that any other Senator might offer today, I would offer one myself, but under the circumstances, I do not feel justified in doing so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, who has charge of House bill 6446, whether he would have serious objection if his bill were continued over until tomorrow. I ask the question for fear that there may not be any legislation pending before the Senate tomorrow to which we could attach the so-called pension repeal amendment.

Mr. WALSH. I have no objection to that course being pursued, if it meets the approval of the leader of the majority.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to it.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LEE. If the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois could be agreed to, it would be agreeable to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, all that is necessary in that situation is to move temporarily to lay aside the pending business and proceed to the consideration of something else, or move an executive session, which I am strongly tempted to do. Unless the Senator from California wants to ask me another question, I was going to say, under the circumstances, if the Senator from Massachusetts has no objection to the pending bill going over until tomorrow, I am perfectly willing that the Senate adjourn now until tomorrow.

Mr. WALSH. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky still make his request?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I think the request ought to be made, and I think it ought to be agreed to. It will have no effect on what may happen tomorrow. If the committee can report tonight on the bill, I think it will be helpful.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I want to say that I have consulted with the Parliamentarian, Mr. Watkins, and I believe I know the procedure I am now entitled to take in relation to the amendment which I desire to present to this bill. Therefore I will not raise any objection to the request made by the majority leader. I desire, however, 1 minute more.

I wish to say to the Senate of the United States that the clamor which has arisen over this bill was not directed at Congressmen solely because they passed a bill providing pensions for themselves. The wrath of the American people descended upon Congress because—in every village, hamlet, and city of the United

States—there are, in the aggregate, millions of elderly people, miserable, insecure, almost facing starvation. The American people know that Congress has not yet had the courage or the energy to face that problem. Thus, it is that Congress has brought upon its head this deluge of letters—from sons supporting fathers, when they are not able to do so; from wives whose husbands, old and unable to work, need medical attention and are unable to get it.

I could read to the distinguished Senator from Virginia hundreds of despairing letters from every corner of the United States, written by people who need pensions; need them so desperately that it seems incredible that, in a Christian land, we will allow such conditions to exist.

So I want to serve notice upon the majority leader that it is my intention tomorrow very firmly, seriously, and energetically to present the ideas of 90 percent of the American people—as revealed in the Gallup poll—that we should do something to relieve the anguish and distress of our elderly people. I shall not seek to delay the consideration of the pending bill, which one way or another is of no importance to me, except to consume the time that will be necessary to attempt to bring before the Senate of the United States the decaying, unhappy, and miserable condition of our elderly people.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to say that it is unnecessary for any Senator "to serve notice" on me that he intends to offer an amendment; but I accept the notice.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to House bill 6446, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand no action has been taken on my request?

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I merely wish to say, as one of the patrons of the repealer resolution, that no Senator is more anxious than is the Senator from Virginia for very early action, but I feel, Mr. President, if it is possible to do it without undue delay, that we should go through the regular process of having a report from the committee. I am a member of the Committee on Civil Service; I think it is a good committee; I believe the members of the committee are diligent, and I think they certainly show their diligence by having a meeting tonight. It is the only committee that I have heard of—certainly in years—which has held a meeting at night. I feel convinced that, with the cooperation of the Senator from New York, if possible, and certainly the Senator from South Dakota, the chairman of the committee, the report on the bill can be made tonight, so that it will be in

order for consideration, as I understand, in the ordinary course of business tomorrow. So I express the hope that tonight all members of the Civil Service Committee will be in attendance, and that we will sit there as late as may be necessary so as to hear the witnesses who want to be heard and those the committee will permit to be heard, give due consideration to the matter, and then submit a report to the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to state what I understand the situation to be. I understand that the bill of which I am in charge will remain the unfinished business, and be in order tomorrow on the convening of the Senate. If the Committee on Civil Service reports a bill, my bill, being the unfinished business, will be in order and will be in a position to be voted on, and then there will be an opportunity presented for the bill reported by the Civil Service Committee to be considered and acted upon.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct about that. His bill will remain the unfinished business tomorrow, and if, in the meantime, the Civil Service Committee reports the bill now before it, I hope that the committee will give serious consideration, for the parliamentary reasons already explained, to the suggestion that it offer in the name of the committee its bill as an amendment to the pending bill. I think, if the committee reports in favor of repeal, it itself might well offer it as an amendment to this bill, so that it will go back to the House as a part of this bill for the consideration of that body.

Mr. WALSH. Am I to understand there will be no occasion for the proposed amendment, the Byrd amendment, being offered to the pending bill, which is the unfinished business, in the event the Committee on Civil Service report the bill they are now considering?

Mr. BARKLEY. I was expressing the hope that if the committee should report the repealer bill before the naval bill should be again taken up tomorrow, the committee itself, in its own name, would offer the repealer as an amendment to the naval bill, so that it would go back to the House in such a way that they could act upon it without a special rule.

Mr. WALSH. Or they could report a separate bill and have it immediately taken up.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes; either way. I offered that suggestion for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, from this point in the Chamber I could not hear what the Senator from Kentucky said.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had suggested to the Committee on Civil Service that if it should report by tomorrow a bill repealing the Retirement Act, the committee itself, in its own name, might offer that repealer as an amendment to the pending bill, so that we might act upon it and send it back to the other body. I merely offered that suggestion for the committee to consider.

Mr. LEE. There was no agreement or understanding with regard to anything else? I did not hear all the debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was no agreement or understanding about anything, except that the pending bill is to go over until tomorrow, and we all hope the Committee on Civil Service will act before that time arrives.

Mr. GLASS and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, suppose the Committee on Civil Service does not act, or acts adversely on the proposed amendment; what are those of us who want to repeal the retirement provision at once going to do about it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Any Senator may offer an amendment to the pending bill, regardless of the action of the committee, that will repeal the particular provision of the Retirement Act.

Mr. GLASS. But if the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is going to present his pension proposition before the committee, God only knows when we can act.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a matter for the committee to consider.

INVESTIGATION OF "NORMANDIE" DISASTER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 225, submitted yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], referred to the Naval Affairs Committee, by that committee favorably reported, and subsequently referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 225) submitted by Mr. VANDENBERG on February 17, 1942, was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of all the facts and circumstances with respect to the fire which severely damaged the U. S. S. *Lafayette* (the former French liner *Normandie*) on February 9, 1942, and resulted in her being capsized at her dock at New York City, with a particular view to determining the cause of such fire and whether it was due to negligence or was attributable to the activities of enemy agents or fifth columnists in an effort to impede the prosecution of the war. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such cor-

respondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGE FROM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive during the recess of the Senate following today's session a message from the House of Representatives relating to House bill 6548, the First Deficiency Act of 1942.

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

CONSUMPTION OF SUGAR IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, much interest has been manifested throughout the country in the question of sugar consumption and sugar hoarding. I was astounded this morning to find that the consumption of sugar in 1941 was a million tons above the sugar consumption in 1940, which is almost conclusive evidence of the fact that an enormous amount of hoarding has been going on. I have gathered together figures and statistics which show that our normal consumption from 1937 to 1940 ran from 6,600,000 tons in 1937 to 6,900,000 tons in 1940. The increase of a million tons, or approximately 16 percent, is astounding.

I therefore ask that a statement I have prepared upon the subject matter be inserted in the RECORD at this point. I do so in the hope that the fact that we have available 7,000,000 tons of sugar, according to the estimates I am submitting, will quiet the fears of the housewives, the manufacturers, and the other consumers of sugar, who, in my judgment, have in hoarding a quantity of sugar approximating 750,000 tons. I submit the statement in the hope also that the housewife, the manufacturer, and others who have this quantity of sugar on hand will refrain from purchases until it is used up; for, if the recommendations of the Price Control Administrator and those who have charge of sugar are followed out by the American people, there will be no damaging sugar shortage in the United States in the year 1942, and I am reliably informed that there will be a surplus of about a million tons of sugar left to take care of our needs in 1943.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement referred to by the Senator from Michigan will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT ON SUGAR BY SENATOR BROWN

So much has been said about the sugar supply situation in recent weeks that I think special emphasis should be given to the true facts, for the purpose of showing the general public that hoarding of sugar is unnecessary and that patriotic citizens should use up supplies they have on hand and depend upon general marketing conditions for their supply.

The consumption of sugar for the years 1937 to 1940, inclusive, are as follows:

Sugar consumed in the United States [In round figures]

1937-----	6,600,000
1938-----	6,600,000
1939-----	6,800,000
1940-----	6,900,000

In 1941, due, I think, to the great decline in shipping space caused by the use of our ships in lend-lease and similar carriage, there was apprehension about sugar supply. Consumption figures indicate an increase of approximately 1,000,000 tons, making a total of approximately 8,000,000 tons. The major part of this was probably due to household and manufacturing hoarding. That supply in excess of normal consumption which probably was not in excess of 7,000,000 tons is now an invisible supply.

A very informative and accurate statement was made by the Price Administrator the first week in February in which he called attention to the fact that the loss of approximately 1,000,000 tons from the Philippines would probably continue for some time and that the reason why this is not made up from Cuba is because of the necessity of converting the sugarcane into molasses for alcohol to be used in the manufacture of powder. Lowry & Co., one of the best-informed sugar houses in the United States, in their February 13 letter (printed at the end of this statement) to the trade called attention to the fact that there is an estimated amount available for the year 1942 of 7,000,000 tons which is probably roughly equivalent to our normal consumption. They also estimate that if our civilian consumption is regulated as the rationing program is outlined, we will probably have an excess of 2,500,000 tons of sugar out of this year's available supply; that we will be able to assist our allies, including Russia, Canada, and Great Britain; and that it is probable that after making reasonable provision for them, we will still have 1,500,000 tons available to make up any possible loss of production in 1943.

There is no question but that we must use sugar sparingly and that we must support the Government's program. I cannot express the matter better than is done by the letter to which I have just referred. I quote:

"Just what is a sugar shortage? True, we have been accustomed to the consumption of more sugar than any other nation in the world and two or three times as much as many. Does cutting down our consumption 10 or 20 percent mean a shortage in the accepted term? We think not. To us, it means only the conservative use of sugar, and we believe that can be brought about not by the kind of statements that have been made during the past 3 months but by emphasis on the very complete, frank, and concise statement by Mr. Henderson made to the press about a week ago. This probably because of its quality did not get the headlines in the papers, and, unfortunately, was printed as a rather small item on an inside page. After calling attention to the fact that other supplies were about, or a bit above, normal, he made reference to the fact that 1,000,000 tons from the Philippines would suddenly, for the present, remain cut off. That instead of making this up by increased importations from Cuba, we had wisely elected to convert a like amount of Cuban sugarcane into invert molasses for the production of alcohol, from which munitions were made. Once that is known, everyone will immediately recognize its necessity. Once this is understood, everyone will willingly and naturally curtail somewhat the use of sugar and will take pride in doing so. Some supervision of distribution is called for, but if we release all the supply as it becomes available it is unlikely that handouts at this time will be found necessary. Why not first give the natural forces a chance to work?

As much depends on how a thing is done as on what is done."

It is my hope that this statement will alleviate the fears that have occasioned the storage of sugar both with manufacturers and domestic consumers and by the publication of the real facts assist in public acceptance of the program.

LOWRY & CO., INC.—SUGAR REVIEW

The sugar supply picture: The logical way to arrive at the amount of sugar available for the civilian population and the percentage basis for rationing would be to take stocks on hand at the beginning of the year, add receipts reasonably assured during the year, then deduct essential war needs, exports to Allies, necessary reserves for working stocks, and then if reasonable supplies are envisaged for 1943, say that the remainder is available for distribution and consumption to the civilian population during the current year and ration accordingly.

In view of the fact that so many "ifs," "buts," and "ands" surround the amounts required for war needs, exports to Allies, etc., let us approach the problem from the other end: that is, estimate the amount of sugar required for the civilian population on the basis of present and proposed rationing percentages, and see how much sugar will be left for other purposes. With this "reserve supply" clearly in sight it will be easier to discuss the possible uses to which it may be put, the need for building it up, and the probabilities of an increase or decrease in the rationing percentages for civilian use as the year progresses.

We believe approximately the following amounts of sugar will be available from carry-over stocks or new-crop production during the calendar year 1942:

	Short tons raw value
Fairly certain:	
United States beets-----	2,000,000
Domestic cane-----	1,600,000
Puerto Rico-----	1,250,000
Cuba (raw or refined)-----	2,377,000
Probable:	
Full duty sources-----	\$ 100,000
Indeterminate:	
Hawaii (estimated receipts from crop of approximately 1,000,000 tons)-----	\$ 550,000
Excess invisibles in hands of trade, recoverable by War Production Board-----	\$ 200,000
Philippines-----	0

Estimated amount available 7,077,000

¹ This is somewhat higher than current trade estimates, but is based upon private information from New Orleans which indicates a crop of about 500,000 tons for the State of Louisiana plus 100,000 tons for Florida.

² The Cuban estimate is based upon a total production of 4,250,000 short tons, less one-third in the form of molasses for the Defense Supplies Corporation, less an estimated 456,000 tons of the remaining sugar production for local Cuban consumption and exports to miscellaneous Central and South American markets.

³ Unless there is the expected reduction in the full-duty tariff on sugar by midyear very little of this sugar is likely to be available for United States domestic consumption.

⁴ The quantity to be received from Hawaii is uncertain. West coast arrivals are very nearly normal and, based upon the best information available at the moment, we believe our figure of 550,000 tons may be considered the minimum, with the possibility that most if not the entire crop may become available.

⁵ We estimate hoarding in 1941 from 500 to 750,000 tons. That portion concealed on the shelves of the housewife probably cannot be recovered to any great extent. It will

gradually be eaten up during 1942-43 as a concealed addition to the proposed ration of 12 ounces per person per week. Wholesalers' and manufacturers' excess stocks are more readily subject to audit, however, and the 200,000 tons included in our table represent a rough guess and is much below the 500,000 tons at one time spoken of as being the amount that may be recovered by the War Production Board and redistributed to the same holders or others as a part of the 1942 supply. We have made no other adjustments for initial or final stocks and expect invisibles to remain on the low side for the duration.

The next step is to arrive at our domestic consumption for 1942. So far, the only rationing in effect is that imposed upon receivers, such as wholesalers, jobbers, and manufacturers. They are limited to "80 percent of use or resale" during the base period of 1941. It should be noted that use or resale is not synonymous with the amount received. The 80 percent is therefore not applied to the distribution of approximately 8,100,000 in 1941, but more nearly to the distribution of 1940, increased somewhat, perhaps, to allow for the actual increase in consumption in 1941. For purposes of calculation, let us assume that "use or resale" in 1941 amounted to 7,000,000 short tons. The manufacturing-household ratio is generally calculated at 35 to 65 percent, or, say, 2,450,000 tons and 4,550,000 tons, respectively. If the 80 percent allowance is maintained for the balance of the year, then the indicated manufacturing consumption for 1942 is 1,960,000 short tons (i. e., 80 percent of 2,450,000 tons used in 1941).

According to press reports, the household consumption will be limited to 12 ounces per person per week by means of a rationing card. Assuming a population of 133,000,000, this amounts to 2,593,000 tons. It should be noted that these calculations throw the customary 35 to 65 percent ratio out of balance, favoring the manufacturer in the ratio of approximately 43 percent to only 57 percent for the householder. This may or may not indicate that manufacturers will be scaled down further to put them on a more equal relative basis with the householder or the latter moved up.

In any event, on basis of present information, we have the following picture:

	Short tons raw value
Estimated supply, as determined above.....	7,077,000
Less United States civilian consumption:	
Manufacturers, as above.....	1,960,000
Householders, as above.....	2,593,000
Total.....	4,553,000
Balance for other disposition.....	2,524,000

We should now make provision for exports to Britain, Russia, or other overseas Allies. Last year Britain and Canada took off about 550,000 short tons of the Cuban crop. This year, because of increased production in Santo Domingo, the British West Indies, and possibly larger domestic beet crops, their take may not be so large. It is safe to assume that they will want some part of the Cuban crop however, and a conservative estimate might be from 450,000 to 500,000 short tons. This would reduce our stock pile to a shade more than 2,000,000 tons. Next we have to consider Russia. No one seems willing to accept responsibility for it but for them a figure of 900,000 tons has been mentioned. The amount seems very large. There are so many difficulties of which shipping is not the least yet because we may not be able to give her all the guns, tanks, and airplanes that she wants some argue that we may try to make it up in foodstuffs. This may be true; we

don't know. We think we are generous when we set aside 500,000 tons for Russia and other overseas destinations, exclusive of Canada and Britain, during 1942, and that any deficit in delivery will be held as an additional reserve. Our stock pile then reduces to approximately 1,575,000 short tons raw value.

It may now properly be asked why this apparently large indicated reserve is necessary; and as a matter of fact the question is being insistently asked by a number of disgruntled manufacturers who find their sugar quotas being cut far below current requirements and fear not only a loss of business but the necessity of curtailed employment of labor. It should be immediately apparent that the indicated surplus of 1,575,000 tons shown in our table is not a real surplus resulting from overproduction but is a stock pile to be held by our Government for future domestic use.

With respect to this it may be argued, first; that crops are dependent upon weather. While generally conditions are now good, they may or may not outturn in accordance with earlier estimates. Second, the supplies from offshore areas must be transported in ships; and at the moment, with our far flung battle lines and the necessity of supplying our distant Allies, the conservation of tonnage is of the utmost importance. Losses by sinkings even in our own coastal waters must be considered. Third, despite the provision that one-third of the Cuban crop is to be made into molasses for alcohol production for the munition manufacturers it may be necessary to divert still more to this use. On this point, however, there is considerable controversy and the increased use of grain might possibly alleviate the situation.

These are some of the intangibles of the situation that cannot be accurately measured now, which, it is argued, must be taken into consideration in advance by creating reasonable reserve stocks in Government hands but not in the pantry. It is well to be forehanded, and make reasonable provisions for unforeseen contingencies. A rather fine point is what is "reasonable"? What really is the difference between going on short rations now in order to build up stocks on the theory these may be needed, or going on short rations after we know that it is necessary to do so. In the trade there has long been the saying that sugar is made for use (sale) and not for storing. If the United States were wholly dependent upon distant offshore areas for its entire sugar supply it would be one thing. But with approximately 2,500,000 tons produced within our own borders and another 3,500,000 tons available for our use in Puerto Rico and Cuba, almost within a stone's throw of the mainland there is room for debate as to the advisability of building up in warehouse a huge surplus of actual sugar now, particularly when the producing areas are themselves doing just that very thing in the form of increased plantings. Everywhere there is increased acreage going into sugar. We must not forget that Cuba once made 5,150,000 long tons of sugar (equivalent to 5,768,000 United States short tons). This milling capacity is still available or can be made available as cane plantings are expanded. Louisiana and Florida producers are not idle; and the beet areas are not expected to retrograde. With average growing weather we may easily see an increase in production of around 1,000,000 tons in the year 1943, just from domestic and nearby offshore areas. This estimate takes no account of increasing receipts from Hawaii, increased production in Santo Domingo, Haiti, British West Indies, United Kingdom, and Canadian beet crops—all of which lessen the foreign demand for Cuba's and makes a correspondingly larger supply available for the United States market. Why then when we have these additional supplies to look forward to should we choose a period of short supply to build up warehouse stock? Generally the argument has been to build up stocks

in time of plenty and release everything in time of scarcity.

The present tight situation can be attributed to a number of causes, not the least of which is the fact that we have been in a between-crop period. New crop production is again under way, and as these supplies arrive and are distributed they will afford relief. There has been in the past so much in the press about a sugar shortage that it is not unnatural on one hand a feeling of alarm should have been created, and on the other a feeling something should be done about it; that is, something radical, a bandwagon on which many well-intentioned like to jump. Looked at soberly and judiciously, we see nothing in the situation as it exists today that justifies the feeling of a sugar shortage. Just what is a sugar shortage? True, we have been accustomed to the consumption of more sugar than any other nation in the world, and two or three times as much as many. Does cutting down our consumption 10 percent or 20 percent mean a shortage in the accepted term? We think not. To us, it means only the conservative use of sugar, and we believe that can be brought about not by the kind of statements that have been made during the past 3 months, but by emphasis on the very complete, frank, and concise statement by Mr. Henderson made to the press about a week ago. This probably because of its quality did not get the headlines in the papers, and, unfortunately, was printed as a rather small item on an inside page. After calling attention to the fact that other supplies were about, or a bit above, normal, he made reference to the fact that 1,000,000 tons from the Philippines would suddenly for the present remain cut off. That instead of making this up by increased importations from Cuba, we had wisely elected to convert a like amount of Cuban sugarcane into invert molasses for the production of alcohol, from which munitions were made. Once that is known, everyone will immediately recognize its necessity. No one will contend that the importance of Mrs. Tom, Dick, and Harry having more than an ample supply of sugar is as important as to have the men on the firing lines supplied with more than ample powder. Once this is understood everyone will willingly and naturally curtail somewhat the use of sugar and will take pride in doing so. Some supervision of distribution is called for, but if we release all the supply as it becomes available it is unlikely that handcuffs at this time will be found necessary. Why not first give the natural forces a chance to work. As much depends on how a thing is done as on what is done.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that we in Florida face the anomalous situation of a sugar-rationing program in the United States and an effective prohibition against growing in Florida the sugarcane and producing the sugar which might adequately relieve the sugar shortage.

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

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

Mr. WHEELER. The situation in Florida does not differ from the situation in my own State. In my State there are farmers who are perfectly willing to put in at least 40,000, 50,000, or 60,000 acres of sugar beets. There are persons who are willing to erect factories to process the sugar beets, providing they can have some assurance that they may go on processing them for a few years.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution of the able Senator from Montana. It merely emphasizes the

wisdom of what the able Senator from Montana, the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], and many other Senators on this floor urged a little while ago, when the question of the extension of the Sugar Act for 3 more years was under consideration by the Senate. At that time, Senators will recall, some of us tried to secure the insertion in the bill of a provision that the quota system, when it should go back into effect, should take cognizance of the situation as it might exist at that time. Now every farmer in any State of the Union who engages in the production of sugarcane does so with a flat prohibition staring him in the face against his continuing to grow sugar or to process sugar when the emergency is over, and the sugar quota system goes back into effect.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My State does not produce any sugar, and I do not want to ask the Senator particularly with regard to sugar; but, if my mail is any indication of that which Senators from other agricultural States receive, there is another situation which applies not only to sugar but to every other agricultural product, and that is that it will be very difficult to induce farmers to increase their agricultural production, and very difficult for the farmers to do so if they try, so long as the present situation prevails with regard to farm labor. The draft authorities do not give agricultural labor a deferred status, although they give it to motion-picture actors and those engaged in various other industries which seem to me to be absolutely nonessential, and the Government is setting up defense plants in the neighborhood of great agricultural areas, where agricultural labor can simply walk off the farm, and, by taking 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 weeks' training, get \$14 or \$15 a day for other defense labor, a wage with which the farmers cannot compete.

It seems to me that the whole agricultural situation, including the question of increased production of sugar and everything else, must be looked into in the light of the condition with regard to labor which confronts the farming interests of this country by reason of what I have just described.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his contribution. Undoubtedly if there is to be protection of the agricultural interests of our country during this emergency there must be a reexamination of some of the statutes we have put on the statute books, to ascertain whether it may be necessary to alter some of the provisions now in effect in order to give agriculture fair consideration.

So far as the national interest is concerned, we have been very much excited here yesterday and today about repealing, instantaneously, a so-called pension system. That is a misnomer. It is, as a matter of fact, a contributory retirement system. As I have said, we are very much excited about repealing a provision of the law which would cost the United States Government \$80,000 a year, as informed Senators on the floor of the

Senate say. Yet the agricultural interests of this country are attempting to grow sugar, and are endeavoring to provide it for the housewives and for use in industrial processes, and we cannot even get anyone concerned about the detriment to the national interest to which reference was made in the beginning of my remarks.

PAY-ROLL SAVINGS PLAN FOR THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before we conclude our session I desire to make a brief statement for the information of Senators and members of their staffs. It pertains to the introduction of a pay-roll savings plan in the Senate, with special reference to the sale of Defense bonds and stamps.

Our plans for financing the war are based on the belief that the American people, of their own free will, believing as they do in the supremacy of democracy, want to assume their share of its cost to support the men in the service. In this effort no group should be more active than the Members of the United States Senate and their employees. We want to be in the front rank of that vast army of patriotic citizens throughout the country who are to supply fighting dollars for fighting men.

There are being established throughout the country, in all forms of private industry, pay-roll savings plans whereby every man and woman gainfully employed are given the privilege and opportunity to purchase United States Defense savings bonds through periodic allotments from their wages.

Under this pay-roll savings plan, which is entirely voluntary, the Members of the Senate and employees of the Senate may sign a card which will authorize the Senate financial clerk to withhold monthly a specified sum from their salaries, to be accumulated in individual accounts until a sufficient sum has accrued for the purchase of a bond of any denomination. The bond will be purchased, registered in accordance with our instructions, and delivered either directly to us or to a designated address. This procedure will be continued for the duration and until victory is assured. Should anyone at any time find it necessary to cancel his authorization, he may do so and receive a refund of any money that has accumulated. The amount of the periodic allotment will be left for each Senator or employee to determine.

As the Secretary of the Treasury has said, "War is always costly; however, it is a million times more costly to lose than to win." Throughout the Nation production schedules are being forced to maximum in order that an overwhelming number of planes, tanks, ships, and guns properly and adequately to equip our men in the front lines may be promptly forthcoming. Here is an opportunity for many of us to lend personal aid to the war effort. Let us get behind it. None of us should be satisfied until this plan has been put into effect and is in force in the Senate and in our offices.

Let me point out that under this plan any bonds purchased by Senators or their employees will be credited to their home

States in order to increase the amounts subscribed for within their States.

As I have stated, this is purely voluntary; it is only a suggestion which is in compliance with plans which those in charge of the Defense bonds program are working out in all the States, and in every industry, however large or small. I think it would be a fine example to the country for the Members of the Senate and their employees to follow the same plan in the purchase of bonds and stamps.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I think this is a meritorious suggestion. Why would it not be helpful to all the Senators and their office personnel if the matter were handled by the disbursing office, and if a notice of the method or plan involved were directed to each of our offices, so that it would be more easily complied with?

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for that suggestion. I am satisfied there will be no difficulty in working out the plan with the financial clerk of the Senate, who will be glad to bring it to the attention of all Senators and their office forces, and all employees of the Senate, whether in our offices or elsewhere around the Capitol.

Mr. MEAD. I believe we should set an example, and this gives us an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I think the Senate should set the example.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, yesterday's New York Times—a splendid newspaper, by the way, which has been very considerate of the Congress in connection with the debate on retirement—carried the story that, following the discussion in the Senate yesterday, I introduced a bill which would make 65 years as the age of retirement, and which would prevent anyone now a member of a State or local retirement system from coming under the Federal system.

I stated during the debate—and I know the newspapers will want to make correction—that I would not introduce a bill, nor would I introduce an amendment to the appropriation bill which was then under consideration, because I wanted to be consistent with my request that our committee be permitted to consider the bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], that therefore I would offer no competition by introducing any proposed legislation of my own. That would permit the committee to consider the bill of the Senator from Virginia, and the committee members could make their own decision based on how they felt about the matter. So, Mr. President, I withheld introducing a bill in order that the committee might give proper consideration to the proposal of the Senator from Virginia. Of course, if the committee desires to consider any amendment I may offer, or which any other Senator may offer, that is within the power of the committee.

Mr. President, in order to make the record clear, I now state that I did not introduce the original bill, nor have I introduced any bill subsequent to the discussion of the matter on the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Navy, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Sundry persons for appointment and promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

From the Committee on Appropriations:

Edward N. Jones to be State director for the Office of Government Reports for Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY—CHARLES H. LEAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of CHARLES H. LEAVY to be United States district judge for the western district of Washington.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I do not desire to occupy the time of the Senate for more than a moment, but I would not have the nomination of Judge LEAVY confirmed without at least some representative of the State of Washington calling attention to the fact that he has served in the House of Representatives for a number of years, and prior to becoming a Member of the House he had a long record of honorable service in the State of Washington.

He was elected prosecuting attorney of the county where he lived, and subsequently served the people of Spokane County on the bench as a superior court judge, where he had a very honorable career, and where he was looked upon as a very honorable lawyer, and a just and upright judge. I know it will bring great happiness to Judge LEAVY to be named to the Federal district bench in my State.

I have one thing further to say for the RECORD. Some question has been raised in our State about the fact that the vacancy to which Judge LEAVY has been appointed has existed for some time—about 2 years. Let it be said that for some reason—which was not made apparent either to me or to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, before whom I discussed the matter—there

have been some 20 or 25 judicial vacancies in the United States which were unfilled for a period of from a year and a half to 2 years, and this vacancy in Washington was merely one of them. I want this statement to go into the RECORD for the information of the press of my State, and of my colleagues in the Senate. I asked why it was, and I could not find out. I desired to absolve myself for any delay in the matter. From time to time I sought consideration of various able men whose names have been presented to me, among which was that of Judge LEAVY. The President desired to appoint him, and he was appointed, and his nomination is now before the Senate for confirmation.

I want the RECORD to show that in the case of the Washington judgeship no greater delay was occasioned than in connection with numerous other judicial posts around the country. They were not filled, and I was unable to ascertain why they were not filled. I want my colleagues in the Senate and the people in the State of Washington to understand that in this case no more delay was occasioned than in many other instances.

I think we can all feel gratification that one of our legislative brethren has been elevated to the bench. He is a dignified gentleman and will honor the bench by his presence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the name of Clinton R. Barry to be United States attorney for the western district of Arkansas.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Powless W. Lanier to be United States attorney for the district of North Dakota.

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

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William B. Fahy to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George J. Keinath to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert A. Sanders to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming.

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

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Agnes M. Hodge to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 35.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry V. Schwalbach to be collector of customs for collection district No. 37.

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

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William A. Sheehan to be State Director for Connecticut.

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

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James H. Flanagan to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission.

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

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of yesterday and today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of yesterday and today.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 19, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18 (legislative day of February 13), 1942:

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Bryson Bruce, April 1, 1941.

Ernest D. McWhorter, September 1, 1941.

Richmond K. Turner, December 8, 1941.

Arthur S. Carpender, December 8, 1941.

Julius A. Furer, January 1, 1942.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Clinton E. Braine, Jr., December 1, 1941.

Arthur C. Miles, December 8, 1941.

William M. Fichteler, December 8, 1941.

Gerald F. Bogan, December 8, 1941.

Sidney E. Dudley, December 8, 1941.

Grover C. Klein, December 8, 1941.

Willard A. Kitts 3d, December 8, 1941.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Bertram J. Rodgers	Samuel P. Ginder
Frank E. Beatty	Van Hubert Ragsdale
John H. Carson	Leon O. Alford
Robert B. Carney	James E. Boak
Arthur W. Radford	Robert P. Luker
Webster M. Thompson	Lewis J. Stecher
Andrew D. Mayer	Harry J. Reuse
Charles T. Joy	Gerard H. Wood
Charles J. Wheeler	

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Charles M. Huntington, April 1, 1941.
 Frederick I. Entwistle, November 1, 1941.
 Burnett K. Culver, November 1, 1941.
 Clinton A. Misson, December 1, 1941.
 Thomas L. Lewis, December 1, 1941.
 William D. Johnson, Jr., December 8, 1941.
 Philip G. Nichols, December 8, 1941.
 Robert E. Jasperson, December 8, 1941.
 James V. Carney, December 8, 1941.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Robert F. Hickey	John W. Jamison
John M. Hoskins	Ralph E. Butterfield
Joseph P. Rockwell	William B. McHugh
Leonard Kaplan	Frederick D. Kime
Ruthven E. Libby	John H. Willis
Francis H. Whitaker	Clement F. Cotton
Carlyle L. Helber	Franklin O. Johnson
Dale Quarton	Charles F. M. S. Quinn
Nicholas A. Drait	Timothy F. Wellings
Henry A. Ingram	Donald L. Erwin
Robert N. Hunter	Eugene B. Oliver
Leslie A. Kniskern	Logan McKee
Walter E. Zimmerman	Clarence E. Aldrich
Wilson P. Cogswell	Leslie K. Pollard
Ralph C. Kephart	Harold A. Houser
Alden R. Sanborn	James A. Roberts
Milton E. Miles	Lionel L. Rowe
William Sterling Parsons	Floyd F. Ferris
Robert E. Blue	Jefferson D. Beard
Adolph E. Becker, Jr.	John A. Sweeton
Bruce B. Adell	Richard W. Dole
Roger E. Nelson	Edward C. Craig
Herbert E. Regan	John S. Harper
Warren K. Berner	Woodson V. Michaux
Robert E. Blick, Jr.	Alfred R. Taylor
Robert K. Wells	

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

James M. Smith, April 1, 1941.
 Frank Turner, November 1, 1941.
 Ulysses S. G. Sharp, Jr., November 1, 1941.
 Eugene E. Lindsey, November 1, 1941.
 Leo W. Nilon, December 1, 1941.
 Robie E. Palmer, December 1, 1941.
 James S. Willis, December 8, 1941.
 Robert Brodie, Jr., December 8, 1941.
 Frederic S. Habecker, December 8, 1941.
 Farar B. C. Martin, December 8, 1941.
 Randolph B. Boyer, December 8, 1941.
 Paul L. High, December 16, 1941.
 Hysell P. Cooper, December 16, 1941.
 Howell J. Dyson, December 16, 1941.
 Edward S. Addison, December 16, 1941.
 John C. Woelfel, December 16, 1941.
 Willard A. Saunders, December 16, 1941.
 Blinn Van Mater, December 16, 1941.
 George D. Dickey, December 16, 1941.
 Thomas B. Neblett, December 16, 1941.
 Thomas M. Dykers, December 16, 1941.
 Mitchell D. Matthews, December 24, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Frank Bruner	John R. Waterman
Thomas J. Flynn	Louis H. Hunte
Selden G. Hooper	Courtney Shands
Walter C. Winn	Monroe B. Duffill
Albert R. Heckey	Herbert D. Riley
Joseph J. Carey	Henry T. Jarrell
Wayne R. Loud	Eugene L. Luginbuhl
Louis T. Malone	Julian D. Greer

William R. Caruthers	Henry Farrow
Joe Taylor	Halle C. Allan, Jr.
Philip H. Ross	John W. Murphy
Leonard B. Southerland	Edward H. Eckelmeyer, Jr.
Frank Virden	Selman S. Bowling
William R. D. Nickelson, Jr.	Robert L. Densford
Emile R. Winterhalter	Robert B. Alderman
Robert J. Foley	Ross R. Kellerman
Frank M. Hammitt	Jules F. Schumacher
William S. Harris	Howard A. Yeager
Carl M. Dalton	Arthur H. Taylor
William H. Brockman, Jr.	George A. Lewis
Charles R. Carroll	Alan R. Montgomery
William C. Asserson, Jr.	Malen Durski
	John Bailey
	Gus B. Lofberg, Jr.
	Marion M. Byrd

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Forrest R. Biard, July 1, 1941.
 John R. Bromley, July 1, 1941.
 Nels C. Johnson, July 1, 1941.
 James H. Ashley, Jr., July 1, 1941.
 Sidney D. B. Merrill, July 1, 1941.
 Roscoe F. Dillen, Jr., August 1, 1941.
 Frederick R. Schrader, August 20, 1941.
 Anthony Talerico, Jr., August 27, 1941.
 Robert E. Dornin, September 1, 1941.
 Noel A. M. Gayler, September 1, 1941.
 John A. Hack, September 1, 1941.
 William P. Gruner, Jr., September 14, 1941.
 John F. Walling, October 1, 1941.
 Romondt Budd, October 22, 1941.
 John W. McCormick, November 1, 1941.
 Robert B. McLaughlin, November 1, 1941.
 John J. Baranowski, November 1, 1941.
 James R. North, November 1, 1941.
 Fred E. Bakutis, December 1, 1941.
 Stephen W. Carpenter, December 1, 1941.
 Omar N. Spain, Jr., December 1, 1941.
 Charles D. Hoover, December 8, 1941.
 Meivin E. Radcliffe, December 8, 1941.
 Robert E. McC. Ward, December 8, 1941.
 Keats E. Montross, December 8, 1941.
 Raymond M. Parrish, December 8, 1941.
 Frederic W. Brooks, December 8, 1941.
 Chester A. Briggs, December 16, 1941.
 James W. Thomson, December 16, 1941.
 William T. Powell, Jr., December 16, 1941.
 Vincent A. Sweeney, December 16, 1941.
 John S. Barleon, Jr., December 16, 1941.
 Harold J. Islev-Peterson, December 24, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Oliver D. Finnigan, Jr.	Jefferson D. Parker
Henry C. Tipton	Robert E. Riera
Sherwood H. Dodge	John J. Powers
Edgar S. Keats	Stanley E. Ruehlow
William G. Jackson, Jr.	George L. Conkey
Louis R. Hird	Edgar G. Osborn
Malcolm T. Wordell	Ralph R. Beacham
John O. Curtis	Rhodam Y. McElroy, Jr.
Don W. Wulzen	Warren J. Bettens
John A. Heath	Frank B. Herold
Russell H. Smith	Nevett B. Atkins
James Scott 2d	Charles B. Langston
Frank K. Slason	Ralph J. Baum
Kenneth F. Musick	Robert H. Prickett
Fenelon A. Brock	
Joseph H. Wesson	

Ensign John K. Knapper to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 4th day of June 1939.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 2d day of June 1941:

Vincent E. Schumacher	Hurlbut E. Gillmor
Robert E. Seibels, Jr.	Ira G. Stubbart
William K. Rogers	Leon W. Rogers
George F. Dalton	Thomas H. Suddath
Alphonse Minvielle	Heber Player
Harry B. Stott	Robert C. Fletcher
Kenneth G. Robinson	Charles J. King
Leo R. Schwabe	Wilson H. Cranford

The following-named medical inspectors to be medical directors in the Navy, with the

rank of captain, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941:

Eben E. Smith
 James W. Ellis
 Earl Richison

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

John M. Bachulus	Lloyd R. Newhouser
Arthur P. Morton	Thomas F. Cooper
John Q. Owsley, Jr.	Carl M. Dumbauld
Arna B. Chesser	Walter F. J. Karbach

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941:

James G. Neff
 Herbert G. Shepler

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Marshall Cohen, April 1, 1941.
 Walter R. Miller, August 1, 1941.
 Marion E. Roubesh, August 1, 1941.

The following-named dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Francis W. Lepeska
 George H. Rice
 Henry C. Lowry

Passed assistant dental surgeon Jesse B. Bancroft to be a dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941.

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John H. Lalley, April 1, 1941.
 Erling J. Lorentzen, August 1, 1941.
 Carl J. Hoffer, August 1, 1941.
 Mallie A. Griffin, August 1, 1941.
 Emeron F. Bachhuber, August 1, 1941.
 William J. van Ee, August 1, 1941.
 David M. Fox, August 1, 1941.

Pay inspector William V. Fox to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941.

The following-named passed assistant paymasters to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 16th day of December 1941:

Donald B. Hilton
 Theodore S. Dukeshire
 Charles J. Naumilket

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Edward S. Rhea, April 1, 1941.
 William W. Hylan, September 1, 1941.
 Graham P. Bright, October 1, 1941.
 Louis M. Detweiler, October 11, 1941.
 Joseph M. Lyle, October 11, 1941.
 Thomas A. Brown, October 1, 1941.
 Emory D. Stanley, Jr., January 1, 1942.
 Warren E. Oliver, January 1, 1942.
 John G. O'Handley, January 1, 1942.
 Herschel J. Goldberg, January 1, 1942.
 John W. Bottoms, January 1, 1942.

Acting Chaplain Roy E. Bishop to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of April 1941.

The following-named civil engineers to be civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of July 1939:

Henry R. Lacey
 Paul J. Halloran
 Algert D. Alexis

Radio Electrician George M. Chaffin to be a chief radio electrician in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 2d day of December 1941.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 2d day of December 1941:

William J. Condon
Guy A. Mason

The following-named pay clerks to be chief pay clerks in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the date stated opposite their names:

Richeleau X. James, October 20, 1940.
Rodney N. Gray, January 10, 1942.

The following-named commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

John E. Rezner, July 19, 1941.
Thomas M. Dell, Jr., August 1, 1941.
Joel Newsom, August 1, 1941.
Apollo Soucek, August 27, 1941.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Daniel T. Birtwell, Jr., April 1, 1941.
Dewitt C. E. Hamberger, May 1, 1941.
James W. Blanchard, July 1, 1941.
Arthur C. W. Baskin, July 1, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Theodore H. Brittan, April 1, 1941.
James D. Ferguson, April 1, 1941.
Henry S. Monroe, May 1, 1941.
Matthew DeMaria, May 1, 1941.
William M. Rakow, June 1, 1941.
James E. Vose, Jr., July 1, 1941.
Robert M. Milner, July 1, 1941.
Thomas H. DuBois, July 1, 1941.
Albert P. Coffin, July 1, 1941.
John N. Shaffer, August 1, 1941.
David W. Taylor, Jr., August 1, 1941.
Blake B. Booth, August 1, 1941.
Evan T. Shepard, August 1, 1941.

Assistant Paymaster James F. Parker to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 2d day of June 1941.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Robert A. Winston to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of November 1939 to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Capt. Porter M. Hoidale, United States Marine Corps, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 2d day of August 1939.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 18 (legislative day of February 13), 1942:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CHARLES H. LEAVY to be United States district judge for the western district of Washington.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Clinton R. Barry to be United States attorney for the western district of Arkansas.
Powless W. Lanier to be United States attorney for the district of North Dakota.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

William B. Fahy to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri.
George J. Keinath to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio.
Albert A. Sanders to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Agnes M. Hodges to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 35, with headquarters at Minneapolis, Minn.
Henry V. Schwalbach to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 87, with headquarters at Milwaukee, Wis.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

William A. Sheehan to be State director for the Office of Government Reports for Connecticut.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James H. Flanagan to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Herbert H. Maxham, Austell.
Zack L. Strange, Collegeboro.
William Wayne Pate, Davisboro.
Bessie E. Meeks, Kite.
Estelle C. Tapp, Powder Springs.
Floy F. Barnett, Resaca.
Emma S. Brindie, Surrency.

MONTANA

Cletus J. Walsh, Polytechnic.

NEW YORK

Melvin L. McNeess, North Chili.
Richard J. Longtin, Paul Smiths.
Mary M. Bihn, Victory Mills.

OKLAHOMA

Harry B. Lyne, Boynton.

OREGON

Loris V. Farleigh, Sisters.
Mayrue Gregory, Westport.

WYOMING

Ina E. Gentry, Lance Creek.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Frederick Elwood Uhl
Rene Edward De Russey Hoyle
John Hutchison Hester
Jack Whitehead Heard
James Irvin Muir
John Clifford Hodges Lee
Hubert Reilly Harmon
Leonard Townsend Gerow
Omar Nelson Bradley
Henry Terrell, Jr.
Willis Dale Crittendenberger
Walton Harris Walker
Ralph Pittman Cousins
George Edward Stratmeyer
James Garesché Ord
Edwin Forrest Harding
Alexander Day Surles

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Harold Cornelius Vanderveer
Ralph Hospital
Lunsford Errett Oliver
John Beugnot Wogan
Vernon Edwin Prichard
Serenio Elmer Brett
Carlos Brewer
Lawrence Babbitt Weeks
Clarence Ralph Huebner
Louis Aleck Craig
Frank Emil Stoner
James Ernest Baylis
Andrew Davis Bruce
William Edmund Larned
Bethel Wood Simpson
Joseph Lawton Collins
Francis Murray Brady
John Earl Lewis
John Eugene McMahon, Jr.
Joseph May Swing
Frank Johnson McSherry
Gordon de Launey Carrington
Henry Benjamin Holmes, Jr.
William Moses Goodman
John Tayler Lewis
Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom
Albert Whitney Waldron
Earl Herbert Metzger
Frank William Milburn
Stephen J. Chamberlin
Leroy Hugh Watson

Adlai Howard Gilkeson
Carl Adolphus Hardigg
Thomas Guerdon Hearn
William Rudolph Gruber

APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONELS

Donald David FitzGerald
Austin Walrath Martenstein
Edwin Barton Bobzien
John D. Corkille
Levi L. Beery

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS

James Van Gorder Wilson
John Kimball Brown, Jr.
Robert Morris Stillman
Richard Elmer Ellsworth
Joseph Gordon Russell
Kenneth Paul Bergquist

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, REGULAR ARMY, INFANTRY

Rex Applegate
Robert Mayer Hamilton
Corson Landrum Hilton, Jr.
Almon Louis Hugins, Jr.
Lucien Fairfax Keller
Jean Koke Lambert
Verle Douglas Miller
Frank Henry Stone
Joseph Szabo
Lamar Asbury Welch

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, REGULAR ARMY, FIELD ARTILLERY

Charles Woodburn Matheny, Jr.
Henry Gaston Mitchel 3d

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, REGULAR ARMY, COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

John Elliott Arthur, Jr.
Eugene Lyle Hess

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, REGULAR ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

James Edwin Foley
Jesse Thomas, Jr.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, REGULAR ARMY, QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Robert Sigman Regenstein

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, REGULAR ARMY, CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

Richard Oliver Gordon
Leonard Charles Miller

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Devitt Talmage Mullett
Capt. James Durward Barnett

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Vandervoort
Maj. Edwin Vivian Dunstan
Capt. William Arthur Davis, Jr.
First Lt. Joseph Edward Gill
First Lt. Albert Edward Stoltz
First Lt. Lawrence Robert St. John

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS

William Stanley Bagnall
James Edmund Vickers
William Richard Corcoran
Jack Robert Hughes
Theodore Alexander Kiersch
James Lee Royals

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, VETERINARY CORPS

Edward James Watson

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Maj. Robert Edward Cullen

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Ralph Finch
First Lt. Robert Carson Kyser

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Lt. Col. Carl Hugo Jabelonsky
 Maj. Robert Stanley Beard.
 Capt. Elmer Elsworth Kirkpatrick, Jr.
 Capt. Clarence Renshaw.
 Capt. Howard Hart Reed.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Stanley Warren Connelly.
 TO SIGNAL CORPS
 Capt. Eugene Anthony Kenny.

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. Irwin Miles Parry.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

David McLean Crawford to be colonel, Signal Corps.
 John Nathaniel Hauser to be colonel, Field Artillery.
 Thomas Jay Hayes to be colonel, Ordnance Department.
 William Hale Wilbur to be colonel, Infantry.
 Sidney Parker Spalding to be colonel, Ordnance Department.
 Byron Quinby Jones to be colonel, Cavalry.
 Stephen Harrison MacGregor to be colonel, Ordnance Department.
 Davenport Johnson to be colonel, Air Corps.
 James Kirk to be colonel, Ordnance Department.
 Robert McGowan Littlejohn to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.
 Wade Hampton Haislip to be colonel, Infantry.
 Robert Nall Bodine to be colonel, Ordnance Department.
 James Harve Johnson to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our blessed Lord God, in whom are centered our longings and aspirations, be very near us this day and continue Thy ministry in our hearts. As we wait in the divine presence, we pray with faltering lips and with humble spirits that Thou wilt forgive the iniquity of our sins and cleanse us from their love and power. In the light of Thy countenance may we feel our need; in view of Thy mercy we loathe our evil tendencies, and let Thy forgiveness fill our souls with the glow of the divine nature.

As the wheels of life bring hunger and thirst, cold, and sickness to those who are wrestling for the daybreak, may we not seek rest from labor but prepare us for toil, making these days for fellowship and human brotherhood, which are the promise and the foretaste of a better world. We call upon Thee, our blessed Saviour, because we are blind, poor, and sinful; clothe us in righteousness amid the conflict and the struggle, the wonder and the mystery, and Thine shall be the glory forever. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced

that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6548. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1521. An act to provide that the Navy ration shall include canned or powdered or concentrated fruit or vegetable juices.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD regarding the understanding said to have been reached between General Hershey and the Secretary of Agriculture, having to do with the deferment of men in respect to the draft, and to include therein certain excerpts and letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial in the New York Times by John Kieran.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a release from the Bonneville Administration, showing the immense amount of electric horsepower possible in the Pacific Northwest. I hope it will be read by the full membership.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.

PRICE OF LAND IN ARLINGTON COUNTY

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.

PIRACY ON THE HIGH C'S

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, all I know about it, as Will Rogers used to say, is what I read in the papers, but how in the world the Government justifies the fact that it pays or offers to pay \$522,040 for nine pieces of land in Arlington County that are this minute carried on the tax rolls of that county at a total assessed valuation of approximately \$300,000 is beyond me.

The owners have been satisfied to pay taxes for years on this and on much lower valuations. They have insisted that the property was not worth more than the figure at which it was assessed. Now,

when it comes to selling, it is a horse of a different color, yet they ought to take into consideration the price they have fixed for fair value for taxpaying purposes and on which they have paid taxes as the fair value to them through the years.

If you will take a look at the lots and the location, you will agree that the exorbitant and extravagant price the Government is being forced to pay for these properties, as against their real value, makes the McLean \$1,000,000 mess growing out of the purchase price paid for Friendship—or on account of it—look like a piker.

It is none of my business, but I am wondering what the taxpayers of Arlington County are thinking about this thing.

I understand the worst is yet to come, while the good old Government can be bled white in its emergency. Think it over!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain communications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.

MR. WILLIAM C. BULLITT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I picked up this morning's Post and saw that President Roosevelt wants Mr. Bullitt to run for Governor of Pennsylvania. When Mr. Bullitt was pressed for an answer, he said that anything the President wants "I shall certainly do." He would be a good man to have in the State of Pennsylvania, because, if I understand correctly, the Federal Government is now trying to get control of the States; and if the President had his own man for Governor of Pennsylvania, then he and JOE GUFFEY would certainly have a picnic in Pennsylvania. They would take the State over—that is what the President would do; not only Pennsylvania but all States and the Government. I think the President of the United States right now has enough to do. I think the President should attend to some of the strikes that are going on; for instance, at the Alcoa plant in Detroit, at the Detroit Nut Co., and at the Mobile shipbuilding plant; all these strikes hinder the prosecution of the war. If the President of the United States wanted to do something for America, he would stop his political meddling, he would attend to those things most important; on the other hand, he would at least try to stop the war in labor unions, or win the war he successfully maneuvered us into all over the world.

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

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial appearing in the Binghamton Sun on the activities of a distinguished predecessor of mine, Hon. William H. Hill, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain editorials from Puerto Rico and also a message from the Puerto Rican Leader to the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a very splendid article recently written about the President by Michael E. Hennessey, of Boston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LARRABEE was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

AMENDING SECTION 7 OF THE NEUTRALITY ACT OF 1939

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 133, amending section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this resolution has the support of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. A rule also has been granted by the Rules Committee. The statement was made and the understanding is that the matter will come up under a rule later in the day. Therefore, this procedure simply expedites that which will come later.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman explain the resolution so that everybody will understand it? When the matter was suggested yesterday it was delayed in order that all Members could have an opportunity to know it was coming up today.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. RICH. Has the Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously passed on the bill?

Mr. BLOOM. The Foreign Affairs Committee has passed on the bill. There was one objection in the committee, but that objection has been withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 133 was brought to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate by a message of the President of the United States, which reads:

Section 7, now in effect, prevents essential financial transactions between persons within the United States and our cobelligerents. In my opinion, there was never any intention that this section should operate during our belligerency. I hope that the Congress will act promptly in this matter to legalize transactions essential in the effective prosecution of the war.

Senate Joint Resolution 133 is a very short resolution. It merely provides that section 7 shall not operate when the United States is at war.

This joint resolution was considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a week ago today, and by unanimous consent was taken up the same afternoon in the Senate and passed. There was no objection to it, even by Senator JOHNSON. I understand that Senator JOHNSON had been somewhat concerned about what effect this resolution might have on the Johnson Act, but when the measure came up on the floor of the Senate he was convinced that the Johnson Act would in no way be affected by Senate Joint Resolution 133.

It is proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 133 that section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 be made inoperative when the United States is at war.

The pertinent parts of section 7 read as follows:

Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, or political subdivision thereof, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit * * * to any such government, political subdivision, or person.

The neutrality proclamations issued under the act of 1939 apply to many of the nations with whom we are now associated in the war effort. Section 7, therefore, is bringing about consequences which are harmful to the war effort of both the United States and the other United Nations.

This is because section 7 prevents many operations between persons in the United States and the governments and citizens of the United Nations which are useful and important in the war effort.

For instance, section 7 has the effect of preventing the extension of credit by any American citizen to governments or the agents of governments which are affected by the Neutrality Act. It means that American firms or banks cannot extend even short-term credit accommodation to an enterprise such as the Canadian National Railways in connection with its important purchases in the United States. It has also acted to prevent the extension of short-term credit by American aircraft engine manufacturers to representatives of Canada and the Netherlands East In-

dies. The lack of such short-term credit accommodations has resulted, in many instances, in unnecessary delay that is needlessly hampering the war effort.

Section 7 has also made impossible the sale on credit by American citizens of oil urgently required for the completion of voyages by British, Dutch, and Norwegian ships. This, too, in cases where such voyages were directly connected with the war effort.

Under ordinary circumstances, the extension of short-term credit in such instances would not cause the delay that now results from the necessity for remitting funds by cable or radio communications. However, there are now often difficulties in the way of such transmission of funds and it is proving very troublesome.

This resolution merely gives to the individuals of this country an opportunity to do business with people or corporations of foreign countries. It allows them to negotiate private transactions. That is all it does.

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

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I earnestly hope the entire so-called neutrality legislation will be repealed. I was always against it. I felt we could not legislate neutrality. I hope this resolution will pass.

Mr. BLOOM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think the statement made by our chairman fully explains it, but I would like to suggest to the House the instances cited before our committee by the State Department as to the need for this legislation.

Mr. BLOOM. Do you wish to do that now?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. If the gentleman will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. BLOOM. I would be glad to have the gentleman state that.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The testimony before our committee showed the need for this legislation and various instances were cited, among them this: A concern in this country was selling airplane parts to the Canadian Government. The private concern which was selling those parts of airplanes was willing to trust the people in Canada for 30 or 60 or 90 days, but it could not be done under this law, but cash had to be paid before delivery was made. This is simply to remove the barrier, so that if anybody in the United States wants to sell to anybody in a country at war on a credit, at their risk, they may have that right, during the existence of this war.

The Trading With the Enemy Act, which we have passed, of course, prohibits any dealings with enemy countries.

Mr. BLOOM. That is correct. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I note from the report on this particular resolution mention is made of not being able to do business

with some countries until they have paid their accounts in full.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that at the time the Johnson Act was passed it was the thought and idea of most Members of Congress that was a good thing and should be put into effect. Eventually we passed the Neutrality Act. If you wanted to be fair with the people of this country at that time, you should have asked for the repeal of the Johnson Act. Then you would not have to come in here with this legislation. We insist that rather than beat around the bush you ought at that time to have come frankly before the Members of Congress and said you did not want the Johnson Act—that you wanted to eliminate it.

Mr. BLOOM. The Johnson Act deals with securities and bonds of governments in default, but this deals with individuals. It is something entirely separate and distinct. The repeal here sought would still leave the Johnson Act in effect. This deals principally with individuals and persons who want to sell goods to people of other countries who are willing to pay for them.

Mr. RICH. As long as the individual wanted to do business with another country, that was perfectly all right; there is no reason why that individual should not do business.

Mr. BLOOM. But he cannot under section 7, which I have read.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I believe what confuses the gentleman from Pennsylvania is that he thinks the Johnson Act and this amendment are the same, whereas they are not.

Mr. BLOOM. They are entirely different.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Here is the difference, if I may be permitted to suggest it: The Johnson Act relates to the transactions of credit granted by our country to these foreign countries not in default. This portion of the neutrality law was patterned somewhat after the Johnson law, but went beyond it. Whereas the Johnson Act relates to the extension of credit by this Government to nations in default on prior debts to our Government, the neutrality law went further and controlled transactions between citizens of this country and individuals or governments of foreign countries.

Mr. RICH. This is the last of the Neutrality Act, is it?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know. I hope it will be.

Mr. RICH. We are in war clear up to our necks. The point I am trying to get at here is whether we have any assurance that this country is going to get anything from the nations we deal with. It is my belief that after a while, not more than 2 or 3 years, our country is going to be wrecked. We are going to find—and you fellows are responsible for it—that this Nation of ours is going to be financially bankrupt, because we shall not have anything left. You have given it all away.

I cannot help but call the gentleman's attention to a letter that was put in the Record yesterday from Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, in reference to a question I asked as to what agreements we had made with countries under the lease-lend. If you will read that letter you will see that the only countries with which we have any agreement whatever are Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Iceland, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Paraguay, and Uruguay, all little countries right here next door to us. If there is any country we ought to help, it is these little countries who are neighbors of ours. But when it comes to the large nations, such as Great Britain and the other great nations that are receiving aid, we have not so much as a dash of ink on a piece of paper signifying any indebtedness to us. Just remember, the American people are going to have to pay the bill.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I hope it is not going to be necessary to object, I am the member of the Foreign Affairs Committee who voted against this resolution in committee, and I voted against it for two reasons:

First. This is a half-baked way of changing our Neutrality Act, which has been suggested by the State Department. This is the second time since Pearl Harbor that we have made such amendments to the Neutrality Act. We have the spectacle of a Presidential neutrality proclamation still in force against 18 nations of the earth, while we are united with part of these nations against the rest of them in the greatest war that has ravaged the earth. I objected to this method of legislation concerning our neutrality situation, and I felt that the President should revoke the neutrality proclamation which is now in effect. He has not done this, nor sought legislation to authorize him to do it, if such legislation is considered necessary.

Second. I also objected to this because the Lend-Lease Act was intended to provide for all necessary kinds of credit for the securing of war materials by the nations that were resisting aggression.

I see no reason why this should not be done, but no arrangements for such credit have yet been concluded under lend-lease.

Since this resolution was acted upon by our committee, I have investigated at the Treasury Department and in the Department of State with those who are in charge of our international economic relations and I find they are all in agreement as to the necessity for prompt reconsideration of the whole situation with reference to the Neutrality Act in wartime. I find they are working toward comprehensive credit and financial arrangements under lend-lease. I further find that they have urgent reasons, some of which have been explained here on the floor, for wishing to free the belligerents who are fighting with us from the prohibitions against financial transactions contained in section 7 of the Neutrality Act. As you know, under section 7 of the Neutrality Act not even ordinary commercial credit of 30, 60, or 90 days

can be arranged between this country and Canada, or between this country and the Dutch East Indies, where they are perfectly willing to pay for the war materials they secure. This is a great inconvenience. The war effort would be speeded up if they should be permitted to have short-term credit so as not to have each item a cash transaction.

For these reasons I hesitate to object to this measure. There is one matter, however, concerning which I feel I should have assurance before this measure goes through. I now wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs whether he joins with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the others who are in favor of prompt reconsideration of the whole Neutrality Act and consideration of repealing what is left of it, in view of our present situation?

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that I have always been against the Neutrality Act from the very beginning. I can assure the gentleman that any resolution or any bill presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee for repeal of such sections of the Neutrality Act as should be repealed at that time will be given immediate consideration.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. With that assurance I withdraw my objection to this bill because while I feel this is the wrong way to go about it, the necessity for the removal of these prohibitions is immediate and urgent in the prosecution of our war effort.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that this bill should pass, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] states that he has always been against the Neutrality Act from the beginning. Did he vote for it?

Mr. BLOOM. I voted for it with certain amendments that were offered; yes.

Mr. RICH. Then the gentleman could not have been very much against it.

Mr. BLOOM. I think the whole Neutrality Act was an absurdity, and the principal value of, and reason for voting for the Neutrality Act of 1939 was because it called for repeal of the arms embargo. The gentleman will recall that repeal of the arms embargo was in the original bill, and after being stricken out in the House, was reinserted by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate Joint Resolution 133, as follows:

Amending section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939

Resolved, etc., That section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (Public Resolution No. 54, 76th Cong.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(e) This section shall not be operative when the United States is at war."

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House resolution (H. Res. 442) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an editorial from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

PRIORITIES FOR WAR PLANES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I called the attention of the membership on the floor to a report which I found later to be a fact; that is, that plane production was facing unnecessary obstacles partly because of a secondary priority rating given aircraft rather than placing it on an equality with warships and tanks.

I have since been informed that our Director of the War Production Board, Donald Nelson, has seen to it, even over the objections of the Army and Navy Munitions Board, that materials going into the production of aircraft for our fighting forces will be on a level with the other items mentioned. I am gratified at the action so properly taken.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

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

CATHARINE SCHULTZE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4622) for the relief of Catharine Schultze, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4622) entitled "An Act for the relief of Catharine Schultze", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$2,000" insert "\$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,

Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
JAMES H. HUGHES,
ARTHUR CAPPER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4622) for the relief of Catharine Schultze, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The bill as it passed the House provided for the payment of the sum of \$3,500 to Catharine Schultze of Peoria, Ill., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred and personal injuries sustained on August 11, 1940, in El Paso, Ill., as the result of a collision of the automobile in which she was riding, with a United States Army scout car. The Senate amended the bill by inserting in lieu of \$3,500, the sum of \$2,000.

At the conference the compromise amount of \$3,000 was agreed upon.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,

Managers on the part of the House.

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

FRED FARNER AND DORIS M. SCHROEDER

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3141) for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3141) entitled "An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$2,500" insert "\$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,

Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
JOSEPH ROSIER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3141) for the relief of Fred Farner and Ernest Schroeder, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The bill as it passed the House provided for the payment of the sum of \$5,000 to Fred Farner of Prairie View, Ill., for the death of his daughter Barbara Frances Farner, a minor, who was killed on August 29, 1940, when she was struck while standing on a sidewalk in Half-Day, Ill., by a United States ambulance driven by an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps. The Senate passed the bill in the amount of \$2,500.

At the conference the compromise amount of \$3,000 was agreed upon.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,

Managers on the part of the House.

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

BRANCHLAND PIPE & SUPPLY CO.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2712) for the relief of the Branchland Pipe & Supply Co., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$145.41" and insert "\$145.38."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

O. C. OUSLEY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2780) for the relief of O. C. Ousley, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps" and insert "not otherwise appropriated."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. D. BATEMAN AND OTHERS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4537) for the relief of H. D. Bateman, Henry G. Conner, Jr., executor of the last will and testament of P. L. Woodard, and J. M. Creech, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out "which project was later abandoned by the Civil Works Administration."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE V. TALBERT AND OTHERS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 793) for the relief of Marie V. Talbert and her sons James Osborn Talbert and Dewey Talbert, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Work Projects Administration workers" and insert "employees of the War Department."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Charles D. Talbert, deceased."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIRAM O. LESTER, GRACE D. LESTER, AND FLORENCE E. DAWSON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2183) for the relief of Hiram O. Lester, Grace D. Lester, and Florence E. Dawson, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$3,500" and insert "\$2,672.14."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "\$3,500" and insert "\$2,642.59."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,000."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES WOOD

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 268) for the relief of James Wood, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 12, strike out "Emergency Relief Work Bureau" and insert "Civil Works Administration."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6548) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for

prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by myself and the reply thereto. This material will exceed two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost \$125.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received from the State director of W. P. A. of Michigan.

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

There was no objection.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the transaction of all business on the legislative calendar and following any previous special order for tomorrow, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 6599, making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R.

6599, with Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am moved to discuss a situation of which most of us are aware and about which I have received considerable protest. It has to do with both officers and enlisted men in our Army and naval services, and also numerous patriotic civilian women and men. I am speaking generally of what we know as the battle of Washington, the battle of New York, the battle of Boston, or the battle of San Francisco, and other large cities.

It is inevitable at a time like this that large numbers of officers and also enlisted men should be passing through large cities in these days, because of transfer, because of new assignments and because of the fact, particularly in Washington, New York, and other places, that they are going to or at Army or naval headquarters for 1, 2, 3, or 4 weeks of training. Obviously they are seen in these large cities.

The subject I wish to speak to you about for a moment has more particularly to do with the commanding officers in these various areas and certain situations which develop in their relationships with civilians which I believe are detrimental to the general morale, both that of the public and of the troops in the camps or the enlisted men of the Navy.

You might refer to some of these matters as the Battle of the Waldorf, the Battle of the Mayflower, or the Battle of the Copley Plaza.

I wish to make a few suggestions to all commanding officers, both Army and Navy, in these areas and to certain patriotic, energetic, and tireless persons, largely ladies, who promote certain social or semisocial relief parties for the benefit of various services. I may tell you how some of these things happen. Mrs. X decides she is going to get up a large committee in New York and to organize such a party. She calls her subcommittee together, and they consider a name for it. It may in the end be "Tea for the Tank Corps," or it may be "Dance for Dakar," or "Sing for Sailors"; it may be "Cocktails for Coast Guardians," or it may be "Smokes for Selectees," or just plain, ordinary "Music for Marines." She enlarges her committee. And what comes next? She calls on the commanding general and his wife and the ranking admiral and his wife and invites them to become, or insists that they be, patrons and patronesses. There is little chance for the generals and the admirals to avoid becoming patrons, but there is the opportunity of refusing to attend. The trouble is that the wife of the general is persuaded to go, and she is persuaded to bring her husband just for a few minutes. Then he has his photograph taken with the committee, possibly in the sert room at the Waldorf or the banquet room in the Mayflower, and often in dress uniform. These pictures in the papers are seen in New York, Boston, San Francisco, New Orleans, the camps, navy yards, and everywhere. The New York papers are full of them.

I do not blame the officers and their wives, for I realize what they are up against, but I simply want to say that I have heard from numerous men in camps and from men on the streets and others in high places protesting against this undue social or presumed social activity of high-ranking naval and Army officers. I want to leave this suggestion with them: That Mrs. X organize her committee and raise the money and give it to the purpose for which it was intended, and then let her devote herself to sewing or the fine activities of the Red Cross under its splendid women leaders, national and otherwise. There is ample opportunity for her energies. Leave the admirals and the generals alone. Then let the admirals and commanding generals in every district say "No."

The threats and chances for sabotage in every military or naval district are today tremendous. We all want to feel sure that commanders are on the job. That they must be.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am very glad to see the recommendation of the committee in the provision for civilian pilot training. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, my interest in the civilian pilot training program stems from the fact that I have seen it in operation. I have seen some of the finest young men that grow take their own time, and, at their own expense after working hours, drive many miles to take these courses. I have heard the testimony of their instructors, and I have heard the testimony of high-ranking Army officers in hearings on War Department appropriations to the effect that these courses have produced excellent flyers. They have produced many of the instructors for the Air Corps' civilian contract flying schools. They have produced a large part of the flyers in the new Air Corps. I am advised that approximately 15,000 C. A. A. trainees have volunteered and been accepted for Army and Navy aviation. During recent months they constituted almost one-third of all flying cadets recruited.

Army records show that the C. A. A. course acts as a very effective sieve for talent in military flying. Only 11.8 percent of cadets with C. A. A. background wash out in Army primary, against 43.4 percent of all others. This means that for the Air Corps to bring 30,000 pilots through its primary stage it would need to start only 34,000 C. A. A. trainees, as compared with 53,000 boys who did not have this training.

It is important to note that in a great many cases C. A. A. trainees get this head start before they are available to the armed forces under the age limits of the selective-service law. Even under recent amendments to that law the C. A. A. can train boys as pilots 2 years before

they are subject to the draft, and thus save precious time.

Now that the country is faced with a need for literally hundreds of thousands of pilots, it becomes plain that the only functioning system for such mass production is the C. A. A. network of some 700 centers, which for 2½ years have been giving elementary flight training under C. A. A. supervision. They are not schools for the production of finished military pilots—that is indisputably an Army and Navy function. But they can act as the feeder into Army and Navy advanced training centers of vast numbers of cadets who have acquired mastery of flight fundamentals. In fiscal 1941 they handled over 46,000 elementary enrollees, and, if funds are provided, can take care of double this quota.

This potential capacity of some 90,000 a year is admittedly far beyond that of the military or any other group of primary training centers. It has been argued, however, that this system of training in the colleges does not "turn out pilots in the minimum of time * * * in order to do that they must do flying and nothing else." Should it become national policy to draft young men between 18 and 20, it would be possible to make C. A. A. students spend full time on flying and thus condense the length of the courses, but it would not increase total output of pilots per year, for the 90,000 rate is predicated on full-time use of instructors and equipment. In other words, 1 student might spend only 3 mornings flying, another might devote 3 afternoons, but the instructors and planes would be continuously occupied.

It is contemplated that while the bulk of these primary trainees will go on to the Army and Navy for combat training, selected graduates will be given advanced C. A. A. courses designed to meet other military needs. The C. A. A. has in operation advanced centers geared to produce this fiscal year 4,500 instructors and ferrying pilots. It has already performed a vital service in this respect by supplying some 2,500 seasoned instructors to the air services of the United States and Canada.

This is the statistical story of C. A. A. training. More dramatic proof of its value is to be found in the newspapers every day. "Lt. George S. Welch shoots down four Jap planes over Pearl Harbor. Lieutenant Welch learned to fly in the C. A. A. program at Purdue. American flyers in the R. A. F. Eagle Squadron bag German planes; two-thirds of the squadron learned to fly with C. A. A.," reports Pilot Officer Harold Strickland. And a South Dakota boy named Gunvordahl, C. A. A. trained, got six Jap planes over the Burma Road in his first week of combat with the American volunteers there.

Thus the C. A. A. graduates justify in action the hopes expressed for them by numerous high-ranking Army and Navy aviation officers:

Brig. Gen. W. G. Kilner, then Acting Chief of the Air Corps:

It should be of material assistance in building up an air force for national defense.

Rear Admiral A. B. Cook, then Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics:

This program will be of definite value to the national defense in case of emergency.

Brig. Gen. Barton K. Yount, then Assistant Chief of Air Corps:

We feel that this program is especially important to us, since, under our present expansion program and under any emergency program which we may have to have in the future, we are going to have a tremendous job in getting the requisite number of qualified young men for the Army Air Corps.

Rear Admiral J. H. Towers, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics:

Inasmuch as time is the all important factor in the present emergency national defense program, I am confident that the Civilian Aeronautics Administration training program may contribute greatly in solving our part of the national defense program.

With such a record of performance and such definite testimony to its usefulness in the war effort, I am glad that the subcommittee in charge of this particular bill brought in for the Appropriations Committee this provision for maintaining a substantial civilian pilot training program in the new fiscal year.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no salary herein appropriated shall be paid to any official receiving any other salary from the United States Government.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, line 6, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That during the period of the existing state of emergency proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939, any Ambassador or Minister whose salary as such is payable from the appropriation 'Salaries, Ambassadors and Ministers' and who, prior to appointment as Ambassador or Minister was legally appointed and served as a diplomatic or consular officer or as a Foreign Service officer, and who, on account of emergent conditions abroad, is unable properly to serve the United States at his regular post of duty, or, on account of such emergent conditions abroad, it shall be or has been found necessary in the public interest to terminate his appointment as Ambassador or Minister at such post, may be appointed or assigned to serve in any capacity in which a Foreign Service officer is authorized by law to serve, and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the payment from such appropriation for the fiscal year 1943 of the salary of such officer, while serving under such assignment, is hereby authorized: *Provided further*, That no person, while serving under such emergency appointment or assignment, shall receive compensation in excess of \$9,000 per annum while serving in the continental United States or in excess of \$10,000 per annum while serving elsewhere."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is not new language. It was carried in a recent deficiency bill and made applicable to the operations of the State Department during the current year. It is now the purpose to extend the same permissive authority for the next fiscal year. It is merely to permit career Foreign Service officers who might become Ambassadors or Ministers to be used in any capacity that the Secretary of State thinks is most effective, including their assignment to the Department of State. You will note that the authority runs

only to career Foreign Service officers and not to any other group. The omission of the language from the print of the bill that you have was an oversight.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not object to this amendment, except that I would like to be assured that the noncareer officers can also participate in these transfer benefits. If the Chairman will assure me that the Secretary can make such transfers, extending it to the noncareer officers, I would not object to the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. This is a continuation of the language now in the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand that.

Mr. RABAUT. Placed in the bill this year.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand that, but I am wondering how it would affect some of the noncareer officers.

Mr. RABAUT. It does not affect the noncareer officers at all. It has no relationship to them.

Mr. STEFAN. It will not mitigate against them in any way?

Mr. RABAUT. No.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. As I understand, the Secretary of State can transfer the noncareer officers without any special authorization of law.

Mr. RABAUT. Noncareer officers cannot be assigned in this manner to the Department. This provision permits the assignment of officers in the field. They may be brought back to the Department, even if they have been Ambassadors, and be assigned to positions in the State Department or any place where they could be of use, in the opinion of the Secretary of State.

Mr. STEFAN. Then I want to be assured that this amendment will in no way mitigate against noncareer officers.

Mr. RABAUT. I am sure that it will not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contracts entered into in foreign countries involving expenditures from any of the foregoing appropriations under the caption "Foreign intercourse" shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, food must be produced if we are to win the titanic war in which our Nation is today involved. Not only food for our own people, but food for the British, Chinese, Russians, Dutch, and our Allies fighting with us against the ruthless Japs and Nazis. Food also, later on, for the starving occupied territories under the dictators' heels.

A plea has been made to the American farmer to increase his production of hogs, of butter, of eggs, and other food products. Our farmers will respond to the very best of their ability but there is a dark cloud on the horizon that threatens this very necessary increased production.

The farms of the great Midwest are being drained of expert agricultural labor, first through the ordinary supply of help leaving the farming regions with its 12-hour workdays and going to defense plants for 8-hour days, coupled with quadruple pay. We cannot blame these young men for seeking better paid jobs—we can however deplore the practice of paying in defense plants time and a half for Saturday labor and double time for Sunday work. No farmer receives double time or wage for any day's work, but on the other hand puts in time and a half every day for not even parity wage.

At this point let me quote from a letter received from Mr. Arvid Anderson, of Hector, Minn.:

The patriotism of the farmer needs no defense. While other groups have been throwing monkey wrenches into the all-out program for national defense, the farmer has labored on unceasingly at his job of producing food for the teeming millions. There is no 40-hour week in his program, no extra pay for overtime; his work is long, hard, and arduous, with no chance to pass on the increased cost of operation, other than hitching up his belt another notch.

The second and greatest cause of the approaching scarcity of farm labor, is the draft.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I wish to read an editorial in the Washington Daily News of today:

THE INDISPENSABLES

When it comes to bad timing, here's a beaut.

On the very day that millions of American men were registering for the draft, Selective Service headquarters in Washington revealed that it had issued a "directive" authorizing local boards to grant draft deferment to labor leaders. Also to employers' labor relations men, and to Government labor liaison men. This came on top of a similar announcement about movie people.

It's going to be a great comfort to your draftee, as he rolls off a hard cot before dawn to catch a transport for parts unknown, to reflect that the walking delegates, the dues collectors, the picket-line strategists, the men who call out on strike "the men behind the men behind the guns," are safe, along with Hollywood glamour boys, for the duration.

If there's anybody that can be spared from civilian life right now, certainly it's the gentry who have sandbagged carpenters and laborers for extortionate union dues before permitting them to help to build army barracks.

Think of this, Members of the House. While such unessential groups to the successful outcome of this life-and-death struggle are to be deferred, men from farms are being called into the service in many cases where these men are the only farm labor available. I am not asking for blanket deferment of farm labor. I am, however, telling you, my friends, that it is foolish to take experienced farmers away from the intricate job of hog raising, butter producing, and

wheat and corn growing, so essential for food for ourselves and our Allies, when in any good-sized town or city, poolrooms swarm with men who have no place in our national defense picture. Take away our experienced stockmen, our experienced tractor men, and yet leave 85,000 good, strong, young men, eager to fight, in C. C. C. camps, at the taxpayers' expense in nondefense work.

I do not blame our draft boards. They must follow regulations. In my home counties our draft boards are composed of the highest type of American citizen, intent only, without pay, of doing the best job they can under present laws and regulations.

It does seem to me, however, that it bodes no good to our Nation to strip our farms of necessary, experienced young farmers, while leaving union labor leaders, picket strategists, and Hollywood artists in absolutely unessential positions for the duration.

Unless Congress, my colleagues, does something about this stripping off from the farms of the great Mid-West of the high-class, experienced farmers and farm labor we have there, we will wake up one of these days to discover we have suffered another Pearl Harbor, in that agriculture cannot, for lack of manpower, produce the food which, next to men, guns, planes, tanks, and ships, will mean eventually the difference between victory and defeat.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, a friend of the farmer.

Mr. NELSON. My colleague heard me this morning ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD with reference to an understanding said to have been worked out by General Hershey and the Secretary of Agriculture, looking to the deferment, not as a class, but of individuals, so that the requisite amount of farm help might be available. I think it is important, and I am glad if the report is correct that some steps have been taken. I fully agree with what has been said as to necessity for taking action along this line.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes; I notice the report has been put out by General Hershey and Secretary Wickard to that effect. We cannot solve this great problem, however, by such indefinite proposals. Action by Congress is what we need so that every draft board will know that the law places skilled farmers and farm labor in the same class as essential defense workers.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, who has always shown, during my 3 years in Congress, an insight sympathetic to the farm needs.

Mr. DONDERO. I am in complete sympathy with what the gentleman has stated. There is an added difficulty to the agricultural sections of our country in the wages being paid in industry and in defense projects, which the farmers cannot pay, and they lose their sons, their only help, in that way.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read to the House a letter from five of the good farmers of my district, men in responsible elective positions in their county, men who know what this problem will mean in a month from now as to the production of food.

To the Congress of the United States:

The vital importance of an all-out production of food is being recognized as second only to the manufacture of war material and equipment for national defense and winning of the war.

History has proven that such reasoning is fundamentally sound. The very life of democratic governments depends upon the efficiency of our industrial plants to produce war equipment to the extreme limits of capacity in record-breaking time by the employment of skilled workmen fitted by training—definite, dependable mechanical perfection.

The same basic principle of reasoning is true and just as sound in the production of food.

The machine age of the present day has changed the entire picture pertaining to methods of farming as compared with those of pioneer days. The successful operation of modern farm equipment is dependent upon careful study and good judgment such as has been acquired by farm boys during recent years through actual practical experience.

Such knowledge cannot be attained in a short time by inexperienced operators without loss of time, money, and costly delays.

This is no time to experiment with high-priced farm machinery which may be ruined in a short time by such operators.

The care of livestock requires continual attention during the entire year. Careful study of feeding practices and management cannot be stressed too much and is of utmost importance contributing to successful results. Such knowledge can only be gained by years of conscientious study and observation. Care of livestock is a job with which farm boys are familiar and in which they take pride.

To the above statements may be added the direct personal interest the farm boy has developed as a result of his intimate and minute knowledge of every detail and phase of farm life. Such help on the farm cannot be replaced by anyone else whose background and past environments are different and whose only interest is the wages he receives.

In view of above facts, we believe that the production of food asked for by the Government can best be produced by keeping the farm boys as much as possible on the job for which they are especially fit. Inefficiency only leads to ultimate failure and defeat. The American farmer has never faltered in peace or war, and all he asks is to be given the same consideration pertaining to efficient help on the farm as is being given our industrial plants.

If such help is not granted, there can be only one conclusion to draw—a general breakdown of agriculture.

The United States of America should not only be an arsenal of democracy but also the breadbasket to feed a starving world after the war.

We, the farmers of Yellow Medicine County, Minn., ask that you do all in your power to give us a square deal, and we will hereby pledge ourselves to bend every effort toward production of food. Please give our request your most careful consideration.

Respectfully submitted

TOWN BOARD ASSOCIATION OF YELLOW MEDICINE COUNTY, MINN.,

J. M. EISCHINS, Chairman.

HENRY JACOBSON, Secretary.

E. S. ROWBERG, Treasurer.

A. J. ANDERSON,

G. M. ANDERSON,
Directors.

Let me quote from another letter from Mr. Frank A. Barnard, of Benson, Minn., just one paragraph:

I am one of the advisers for the registrants under the selective-service system. I have handled a great many cases and find that at the present time and under the present regulations that there is no question in my mind but what certain farm lands are going to lie idle and a great amount of production in livestock, butterfat, poultry, and swine is going to be seriously curtailed in this part of the country. We are not going to have enough help to get our crop in this spring and to harvest our crop next fall.

A lady writes me as follows:

The other day 44 young men were sent up to Fort Snelling from our community for a physical examination and nearly all of them were from the farms. We think this is not fair. Scores of men in the towns are working on Work Projects Administration projects and it seems to us that some of these men might be spared for the Army much better than men who are almost indispensable on the farms. Many farmers around here will have to get rid of part of their stock especially the cows, because of shortage of help.

Another farmer from my district writes as follows:

I have been trying to get help here on the 400 acres I am operating but there seems to be none available. I am unable to work myself because of heart trouble but I sure would like to do my bit for democracy and help win this war by producing food and clothing. I have one young son whom I can depend on to operate this farm, if he only can be deferred.

Another farmer writes me:

We farmers are asked to produce more milk, more eggs, and more hogs, and will do our best. But the way young, experienced farmers and farmers' sons are being drafted in our neighborhood, I just don't see how we can produce even an average crop.

Mr. W. S. Moscrip, head of the Twin Cities Milk Producers Association wires me as follows:

Farm labor situation critical. Defense activities at wages completely beyond ability of farmers to pay rapidly bringing about impossible situation. If any hope is to be had of maintaining present production levels, draft boards must be immediately and definitely instructed to defer essential farm help regularly employed. Otherwise, agriculture faces the most tragic period in history.

Mr. Chairman, I receive, as all mid-western Congressmen receive, letters by the dozen expressing pitiful cases of hardship because of farm labor shortage. Letters come to me that tell of selling out cows and hogs and machinery just because one man can only do so much work and no more. Letters reach me about young farmers called in the draft who must have sales and quit producing food while Hollywood artists and labor-union leaders, parasites on the face of the earth at a time such as this, are given deferment. What folly. Where will this lead us to?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, a man with much agricultural understanding.

Mr. HARE. I find myself very much in sympathy with the sentiments expressed. Does the gentleman have any definite, concrete suggestion to offer?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Very definitely. First, let Congress make the Selective Service Administration grant to essential, experienced farmers and farm labor the status of defense workers. Let Congress instruct the Selective Service to take any young man, not essential to production of food and war materials, before it dips too deeply into the food-producing element, whether on farms or in villages and cities. Third, we have nearly 100,000 young men, veterans excepted, in C. C. C. camps. Yes; 84,875 boys in those camps as of January 31 of this year, and this number increasing every day. I believe, with all regard for the splendid work the C. C. C. has done in days gone by, that now, in this period of great national jeopardy, that C. C. C. should be abolished for the duration of the war. Yes; many other nondefense institutions can be discarded and those men go into essential employment.

Let us tell these young men, fine young Americans, "Boys, our Nation needs you elsewhere than in C. C. C. camps. The Nation needs you to produce food, manufacture arms, and fight the enemy. God bless you; go where you can do the most good for the greatest and best country in its hour of crisis."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in support of the argument of the gentleman who just preceded me, let me again call attention to the fact that not only have individuals connected with the motion-picture industry been given a ruling which can be used to defer their military service, but labor leaders have received special favors in the way of deferred service.

As we all know, some of the most active and prominent labor leaders, some who have heretofore received favors from this administration, who have been coddled and deferred too, have been active in promoting strikes.

Walter Reuther, who with his brother worked in the factories of Russia and who while there with his brother sent back a letter to his comrades in Detroit, advising them to—and I quote—"Carry on the fight for a Soviet America," would benefit by this order, while the farmer's boy, the farmer's hired man, must march away to war.

Some of these labor leaders have instigated and carried on strikes in our defense industries. Now they are to be given preferential treatment, exempted from war service, left in positions where they can deprive our armed forces of the tools of war.

Our farmers are reasonable. They are patient. They are long-suffering. Their complaints are just, as indicated by a letter received this morning and which reads as follows:

COLOMA, MICH., February 16, 1942.

HON. CLAYTON E. HOFFMAN,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I wish to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to you for the fine remarks made by you before Congress January 15, 1942, Just a Little Justice for the Farmer.

During the month past and at present we hear the call upon the farmer to produce more than ever before; yes, every hour we can hear some gentleman on the radio telling

the farmer that he must produce more food to win the war, but we never hear anyone of those gentlemen offering any help to the farmer.

The farmer is a willing worker, but he cannot be expected to produce without any help. To win this war we not only need food and soldiers; we also need ships, tanks, airplanes, and guns. But I would like to see any industrialist produce them without the help of money and labor.

Permit me to give you some facts about myself as a farmer. Just recently I attended a meeting called by the F. S. A. for the purpose of instructing the farmers to produce more food this year. The speaker very well knew how to go about it in order that we may produce more, but when I asked him, "How about help of labor?" he simply answered, "That is your problem."

Here I am a farmer. I have 114 acres of land with a \$7,500 Federal land-bank loan on the same. My wife and I, two sons, and one daughter worked this farm for 14 years, but on account of crop failures and low prices we have not been able to discount the loan on the farm; in fact, during the winter months we had to find other employment to make a living.

Today my two sons are being called into the Army. My wife is ill and is being attended daily by a doctor, and I am working as a carpenter at 65 cents an hour building ships for the defense of our country. I am 56 years old and I thank God who gives me my health and strength so that I can do my part. I know that we are going to lose our farm and home, because at my age I cannot work and keep up the payments alone on the farm or work the farm alone and produce sufficient to keep it up.

Mr. HOFFMAN, I know that I am not the only farmer in Berrien County who is facing this fact. I know that at least 60 percent of the farmers, not only in Berrien County, but throughout the State are faced with the same problem. One of my neighbors is 65 years old and is ill at this time. He has one son who worked the farm for the last 3 years. This only son is now being called into the Army. Another neighbor is a widow 60 years old and ill. She has one son who took care of her, but he has to go into the Army.

The above are only two farmers who are facing the same problem, but I know of many more. By giving you these facts I don't want you to think that I am complaining; in fact, I am proud to be one American who was not afraid of work; to be one American who has two fine sons who can take a gun in their hands and defend our country and the home for deserving and non-deserving Americans.

During the years past I have known many so-called good Americans. When my wife and I stayed at home nights and took care of our children, those good Americans went out, spent their money, and enjoyed their lives and their freedom and never bothered to raise a child. Yes, my wife was called a fool to bother herself with children, but today we are proud of having those boys even if we will lose our home.

I sincerely believe that our Government is making a big mistake by taking all the boys away from the farms, and I know that this will be realized first at a time when it will be too late. If the farmers are to produce, they must have help. In 1941, here in Berrien County, thousands of bushels of fruit went to waste on account of shortage of help. This year I am sure that not only a lot of the fruit will not be harvested, but hundreds and thousands of acres of land will lay idle; many bushels of beans, potatoes, and tomatoes will not be planted because there is no one to plant them and there will be none to harvest them.

The grain farmer doesn't need as much help as the fruit and vegetable farmer because grain can be planted and harvested with machinery. But let us not forget that the workingman in the factory and soldier at

the front cannot live just on bread. It takes only 2 hands to plant 1 bushel of beans, but it takes 10 hands to harvest them and prepare them for the market.

If there would be any help that could be hired for farm work, the fact still remains that many farmers have no money to hire help, especially at planting time. At the time of harvest the farmer sells the products and pays his help but he cannot do so before. Besides that, the cost of labor will be so high that the farmer will not get a price for his products that will cover the cost of labor.

We are being told that women from the cities will be sent out to work on the farms. Mr. HOFFMAN, do you believe that some of those fine ladies will go on the farms to break off their long fingernails and ruin their pretty hands? I don't think so. I am sure that if the farmers will have to depend upon such help, our soldiers will have to starve at the front. Let us not go by what the women do in England. The English women have learned how to work for generations, while most of our American ladies have learned how to smoke cigarettes and enjoy themselves in amusement places.

To win this war we must have food; our Government can depend upon the farmer. The farmer will do his part and will produce, provided the Government will stand behind the farmer as much as it stands behind the industrialist.

Very truly yours,

E. MESSAL.

Mr. Chairman, my suggestion to this administration is that it do not push our loyal, patriotic farmers too far; extend too many favors to motion-picture actors and so-called labor leaders.

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet the obligations of the United States under the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations between the United States and the other American Republics, signed at Buenos Aires, December 23, 1936, and to carry out the purposes of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics," approved August 9, 1939, and to supplement appropriations available for carrying out other provisions of law authorizing related activities, including the establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease for the duration of the experiments and demonstrations, and construction of necessary buildings thereon; such expenses to include personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$100,000 for printing and binding; stenographic reporting, translating and other services by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; tuition, compensation, and monthly allowances while not in travel status, all to be fixed by the Secretary of State, and traveling expenses in the United States and abroad in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended, of educational, professional, and artistic leaders, and professors, students, and persons possessing special scientific or other technical qualifications, who are citizens of the United States or the other American republics: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized under such regulations as he may adopt, to pay the actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other

expenses, of citizens of the other American republics while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, and to make advances of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses of members of advisory committees in accordance with section 2 of said act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 249a); purchase and exchange (not to exceed \$6,000), hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled and animal-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; and purchase of books and periodicals, \$1,700,000; and the Secretary of State is hereby authorized, subject to the approval of the President, to transfer from this appropriation to other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government for expenditure in the United States and in the other American republics any part of this amount for direct expenditure by such department or independent establishment for the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That any funds herein appropriated which may be transferred to the Federal Security Agency for the Public Health Service shall be available for the salaries and expenses of not to exceed two additional regular active commissioned officers: *Provided further*, That the unobligated balance of the \$10,000 transferred to the Civil Aeronautics Board under the authority contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1942, under this heading, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1943.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 29, line 19, after the word "periodicals", strike out "\$1,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,750,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, first, I should address an inquiry to my good friend from Michigan, the chairman of the subcommittee. The Budget reported \$1,819,500 for Latin-American cooperation. That amount was reduced to \$1,700,000 by the committee, or a net reduction of \$119,500.

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that the amount of \$50,000 requested for the purpose of establishing three radiosonde systems in three different places in Mexico cannot be established and installed by virtue of the reduction made by the committee; and if that is the case, the purpose of offering the amendment for \$50,000 is to restore this matter.

Mr. RABAUT. No. In our reduction of this amount we have left it in the discretion of the officials of the Department to allow such individual projects to proceed, or to curtail some to some extent and leave others go on accordingly as they decide in their own judgment. I personally, and I think other members of the committee, feel very favorably disposed to these radiosonde systems.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan I have been advised, and members of the Air Safety Committee have been advised, that if this reduction stands as now carried in the bill, it will be impossible for the Weather Bureau to install the three radiosonde systems in Mexico, and that it requires the restoration of \$50,000 if this work is to go on.

Mr. RABAUT. Now, I will ask my friend this question: How could this be

decided so suddenly among all the projects they have, wherein we are making allowance for those particular projects in an appropriation of \$1,700,000? The request was for \$1,819,000. So that is \$119,000 in excess of the amount that we allowed. All of a sudden one particular item is singled out in the whole list of projects to be taken care of under this particular appropriation, radiosonde systems.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, I will answer my friend and then I will ask the chairman of the select committee on air safety to answer further. Major Reichelderfer has been appearing before that committee for the last several days and he has indicated to the members of the committee from information now available to him that if the \$50,000 is not restored he will have no fund with which to install the radiosonde systems in Mexico.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. It must be, then, that he considered it the least important item he is working on, because under the latitude we permitted him he could arrange to cut out whatever he desired; and if he omitted that, he must consider it the least important. Personally, I do not; but evidently he does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, evidently not; otherwise he would not have manifested an interest in it and brought it to the attention of the Aid Safety Committee. This \$50,000 is necessary.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I think perhaps in his particular activity he has a fear that his particular project will suffer a curtailment; but I am certain this had all been decided when this bill was first released to the public last Monday; that it had already been decided that this one particular industry should receive a cut of \$119,000 on a \$1,819,000 item.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I answer my friend from Michigan as a colleague of his on the Appropriations Committee of considerable experience that these distributions are made and the allocations of funds to the different functions and activities are determined long before the bill ever comes to the floor. As my friend will remember, it is all carefully set out in the justifications that are submitted to the subcommittee. So there has been a justification for this work on the basis of a Budget figure of \$1,819,000.

Mr. RABAUT. But the State Department will have to set up the priorities on this list or set forth the individual cuts they are going to make in the individual projects.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to commend the chairman of the committee for his interest in this matter because he knows from his sojourn on official business in

South America how important it is. I want to say to the other Members of the House that when we investigated air-safety conditions in South America we left Guatemala City and got lost at 13,000 feet elevation. We were flying in and out among the peaks and found to our dismay and our regret that there was inadequate weather service in that country. Some day it may be the direct line of flight for all our military aircraft to Guatemala and on to the Panama Canal. So, we cannot do too much in the field of weather observation in order to enhance the safety of military and civil aircraft that fly over that route.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I would like to go on record here as saying that I am very favorable to the proposition that the full amount should be allowed by the department within the limits of the appropriations set out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My reason for offering the amendment today is to make sure that the matter is fully ventilated on the floor.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is not this an independent establishment the gentleman is referring to?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am referring to the item of cooperation with the South American republics.

Mr. KERR. Yes; an independent establishment. If the gentleman will read the language at the end of the State Department title of the bill, I think he will find it takes care of it. It reads as follows:

and the Secretary of State is hereby authorized, subject to the approval of the President, to transfer from this appropriation to other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government for expenditure in the United States and in the other American republics any part of this amount for direct expenditure by such department or independent establishment for the purposes of this appropriation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but my amendment would take the conjecture out of it and provide the money without its being transferred by the Secretary.

Mr. KERR. But the bill carries in this paragraph \$1,700,000, of which the Secretary can transfer any part that may be necessary under this provision I have read.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us assume it is not so considered. Then, of course, the radiosonde stations that are so essential at the present time cannot be established.

I hope the chairman of the special committee will discuss this matter, because he has been taking testimony from Commander Reichelderfer for several days.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. I want to commend the gentleman that while he was in Guatemala he did not take the same course "Wrong Way" Corrigan did.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to address my remarks particularly to the committee. I hope the Members present will not oppose this amendment. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has said, your select committee on investigation of air safety has for the past few days had before it Commander Reichelderfer and his staff. They are there this minute. We will go back into session at 2 o'clock.

Please do not quibble about any reasonable expenditure for the establishment of air observation stations, included in which is the radiosonde you are talking about right now. Let me tell you something. You might be surprised to know that in continental United States and Alaska we have but 40 stations that use the radiosonde. Do you know what it is? It is an instrument that is hooked to the bottom of a balloon about 6 feet in diameter. That balloon is filled with gas. It has in there a little radio broadcasting station, literally. They turn this balloon loose in the sky and it goes up 20,000, 30,000, 50,000, and has recorded as high as 70,000 feet. At the various altitudes, and as it goes through the various pressures, the atmospheric conditions are recorded.

On the basis of this information is made up the air-mass analyses of the upper strata of the air through which our military, naval, and commercial airplanes must fly and operate. Do not forget, please, that the efficiency of our military craft, Army and Navy and commercial, depends almost entirely upon the accurate forecast of weather conditions over certain areas and they not only have to know what the surface condition is but they must know what the condition is in the upper air. This is the only means known by which you can gather the information.

There is one other startling thing to which I wish to refer. If your good Appropriations Committee will be so kind, soon we are going to ask you for an appropriation of quite a lot of money to establish probably 40 more of these stations in the United States. For what purpose? For the purpose of giving necessary information to our armed and civil air forces.

The matter of the weather in Mexico is just as important. It is just as necessary to have that information and to make accurate forecasts in Mexico as it is to have the information in Nebraska. With these 40 stations today we are covering on an average of 22,000 square miles per station. Think of that. Let us not quibble about this thing. We need these 3 stations in Mexico and also, remember, please, that these men in the executive departments downtown, and you gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee know this better than anybody else, are reluctant, as a matter of fact their hands are tied, they cannot come up here to Congress and say, "Now, we have just got to have this. We want you to put this back in the bill."

We called those men before our committee and asked them the question and

they made a fine case. Believe me, they did make a fine case.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. My colleague should not leave the impression they did not come before our committee. If you will look at the hearings, page 303, the gentleman will see that Commander Reichelderfer appeared before our committee.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman does not have to cite the record now to prove to me that Commander Reichelderfer was present.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Commander Reichelderfer will tell you that he never had a more sympathetic hearing before any committee in his whole existence than was accorded him last year when we gave him about a day before the committee.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is scant time for this subject. We have had them before us for 3 days, and I guarantee we have not touched the situation.

Mr. RABAUT. We know we have not touched it either. We are very glad to take his advice, and we are very glad to give him what he asked, but under the very amendment that is up here for consideration, all you are doing with the amendment is to add \$50,000 to \$1,700,000.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is right.

Mr. RABAUT. You still have a cut in the amount of the difference between \$1,750,000 and the \$1,819,500. There is no reason for it except the one injected into this debate, that insufficient money will be assigned by the State Department to this particular agency. We recommended that the entire amount for this agency be given to it from the funds allowed in the bill, \$1,700,000; that is, that \$50,000 go to the Weather Bureau. That is all the gentleman wants, so I feel we are in unity on the subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I fail to find any recommendation in the report or in the bill that you have earmarked \$50,000 for this purpose. There is general distribution only by the Secretary of State.

Mr. RABAUT. It does not say it is a general distribution. It is left to the discretion of the Secretary of State and the importance of this particular activity will certainly receive the Secretary's attention.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, now, we may be advised wrong. Very often we fellows up here on the Hill get bad information.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, it is our information that if this item is cut out of the bill the Weather Bureau will not get the money with which to install these three radiosonde stations. That is the whole case as far as I am concerned.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I think the gentleman will find that the committee as a whole—I can speak for one member of the committee—is in thorough accord with the ideas advanced by the gentleman from Oklahoma. However, the committee thinks that the appropriation of \$1,700,000 will take care of this situation. But the committee did not want to place itself in the position of saying which should have priority under the appropriation. We leave it entirely to the State Department. If the State Department and the other bureaus believe that these three stations in Mexico are more important than other phases of the bill, they will have the power to use it for that purpose.

Mr. NICHOLS. Then will this amendment hurt the bill outside of the pride of authorship of the committee, and—I am sensitive of that?

I was hopeful that the chairman of the committee might accept the amendment. I cannot see how it will hurt the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not feel that we should accept the amendment. Let me read from the hearings:

Mr. RABAUT. How many stations do you have in the United States?

Dr. LITTLE. We are operating 33 radiosonde stations in the United States and 7 in Alaska.

Mr. RABAUT. This is widening the scope of the service, by giving us reports that may be of value to us in our own country?

Dr. LITTLE. Yes, sir. Storms in the southern part of the United States, in New Mexico, Arizona, and California are caused by moist air coming from the Gulf, and this will give us valuable information upon which to base predictions of storm and flood conditions in that region of the United States.

In view of the debate that has taken place on the floor today, does the gentleman believe that the Secretary of State would think for 1 minute of curtailing this sum of \$50,000? If so, then I do not understand the operations of the departments of the Government in trying to dovetail their activities with the wishes of the Congress.

Mr. NICHOLS. I may say to the gentleman that I have every fear of that, and that is no aspersion on our great Secretary of State or our State Department. They are busy men. I am not so glib as to think that those busy men know every bit of repartee that goes on between Members on the floor here. I think there is every chance, because Commander Reichelderfer tells us so, and I think he is an honorable man, that if this money is not in the bill we shall not get the three radiosonde stations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. It is all right with me whether or not you put that money in this bill, but let me sound this note of warning: There is nothing more vital to the defense of this country today than aviation, and there is nothing more vital to the proper functioning of aviation than proper weather forecasting and observation. Why we should quibble over \$50,000 is more than I can understand. The time is not far removed when you will have an opportunity to quibble about doubling the radiosonde stations throughout the United States, and that within a few weeks. I believe you ought to accept the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to see my committee in the position it has been placed in on this floor today. There is no one in this House—I do not care on what committee he may be—who has taken a more marked interest in aviation and in the training of pilots than the committee that has this bill before you today. We have not talked about only \$50,000; we have just pushed the Budget up \$16,000,000 for the training of civilian pilots. That is notice to the world, notice to this country, and notice to the distinguished gentleman who just preceded me that this committee is not a quibbler and does not need that appellation applied to it. That is point No. 1.

No. 2 is this: Commander Reichelderfer is certainly badly mistaken if he thinks he can come in here and coerce this committee. Commander Reichelderfer is no more acquainted with what the State Department will do with this \$1,700,000 than is the gentleman who just preceded me. What is more, I as chairman of our committee will see to it that the Department of State and the Secretary of State will be informed of our interest in seeing that radiosonde is continued in this country and down in Mexico, where three or four new stations will be established. All the stations requested are provided for in appropriations in this bill. If they tell us it is necessary to go much further, they will find no group more respectful of their wishes in that regard than the committee that has heard Commander Reichelderfer on this matter.

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

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

Mr. JONES. May I say to the chairman that the general program of relations with South America and with Mexico has been divided by the Budget Bureau into two groups, the temporary or emergency program under Nelson Rockefeller, and the cultural relations or long-range program under the State Department. Nelson Rockefeller, with the

emergency program, to which I believe this item really belongs, in the fiscal year 1942 received \$15,000,000 in appropriations and \$3,000,000 in contract authorizations. Even if the State Department should cut out this item, if Mr. Reichelderfer could not then make out a case with Mr. Rockefeller it is a pretty poor project.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to say one other thing, and then I shall ask for a vote. The amount requested was \$1,819,500 for this program, covering a series of objectives. The amount we allowed was \$1,700,000. If the \$50,000 covered in the gentleman's amendment is allowed—and I understand the good intentions of the gentleman in offering his amendment, and although in accord with the idea I do not believe the amendment is necessary—it would still be less than the full amount requested by the sum of \$69,500, and the amount would still be subject to a cut if it were assigned to the projects on a pro rata basis. However, it is not to be on a pro rata basis. The decision is left to the discretion of the Secretary. Knowing the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, as I do, I know that in view of the importance attached to radiosonde it will certainly receive every consideration from him, and I can vouch that the amount for this activity will not be cut one penny.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. In all candor, let me say to the gentleman that when the Budget set up this item it included \$1,819,500. The gentleman's committee cut off \$119,500. Some functions are going to have to be cut out; that is, some functions that were sent here by the Budget Bureau as approved by the State Department.

Mr. RABAUT. Some will be partially curtailed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is up to the Secretary of State to make distribution of the money in that respect.

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Suppose he does not distribute the funds so that there will be money for the radiosonde system in Mexico, where such stations are necessary; then the stations will be out unless the Senate restores the funds.

Mr. RABAUT. I give the gentleman my assurance that I will tell the Secretary of State personally the interest the House has shown in this fund as contained in the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it is still not necessary for the Secretary of State to follow out the admonition of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. RABAUT. No; but I think he would.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to attend a conference, but before I go I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] for the splendid presentation he has just made. I am very much interested in the civilian pilot-training provision in this bill. I believe the thing to do today is to double the amount. Make it \$72,000,000 instead of \$36,000,000. We will need \$144,000,000 before January 1 unless unforeseen things happen in the democracies' favor.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that I believe the committee would have considered a much greater amount, but this is the amount of the agency's request to the Budget. It was cut by the Budget from \$36,000,000 to twenty-million-and-some-odd-thousand dollars. The committee restored it to the original figure as requested of the Budget.

Mr. SNYDER. I know that and that is one case where the Budget did not know what it was doing. It should be \$96,000,000 instead of \$36,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, perhaps in an effort to promote unity and harmony, or it may be just because he was feeling kindly, generous, and charitable, the majority leader [Mr. McCormack] referring to a talk just made by a Republican from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], said this:

We have just listened to a rambling, rank, critical speech.

Did that statement, I ask you, tend to promote unity, harmony?

The majority leader continued, I quote:

This is not a Democratic war, this is not a Republican war, it is not an Independent war. It is an American war.

On the 13th, over in the other body, a Democratic statesman, not a politician, a veteran of World War No. 1, distinguished for his active service in that war, expressed the same truth in these words:

We are not running a New Deal war or an Old Deal war, a Democratic war or a Republican war. A man is not asked what his political beliefs are when he is drafted for service in the Army or Navy.

But when a patriotic American citizen seeks to aid his country, to support the fighting men, because of the policy of the majority party, he is asked:

Do you belong to the union? Have you paid your dues?

Yesterday, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] offered his usual amendment, which would give us increased production, permit citizens to

exercise their right to work, aid in national defense. It met its usual fate.

I hope the committee will listen to these words from a distinguished Democratic statesman, one who was speaking as an American. He said, on Friday last:

I am not satisfied with the industrial situation either. I think strikes ought to end and stay ended until the men in the front lines get the guns which they ought to have to defend their lives and save this country. I am disheartened that there is not enough courage in the high leadership of this country to bring into being a law which would prevent strikes.

How true is that charge. We call on our soldiers, our sailors, our marines to have courage on the battlefields and on the sea and we lack the courage to vote our convictions. Yesterday the amendment which contained practically the same provisions that the House put into the Smith act a year or more ago by a vote of 2 to 1, and which would prevent strikes, received on the floor here just 39 votes. Yet the majority leader of the House cautions us to keep still. He said:

I am confident that most of those who followed a certain policy and who did it sincerely should now at least employ decency by remaining silent in these days if they cannot make constructive utterances.

The Republicans have offered many constructive suggestions, similar to the one offered yesterday by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOWARD SMITH], similar to those offered by a Democratic statesman on Friday last over on the floor of the other body and just quoted above—RECORD, page 1247.

Now, let me read again from the distinguished Democratic statesman's remarks. He said on the 13th of February:

It becomes more and more difficult to sit silently in this Chamber in the face of undertakings throughout the Government which, in my judgment, are sufficient at times to cause the soldier in the front line in the Bataan Peninsula to throw down his gun in disgust. * * * While they are dying on the battlefield, as many of them are doing every day, here at home we are destroying the very thing which they give their blood and their efforts to perpetuate.

This Government is an overgrown monstrosity from top to bottom, an extravagant, wasteful bureaucracy in the midst of the whole war prosecution.

This statement was made over in the other body. Yet when we venture here to offer amendments or offer criticism which will remedy a situation caused by these strikes, we are told that we should have the decency to sit down and keep still. I say the majority party, the majority leadership, should have the decency to undo this intolerable situation to which this distinguished Democratic statesman refers.

That same Democratic veteran, a statesman, said:

I know that unless someone begins to speak and to speak courageously, this war might be lost and all the dead would be just as dead as if the war had been won.

Another statement was made by the majority leader yesterday. I quote:

I particularly exhort those who opposed everything, or practically everything, prior to December 7, to remember that we are in a war now. If we had followed their leadership we would be defeated today.

In reply to that erroneous statement I say if this administration had followed the suggestions of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], we would not have gone into a two-ocean war when we were unprepared.

Then the majority leader went on to say—RECORD 1364:

If we had followed the leadership of the gentleman from Kansas we would be defenseless today.

What an utterly absurd statement. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] and those who believed as did he advocated almost incessantly that we prepare for defense of our homeland before we sought trouble elsewhere. If there is a man on the floor of this House who has more good, hard, common sense and vision and the fearlessness to speak his mind, to warn the Nation of impending disaster, than has the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], I know not his name. I say to you that, if we had followed the leadership of the gentleman from Kansas, the President could not yesterday have made the statement which he did make at his press conference; could not have said that our northwest Pacific coast and our Atlantic coast are at the mercy of an attack from our enemy who comes from across the sea.

The majority leader yesterday, when he so futilely attempted to give the minority a verbal spanking, made this observation. I quote—RECORD 1364:

Let us stop making mountains out of mole hills.

Does he think that Pearl Harbor was a mole hill? Does he think that the inexcusable, the criminal loss of the *Normandie* was a mole hill? When a ship like the *Normandie*, so sorely needed for our national defense, is permitted to burn and sink at a dock in the city of New York, because of the carelessness, the incompetency, of those who are acting under the Secretary of the Navy, under the Commander in Chief of the Navy, the President himself, does the majority leader mean that we should sit still, remain silent, not call for greater vigilance, for greater efficiency? Just how great must be our losses before we of the minority are permitted to ask that steps be taken to prevent similar disasters?

And then the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], continued:

You may talk about labor unions, but we all have a card in the Union of the United States.

As an oratorical statement that may be a gem, but it is meaningless insofar as it applies to one of the evils of which I have complained. True, figuratively speaking, we all have a card in the Union of the United States and presumably we all have a right to work for the defense of the Union of the United States.

But, under the policy pursued by the party represented by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], while our union card admits us to the Army and the Navy, to the armed forces of the Union, it does not admit us to a national defense job. This administration, the majority party, backs the policy

which renders our card in the union of the United States of no value, insofar as national defense work is concerned.

While the gentleman from Massachusetts and all the rest of us have, as he said, a card in the Union of the United States, that card does not take us through the gates to a national defense job until we have bought a license to work from the labor union which is backed by the administration.

The appeal of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] was that we look first to the defense of our own land. He is a realist. Coming from the Grass Roots, he knows that every successful enterprise or venture must have a sound foundation. He knows, and what he has tried so often to tell this House, if I understood him correctly, is the elemental truth that, unless we first prepare here in the homeland an impenetrable defense, we cannot successfully and with safety send armed forces to fight on every continent, on every sea.

Had the advice of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] been followed, it would not have been necessary for another Democratic statesman in another body to have suggested, as he did the other day:

The day may come when we shall have to bring back from the four corners of the world our depleted Navy to be a source of defense for our own shores.

If the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, wants unity, let me most humbly suggest to him that he can best get it by directing the efforts of this administration toward the winning of the war, the forgetting of its social reforms, the advancement of its own political fortunes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am sure that it behooves us all in these critical times to be very much interested in the economy that can be effected by the reduction of nondefense spending. A few days ago I made some remarks on the floor of this House with reference to the propriety of having some agents of our own follow up these various appropriations and see how the money is spent. In other remarks I also made inquiry of the Committee on Appropriations with reference to the amount now being expended for printing and binding. I received the rather startling information that the discoverable printing and binding, aside from that which is done in the various bureaus and departments themselves, would aggregate \$50,000,000 a year.

I now direct the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to another inquiry or two. How much is being expended annually in the various agencies for long-distance telephone calls? This whole country can be covered today in 24 hours or less by air mail at very little expense. Of course, Members of Congress do not have the privilege of using the telephone at Government expense on these official long-distance calls, and that is quite proper, and I have paid for several of my own quite recently; but it seems to me ridiculous to expend great sums of money in having these various agencies telephone all over the country at

Government expense when an air-mail stamp would serve the same purpose and about as expeditiously. Of course, in these times some such calls are necessary, but I am sure the expenditures can be very greatly reduced without detriment to the service.

Further, the committee might look into the amount expended with reference to travel. I feel confident that a great deal of this travel is unnecessary and that it could be eliminated.

I am preparing a measure as a basis for consideration along the line of my remarks the other day, to have some agents of our own to follow up these appropriations and help us in the economy that we can effect, and thereby save the taxpayers of this country very great sums of money.

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

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. HARE. I suggest that the subcommittee to which I happen to belong has emphasized the cost with reference to printing and binding and with reference to telephoning. The gentleman will find in the RECORD where I made some observations at the beginning of the year about this. This is one item we felt that can be reduced and should be reduced. I refer to printing and binding.

Mr. LANHAM. Can the gentleman advise me how much is spent annually on these telephone calls?

Mr. HARE. No, I cannot, but I can say that our committee has insisted that the telephone calls be reduced to a minimum. I agree with the gentleman that we are spending too much. We have insisted in every case that they centralize this activity as much as possible, particularly the matter of traveling. I think the suggestion that they should use our air mail should be given great consideration, because so far as telephone calls are concerned, the cost of them or the profit in them goes to the private industries, while if they use air mail and buy stamps, the income goes to the United States Government. For that reason we have insisted, and I shall continue to insist, that they use the air mail where possible. I appreciate that some one from some other committee has taken up this suggestion.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for what he has said in that regard, and I think these various matters, to which attention has been called and concerning which it is impossible to get any definite or accurate information, accentuate the necessity for legislation along the line of that which I hope very soon to introduce.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I agree, and this subcommittee agrees, with the observations of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. In fact, for the past several years we have been complaining to the various bureaus and departments about their telephone bills and their travel bills and their printing and binding bills. Not only have we been doing this, but we have been demanding that in each succeeding

year the telephone bills and these other bills be cut down, and I believe efforts at savings have been made by the various departments.

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

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], a very valued member of this committee.

Mr. JONES. I suggest to the gentleman from Texas that his idea of a Representative from Congress to look after the spending of the appropriations is commendable.

However, providing an agent of Congress to see that the money is spent for the purposes appropriated, is a legislative matter and cannot be brought in by the Committee on Appropriations. There is no legal authorization for such a position and therefore any amendment to this bill would be subject to a point of order.

The gentleman is chairman of the housing committee and has been responsible for a little over a billion dollars being appropriated for housing, but lo and behold, from an investigation I made personally, three and one-half billion is available for housing. It is handled by 14 uncoordinated agencies, each of them going to a separate budget officer and making requests independently of each other. No budget examiner knows what the other is allowing. They are even using the prewar borrowing power of spending agencies for housing. I think a good start could be made by clearing up the housing situation, by the gentleman's committee bringing in a bill to give Congress a representative to check upon the expenditures in his particular committee, and I will support it enthusiastically.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, I intend for these employees to make these inquiries for all of the different committees; to be the agents of the Congress. Although the gentleman has exaggerated the sum that has been expended through authorizations by the committee of which I am a member, I may say that we have already eliminated one of those agencies and we are seeking to eliminate some of the others.

Mr. CARTER. We congratulate the gentleman upon his success so far and we hope it may continue.

I appreciate that the remarks of the gentleman from Texas are very pertinent. We must scale down all of these nondefense appropriations. The travel bill of this Government is startling and alarming. Our committee only handles three of the smaller departments of this Government, but, notwithstanding that fact, the general travel bill of the Government is increasing year after year by leaps and bounds. Something must be done to hold it down.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. In view of the specific request as to the amount of money being

spent for telephone bills by the departments, I think it would be well if the gentleman would, through the clerk or otherwise, find out approximately how much there is in this bill for telephones in the Departments of Justice, State, and Commerce, in order that we might bring it into the record. Of course, the gentleman could not be expected to give the figures from memory.

Mr. CARTER. We can get it for the benefit of the House as far as our own departments are concerned. We have scanned those figures before the committee and we are using our best endeavors to keep the amounts down.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. HARE. The gentleman will recall that last year when we reported the bill I emphasized the fact that one agency in the Government, employing 800 people, spent a little over \$33,000 for telephones.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I want to say to the gentleman that I was not intending any criticism of the Appropriations Committee as I realize they are very busy men, but I do think we ought to have this information from all the departments. That is the reason I think we ought to have these follow-up men who are agents of our own.

Mr. CARTER. I appreciate that and thank the gentleman for his constructive suggestion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps there is no better time than the present to bring forcibly to the attention of the committee the diligence and the devotion of the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal judiciary. This committee is really familiar with the items that come before it. When you asked the questions about telephones, I say to you that the item of telephones is covered by the individual agency in each little subdivision of the Government as they present their justifications before the committee, as they make their appeals for funds. If it is the desire of the House to assign someone to gather all those different telephone bills and put them into one figure, it could be done. However, what we did do in the matter was this: We instructed the secretary and the assistant secretary to appoint someone in the Department to give the O. K. for permission to make long-distance telephone calls, and that personal calls in the Departments be absolutely frowned upon. This is not new this year with this committee, to my knowledge. This committee has repeatedly emphasized this for the past 7 years. This committee has been interested in more things than telephones. I have some notes here that I made to tell the committee about, not since this question came up but long before.

SAVINGS IN COMMUNICATIONS; CONSOLIDATION IN TRAVEL

We have made a tremendous saving in the consolidation of travel. Some years ago some bureaus had no limitation upon their travel allowance. The sky was the limit. It is not so today.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. In every Budget estimate for each agency there is an item for communications, is there not?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Which includes not only telephone but telegraph and other communications?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. It would be a comparatively simple matter to bring those totals together, to show what the total appropriation for communications is for your entire appropriation bill, would it not?

Mr. RABAUT. I assure the gentleman that because of the fact that this subject has been brought up in the House today, as far as our committee is concerned, we shall bring such totals before you next year.

Mr. KEEFE. Can the gentleman advise the House now whether the amount contained in the pending bill for communication items is greater or less than the similar items in last year's bill?

Mr. RABAUT. I could not tell the gentleman in the aggregate because it is in different parts of the bill, spread all through the bill, and this bill deals with four departments of the Government, State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary.

Mr. KEEFE. But each department has a specific item in its Budget estimate under the heading "Communications," does it not?

Mr. RABAUT. We could supply the gentleman this information, but we could not give it to him at this moment.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I am very pleased to yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is there an item in the bill for the purchase of automobiles? I am not criticizing the subcommittee, being a member of the whole committee myself, but a matter that gives me some concern is that we are spending too much money buying automobiles for bureaucrats in the various agencies of the Government when very often they are probably not used for official purposes. It would be much cheaper, it seems to me, if we could work out some plan whereby we could allow them taxi fare when they want to go from the departments to the Capitol or from one department to another department. Does the gentleman have any information on that point?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Coming from Michigan, as I do, the home of the automobile, I am very glad to answer the gentleman.

I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that the Army, the Navy, and some of the attachés appointed to United States consulates and embassies throughout the world, and high-ranking officers of the Army and the Navy have very de luxe cars, in the observation of the gentleman from Michigan. But, do you know that we furnish no cars to our Ambassadors? This is no bill in which to introduce a complaint against the purchase of automobiles. There are plenty of places where I think it would apply, but it does not apply to this particular bill. I notice the gentleman defending the Army is right here on his feet. I yield to him now.

Mr. MAY. I am very glad to say to the gentleman that I am not defending the Army and the Navy, for they need no defense; they are the two organizations defending all of us.

Mr. RABAUT. Very good.

Mr. MAY. But I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there are several other organizations in the Government that are buying automobiles. Expecting to be criticized for calling one particular organization by name, I can advise the gentleman from Michigan that the Tennessee Valley Authority has 6,000 cars in the State of Tennessee.

Mr. RABAUT. Take that up with the Committee on Appropriations, not with me. I want to say to the gentleman, however, that it does not seem quite right when you go to an embassy of the United States and see the commercial attaché, the naval attaché, or the military attaché with an automobile, but the Ambassador, unless he has his private vehicle, has to go to an American friend and ask for the loan of his car, if you ask the Ambassador for one. That is what is going on today. Now, there are two or three other things I want to discuss.

This committee was one of the first to frown upon the idea of detailing employees from one department to another not within the scope of the appropriation from which their salaries were paid. There has been some abuse along this line right here in the House. A committee will be set up and be given \$10,000 for a certain investigation. It will then proceed to walk down to one of the departments and ask for \$25,000 worth of help. That department is then short, of course, and comes before us first under an emergency for temporary employees, and then walks up to the regularly constituted subcommittees and presents justifications for keeping them on the permanent roll. The net result is they get about \$25,000 additional appropriation. This abuse has occurred as between departments, it has occurred here in the Congress, and even in the White House. I do not object if they want it done that way, but I admire frankness. If an investigation is going to cost \$100,000, ask for the \$100,000 and find out if the House will grant it. Perhaps it will not, but do not ask for \$10,000 and then proceed to one of the departments to obtain \$25,000 more through use of employees they must pay. It is not right. It is a procedure

this committee has been very much interested in and has frowned upon.

Another thing we are interested in is prison camps. We have a lot of these C. C. C. camps that ought to be turned over for prison camps, and it would be an inexpensive and a good thing.

Our activities have been many. This committee purchased some land about a year ago, and I would like the committee here to note what we paid for the land, which was adjacent to the Bureau of Standards on Connecticut Avenue. After much dickering, we bought some 14 acres for \$125,000. Compare that with some of the prices recently paid for land in the District of Columbia. This committee inspected the site, convinced the owners that the Government was the only purchaser for that property.

The committee has suggested many improvements in the Foreign Service of the State Department as a result of knowledge gained from inspection trips. The Committee made recommendations for improvement in the situation respecting Mexican immigration, prisoners have been put to work, hard work, and now they are beginning to have more respect for the immigration law. Those are some of the things that have been accomplished and we are now looking for further improvement along some other lines.

First. Improvement in the parole procedures.

Second. The enactment by Congress of an indeterminate sentence law.

Third. The proper disposition of the expensive and valuable land in the District of Columbia now erroneously occupied by the National Training School for Boys, over 300 acres on Bladensburg Road.

Fourth. A marked improvement in the conditions and management of county and city jails, and in this connection I quote from the report.

The Bureau of Prisons has maintained for several years a force of jail inspectors who visit these county and city jails in which Federal prisoners are kept, for the purpose of rating them in terms of their general condition and management. Some of the conditions that exist in these local institutions are appalling. The committee has inserted in the record a list of those jails where conditions are most glaringly bad, as well as a list of those highest on the list as far as their ratings are concerned. Over the past several years only a meager improvement appears to have taken place in the general picture of jail conditions in the cities and counties of the country. The committee is convinced that the only way now that any measurable improvement will take place is to have the glaring light of publicity focused on the institutions that are the worst offenders.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the Department of Justice, \$567,500.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 33, line 15, strike out "\$567,500" and insert "\$482,500, of which not more than \$33,000 shall be used for the purchase of paper for the purpose of issuing press releases by the

publicity and propaganda agency of the Department."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this is a cut of \$75,000 in the printing and binding item. I have arbitrarily cut \$75,000 off of this item. There is no scientific basis for the cut, except from what we can figure from the back door up to the front.

You cannot tell how much the Government is spending for publicity bureaus. The salaries of all branches of the Government cost the taxpayers \$27,700,000 a year. You cannot tell because there is no separate budget and accounting for publicity bureaus. They are hidden in the bureaus under the heads of "assistant clerks," "stenographers," and "secretaries." Anybody who can turn a crank on a mimeograph, labeled "clerk," "secretary," or "stenographer," is in the Federal Publicity Bureau. The Budget Bureau which grants the funds for each department cannot tell you how much is spent for publicity in all of the bureaus of the Government.

Something was said this morning about trying to cut down the Government publicity, and I heartily agree with that proposition. Since Pearl Harbor the United States has been united and there is no excuse for any department or agency carrying on a publicity bureau for the benefit of itself or for the benefit of the Government. This applies especially to the Department of Justice. It has no excuse whatever for a press and propaganda service, because it has the ear of the country. What it says is spot news. Mr. Biddle, the Attorney General, can get into the Movietone News, RKO News, Pathé News, and Paramount News. He can get widespread publicity by merely asking for it. He will be thus offered the opportunity to give any message to the public he wants to. The newspaper boys have their ears out for anything that the Attorney General, the F. B. I., the Antitrust Division, or the Federal Bureau of Prisons has to say. It is therefore not necessary for the Department of Justice to have a publicity bureau.

My amendment cuts the amount of \$75,000 from the printing and binding item for the Department of Justice for this reason. In 1940 the Department of Justice bought from the Government Printing Office blank paper of the type of mimeograph or duplicating paper in an amount of \$107,986.66. Add that to the other paper that all the other departments bought from the Government Printing Office for duplicating purposes in the fiscal year 1940 and the total amount is \$1,803,418. That is for 1940.

In 1941 the total duplicating-paper price rose from \$1,800,000 plus to \$2,500,000. Think of it, that is for blank paper alone. Proportionately the Department of Justice's increased from \$107,986.66 in 1940 to \$187,258.56 in 1941.

Mr. Chairman, conditions have changed since the first bomb dropped on Pearl Harbor and there should not be any need for this waste of the Department of Justice paper. There should be no more paper than is necessary for interdepartmental communications. I think the

amount I have set of \$33,000 ought to cover that.

The Department of Justice, more than any other department, should be the first one to stop this flagrant use of the propaganda method of publicizing itself. People look up to the great Department of Justice as a shining example. There is a specific law that is being transgressed in every department except the Congress' own General Accounting Office. That is the only agency that does not have a publicity bureau that I know of. All of these departments have been hiring and employing publicity men outside authorized appropriations and in violation of law.

Did you know the reason why propaganda specialists are not on the pay roll as publicity men? Because in about 1916 the Congress passed a law which said that the departments could not have publicity men unless Congress specifically authorized the appropriation for publicity purposes. The only way they could expand the publicity departments was to do so dishonestly. It is generally done that way, so that no one can check back on it. That is the method of circumventing what you gentlemen on both sides of the aisle talked about this morning. Take away the paper and they will not have anything to spill ink on. Take away the paper and there will not be any necessity for these publicity jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I trust my amendment will be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee who is handling this bill if he will explain to the House what the special counsels requested in the bill are going to be utilized for?

Mr. RABAUT. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from California, I may say that the work to which these special attorneys are assigned is left entirely to the discretion of the Attorney General. May I further say to the gentleman, following along his line of thought, which I believe is based upon economy, that the amount we allowed for this particular activity in 1936 was \$700,000, to which was added a supplemental appropriation of \$176,000. The appropriation for 1943 is \$200,000, so I think the committee has done well with this item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I concur in the statement of the chairman to the effect that the committee has taken exceptionally good care of the department as regards furnishing special counsel is concerned, but may I ask the gentleman if there was any indication in the justifications that were presented to his committee whether or not any of these special attorneys were to be used to take care of the Japanese menace that now exists on the Pacific coast, and if not, why not?

Mr. RABAUT. We made no particular inquiry of the Attorney General as to what he is going to do with these special attorneys, feeling that is a matter which should be entirely within the discretion of the Department of Justice.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I concur in general with the committee because they have always done a splendid job, but I do think it is time that this House is entitled to know whether or not the Attorney General has enough help to do the job that the people on the Pacific coast know he is not doing under the present circumstances; in fact, he is using legal excuses to avoid responding to the protective requirements of the people on the Pacific coast as regards their and the national welfare.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may say to the gentleman that it is my understanding that at least in the Los Angeles area, where the Attorney General has his investigators gathering information, they do not cooperate with the Army Intelligence or the Naval Intelligence Services and, as a result, these other branches of the Government are not getting the information the F. B. I. discovers and has available, so that they do not know from what source they may expect trouble and do not know how to protect themselves against it. I believe this situation certainly ought to be remedied by the Attorney General's directing his staff, at least out there, to cooperate more fully with the other branches of the Government.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to speak for the rest of the California delegation, but as an individual Representative from the State of California I serve notice upon the Attorney General that if something is not done rapidly to correct the hazards that everyone who has any degree of intelligence knows exist on the Pacific Coast with regard to the Japanese question, I am going to introduce a resolution to investigate the activities of his office for the protection of the white citizens of my State.

I also call your attention to the opinion of the Jap condition as expressed by Walter Lippmann:

[From the Washington Post of February 12, 1942]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE FIFTH COLUMN ON THE COAST

SAN FRANCISCO.—The enemy-alien problem on the Pacific coast, or, much more accurately, the fifth-column problem, is very serious and it is very special. What makes it so serious and so special is that the Pacific coast is in imminent danger of a combined attack from within and from without. The danger is not, as it would be in the inland centers or perhaps even for the present on the Atlantic coast, from sabotage alone. The peculiar danger of the Pacific coast is in a Japanese raid accompanied by enemy action inside American territory.

This combination can be very formidable indeed. For while the striking power of Japan from the sea and air might not in itself be overwhelming at any one point just now, Japan could strike a blow which might do irreparable damage if it were accompanied by the kind of organized sabotage to which this part of the country is specially vulnerable.

This is a sober statement of the situation, in fact, a report, based not on speculation, but on what is known to have taken place and to be taking place in this area of the war. It is a fact that the Japanese Navy has been reconnoitering the Pacific coast more or less continually and for a considerable period of time, testing and feeling out the American defenses. It is a fact that communication takes place between the enemy at sea and enemy agents on land.

These are facts which we shall ignore or minimize at our peril. It is also a fact that since the outbreak of the Japanese war there has been no important sabotage on the Pacific coast.

From what we know about Hawaii and about the fifth column in Europe this is not, as some have liked to think, a sign that there is nothing to be feared. It is a sign that the blow is well organized and that it is held back until it can be struck with maximum effect.

In preparing to repel the attack the Army and Navy have all the responsibility but they are facing it with one hand tied down in Washington. I am sure I understand fully and appreciate thoroughly the unwillingness of Washington to adopt a policy of mass evacuation and mass internment of all those who are technically enemy aliens. But I submit that Washington is not defining the problem on the Pacific coast correctly and that therefore it is raising insoluble issues unnecessarily and failing to deal with the practical issues promptly. No one ever can hope to get the right answer unless he first asks the right questions.

The official approach to the danger is through a series of unrealities. There is the assumption that it is a problem of enemy aliens. As a matter of fact it is certainly also a problem of native-born American citizens. There is the assumption that a citizen may not be interfered with unless he has committed an overt act, or at least unless there is strong evidence that he is about to commit an overt act.

There is the assumption that if the rights of a citizen are abridged anywhere, they have been abridged everywhere. The effect of these assumptions has been to precipitate legalistic and ideological arguments between the military authorities out here and the civil authorities in Washington, and between the aroused citizenry of the coast and their fellow countrymen in the interior:

A much simpler approach will, I believe, yield much more practical results. Forget for a moment all about enemy aliens, dual citizenship, naturalized citizens, native citizens of enemy alien parentage, and consider a warship in San Francisco harbor, an airplane plant in Los Angeles, a general's headquarters at Oshkosh, and an admiral's at Podunk. Then think of the lineal descendant, if there happened to be such a person, of George Washington, the Father of his Country, and consider what happens to Mr. Washington if he decides he would like to visit the warship, or take a walk in the airplane plant, or to drop in and photograph the general and the admiral in their quarters.

He is stopped by the sentry. He has to prove who he is. He has to prove that he has a good reason for doing what he wishes to do. He has to register, sign papers, and wear an identification button. Then perhaps, if he proves his case, he is escorted by an armed guard while he does his errand, and until he has been checked out of the place and his papers and his button have been returned. Have Mr. Washington's constitutional rights been abridged?

Has he been denied the dignity of the human person? Has his loyalty been impugned?

Now it seems to me that this is in principle and in general the procedure which ought to be used for all persons in a zone which the military authorities regard as open to enemy

attack. In that zone, as in the corridors of the general's headquarters or on the deck of the warship or within the gates of the airplane plant, everyone should be compelled to prove that he has a good reason for being there, and no one should be allowed to come and go until he has proved that his business is necessary and consistent with the national defense.

In the vital and vulnerable areas it should be the rule that residence, employment, communication by telephone, telegraph, automobile, and railroad are confined to licensed persons who are fully identified and whose activities are fully known to the authorities and to their neighbors. The Pacific coast is officially a combat zone. Some part of it may at any moment be a battlefield. Nobody's constitutional rights include the right to reside and do business on a battlefield. And nobody ought to be on a battlefield who has no good reason for being there. There is plenty of room elsewhere for him to exercise his rights.

This is in substance the system of policing which necessarily prevails in a war zone. By this system the constitutional and international questions about aliens and citizens do not arise at the very place where they confuse the issues and prevent the taking of thorough measures of security. Under this system all persons are in principle treated alike. As a matter of national policy there is no discrimination. But at the same time the authorities on the spot in the threatened region are able to act decisively, and let the explanations and the reparations come later.

This approach to the question by-passes the problem which, as I see it, has caused the trouble in Washington. For what Washington has been trying to find is a policy for dealing with all enemy aliens everywhere and all potential fifth columnists everywhere. Yet a policy which may be wise in most parts of the country may be extremely foolhardy in a combat zone.

Therefore, much the best thing to do is to recognize the western combat zone as territory quite different from the rest of the country, and then to set up in that zone a special regime. This has been done on the Bataan Peninsula, in Hawaii, in Alaska, in the Canal Zone. Why not also on the threatened West coast of the United States?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 32, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, special committee No. 1, that on aviation, of the House Military Affairs Committee, recently submitted an interim report of its investigation and inquiry into the state of the Army air forces. This was printed under date of February 3, 1942, and is known as House of Representatives Report No. 1735.

As chairman of this special committee, I rise to inform the House of certain matters that have come to the attention of the special committee since the filing of the report and the action taken at a meeting of the committee held this morning.

Only recently have complaints been made to the committee by numerous persons, including responsible persons connected with the aircraft-manufacturing industry, that priorities heretofore grant-

ed for materials, tools, and productive equipment for the production of aircraft have been inadequate and, if continued, were bound to lead to serious shortages and retard the production of bombers, pursuit aircraft, and other military types. This has become a serious threat to 1942 production.

Prior to yesterday, four-engined bombers operated only on an A-1-B priority, and all other types of combat airplanes with an A-1-D rating. It is incomprehensible that men charged with the direction of our war effort, in view of the experience in every theater of war, should place priorities for aircraft behind any other priorities whatsoever. Every aircraft manufacturer in the Nation is expanding plant facilities, and with huge new plants scheduled to open this year, the aircraft industry is faced with innumerable pending shortages of materials because of the lack of foresight on priorities here in Washington. Apparently control is still in the hands of those who think in terms of battleships and ground equipment.

How, under the sun, are we ever going to win this war unless we can clear the skies of enemy aircraft, so that our Navy can convoy the necessary troops, tanks, arms, and equipment to the end that we may push the enemy out of the territory he has overrun?

The material shortage has become acute with some of the airplane companies. It is remarkable that they are producing so much in view of the situation that confronts them. Up until yesterday the priority rating given aircraft placed it behind the bulk of the Navy program, behind battleships, behind tanks, behind trucks, and a host of other war items.

Let me warn Congress and the American people that the A-1-A priority finally given the aircraft industry yesterday will be of little avail unless aircraft manufacturers are given preference over many of the items to which a similar rating has been granted. A-1-A is completely overloaded.

We are informed hundreds of items have A-1-A priority. If this be true, aircraft should have a triple A-1-A rating.

I quote a letter dispatched today to the President, to the Chief of the War Production Board, to the Secretary of War, and to the Chief of Staff:

The attention of special committee No. 1, that on aviation, of the House Military Affairs Committee, has been called to newspaper reports, to complaints of trade journals of the aviation industry, and by responsible persons identified with aircraft manufacture to the very unfortunate situation which has existed with reference to priorities for raw materials, tools, and productive equipment for the aircraft industry.

Surely our armed forces must be conversant with the fact that to be successful on land or sea requires air supremacy. Every campaign of the present war, beginning with Poland, is indicative of this.

The A-1-A priority finally given the aircraft industry yesterday will be of little avail unless aircraft manufacturers are given preference over some of the many industries to which a similar rating has been granted. Allocations of raw materials, tools, and productive equipment should be made so as to provide all elements necessary to obtain the

maximum possible output from existing and planned facilities for aircraft production for 1942.

Signed: Dow W. Harter, Andrew Edmiston, John M. Costello, Overton Brooks, W. G. Andrews, Leslie C. Arends, Charles R. Clason, Charles H. Elston, S. W. King.

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

Mr. HARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I am in accord with everything the gentleman has had to say. I would be glad to join the gentleman, the gentleman from West Virginia, and all the other Members of the Congress in an attempt to correct this situation.

May I ask the gentleman this question, Does this apply to trainers as well as bombers?

Mr. HARTER. It applies to all aircraft under the program.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think they ought to have top rating.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. As one of the members of the subcommittee, it is my conviction that aircraft should be given a special rating above all other ratings, so that all the necessary materials to build the planes that are so badly needed to protect the men, the ships, and the tanks will be produced, in order that we may bring this war to an early conclusion.

Mr. HARTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from Ohio has just given us a very interesting report. However, it is out of order in the discussion of this bill, and we have had a number of other out-of-order speeches here. Consequently, we are getting along very slowly with the consideration of this bill. I have no desire to shut anybody out or to invoke any harsh rule, but if we are going to get through with this bill today I think the speeches hereafter should be confined to the subject matter of the bill. I give notice now that I shall feel constrained to make a point of order against further such speeches if Members do not comply with the rule.

Mr. RABAUT. I am in accord with the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try to comply with the suggestion of my colleague from California in that I shall discuss the Department of Justice. I am afraid, however, that the Department of Justice is

not aware of what year we happen to be living in. We have had discussions by members of the Pacific coast delegation with representatives of the Attorney General's office regarding the situation on the Pacific coast to which my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] referred just a moment ago. The Department tried to impress on us the fact that they had been working with great speed in that they had already arrested some 1,500 aliens throughout the country, whereas during the World War, in 1917, it was 8 or 9 months before they had interned a single alien.

Unfortunately, I think that is just what the Department of Justice is doing. They are living in the World War period of 1917, and they do not realize that the conditions of warfare have changed, and that the method of conducting warfare has changed. We have a problem on the Pacific coast that the Department of Justice does not seem to fully appreciate. They have representatives out there who, perhaps, are trying to find out what it is all about. The Department of Justice claims it is limited, and they can only handle aliens. Well, to handle the alien on the Pacific coast does not help the situation, it only aggravates it.

Next Monday they are going to demand that certain aliens move out of certain restricted areas. What happens to the citizen Japanese generally, and where do the aliens go? Has any provision been made by other Departments of the Government to house and resettle these Japanese aliens that are to be moved?

Practically no step has been taken out there on the coast to remove the Japanese American-born citizen, and there is where the crux of the whole question lies. The Department of Justice, I feel, has, to a great extent, tended to block and interfere with a program dealing with the moving of the citizens. That is the whole problem out there. The alien problem is simple to handle, but the real threat to the entire Pacific coast comes from the citizen of Japanese ancestry. Many of them have spent 15 or 20 years in Japan being educated. Some of them do not even speak the American language although they are citizens, and if there is any fifth column threat on the Pacific coast, it is going to come from that group and not from the alien who entered this country 40 or 50 years ago.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KERR. Is not the gentleman complaining about something that is really within the jurisdiction of his local court?

Mr. COSTELLO. I will state to the gentleman that it is not within the jurisdiction of our local courts.

Mr. KERR. You have a grand jury out there and you have the prosecuting attorneys and their assistants and you have the judges. Why complain about the Department of Justice unless you show that those people have not done their duty?

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state to the gentleman that he, likewise, fails to understand the problem. You cannot wait until a crime is committed and then go to a grand jury and demand that the certain persons who committed the crime be put in prison. What we have to do is to anticipate the commission of a crime. We have to move before any sabotage takes place, and, if you do not move in advance of that sabotage, Pearl Harbor will be insignificant compared with what could happen on the Pacific coast. Unless the Department of Justice moves speedily, unless the Department of Justice makes the information that is available to them also available to Army Intelligence, makes it available to Navy Intelligence, makes it available to our police forces and our sheriffs out on the Pacific coast, then you are liable to have just that situation develop. These things are not being done.

The Dies committee has had an investigator in Los Angeles for over 2 years, and he has investigated the Japanese problem, and it is my understanding that the Department of Justice has not even consulted with him. The information is available, and yet the normal means of pursuing that information are not followed. I say, in all sincerity, that unless something very definite is undertaken in the immediate future you are liable to have a most serious situation.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is not the gentleman's idea the same as that of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]—that all the Japanese should be removed out of that area because we cannot tell the good from the bad?

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state to the gentleman that undoubtedly that is the situation. They should be removed and resettled somewhere else, for their own safety as much as for ours. It can be done if the various agencies of the Government will take the necessary steps, but they should take them promptly.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman will recall that we had a measure pass the Congress which provided for the registration of aliens in this country. I have seen a recent report from the Department of Justice on that, which shows that 91,858 Japanese registered. Of that number 38,171 Japanese aliens are found in California and 38,149 are found in Hawaii. In other words, there are as many Japanese aliens in California as there are in Hawaii this very day.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state further to the gentleman that there are approxi-

mately 40,000 alien- and citizen-born Japanese in Los Angeles County alone, one of the most important strategic centers of this country, and unless that situation is taken in hand we are liable to have a real disaster.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the gentleman know there was a written order issued within the last few days to the people who handle the registration in California to extend the time of that registration over and above its original date?

Mr. COSTELLO. I did not know that that had been done. I think it is most unfortunate. I might also point out that while we have taken guns and cameras and other things away from the alien enemies we do not take them away from the children who happen to be citizens, and the result is that those who are citizens can have all of the guns they want. Up near Monterey there is a tremendous concentration of Army camps and activities. Agents went into a Japanese shop, a shop that sold sporting goods. Seventy thousand rounds of ammunition were found in that sporting-goods store, together with guns and cameras and various kinds of radio receiving and sending equipment—all in a sporting-goods store. I sincerely hope that the sport will not be against the American citizens and our industries.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it a fact Japanese are living contiguous to these Army air fields and arsenals and Army bases out there on the coast at the present time, that are not under surveillance, and not being removed?

Mr. COSTELLO. I say to the gentleman that they are scattered all over the Pacific coast. They are close to all of these Army camps and war industries, and they are not being removed. By removing the aliens from the immediate proximity of the camps and aircraft factories you would not solve that problem, because you can move them only a mile or two away and you cannot sufficiently guard any one of these areas so as to prevent a group returning there. The only solution of the problem is to remove them from the area completely, alien and citizen alike, all those persons who are likely to commit sabotage. As a matter of fact they can be removed and settled on other lands, on agricultural lands, and can be made comfortable and made to provide their own livelihood. Those things can be done, and the Japanese themselves will be better off. It is not a gigantic, difficult problem as it seems at first, provided the various agencies of the Government will cooperate and try to work out a solution of the problem, but when the Attorney General's office takes the attitude that they can handle only aliens and do not want to be bothered with citizens, they are not solving the problem, but they are ignoring it, and ignoring this problem will not do us any good, because we may wake up a day or

two late and find that the crime has been committed, and then the Department of Justice will endeavor to find the perpetrators and put them in jail, but they will be from 24 to 48 hours too late.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What can we do to help that situation?

Mr. COSTELLO. I think that all we can do is to urge the Department of Justice to take the necessary steps and cooperate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can we do that by resolution?

Mr. COSTELLO. I think that merely our remarks on the floor might tend to do a lot. In fact, I think the people out in California and the entire west coast are bringing enough pressure to bear, and perhaps finally we will get the Attorney General to cooperate. Cooperation is all that we need. Action can be taken, and I am sure that it is going to be done, because it has to be done.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman made the statement a few moments ago that the Attorney General would not do anything about the thousands of non-allies out there. Has he done anything about the aliens?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes, in respect to a few strategic positions. All of the aliens must be removed therefrom. Those aliens are to be removed, and were notified about the 7th of February, 2 months after the Pearl Harbor incident. That is the first actual step they have taken to do anything about the aliens. Three weeks' notice was given.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. To say that the gentleman in connection with the Pacific coast delegation has made every effort to impress the Department with the seriousness of the situation with respect to the native-born Japanese. We passed resolutions, in which the gentleman was very much interested, and in every manner tried to urge the Department to take steps to remove the menace of the native-born Japanese.

Mr. COSTELLO. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion, but I think the entire Pacific coast delegation has been working faithfully on this problem and I hope that we may get some results.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Conduct of customs cases: Assistant Attorney General, special attorneys and counselors at law in the conduct of customs cases, to be employed and their compensation fixed by the Attorney General; necessary clerical assistance and other employees at the seat of government and elsewhere, to be employed and their compensation fixed by the Attorney General, including experts at such rates of compensation as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General; expenses of procuring evidence, supplies, Supreme Court Reports and Digests, and Federal Reporter and Digests, and other miscellaneous and incidental expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General; in all, \$146,900.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before we leave the subject of the Attorney General's office, I want to add a word to what has already been said with reference to the very grave situation that exists on the Pacific coast owing to the heavy Japanese population. It is not limited to California, but it obtains all along the Pacific coast. In my own State of Oregon it is just as aggravated, although there is not such a large number of Japanese.

The serious problem with reference to the Japanese is this: They congregate close together around strategic undertakings having to do with national defense. For instance, in my own State, around the airports, where we are building airports for war purposes, the Japanese are gradually congregating and gathering at other strategic places. I understand down in California they own land, much of it in the names of children, minors, and babies, which is situated directly over large oil conduits. They have buildings that are directly over those conduits. They have strategic properties which are in almost every instance around these vital war activities that we are carrying on. I understand we have some 140,000 Japanese in the western area. As has been said here, it is not the alien Japanese that gives us such concern as it is the citizen Japanese, born in this country, holding dual citizenship. They are educated in our schools, speak our language, and have intimate knowledge of our defense industries.

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

Mr. ANGELL. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Is the gentleman certain that the Attorney General has legal authority to proceed against those citizens?

Mr. ANGELL. I will say to the gentleman the Attorney General and the military authorities have ample power. We are in war, and when the Attorney General's office and those in charge of the war program come to a realization that we are in war, then we will have some protection from this Japanese menace. We must not wait, as we did at Pearl Harbor, until it is too late. Is it reasonable to assume that in the case of Pearl Harbor we were powerless to do anything to protect ourselves when those Japanese were located all around that strategic area ready and poised to bomb into eternity our peaceful citizens and blow up our defenses? Self-preservation is the first law of society. I say that where we can establish a strategic area and deprive an American citizen not of alien lineage of the right to enter that area, we certainly can deprive the American-born Japanese of the right to live and carry on in these vital areas in the Pacific coast, when they have daggers behind our backs ready to be thrust into our hearts. You know that you gentlemen who sit on this floor today cannot go into the War Department Building or any strategic area unless you show your card with your picture and your signature and receive permission to pass. Do you mean that

merely because these Japanese are born in this country and cling to the right of dual citizenship, with their first loyalty to their Emperor and their first duty to their native country, Japan, we cannot say to them that they must keep off of these strategic areas, containing military installations, war industries, water and power-plant projects, oil fields and refineries, transportation and other essential facilities? I urge that all Japanese be evacuated forthwith from these areas and be held in protective custody.

The Attorney General does not seem to be alert to the imminent danger confronting the Pacific coast. The F. B. I. has a large appropriation in this bill. I have supported the F. B. I. 100 percent and will continue to do so, but I say to you as one of the Members from the Pacific coast that we must wake up, and if we do not wake up and protect ourselves from this menace something infinitely worse than Pearl Harbor will be enacted on our very shores.

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

Mr. ANGELL. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Do you not think it would be a good idea, in order to protect our boys being held as prisoners over there, to give about two Japanese for one American and bring our boys back to us?

Mr. ANGELL. I will say to my friend that I will do anything in my power to release our brave men held by the Japanese.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. I am wondering if we might not pass some legislation that would help the Attorney General. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. ANGELL. Personally I do not think any legislation is necessary, except we could properly earmark for this purpose a portion of the appropriation for the Attorney General's office. Otherwise I think we have passed all the essential legislation that is needed. We have placed complete control in the hands of our President, who is our Commander in Chief, with full power to deal with this serious problem. I hope the Attorney General and our military officers in charge will act in this matter at once.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

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

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I am wondering if we cannot get along with the bill? These are all pro forma amendments. I hope we can go along with the business before the Committee.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General appeared before the Pacific coast delegation meeting to discuss the Japanese menace in the West, in the New House Office Building, and when he was questioned as to his authority in the matter, he made practically this statement. He said, insofar as the Japanese aliens are concerned he

could and would go all the way, but when we come to Japanese who are American citizens he was estopped.

Now, it seems to me that in a situation like this we cannot indulge in any fine-spun theory. Japanese are situated on ground beneath which we have some of our main water-supply pipes. They are living on ground adjacent to our main transmission power lines. They are situated at places where at any moment they can do almost irreparable damage to the public utilities on which the people of the coast depend for water, power, light, fuel, and transportation.

There is a point that I think should be dwelt upon. I did not hear all of the statement made by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], and I do not know whether he touched on it or not, but there is what we call dual citizenship. Every child of Japanese parentage, born in the United States, according to the law of the Imperial Japanese Government, is still a citizen of Japan. He cannot break that citizenship unless he goes personally to the Japanese consul and gets from him permission to denounce that citizenship. When he does that he is no longer a dual citizen; he is a citizen of the United States. I do not suppose one-tenth of 1 percent of the Japanese in the United States have taken this step. They are therefore all dual citizens and not citizens of the United States. They should not be treated as citizens of the United States. They should be required to move away from strategic areas where they cannot bring about another Pearl Harbor. I do not advocate that they be treated harshly. They should be afforded every protection, but they should be excluded from all areas where they are a potential menace to the safety and security of the people, not only of the Pacific coast but of the entire Nation.

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

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws: For the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, including traveling expenses, and experts at such rates of compensation as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General, except that the compensation paid to any person employed hereunder shall not exceed the rate of \$10,000 per annum, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$1,800,000: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be expended for the establishment and maintenance of permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL: Page 40, line 13, strike out "\$1,800,000" at the end of line 13 and insert "\$2,000,000."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to restore to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice the amount recommended by the Budget Bureau. Last year the appropriation was \$2,350,000. That was the largest sum that has been devoted to that particular Division of the Depart-

ment of Justice in many years, and that came about mainly by reason of the fact that the President in a previous year had set aside \$250,000 of funds from other sources in order that the Antitrust Division might proceed with its work.

I assume that the committee, in taking off a further \$250,000, making in all a reduction of approximately 20 percent of the funds previously allowed to the Antitrust Division, were actuated by a sense of economy; but I cannot see any economy in licensing, legalizing, or refusing to prosecute conspiracies against the people and conspiracies against the Government.

It would be just as logical if we wanted to save money for the Government on all angles to repeal the law against mail robberies or post-office robberies or many other felonies we have provided in the statute books, in order to save the cost of the prosecution of the felons.

Mr. Arnold appeared before the committee and tried to lay before them the situation as to his Division. I have not the time now to call the attention of the Members to all of his testimony, but I would like to have those within my hearing read the testimony of Mr. Arnold commencing on page 194 of the hearings to get an understanding of a few of the things this Bureau has been doing which have saved the Government many millions of dollars. I read this statement made by Mr. Arnold on page 196 of the hearings:

Mr. ARNOLD. The first thing that we are interested in with respect to the war is restraints of trade which hamper full war production. Last year I came to you with some very startling stories of domination of American industry by foreign cartels. If you will turn back to your hearings, you will find a brief description of that.

Since that time we have either convicted or investigated illegal cartel arrangement in drugs, hormones, magnesium, fertilizer, tungsten carbide, nitrogen, aircraft precision instruments, chemicals, and zinc, and we are now interested in copper.

Unless you ask me, I am not going to detail those investigations, but I will give you a sample.

In the tungsten carbide case, we found an agreement between General Electric and Krupp, by which General Electric and Krupp, through pooling their patents, had monopolized tungsten carbide, and in 1 day, or at least in a very short period of time, they shot the price of tungsten carbide, which is the heart of the German machine-tool industry, from about \$48 a pound to about \$400 a pound. Immediately after our indictment, the price dropped down to \$48 a pound again.

That was typical of the cartel arrangements which we described to you last year through which Germany, by making an agreement dividing the foreign markets and agreeing not to import, assisted our own manufacturers in restricting the production.

That tungsten carbide indictment is typical. We found the same thing in drugs; we found the same thing in nitrogen, and so on.

Those foreign cartels, I think, to a large extent are cleaned up so far as their present operations are concerned. I think that we have made that sort of thing hazardous, and the imposition of a freezing order assists us very much in preventing the foreign domination of our own industry.

The tungsten carbide case is just one illustration. Here, as the result of the

work of this Division of this Department, the Government is saving \$352 a pound on a very essential material needed in our tool-making industries today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, proceeding a little farther, on page 197 he tells about the prosecution of the drug industry and the collection of fines which run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. He tells about the progress of the magnesium suit. The magnesium trial is set for March. The tungsten carbide trial is set for February. Nitrogen is set for trial. The drugs are all finished. The chemicals and metals are still in a state of investigation. If you will take time to read this testimony you will find what efforts the Government is making to combat these conspiracies to increase prices.

He mentions at the bottom of page 197 another investigation of rings interested in Government contracts. We have had this subject up here repeatedly. We all know that the contractor rings have bid the same price on various commodities needed by this country in peacetime. We all know that some of the 270-percent profit which some of these monopolistic corporations are getting out of these war contracts stems from the same kind of manipulation.

He says at the bottom of page 197:

Another type of thing we find is an increase in the creation of rings interested in Government contracts. To give you a sample of that, I will refer to our hat indictment. Here was a contract made under Office of Production Management direction, perfectly proper. We found out later that a group of manufacturers which formed the existing ring wanted to prevent anybody from breaking into it.

He goes on and describes how that fraud was worked upon the Government.

On page 199 he tells how the sulfuric acid proposition was put over on the Government by increasing the price of sulfuric acid, when at the same time the supply was increasing, by 20 percent. The Government was obliged to pay the price, even after the Government itself had fixed the ceiling.

He also told us about the matter of dairy monopolies, and he disclosed the nature of the control of the cheese industry in Wisconsin by the monopolies.

He takes up numerous other cases of how the farmers are mulcted by these monopolies.

Mr. Arnold stated:

We went into tobacco. We went into cottonseed oil, and we have six indictments in meat against the packers. I will read the products: Bread, butter, canned fruits, cheese, citrus fruit, cranberries, eggs, fish, groceries, meat, potatoes, rice.

The potato case is very interesting. That was in the South, in three States. The fertilizer companies finance the farmers. The farmers were compelled to buy all of their seed and all of their supplies from the fertilizer companies at vastly increased prices, and their potatoes were turned over to the fertilizer companies for sale, then they depressed the prices until the proceeds just

about paid the debts the farmers had owed the companies.

That indictment is now down in South Carolina—

He goes on to tell about the meat packers and what they are doing. He states:

We have had six indictments against the packers, all of which I think will stand. The packers, in brief, have been allocated these markets. They have been shaking dice to determine who should bid on this and that, so that in these situations I think that, in general, the antitrust laws are sufficient. I would say this, that I think that the antitrust laws are as good as anything that we are likely to get right now out of Congress, and I think that they are the most effective tool that now exists in the Government.

I wish I had the time to go further into the testimony of Mr. Arnold. It discloses that at a time when the people are complaining about expenditures, when we are levying huge taxes, when our total war authorizations run to \$142,000,000,000, these monopolies are continuing not only to oppress the people, but they are continuing to keep up prices of production for national defense.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this amendment is worthy and should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. Chairman, this proposed appropriation and this activity the committee is most sympathetic toward, but we believe the amount written into this bill is sufficient to enable this important piece of legislation to enforce the antitrust laws of this country. When this division in the Department of Justice was established we first appropriated \$700,000 in order that it might function and in order that it might look after the violators of the antitrust laws.

In the last 3 years we have constantly raised this appropriation until last year we appropriated \$2,325,000. Let us look into this matter a little bit and see if our present appropriation of \$1,800,000 is not a sufficient amount for the valuable service which this division of the judiciary is rendering.

We asked the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Arnold, who appeared before us to give us a list of the cases tried in the last 2 years, 1940 and 1941. He gave us a list of those cases and we discovered that in the prosecution of these cases he had succeeded in getting a judgment against the violators of the law in about 35 cases and these were fined a considerable amount. About 25 of the cases that were taken to the Federal courts were dismissed or not-prossed by the judge before whom they were brought and the prosecutors of these cases were certainly the equal of any lawyers in the Department of Justice. The fact is that I am convinced that Mr. Arnold has a splendid corps of lawyers assisting him in this valuable work which he is doing. You will note that almost one-third of the cases which were prosecuted under the antitrust law were dismissed in the above manner, and this embraces the

work of this Department for the last 2 years.

The record also shows that about 35 of the cases originated by this Department and carried to the courts went off by consent judgment. I must confess I do not know what a consent judgment means in a Federal court, unless it means that the prosecutor did not make out his case, and consented to its dismissal.

This amendment proposed raises the committee appropriation \$200,000 and the committee in its endeavor to cut appropriations wherever possible and in light of the record of the cases which had been prosecuted by this division of the judiciary, thought that \$1,800,000 would be sufficient to enable the antitrust division to do a good job and justify itself as a valuable factor in the administration of justice.

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

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

Mr. JONES. May I point out that since the Oil Coordinator has organized his office the antitrust cases that formerly burdened the Antitrust Division have all been turned over to Mr. Ickes' office, so that Division does not have that work to do any more. Thus there is considerably less demand for the funds, and taking out that factor will more than offset what the gentleman's amendment will attempt to do.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman is entirely right.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Further, we have a Price Administrator administering prices today, so there is not the necessity for this particular activity that there has been before.

Mr. KERR. Let me say finally, that this committee has been most generous with this activity in my opinion, and we consider that Mr. Arnold is doing a very valuable service for the country, but we do not think that it should bait private business and bring people into court unless they have a good case against the violators of the antitrust law. That is the truth of the whole business. The records of the prosecution of this Division in our judiciary show that almost two-thirds of the cases brought have been dismissed by the court, or else the cases went off on a consent judgment.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is it not a fact that the Budget itself cut off \$325,000 and denied an asked-for increase of 10 percent, which makes a grand total of \$557,000 the Budget eliminated because they did not believe such a sum was necessary?

Mr. KERR. I think that is correct.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HULL. The suggestion I should like to make is in the form of an argument. If it is true that this antitrust division is inefficient and cannot do the business, then why allow it any sum?

Mr. KERR. It can do some business, and they have done some valuable work. I think it is a good organization. However, I think the evidence discloses that in their work they have prosecuted a great many cases which were unnecessary. That is what I think about it. I believe the \$1,800,000 the committee has given them is a sufficient appropriation, and the committee is not endeavoring in any way to minimize the splendid service done by Mr. Arnold and his assistants.

Mr. HULL. May I suggest to the gentleman that if they would prosecute the dairy monopolies that control the cheese industry in Wisconsin alone they would save four times the cost of the whole Division.

Mr. KERR. I hope this fund of \$1,800,000 will enable it to prosecute these monopolies, and the committee is convinced that it will.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly in hearty accord with the attempt of my colleagues to increase this appropriation by this small amount. The member of the committee who just preceded me is, of course, right that it is a difficult job to cope with these big corporations, because they do not hire \$4,000, \$5,000, or \$6,000 lawyers when they go into court; \$50,000 or \$100,000 does not make much difference to them in such a case. They make the case appear as ridiculous as possible and drag it from one court to another.

I happen to have been on a board appointed by the State in Wisconsin when we investigated the cheese monopoly, the group that meets in Plymouth every Friday and sets the price on cheese, and that is the price for the whole United States. It is supposed to be an auction, and the cheese is supposed to go to the highest bidder, but we know that those men representing the big chain stores, the big cheese processors, and the packers, meet there and have their lunch during the noon hour, and then at 2 o'clock they go into the cheese board meeting and there supposedly overbid each other. We know very well, however, that the price is all agreed on beforehand, and nobody overbids the other fellow. They determine the amount of cheese which is available to them. This same thing is done on the markets in Chicago and New York with regard to butter and eggs.

I know a half dozen attorneys under Mr. Arnold were good attorneys, but, nevertheless, they were receiving \$4,000, \$4,500, or \$5,000 a year. They were young men, and they were not any match for the attorneys the big monopolies are able to hire. Nevertheless, in spite of the handicaps that were faced and the limitations in the amount that Mr. Arnold can pay attorneys in certain cases, he has made a very good showing in every line. He has started and made a showing, and at least has partially scared the big dairy operators.

We talk about price fixing. Yes, we have a Price Administrator, but he sets the price to the farmer, and the farmer

cannot get any more than that. But who looks after those in between, the big monopolies that boost the price? Why is it that the farmer back home today gets 25 or 26 cents for eggs and the consumer here and in New York pays 50 cents or more for eggs? Why is the same thing true about butter and meats and everything the consumer buys?

I think Arnold could step in there and find out why the monopolies are able to manipulate the price between consumer and producer. It is not the retailer who is fleecing both the producer and consumer. I think the best thing we could do would be to spend a little money to investigate the monopolies in between.

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

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think every Member of this House is in favor of breaking up monopolies, but does not the gentleman realize that we still have \$1,800,000 in this bill for that purpose?

Mr. GEHRMANN. One million eight hundred thousand dollars? I will bet that in the big oil case that was tried in Madison 4 or 5 years ago the oil interests spent more than that on that one case.

Mr. HOUSTON. Why were the oil investigators of this Division allowed to go over to the Department of the Interior, where they are turning their hand to this problem, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I do not know, but this case was tried several years ago. I know they had that case, and most of the parties were dismissed, just because this Division did not have enough money. Four or five years ago they had even less money than they have now and I think we should not squabble over this small amount.

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

Mr. GEHRMANN. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not part of Arnold's trouble grow out of the construction given to our antitrust law by the Supreme Court?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I believe that Arnold himself is being held down by his superiors. That is my honest conviction. I think Arnold would like to go after some of these men, but he is being held down. I do not think even the head of the Department wants him to go out and expose these big monopolies. I believe Arnold has the "guts" to do it if he were given a free hand and enough money to do it, and I hope we will adopt this amendment which is now offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 19, noes 42.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, special war effort unit: For personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including supplies and equipment, and all other expenses (except printing and binding) necessary for the enforcement of the Voorhis Act and other acts relating to the national security and defense, including the purchase, exchange, and rental of typewriters; travel expenses, including attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; stenographic reporting services by contract or otherwise; and books of reference, periodicals, newspapers (not exceeding \$2,500), and press clippings, \$385,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 42, line 21, after the semicolon, strike out the remainder of line 21 and all of lines 22 and 23, and insert "\$250,000."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this is the national defense unit of the Department of Justice. It formerly was the neutrality unit. It has charge of the enforcement of the Voorhis Act, which was passed by the Congress last year. The case they made for their expenditure of funds was to reclassify the Federal Bureau of Investigation's fingerprint files on aliens and enemies of the country. They claimed that through their work and their efforts warrants were prepared from their files so the F. B. I. was able to arrest with dispatch enemies after the declaration of war, particularly the Japanese, the Germans, and the Italians. When Mr. Hoover came before our committee it became apparent that the F. B. I. had the situation well in hand. They made the arrests 24 hours before this unit's warrants were delivered. I do not believe the record will show there is any excuse for their existence so far as this phase of the work is concerned. Their next claim for existence is that they provide clippings from various publications throughout the country, particularly the foreign-language newspapers. The Congressional Library has the facilities and the foreign-language translators. Under this item there is a provision to hire more translators in the Attorney General's Office, although the Congressional Library already has such facilities. The Library has the equipment and the personnel which could easily be expanded to take care of this matter. I do not believe the work should branch out in the Department of Justice in this respect.

Press-clipping work is also done by the Office of Government Reports. It seems to me with the extensive office force that the Office of Government Reports has that work should not be supplemented by this agency of the Government.

It seems to me we are running far afield in our national defense work by having one agency duplicating the functions and duties and responsibilities of other agencies. We are running into a number of bureaus handling closely related work.

The amendment will not prevent them from doing the unduplicated work which should be done by this bureau and on which I have no criticism to offer.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this particular agency does all the translating of foreign newspapers and periodicals published in the United States, and the purpose for making these translations is to uncover subversive activities. In these trying times, with the present world picture as it is, I think it is quite necessary that this work should be continued.

Moreover, we made a specific inquiry at the Library of Congress to see if there was any duplication of work and they assured us there was none.

In addition, this particular group is charged with the enforcement of the Voorhis Act, which is an enactment of Congress, and the Appropriations Committee, of course, is charged with the responsibility of furnishing the funds to administer that act.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I am pleased to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to my colleague from Ohio, but before I yield there is one further statement I wish to make. The committee itself has reduced the amount of the appropriation. The appropriation for 1942 was \$380,000.

Then there are additional amounts added to that. The Budget estimate for 1943 amounted to \$423,270. The committee reduced that to the sum of \$385,000, being a reduction of the Budget estimate amounting to \$38,270. I remember very well that in the committee my colleague was present when we considered this item, and while he was not in accord, nevertheless, I did not think he was going to make any special amendment with respect to it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, at the time I was in favor of eliminating the organization altogether. However, the Voorhis Act must be enforced. Only a few organizations were coming under control. Now, however, they have changed the name and call themselves the National Defense Unit. I think the \$250,000 will give them the personnel and expense money to do the things that should be done.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay and expenses of bailiffs: For pay of bailiffs, not exceeding three bailiffs in each court, except in the southern district of New York and the northern district of Illinois; and meals and lodging for bailiffs or deputy marshals in attendance upon juries in United States cases, when ordered by the court, \$305,000: *Provided*, That, except in the case of bailiffs in charge of juries over Sundays and holidays, no per diem shall be paid to any bailiff unless the judge is present and presiding in court or present in chambers: *Provided further*, That none of this appropriation shall be used for the pay of bailiffs when deputy marshals or marshals are available for the duties ordinarily executed by bailiffs, the fact of unavailability to be determined by the certificate of the marshal.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise

to find out the location of the item in the bill for the work of the Woman's Division in the South American cultural relations activities under the State Department appropriations. I have been unable to find it, and I understand that it is in the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. I suggest that the gentleman get a copy of the hearings and find where it is in the index of the hearings. I refer the gentleman to page 266 of the hearings.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That particular item then is in the bill?

Mr. RABAUT. All of the items allowed are in there. There were a great many items under this particular caption. As the item was set up there was a request for \$1,819,000. The committee reduced that to \$1,700,000.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I was not in the room at the time the gentleman referred to it. I find an item listed under the "Welfare of employed women," \$10,000, and I presume that that is the item which would permit the continuation of this splendid work between our country and the South American republics.

Mr. RABAUT. Of necessity, because of the cut by the committee in the amount requested of \$1,819,000 to \$1,700,000, there will be some effect in all of these items, to some little degree, but only in the discretion of the Secretary. If the Secretary wishes to give the full amount to some individual items, he can do as he wishes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sixty percent of the expenditures for the offices of the United States district attorney and the United States marshal for the District of Columbia from all appropriations in this title shall be reimbursed to the United States from any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: Page 52, after line 18, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"That of the sums heretofore appropriated in title II of this act, \$300,000 is made immediately available for the purposes of investigating and prosecuting Japanese and those of Japanese descent in the States of California, Oregon, and Washington."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering does not increase the amount of this appropriation. I have conferred with the chairman of the subcommittee, and he is agreeable to this amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. As I understand it, this is not a mandatory provision, but it is permissive to the authorities.

Mr. CARTER. The amendment that I have just offered makes \$300,000 of this appropriation immediately available to the Attorney General for a specific purpose. Gentlemen have heard the talk here this afternoon from the Representatives from the Pacific coast. We are somewhat alarmed out there, and from

the information that we have we believe we are justifiably alarmed about the situation on the Pacific coast. To be sure, the Attorney General has some funds with which to carry on this work. Ordinarily the funds appropriated in this bill would not become available until after the first of July, but this amendment will augment the funds that he is figuring on in respect to carrying on this work by \$300,000 which will be immediately available. It is a serious situation and demands immediate action.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I could not understand the reading of the gentleman's amendment. Just what does it provide?

Mr. CARTER. It makes immediately available to the Attorney General, in addition to any other funds that he has, the sum of \$300,000 of the funds carried in this bill, for carrying on investigations and prosecuting Japanese and persons of Japanese descent in the States of California, Oregon, and Washington. The problem was thoroughly discussed here this afternoon at considerable length. I do not know whether the gentleman was on the floor at the time, but great apprehension was expressed by Members from the Pacific coast, and I say very justifiably expressed. Some criticism was made of the Attorney General for lack of cooperation and possible inaction in regard to this matter. I think the adoption of this amendment—and I hope it may be adopted unanimously—will be notice to the Attorney General of the interest and the determination of this House to see that every protection possible is taken on the Pacific coast.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I want to ask why does he not amend his amendment also to cover the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. CARTER. I would have no objection to including the Hawaiian Islands, although the problem that we are discussing this afternoon refers to the three States above mentioned.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to amend my amendment to include the Hawaiian Islands and Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the amendment was amended by adding the words "and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska."

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield? I understand that they have martial law in the Hawaiian Islands and that this may not be needed for that purpose there. I am in favor of the suggestion made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. It will be needed on the Pacific coast, however, because we do not have martial law. It is such a large territory that it would be inadvisable to declare martial law.

Mr. CARTER. Even though martial law is declared in Hawaii, it will do no harm to include Hawaii.

I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his suggestion to include Hawaii and am going to include Alaska also. I hope the amendment, which I think is a very important one, may be unanimously adopted.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the committee is willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to run the Japanese out of Hawaii or they are going to run us out. The sooner the American people understand that fact the better off we are going to be.

I know the Hawaiian Islands. I know the Pacific coast where these Japanese reside. Even though they may be the third or fourth generation of Japanese, we cannot trust them. I know that those areas are teeming with Japanese spies and fifth columnists. Once a Jap always a Jap. You cannot change him. You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear.

When I went to Hawaii in 1937 on a committee to investigate the proposition of statehood for Hawaii, we found the Japanese were 100 percent for it. They wanted a State they could control. They knew they had the balance of power in Hawaii. They were denouncing what was called the Rankin bill. That was a bill I had introduced at the request of President Roosevelt to give him the right to appoint the Governor of Hawaii from the continental United States. We found that the elective officers in Hawaii were all afraid of these Japanese because of their political power. They constituted about 40 percent of the voting strength of the Hawaiian Islands. In our investigation I drew out and exposed the dual citizenship, under which, while claiming protection of the American flag, the Hawaiian-born Japanese admitted allegiance to the Japanese Empire.

Some of them who had voted in our elections the year before were then being drafted into the Japanese Army and Navy. Some were volunteering. We found throughout Hawaii, Shinto temples where these Japanese worshipped the Emperor of Japan. Some of those temples exist in California, Oregon, Washington, and probably Alaska. When we came back I refused to sign the report recommending statehood for Hawaii. Those Army and Navy officers told me that that island was literally teeming with Japanese spies. They pointed to the oil tanks and said, "Every one of them is in danger at any time a movement is made by Japan against these islands." The officer in charge of the air force in Hawaii at that time heard my statement that we needed the strongest air force in the world. He said:

For God's sake give us more of it in Hawaii.

This is a race war, as far as the Pacific side of this conflict is concerned, and we might as well understand it. The white man's civilization has come into conflict with Japanese barbarism. Christianity has come in conflict with Shintoism, atheism, and infidelity. One of them must be destroyed. You cannot regenerate a Jap, convert him, change him, and

make him the same as a white man any more than you can reverse the laws of nature, or, as the Bible says:

Bind the sweet influences of Pleiades or loose the bands of Orion.

This is a question we have to settle now, and we might as well understand it. I am for catching every Japanese in America, Alaska, and Hawaii now and putting him in concentration camps and shipping them back to Asia as soon as possible. If they own property in this country, after the war we can pay them for it, but we must ship them back to the Orient, where they belong. Until that is done, we will never have peace on the Pacific, and we will never have any safety in Hawaii, Alaska, Oregon, Washington, or California.

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

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. We found also that they had their own schools, in addition.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes; I was coming to that. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] was a member of that committee, and he saw what was going on. He and I discussed it at the time, along with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], who now sits before me. I said then that we had to get rid of those Japs or they would get rid of us. There can be no compromise.

I spoke in practically every high school in Honolulu, practically everyone on the island of Oahu, and they told me there that just as soon as those schools were out in the afternoon the Japanese children, and children of Japanese descent, would go directly to a Japanese-language school. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], who was a very able member of that delegation, will vouch for that statement.

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

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. Does not the gentleman think we should have an amendment in this bill providing for the deportation of Japanese from Hawaii in place of an investigation?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes; that is what I want. We must get rid of the Japs in Hawaii or they will get rid of us.

This is not a new proposition with me. I agreed with Richmond P. Hobson when he called the Japs "the yellow peril" more than 25 years ago.

Right after the World War, if you remember, the Japanese sneaked into Mexico and tried to secure a naval base in Magdalena Bay in Lower California. I have seen the very spot where they tried to establish that base, and would have done so if we had not blocked them.

We are at war. We are at war with Japan, the most ruthless and damnable enemy that ever insulted this country, and I am in favor of treating it as war and stopping all this interracial nonsense by which we have been petting the Japanese for the last quarter of a century.

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

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to vindicate the courage and the accuracy with which the gentleman from Mississippi speaks.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I should like to say that many Members of this House, including the gentleman now addressing the Committee [Mr. RANDOLPH], have suggested that the Civilian Conservation Corps camps now vacant be used to take care of the thousands and thousands of Japanese who are a menace on the west coast.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Certainly! I do not care where you put them, so long as you put them in concentration camps. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CORFEE].

Mr. CORFEE of Washington. I just wanted to add to what the gentleman has said about schools in Hawaii: That in the State of Washington the Japanese-Americans attend Japanese schools and study the Japanese culture daily following their attendance at the public schools. The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have taken the same stand as the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And another thing, they go to the Shinto temples and practice the Shinto religion, in which they worship the Emperor of Japan as god. Do not forget that.

Mr. CORFEE of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Do not forget that once a Japanese always a Japanese. I say it is of vital importance that we get rid of every Japanese whether in Hawaii or on the mainland. They violate every sacred promise, every canon of honor and decency. This was evidenced in their diplomacy and in their bombing of Hawaii. These Japs who had been there for generations were making signs, if you please, guiding the Japanese planes to the objects of their iniquity in order that they might destroy our naval vessels, murder our soldiers and sailors, and blow to pieces the helpless women and children of Hawaii.

Damn them! Let us get rid of them now!

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to thank the Committee for the adoption of this amendment by a unanimous vote; and I want the Record to show it was adopted unanimously, as it was. I am sure we who are out there on the Pacific coast exposed to the danger appreciate the action of the Committee this afternoon very much. Please accept not only my thanks and appreciation, but that of every good American on the Pacific coast.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to commend my colleague. He has been just as alert in the Committee of the Whole here this afternoon as he always is in the full Committee on Appropriations and its subcommittees in all things that relate to the safety of this Nation.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For all printing and binding for the Department of Commerce, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, except the Patent Office, the Bureau of the Census for the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1942, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and work done at the field printing plants of the Weather Bureau authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing, in accordance with the act approved March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220), \$550,000: *Provided*, That an amount not to exceed \$2,000 of this appropriation may be expended for salaries of persons detailed from the Government Printing Office for service as copy editors.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 55, line 5, strike out "\$550,000" and insert "\$475,000, of which not more than \$42,000 shall be used for the purchase of paper for the purpose of issuing press releases by the publicity and propaganda agency of the Government."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on page 55 to strike \$75,000 from what the committee allowed for printing and binding. The aim is to cut the paper purchases that may be used for press releases down to \$41,786.

Even though the committee has marked up this bill in the present amount, I think we should reconsider the item of printing and binding in view of the fact that yesterday we passed a \$32,000,000 appropriation bill for necessary war equipment. I point out again that since Pearl Harbor there is no need for publicity bureaus. I offer this amendment now in reference to the Department of Commerce in order to give the Congress an opportunity to let themselves be heard on the item of publicity, which runs into the tremendous sum of \$27,700,000 a year, involving some 2,995 full-time employees and 31,000 part-time employees. This is waste of such importance that we should now move to eliminate it if possible.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman recalls the President's conference the other day at which he said that economy cuts were up to Congress. It is up to us to make reductions in our normal expenses.

Mr. JONES. That is correct. I would like to see the Members of Congress take this much responsibility today. It may be the straw in the wind that will stop this evil practice.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of my colleague from Ohio to the fact that for 1943 the estimates for this purpose were \$585,000. The committee has cut this item \$35,000.

These are items which cannot arbitrarily be cut down. An action of this kind would only create additional work. The Department would be forced to submit another request to the Budget and then justify this request before the Deficiency Subcommittee. In these times, when all Government departments are overworked, such delay would be unwise. This item has already been cut \$35,000 and I think the committee has given it every consideration that it deserves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 37, noes 47.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. RABAUT and Mr. JONES to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 55, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Civilian pilot training: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in carrying out the duties, powers, and functions devolving upon it pursuant to the authority contained in the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 (49 U. S. C. 751, 752), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses; hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; \$36,000,000, of which sum \$8,000,000 shall be available immediately: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$402,000 of this amount may be transferred to the appropriation "Enforcement of Safety Regulations, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics", for expenditure in connection with payment of salaries and travel of aeronautical inspectors engaged in supervision and promotion of the safety features of the civilian-pilot-training program.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, that the House may be informed concerning the splendid work of the Civilian Pilot Training Corps I have asked for this time.

The Budget for the fiscal year 1942 carried a recommendation for an appropriation of \$18,000,000 to carry on the civilian pilot training work. Last year, the committee developed this entire subject very thoroughly, had before it representatives both of the Army and the Navy and, after much controversy and discussion, an agreement was worked out between the Army, the Navy, and the Department of Commerce which gave civilian pilot training graduates credit for the training they had undergone in the civilian pilot training school upon their entrance into the flying service of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. The committee

at that time increased the Budget estimate of \$18,000,000 for this training to a total of \$25,000,000, and that figure was made available by the Congress for expenditure in the current year. In the Budget for 1943 it is proposed that an appropriation of \$20,669,919 be made for this activity. The committee has increased this sum to \$36,000,000, which is the amount requested of the Budget Bureau by the Department of Commerce for the continuance of this training. This is an increase of \$15,930,081 over the approved Budget figure. Of the \$36,000,000, a total of \$8,000,000 is recommended to be made available immediately in order to get the accelerated program in prompt operation. The committee has no hesitancy whatever in recommending this substantial increase. If this war is to be won, obviously it will be won with planes and pilots. We are setting about on a huge expansion of our air power. Scores of thousands of pilots will be needed. The civilian pilot training program is the cheapest and safest program that has yet been devised for giving the primary training to those seeking to qualify for use in the armed air services of our country. Up to date the civilian pilot training program has trained some 70,000 pilots and over 21,000 of this group have gone into the armed services of our country. Over 3,000 have entered the flight services of Canada and England. Three-fourths of the fliers in the R. A. F. American Eagle Squadron are graduates of these schools. More than 25,000 C. P. T. fliers who have completed one or more courses are still in college and nearly all of them are pledged to fly for our armed services—a splendid reservoir of pilots. The safety record achieved in this work is equally impressive and it is worthy of citation that since the last trainee fatality these civilian pilot training students have flown over 17,000,000 miles in the course of their training.

It was represented to the committee that the Civil Aeronautics Authority could expand their program of civilian-pilot training to absorb an appropriation of \$89,000,000 without the necessity of purchasing one additional piece of equipment, and with this sum it would be possible to train 45,000 of the elementary college group, 30,000 of the elementary noncollege group, 10,000 in the secondary training course, 2,000 individuals on instrument flying, and 3,000 on multi-engine ferry-pilot work. It is to be hoped that both the War and the Navy Departments will make use of every facility for training now available rather than to incur the additional expense incident to the purchase of additional equipment and establishment of additional training areas.

Pilots for the War Department are trained at selected commercial schools, equipped by the War Department as far as planes are concerned for the training of Army pilots. Such a school is the Hawthorne School of Aeronautics, in charge of Mr. Alfred B. Bennett. The school is located at Orangeburg, S. C., and the letter which I will insert from Mr. Bennett, under date of February 8, gives

ample testimony as to the favorable contributing factor of civilian-pilot training. Of 33 instructors in this Army school of training, all but 4 had experiences of some kind with C. P. T. The letter follows:

HAWTHORNE SCHOOL OF AERONAUTICS,
Orangeburg, S. C., February 8, 1942.
Mr. ROSCOE WRIGHT,
Civil Aeronautics Authority,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROSCOE: Have just tabulated the results of my questionnaire.

Of the 33 instructors questioned:

Eleven took C. P. T. primary.

Eleven secondary.

Eight cross-country.

Seven commercial refresher.

Nineteen instructor refresher.

Sixteen had experience instructing C. P. T.

Twenty-six said their C. P. T. experience

helped them to qualify for their present jobs.

Seventeen said they could not have qualified without C. P. T.

Four had no experience of any kind with C. P. T.

This should convince anyone of the importance of C. P. T. in our big Army training program. I'll bet the experience of other schools is parallel, with the possible exception of some of the very first ones. However, we are more dependent now than ever before upon C. P. T. to produce new instructors, as the old-timers are being absorbed. Even the latter have a better chance of qualifying for Army instructing, having followed C. P. T. requirements.

I hope the above will be of value to you, and if you can use me to testify, I will be glad to come to Washington.

Sincerely,

ALFRED B. BENNETT.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have been very liberal all day about time. It is now 25 minutes of 4.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

Mr. RABAUT. I appreciate the gentleman's position.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has shown considered judgment and has given excellent support to the civilian pilot training program of the United States. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and others have made a notable contribution to this subject. Exhaustive study by the gentleman from Nebraska was reflected in his address on Monday when the bill was originally brought before the House for consideration.

I address my remarks today on a correlated subject which is of such importance that I believe the Members may desire to listen to certain observations I have to make. We are developing today a critical bottleneck from the standpoint of the need for trained airplane mechanics in the United States. We can delay no longer the building of a large-scale training course for mechanics. We must act before it is too late. In our attempt to build the greatest air force in the world

we have run into many obstacles. First of all, there was a shortage of factory space, then there was a shortage of materials. There have been other obstructions placed in the way of building a great air force by men in charge of the conduct and the planning of the war who are not yet sufficiently cognizant of the changes that have been wrought in the method of fighting any conflict this Nation must wage.

We know at the present time there is not only a shortage from the standpoint of pilots, but there is a mechanic manpower shortage, and it grows more acute. We know there are no stockpiles of such trained men or women in this field. We recognize that for the planes that are put into the skies we must have mechanics to produce them in the factories and to maintain them after the planes are in operation and being battered in actual combat.

On September 19, 1941, I introduced in the House the bill H. R. 5695, to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to include mechanics. This measure was given a hearing before the standing subcommittee on aviation of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The hearing was held on December 8. I hope Members will go over statements made by witnesses at that time. The subcommittee reported the proposal unanimously and later the full committee reported it unanimously. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], reported the bill to the House on January 19.

I trust I may be pardoned for saying to the members of the committee that I have written an article on this vital subject which appears in the March issue of *Flying and Popular Aviation*. I trust some Members may find it possible to read certain material in that story, based on careful study. I may place the article in the Appendix at a later date.

There are 46 private schools now approved by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. These 46 private schools are ready and eager to give training to mechanics. I am told many fine schools are operating today on about a 30-percent basis. They have the equipment and the instructors to take care at the present time of an additional sixty to seventy thousand students every year. We will be blind to facts if we do not utilize this basic background.

I am making no criticism of the United States Office of Education, which has carried on a certain limited program for the training of aircraft mechanics. It has done a splendid job. It is my understanding that about 265,000 young men have been given some type of instruction. However, the money used by the Office of Education can be applied only to the tax-free public schools. Throughout this country the private institutions are unable to share in this training program. That is not a sound national policy as we get set to wage war on a large scale in the skies.

We must realize—and I am certain we do—that with the increased production of fighting planes there will come a vast

increase in numbers of officers and men to fly them. Two million men will be needed. In that picture we cannot forget the need for hundreds and hundreds of thousands of trained mechanics to produce the planes and maintain them after they are ready for combat. I hope the House will soon approve a sound mechanic-training program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of officers and men on vessels: For all necessary employees to man and equip the vessels, including professional seamen serving as mates on vessels of the Survey, to execute the work of the Survey herein provided for and authorized by law, \$832,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I direct my remarks to the chairman of the committee for the reason that since we reported this bill I have been giving some study to the Coast and Geodetic Survey item in the bill. If you will turn to page 67, line 9, you will find there an item of \$80,000 for that agency. I am informed by the Department that the reduction to \$80,000 in that item from \$450,000 may result in disrupting considerable work in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, especially the map-making. They say the Army needs this badly.

The Budget sent to the Congress the amount of \$450,000, after having considered the necessity of transferring additional funds to the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the War Department. The defense map-making plan of the War Department contemplated a direct contribution to the Coast and Geodetic Survey of about 90 percent of that amount of money. We were of the opinion that this money was coming to the Department from the Army. They tell me now that perhaps they will not be able to get it in time, and that they are being asked for this work. I merely wanted to call the attention of the committee to the information I have received since we reported out the bill.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman knows I did not look with favor personally upon this cut in the amount made by the committee, but the gentleman knows as well as I do, and as every Member on this floor knows, that at times it is difficult for a subcommittee or a full committee to agree upon the exact amount of an appropriation. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman that this cut has been too drastic, but I think the proper place for it to be ironed out is probably in the Senate when the bill goes there.

Mr. STEFAN. I am worried that we do nothing here to impede our war effort. I was assured in committee that this money was going to the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the Army. They tell me that while that may be true, it is liable to be too late, that they need to do this work immediately. We shall not save any money by cutting this item, because the money will come from another Department anyway. We take it from one pocket and put it in another.

Mr. RABAUT. That is the very point I make, that it can be more fully developed by the Senate at their hearings. It is well that the gentleman brought the matter up at this time, because this gives notice to the Senate that there was some question about the item even in the minds of the subcommittee.

Mr. STEFAN. Let us get the record straight. If the gentleman assures me that the matter will be taken care of, I think it is all right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Field office service: For salaries (not to exceed \$310,000) and all other expenses necessary to operate and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices for the collection and dissemination of information useful in the development and improvement of commerce throughout the United States and its possessions, including foreign and domestic newspapers (not exceeding \$300), periodicals and books of reference, and the transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder, \$345,000.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 70, line 21, strike out "\$345,000" and insert "\$200,000."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, on every hand we hear talk about economy in nondefense departments. Every time we pick up a newspaper and look at its editorial page, we find a cartoon and an editorial asking the Congress to cut down on nondefense spending. The President only recently stated that it is the Congress that can do something about cutting down on nondefense expenditures. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] called your attention to this just a moment ago.

If there is any one place where we can cut, it is right here. The Price Control Administration and the Interstate Commerce Commission are two of the agencies now doing this work.

Frankly, there is little need for this field office service. I know that the committee did cut down on this particular activity, but they did not cut enough. If we are sincere about cutting down nondefense appropriations, let us give the American people evidence of our sincerity right here. Do not be kidded by representations that the little business man needs these parasites. Thus far, all the little business man has had is conversation in great abundance. No relief. Little business men are folding up by the dozens.

This is a relatively small item considering the billions of dollars we are appropriating here every day, but we must begin somewhere. These field offices are not necessary to the national defense. Other departments are carrying on the work they had formerly engaged in. In this mushroom era, the taxpayers of the Nation are entitled to one definite commitment by their Federal Government. Inefficiency and idleness in a defense industry would be intolerable. Equally, inefficiency and unnecessary civilian employment must be intolerable in our governmental agencies during the war. No

workers should be added to national pay rolls whose presence is not dictated by absolute necessity.

Uncle Sam's taxpayers are determined to play fair with their country. Their country must play equally fair with them. We could well afford to stay here until midnight, if necessary, and go over this bill with a fine-tooth comb and analyze and dissect every item. We need to do this, and if we are sincere about that which we write our constituents back home, telling them we agree with them when they ask that nondefense appropriations be cut, we will cut right here when the opportunity is afforded.

I trust every member of the Committee will vote for this amendment now.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made awhile ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. Chairman, the fact that the gentleman would cut this appropriation about \$140,000 in this particular item would indicate to me that he has not studied the bill very well. The gentleman suggests that we stay here until midnight and go through this bill with a fine-tooth comb in order to cut the appropriation. I call his attention to the fact that this committee has been working since January 3 on this bill and going through it with a fine-tooth comb considering 140 items. We bring to you a bill which shows a reduction over last year of over \$150,000,000. In this particular item which the gentleman proposes to cut \$140,000, we show you a cut of \$368,000. This item has already been cut \$283,000 for the Washington office and \$85,000 for the field offices. I opposed that cut, Mr. Chairman, for the reason that this particular organization, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 18 months ago went on an all-time war basis and more than 50 percent of its activity is now connected with war work and many defense organizations are calling upon it for valuable information. The War Department, the Navy Department, the Executive Office, and all the other departments are now depending upon this particular bureau for valuable information and very confidential information which they must have in order to continue the war effort.

Now, you can cut these field offices, if you wish. Our committee cut it \$85,000, but when you do that I am told the small business man will suffer.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. I agree with the gentleman, and I think the committee has already cut too deeply in this item. This is the only thing in the bill, or in a bill that I know of, that is trying to help the small business man.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no doubt about that. I dislike to disagree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] when he

offers an amendment to cut an appropriation, but this committee is notorious for cutting nonessential items, and we have already shown you quite a saving in this bill. I do not want to do something that will impede our war efforts.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman tell me where the small business man has been helped in any way at all, except with gags and conversation on the floor here?

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, I cannot go into details now, but I am interested in helping small business wherever possible.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? My question is along the same line as that of the gentleman from Ohio. In view of the gentleman's statement—and I ask this in the utmost good faith—does he think this particular agency will help the small business man?

Mr. STEFAN. I gave that information in somewhat lengthy remarks yesterday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I heard the gentleman, but I still do not quite understand it.

Mr. STEFAN. This organization, in my opinion, will help the small business man who is being closed out of business today. We have got to help him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I know that, but does this give him any contracts or furnish him any information where he can get them?

Mr. STEFAN. It will furnish information of all kinds immediately. This Bureau is on war basis now, and it is absolutely needed by the War, Navy, and executive departments, and many defense organizations.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman will pardon me, but he said it was to help the small business man.

Mr. STEFAN. Part of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I simply wanted to know how we can help him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and general expenses: For salaries for shipping commissioners, inspectors, and other personal services; to enable the Secretary of Commerce to provide and operate such motorboats and employ such persons as may be necessary for the enforcement, under his direction, of laws relating to navigation and inspection of vessels, boarding of vessels, counting of passengers on excursion boats to prevent overcrowding, and to secure uniformity in the admeasurement of vessels; fees to witnesses; materials, supplies, equipment, and services, including rent and janitor service; the transfer of household goods and effects, as provided by the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1105), and regulations promulgated thereunder; purchase, exchange, and repair of instruments; plans and specifications; insignia, braid, and chin straps; coats, caps, and aprons for stewards' departments on vessels; and other incidental expenses of field offices, including contract stenographic reporting services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; \$2,700,000: *Provided*, That \$85,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available only for the payment of extra compensation for overtime services of local inspectors of steam vessels and their assistants, United States shipping commissioners and their deputies and assist-

ants, and customs officers and employees for which the United States receives reimbursement in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 11, 1938 (46 U. S. C. 382B).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 71, line 25, strike out "\$2,700,000" and insert "\$2,400,000."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation has charge of inspecting the ships that are being purchased by the Government; that is, in reference to safety regulations. In the days when private enterprise built the ships, private shipbuilders had their own inspectors to see that they got their money's worth. Now the Maritime Commission builds practically all the ships and they have their inspectors representing that branch of the Government to see that the Government gets its money's worth. In fairness to both the Maritime Commission inspectors and the Bureau of Marine Inspection, both Bureaus are authorized by the basic law creating them to inspect the work of their particular departments. Since changing conditions which I have described were not foreseen when the Maritime Commission law was put into effect duplicate inspections have been made by the Marine Inspection Division of the Department of Commerce, and the Maritime Inspection of the Maritime Commission. My amendment would cut it \$300,000, which is approximately the expense for the branch of the Marine Inspection that inspects new ships that the Government is buying. The \$300,000 my amendment would take away would only eliminate the duplication and would not interfere with the remainder of marine-inspection work.

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

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. RABAUT. I am in sympathy with the suggestion that the gentleman has made, but there are two agencies here. One is in the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

The other one, the Maritime Commission agency, is in the independent offices bill. This is under basic law. We have no rights in the matter unless the basic law is changed. On the other hand, these agencies could be merged under the War Powers Act, in the hands of the Executive. That is the only way it can be changed.

I congratulate the gentleman in recognizing that there are some duplications. I think it would be well if they are merged during the period of the duration, but we have no power in this particular instance to do so.

Mr. JONES. I am indebted to the chairman for his remarks. I am indebted to the chairman for developing this in the hearings. If you will refer to the hearings you will see where the chairman very painstakingly and carefully, as he always is, being alert to the duplication in the several bureaus, observed this and questioned the commander at some length. Page 39 of the hearings takes

cognizance of it, but I offered this amendment in order to bring it to the attention of Judge Bland, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and give him an opportunity to take action in the matter between now and the beginning of the fiscal year. The committee has done a commendable thing in calling attention to this duplication of effort, but if my amendment is adopted, perhaps Judge Bland's committee will immediately bring in a bill authorizing the merger of these two inspection units and we will have the duplication dispensed with by the beginning of the next fiscal year. Unless my amendment is adopted I fear that the duplication will continue until July 1, 1943—a year and a half from now. Adopt my amendment and remove the duplication July 1, 1942. I hope the Committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted. I am satisfied that there is no duplication. The able chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], spoke to me a short time ago about the possibility of duplication. I immediately took the matter up with the Maritime Commission in an effort to find out whether duplication existed and what it consisted of. The information which I received was to the effect that there was no duplication that the Maritime Commission knew anything about. Of course, the hearings were not available then. They have only become available in the last few days. It is my intention to investigate to see whether or not duplication exists, but I do not believe there is. However, I urge that this amendment be not adopted now, in view of the large building program that is in progress and in contemplation.

The inspection made by the inspectors of the Department of Commerce has to do with the inspection of the vessels, in large part, after they are launched. They inspect them yearly. They inspect whenever the law requires, and that is many times. This is to prevent accidents or danger. Sometimes they must inspect the tailshafts and other inaccessible parts of the ship. There must be inspections to keep the ships seaworthy. These inspectors see about the seamen—their certificates, whether they are ordinary or able, the qualifications of lifeboatmen—the lifeboats, and the davits. In this way accidents have been reduced materially.

I made inquiry of Commander Field about duplication and I am informed that it is apparent that the Committee may feel that this Bureau has a permanent staff of inspectors at all shipyards working alongside of a permanent staff of Maritime Commission's inspectors, inspecting and checking the same details. This is not the case. As you know, the great bulk of the routine work of the inspectors in the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation is in connection with annual inspections, drydock examinations, periodic reinspection of vessels in service, licensing and certificating of officers and seamen, conducting investi-

gations, and so forth. In addition to this, these inspectors inspect all the steel that goes into boilers and pressure vessels at the steel mills. They inspect the boilers and pressure vessels at the place of manufacture and after installation on board ship. At the plants of manufacture they inspect the boat davits, the boats, various other items of lifesaving equipment, and so forth, which they are required by law to inspect. It is this inspection work at the factories, not at the shipyards, which represents the greater part of the increase the Bureau must have for the coming year or two in order to meet its obligations incident to the greatly expanded shipbuilding program.

It is true that at the shipyards there is a considerable amount of inspection work required by law, but for emphasis I repeat that the greater part of the increase in the work of the Bureau resulting from the expanded building program is work at the steel mills, the boiler plants, the boat davit manufacturers, lifeboat manufacturers, and work done by those inspectors at these places is not only not duplicated by the Maritime Commission, but is not touched upon by the Maritime Commission.

I believe that this information is correct, but I am not going to act on my belief. I am going to find out. I am going to ask you to reject the amendment, and Commander Field (that is, the head of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation) and his subordinates, and the head of the proper division of the Maritime Commission and his subordinates will be brought before our committee, placed around the table, and together the duties of each will be worked out. If there can be a saving by consolidation anywhere, it ought to be done, and it will be done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] for his alertness in the matter. I am opposed to the amendment, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, clerks of courts: For salaries of clerks of United States circuit courts of appeals and United States district courts, their deputies, and other assistants, and expenses of conducting their respective offices, \$2,456,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 87, line 9, strike out "\$2,456,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,462,900."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, involving the restoration of \$6,900 to the appropriation for clerks of courts, and one that I shall present to the paragraph that we shall subsequently take up for miscellaneous salaries and which involves an increase of \$2,500, results from an inadvertence in failing to make provision for a small group of employees to whom the committee has ap-

plied the principles of the Ramspeck Act as far as promotional policy is concerned. The original computation of all the items entering into the sums that we have allowed failed to take into account this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Probation system, United States courts: For salaries and expenses of probation officers, as authorized by the act entitled "An act to amend the act of March 4, 1925, chapter 521, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1930 (18 U. S. C. 726), \$988,000: *Provided*, That the salary of no probation officer shall be less than \$1,800 per annum nor more than \$3,600 per annum: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to abridge the right of the district judges to appoint probation officers, or to make such orders as may be necessary to govern probation officers in their own courts: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any probation officer who, in the judgment of the senior or presiding judge certified to the Attorney General, fails to carry out the official orders of the Attorney General with respect to supervising or furnishing information concerning any prisoner released conditionally or on parole from any Federal penal or correctional institution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

How much of this appropriation for the judiciary is to be used for pensions for judges?

Mr. RABAUT. A little over half a million dollars.

Mr. HOFFMAN. For pensions for the judges?

Mr. RABAUT. For pensions for the judges.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous salaries: For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, \$890,600: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salaries of secretaries shall not exceed that of the senior clerical grade and the salaries of law clerks shall not exceed that of the principal subprofessional grade: *Provided further*, That none of this fund shall be used for the pay of a law clerk appointed by a district judge unless the senior circuit judge of the circuit (the District of Columbia being considered a circuit) in which the district where the clerk is needed, is situated, shall certify to the necessity of the appointment: *Provided further*, That not to exceed three law clerks to district judges shall be appointed in any one circuit.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 88, line 25, strike out "\$890,600", and insert in lieu thereof "\$893,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is the \$2,500 I referred to a moment ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 504. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this Act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take my place tonight in the well of the House to raise my voice in praise of one who has faithfully served the great Committee on Appropriations and indirectly the Members of the House. Jack McFall today completes his last bill prior to his entry into the armed services of his country. The outside world little knows of what assistance able clerks are to the Members of Congress. Personally, I have always felt that the cognomen "clerk" was a very erroneous denomination of their position. They are secretaries in every sense of the word.

I want the Members to read in the hearings of the State Department appropriation bill on page 492, Jack McFall's appraisal of his friends and of the nine chairmen with whom he has served since coming here as a clerk to the Appropriations Committee some 14 years ago.

Jack McFall is a man of principle. He is a Christian soul; he is devoted to his tasks. No job was ever too big for him and he never turned a short corner. No matter how many books had to be thumbed, no matter how many departments had to be called, Jack McFall did everything that was required of him, and much more. It was an inspiration to me and the members of my committee, and to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], and the members of his subcommittee to have worked with him; and all of us are unanimous in our praise of his devotion to duty. In his farewell remarks he refers to references in the press to "junks" by Members of Congress and stated as his opinion as a humble clerk of the committee that so much good has come from them he hopes there will be more. A man who goes some place and goes there to serve comes back with knowledge that he never gains sitting behind the mahogany.

I am proud today in the name of this committee to take my place on this floor and pay tribute to one whose passing from our midst is our loss and whose going to the Navy is their gain. Thank you.

The following is an extract from the hearings, and it gives me pleasure to insert Mr. McFall's remarks.

RESIGNATION OF JACK M'FALL, CLERK OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE, TO ENTER THE UNITED STATES NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. M'FALL. I would like to make a statement, if I may, inasmuch as this is the end of the hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. M'FALL. This hearing represents the end of some 14 years of my service on the committee that I have been privileged to enjoy. I have been engaged about 9 years on the work of this subcommittee, and for a somewhat less period with other subcommittees.

Through that period of 14 years I have been privileged to serve with some eight chairmen, starting some 9 years ago with Hon. Anthony Griffin; then, in succession, I served Chairmen William B. Oliver, of Alabama; J. B. Daly, of Pennsylvania; Louis Ludlow, of Indiana; Malcolm Tarver, of Georgia; Thomas S. MacMillan, of South Carolina; James McAndrews, of Illinois; and your own good self, Mr. Chairman.

I only wish that all citizens of our great Nation might be afforded the experiences that I have had in attending our committee meetings and committee councils and see our democracy in the making. The tremendous burden of work and responsibility that you members of the Appropriations Committee must bear in serving your Nation and its citizens is, I fear, little understood and hence not appreciated by the public at large. During the course of my service I have been privileged to take several trips of inspection with the committee to the field. These trips have taken me to Alaska three times, twice to Europe, once to South and Central America and several times on visits in most of the States of the Union, to the various public institutions and field offices of the bureaus falling under the jurisdiction of the subcommittees to which I have been assigned such as the Federal prisons, field offices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States courts, field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and so forth. On each and every field trip that I have taken with the committee, the members have subordinated all personal interests to the consummation of the task at hand with a result that you have returned to your labors fortified with a knowledge of conditions in the various services of government for which you must make available funds for operation. This knowledge you could never gain by constantly sitting around a committee table and listening to ex parte testimony of bureau chiefs. I feel very strongly in the matter of the value of these trips to me, as a means of serving you more effectively, and I know that they have been equally valuable to you. Members who have taken them, in giving you an insight into Government operations that you could gain in no other manner. If such trips as I have taken are "junks," then I can only say that the American taxpayer should insist on more and larger ones.

Through this period of service I have made many friendships that I am confident will endure throughout the years to come, whether time and tide shall bring me back here or land me on some other shore.

Appropriately I wish to pay my abiding thanks and appreciation to Marc Sheild, with and for whom I have had the privilege to serve all these years, for all his help and counsel that he always so unstintingly gave me on every occasion. I think when God made his pattern He purposely threw it away that he might serve as an example of what a man should be. He is one of the finest Christian gentlemen it has ever been my

privilege to know. I also want to extend my thanks to all of the other clerks of the committee, John Pugh, Jim Scanlon, Bill Duvall, Bob Williams, George Harvey, and Arthur Orr, and to our efficient apprentice, Jimmy Strachan, and our faithful messenger, Robert Lewis, for the genuine cooperation I have enjoyed from all of them throughout the years.

If fortune does not bring me back to my work here when this holocaust we are in is over, I hope I may at least be afforded the privilege of renewing and enjoying, from time to time in the future, the many lasting friendships I have made during the course of my service here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 94, line 1, after the word "is", insert "or who within 5 years preceding his appointment or employment has been."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill states on page 93 that "No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence."

You will recall that from time to time the Appropriations Committee has found it necessary to name certain individuals who should not receive compensation from funds appropriated by Congress. Every once in a while there is objection to the employment or to the payment of Government money to the members of a certain organization. Often when that course is attempted we are confronted with the statement that the one so pointed out has reformed, he is, so it is said, no longer a Communist or he is no longer working against the Government.

I just seek to add the words "or who has been within the preceding 5 years" a member of such an organization. I want to put this person, who was once a Communist or a Nazi, on probation, so that his reformation will be thorough and complete, and I want him to be on probation for a period of 5 years.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The language contained in this bill is similar to the language carried in all appropriation bills. It is carried in the deficiency bills, and so forth. This language dovetails in with the language of all of the appropriation bills. So we would have an exception here if we placed any different language in this bill. The place where that would have to be done is in the full committee. I think it should be taken up with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and see if the language cannot be supplied to all the bills making appropriations from this time on.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In other words, it is a good suggestion?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman has a good idea, but I do not think we could very well take it up here and make it piecemeal. I would be willing to leave the idea to the House, however.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is a good suggestion, as I get it from the gentleman's remarks, we ought to do it, but unless we can do it all at once in all the bills which never come before the House together we should not make a beginning. Why not begin today with this bill if the amendment is, as the gentleman admits, a good one. I admit that the amendment has the fault of being offered by a Republican, but that seems to be its only fault.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6548) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6548) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 8.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Civilian Defense: To enable the Director of Civilian Defense, under such regulations as the President may prescribe (which regulations may provide exemption from the requirements of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes), to carry out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to provide protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in the United States, and for other purposes', approved January 27, 1942 (Public Law 415), fiscal year 1942, \$100,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943, of which not to exceed \$3,000,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses, including printing and binding and personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any person in the Office of Civilian Defense unless such person is directly employed in the administration of such act of January 27, 1942: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein may be used for the employment of persons, the rent of facilities or the purchase of equipment and supplies to promote, produce or carry on instruction or to direct instruction in physical fitness by dancers, fan dancing, street shows, theatrical performances or other public entertainments: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of \$4,500 per annum or more unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That the Director of Civilian Defense shall transmit to the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives every sixty days following the date of the enactment of this Act, a report in summary and by categories of the progress of the procurement of equipment and material provided by this appropriation: *Provided further*, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of any person especially employed by a contractor to solicit or secure a contract upon any agreement for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee," and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$253,000" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$106,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6548) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes—the First Deficiency Appropriation bill, 1942—submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1 provides for an adjustment in the compensation of an employee of the Senate as proposed by the Senate.

No. 2 appropriates \$1,720,000 for the fiscal year 1942, as proposed by the Senate, for Congressional printing and binding.

No. 3 appropriates \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate, for general expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for the current fiscal year.

No. 4 relating to the Office of Civilian Defense: Inserts a substitute for the amendment of the Senate which substitute restores all the language of the House bill and adds from the Senate amendment the following: the provision for Senate confirmation for all appointments to positions with a compensation of \$4,500 per annum and over, the prohibition against payment of a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee by a contractor to anyone for securing a contract under the appropriation, modified so as to make the prohibition only apply to anyone "especially" employed for such purpose; and the provision for a report to Congress every sixty days modified so as to require such report to be a "progress" report in summary and by categories and to be submitted to the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of each House.

Nos. 5, 6, 7, and 8, relating to the Federal Security Agency: Appropriates \$77,481 for the fiscal year 1942, as proposed by the Senate, for diseases and sanitation investigations, Public Health Service; and strikes out the appropriation of \$12,035 for the fiscal year 1942, inserted by the Senate, for salaries and expenses of the Forum Advisory Service in the Office of Education.

Nos. 9, 10, 11, and 12, relating to the District of Columbia: Appropriates additional amounts for the fiscal year 1942, as proposed by the Senate, as follows: \$250,000 for assessment and permit work, sewers, \$250,000 for extension of water mains under the assessment system, and \$6,350 for the payment of judgments.

Nos. 13, 14, and 15, relating to the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior: Appropriates additional amounts for the fiscal year 1942, as proposed by the Senate: \$66,000 for oil and gas investigations and \$225,000 for investigations relating to domestic sources of mineral supply.

Nos. 16 and 17, relating to the consolidated emergency fund, fiscal year 1942, Office of the Secretary of the Treasury: Appropriates a total of \$253,000, instead of \$172,000 as proposed by the House and \$267,000 as proposed by the Senate, and fixes the amount for allocation to the Bureau of Internal Revenue at \$106,490, instead of \$25,490 as proposed by the House and \$120,490 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction effected by the conference Committee is made in the funds for the special tax research on Federal, State, and local fiscal relations to the end that such activity is not financed beyond April 30, 1942.

Nos. 18 to 41, inclusive: Appropriates for the payment of property damage claims determined pursuant to law and certified for appropriation by the heads of Federal agencies, for the payment of judgments of United

States courts, and for the payment of claims allowed by the Comptroller General and certified for appropriation pursuant to law.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TAHER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 6548, and I ask that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because the matters of difference have been ironed out so that all those present at the conference were prepared to sign the report. The matters of difference were very small.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Senate added 41 amendments to the bill, increasing it about \$3,000,000. Of the 41 amendments, 28 were for legal claims and certified judgments, which, of course, had to be paid. Of the remaining 13 amendments, 3 are form amendments and only 10 related to substance. These were of such obvious nature that there was little difference of opinion about them, and we reached a complete agreement. The conference report is signed by all the members of the committee of conference.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell us when the bill to repeal the congressional pension law will be considered?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the plan for next week? Will any business be considered on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; of course, there will be the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

If the gentleman will permit me to suggest it, the minority leader usually asks that question. I am sure the gentleman

would feel better and I would feel better if the minority leader were permitted to make that inquiry.

Mr. CURTIS. Most certainly, I am pleased to yield to the acting minority leader.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts state what the program will be for tomorrow and next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I was expecting that question from the gentleman from Michigan. I know the gentleman from Nebraska understands the situation.

Mr. CURTIS. Surely.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is the anniversary of Washington's birth, and there will be the reading of his farewell address, and that is all. No legislation will be considered on Monday.

On Tuesday, if a rule on it is reported, the war powers bill will be considered. Following that will come the war insurance bill, with which Members are acquainted. There is also the Rogers bill. However, I do not want to be committed to the particular order in which these bills will be taken up. The Dies resolution is also to be considered.

Of course, I do not want to discuss the bill to which the gentleman from Nebraska referred until I know what the committee does. I do not want to be put in the position of discussing when a bill will be before the House when it has not yet been reported by the committee having it in charge. I appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman's inquiry, and my remark in no way is to be misunderstood in relation to his inquiry.

Mr. MICHENER. I think we may all hope that if the Committee on the Civil Service reports out legislation affecting the so-called congressional pensions, the distinguished majority leader will assist in every way in bringing that bill before the House at the earliest opportunity, so that the House may have an opportunity to express its judgment as to the wisdom of the legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a fair way to put it. To put it another way, if I may, the majority leader would do everything within his power to reduce the political high blood pressure that exists.

Mr. CURTIS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the conversation on the floor would indicate that perhaps the Committee on the Civil Service will report that bill for the repeal of the congressional pensions out on Thursday, and that it might be disposed of this week. I believe any legislation the House might undertake would be handled much better after the pension bill is out of the road and repealed. We owe it to the country to repeal this at once.

Mr. McCORMACK. I profoundly appreciate the state of mind of the gentleman. I think the statement made by the distinguished acting minority leader and my rejoinder to him, in which our state of mind was frankly expressed, ought to clarify the situation. Whether it would be very beneficial to the country to see the Congress go down one road and go back another road is a question for the future. I shall not pass on that. However, I said that if a bill does come out of

the committee and if it is consistent with other important matters of concern to the primary objective we all have, that is, war legislation, I will do all I can to relieve the political high blood pressure that exists.

Mr. CURTIS. I was hopeful that the gentleman would use his high office to bring that bill to the floor immediately.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know that my office is high.

Mr. CURTIS. As far as going down a road and retreating is concerned, some of us have not had a chance to go down the road yet. That is what I am concerned about. I have never favored or supported pensions for Congressmen. I have voted against this every time a vote has been taken in this body. I am not retreating.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right; I will let it stop there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell us on the evening of which day the \$100 dinners will be held?

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as Massachusetts is concerned, it will be held Sunday night. That is not a \$100 dinner, of course.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not interested in the others; just the \$100 dinners. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not that date falls on the same day as the President's report on the progress of the war?

Mr. McCORMACK. There are two questions—

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand; it is too much for the gentleman. I will waive it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan is too much for the gentleman from Massachusetts at all times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will waive it. After the gentleman's lecture of yesterday, I shall not presume.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman overwhelms me at all times.

Mr. DITTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the minority should acknowledge to the majority leader his indulgence in connection with our Lincoln Day dinners. Any concessions of pressure that might otherwise present themselves as a result of the legislation that is presently under discussion I think should give way, so that there will be reciprocity on the part of the minority to allow the majority the same possibilities the minority has enjoyed.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Michigan also inquired of me, personally, as to what will be up tomorrow on the call of committees, Calendar Wednesday having been transferred to that day. The Tolson bill will not come up. The Beiter bill, I have been informed by the chairman of the Committee on Labor, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. NORTON], is the only measure that will come up.

Mr. MICHENER. If the Committee on Labor finishes its call, will any other committee be called tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not heard from the chairman of any other committee and in order to meet that situation I am going to ask unanimous consent, when this request is acted upon, that the call of the committees tomorrow be confined to the Committee on Labor so that

Members will definitely know the situation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, some of us are quite interested in the war powers bill and I am very doubtful if 4 hours of debate is sufficient on that measure. It is a bill of such importance that it seems to me it should be given very careful consideration and I think we should go a little further than that.

Mr. MICHENER. That matter is before the Committee on Rules, I may say to the gentleman from New York, and it has not been definitely decided that we are going to have a rule. In due season the committee will determine that question and discuss the matter of time. Four hours of debate has been suggested, but nothing definite has been determined. I believe the Rules Committee will do the best it can to see that proper time is provided.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I make this statement? If a rule does come out tomorrow from the Rules Committee on the war powers bill, then it will come up Tuesday. If not, then the war insurance bill and the Rogers bill and the Dies resolution, but I would rather not be committed as to the order of consideration as between the Rogers bill and the Dies resolution. But the war-insurance bill will be taken up on Tuesday.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has named three important bills which would make next week, after the session on Monday, one of the most important weeks in the matter of legislation that we have had for a long time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I submit the further unanimous-consent request that the call of committees on tomorrow be confined to the Committee on Labor.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including a poem written by an outstanding gentleman of the city of Redlands, Calif.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill under consideration today may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee today and add some extracts from the hearings and also a letter concerning civilian pilot training.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a letter that I have written to the Secretary of War on the subject of Negro soldiers being discriminated against. I find that this exceeds the limit, and I have an estimate of \$45 from the Printing Office. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Record, notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the close of business and such matters as may be on the Speaker's desk, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a beautiful but very brief eulogy of the junior Senator from Illinois by my friend and colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by the Secretary of Commerce on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a tribute to my predecessor, Mr. Edelstein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a speech delivered by Hon. JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE, Resident Philippine Commissioner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the Record and include a brief poem on Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the Daily News of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain questions asked me by constituents back home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, to extend my remarks twice in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks made by myself today in Committee of the Whole House, and include certain letters, and also an editorial from the Washington News of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record following mine today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an article on rubber from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PAY-ROLL-SAVINGS PLAN IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me to submit to the House for its information a matter which I think is of great importance. The majority leader in the other branch called it to the attention of the Members of the Senate sometime today, so I am informed.

In the financing of this war we are of the opinion that the American people, of their own free will, want to assume a large share of its cost. To assist in this effort there is no group that should be more active than the Members of the House of Representatives and our employees. We, too, should take our place in the front ranks of that great army of wage earners throughout the Nation who are so generously supplying fighting dollars for fighting men.

Throughout this great united country of ours there are being established in all forms of private industry pay-roll-savings plans whereby every man and woman gainfully employed is given an

opportunity to purchase United States Defense Savings bonds through periodic allotments from their wages.

We of the Seventy-seventh Congress and all our employees should be a part of this program. Through this pay-roll-savings plan, which is entirely voluntary, the Members of the House can authorize the Sergeant at Arms, and our employees can authorize the financial clerk, these two gentlemen being disbursing officers, to withhold a specified sum from our salary each pay day, to be accumulated in individual accounts until a sufficient sum has accrued for the purchase of a bond. The bond will be purchased, registered in accordance with our instructions, and delivered either directly to us or to a designated address. This procedure will be repeated indefinitely, but should anyone at any time find it necessary to cancel his authorization and discontinue the allotment, he may do so and receive a refund of any money that has accumulated to his credit. The amount of your periodic allotments will be left for you to determine.

There are no truer words than those of Mr. Harold N. Graves, the Assistant of the Secretary of the Treasury:

The bonds will not serve their purpose if you buy one bond or a dozen and then stop. They are put forward as a means for every citizen to carry on a consistent and continuous savings program, to be followed week by week or month by month.

We know production schedules are being forced to a maximum that an overwhelming number of ships, planes, tanks, and guns to properly equip our boys may be forthcoming. Gentlemen, we now have the opportunity to do something financially substantial as our part in this all-out war effort. Let us back those boys of ours up. None of us should be able to rest until every Member, all clerks, and assistants in the House of Representatives are doing their part under this pay-roll-savings plan.

Any bonds purchased will be credited to the State in which a Member or employee lives.

I make this announcement. I consider that this plan put into operation in the House will be an inspiration to the rest of the country and an example for those in private employ to follow.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

THE "NORMANDIE"

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in the present war effort of the country carping criticism has no place. On the other hand, where carelessness, negligence, and incompetence have brought disaster to us, the silence of those upon whom in part rests the successful outcome of the war will lead to naught but loss of the confidence of our people.

Within 2 months we have suffered two major catastrophes—the disaster in the Pacific at Pearl Harbor on December 7 and the disaster to the *Normandie* in New York on February 9. They are disasters that never should have occurred and never would have occurred if the Navy

command had used only ordinary and reasonable precautions. They are disasters that have unnecessarily prolonged the war and postponed the day of peace.

We have had a board of inquiry investigate the Pearl Harbor debacle, and the net result thus far after 2 months has been the tender of the resignations of an admiral and a major general.

According to newspaper reports, a Navy board of inquiry is conducting a secret investigation into the burning of the *Normandie*. Why, may I ask, a secret inquiry, when everyone in New York knows the cause; why a secret inquiry, except to whitewash those who are responsible for the disaster or to withhold from the public and the press the extent of the negligence, carelessness, and incompetence of the Navy command?

Within a few hours after the disaster the district attorney of New York County had examined some 70 witnesses and had come to the inescapable conclusion that the destruction of the *Normandie* was due to gross carelessness.

Fire Marshal Brophy, who has investigated thousands upon thousands of fires in his capacity as fire marshal of the city of New York, reached the same conclusion.

The statements of eyewitnesses, one of them former Alderman Edward J. Sullivan, a friend of mine for 20 years, were carried in the newspapers of New York. All the evidence points so incontrovertibly to carelessness, negligence, and incompetence that secret hearings by the Navy board of inquiry can only arouse suspicion when we ought to be instilling confidence.

Let the Navy stop its secret hearings and bring out the facts in the light of day and under the pitiless publicity that should be given those facts. The American people can take it. They took it at Pearl Harbor and they can take it in New York, but what they will not take again is a tender of resignations. They want the men who are responsible for the *Normandie* disaster brought to a bar of justice and, if convicted, stripped of their rank and punished according to their deserts.

Carelessness, negligence, and incompetence lost us a part of our fleet in the Pacific. Carelessness, negligence, and incompetency lost us more tonnage in the safe waters of the North River than has been occasioned by enemy submarines in the Atlantic Ocean. Carelessness, negligence, and incompetency should not be pensioned.

When I think of MacArthur and his brave band of Americans and his gallant Filipinos on Bataan, when I think of our fleets upon the seas, manned by brave American lads and officered by men ever on the alert, my blood boils at the thought of the *Normandie*, lying on her side in the mud of the North River, a monument to inefficiency and incompetence.

Let me give you a picture of the *Normandie* at 2:30 in the afternoon of February 9. Two thousand men are working aboard her as she lay in her berth at pier 88, North River, N. Y. These men are converting the \$53,000,000 luxury liner to war purposes, and it was

only a matter of days when she would be in readiness to undertake her grim duty. A workman is using an oxyacetylene torch to remove some ornamental iron-work in the grand salon, which is stacked high with kapok mattresses, wrapped in tar paper and packed in burlap bags. Sparks fly from the torch and ignite the highly inflammable burlap, tar paper, and kapok mattresses. The workmen fight the fire and call the fireguards, who try to quell the flames, which are spreading rapidly. Finally someone thinks of turning in the fire alarm and at 2:49 an alarm is turned in from a private box on the pier. Immediately the Fire Department of the city of New York is in motion and four engine companies, two trucks, two hook and ladders, a fireboat, and two battalion chiefs are moving toward the fire. Within 3 minutes the first land company arrives and the men drag their hose over the pier and amongst the milling men fleeing the ship and hook up to a pier standpipe. Then up through the ship they go to the scene of the fire, which is above the river level a height of approximately a six-story building. One look at the fire and the battalion chief sends for assistance. Back through the ship, back over the pier, the fireman dashes to the city alarm box at Forty-eighth Street and Twelfth Avenue and at 3 bangs out the first alarm at box 852. At 3:01 the second alarm flashes 2-2-852—four more engine companies, another fireboat, a rescue company, a water tower, and a deputy chief begin to move to the fire. At 3:02 the signal 3-3-852, a third alarm, is flashed and five additional engine companies, another fireboat, a hook-and-ladder company, another battalion chief, and Assistant Chief McCarthy respond. Meanwhile engine companies all over the Borough of Manhattan are relocating, on the alert, so as not to leave the rest of Manhattan Island unprotected. At 3:12 Assistant Chief McCarthy banged out 4-4-852—a fourth alarm—that brought five additional companies and another hook and ladder and Fire Chief Patrick Walsh.

At 4:08 Chief Walsh sounded the fifth alarm—5-5-852—that brought six additional engine companies as a precautionary measure and for possible hose replacements.

At 6:30 the fire was under control and the fire companies began to roll up their hose and return to quarters, leaving a part of the first assignment to watch for any sporadic outbursts.

The Fire Department of New York City had confined the fire to the two upper decks and part of the third deck. They had kept the fire from the pier, which, if it had caught fire, would have made it practically impossible to fight the fire on the *Normandie* from the land side.

The people of New York are, and ought to be, proud of Chief Walsh and his men. Chief Walsh is a veteran of 40 years in the fire department and knows his job.

At 8:30 Mayor LaGuardia said to reporters—and I quote:

The chief's got his fire out, and now the naval people will watch the ship.

At 10 p. m. the *Normandie* had developed a list of 16° to port—a safe list—3½ hours after the fire was under control, an hour and 40 minutes after the Navy took charge. From then on things got worse. At 12:30 a. m. all hands were ordered off the ship by Admiral Andrews. A little past 2 a. m. came the death rattle as articles began to slide toward the rail, and at 2:35 she quietly slid over on her side.

Mr. Speaker, the carelessness that caused the fire was bad. The carelessness or incompetence that permitted the capsizing of the *Normandie* without raising a hand to save her was worse.

The bulkheads were open; why were they not closed? The ballast tanks were empty; why were they not filled before the list became acute? But why, above all, Mr. Speaker, were not the pumps used? The engine room was dry; the evidence of that is that, later, the engine room was sealed to keep the water out after she had capsized.

What a picture of incompetence. The Navy officers standing on the pier for hours, waiting for the *Normandie* to capsize—while MacArthur waits in Batavia. The danger must have been obvious. Surely, the Navy must have known that the flood tide was due. Every youngster along the water front of New York knows the tides. If the Navy did not know what to do or how to do it, or if it did not have the equipment, why, in the name of common sense, was not there enough intelligence in the outfit to call in one of the salvage companies who know how to pump out a ship and have the equipment on hand to do it?

Mr. Speaker, no matter what the result of the secret inquiry, the American people will not be content. An open inquiry will give more aid and comfort to the American people than it will to our enemies.

I am in receipt of a letter from the principal of a public school in the Bronx which typifies, in my opinion, the feelings of the American people. It reads as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Pearl Harbor was bad; the *Normandie* was inexcusable. How can Washington expect children in the schools to buy Defense stamps with patriotic fervor if what they hear is a tale of management that makes their own fire drill a miracle of efficiency? If Admiral Hart was old and sick and Helfrich available, why didn't Helfrich get it in the first place? Our errors make England wince; English errors make American soldiers victims. When can the American feel confident that America is really on the job and no fooling?

Very truly yours,

JOHN D. HANEY.

FEBRUARY 13, 1942.

Mr. Speaker, let Secretary Knox end his secret inquiry. Let him be fair to the American people, who are fighting this war, and give them the facts—not a part of the facts, but all the facts. That is what they want and that they are entitled to receive.

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

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. IZAC. I would like to observe that this morning by resolution the Naval Af-

fairs Committee of the House decided on an investigation by our committee, so that the House may be assured we will go into this thing thoroughly.

Mr. LYNCH. I am delighted to hear that such investigation has been authorized. I hope it will be an open inquiry so that witnesses may be called and their testimony heard in the open. Then let the chips fall where they may.

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

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has painted a very vivid picture of the incompetency of the naval officers who were at the scene of the disaster. Is that correct?

Mr. LYNCH. I do not know how vividly I have painted it, but I have tried to point out to you that after the fire department of New York left, apparently nothing was done to save the *Normandie*.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The fire department accomplished everything that could possibly be done; but is it not true that at least the major part of the responsibility for the carelessness of these officers, their incompetency rests right here in Washington with the Secretary of the Navy, who has no knowledge of naval affairs?

Mr. LYNCH. I am not familiar with what knowledge the Secretary of the Navy has of naval affairs, but I say if those men are found to be incompetent, if they allowed a situation to arise which never should have arisen if they had used ordinary precautionary measures, they ought to be punished.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. But should not the man at the top be punished as well, if anyone is to be punished? How can the Secretary of the Navy escape responsibility. He is the head; he is at the top; he is chargeable with the knowledge of the location of this ship with the conditions surrounding it. It was right here at home under his nose almost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SULLIVAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first I want to say that I appreciate the attendance of those who are here at this late hour, and I very much regret the absence of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. Speaker, about a year ago I spoke here in the House about the procedure of the special House Committee on Un-American Activities. I pointed out that while the committee's purposes might be worth while the committee itself all too often acted irresponsibly. Investigations were frequently undertaken and announcements made, I said, without any vote by the committee, without any discussion, without even any meeting. Such a method of doing things, it seemed to me, was rash and reckless in a time of national danger.

Now the national danger is far greater, and within a few days a resolution will come before the House to extend once again the life of the Dies committee.

We will have a chance to repudiate that committee's way of doing things—to prove that we have the courage to court inevitable abuse and misunderstanding by doing an honest job for the good of the country. A vote against the Dies committee is not a vote for un-American activities, fascism, or communism. Far from it. A vote against the Dies committee is a vote for responsible government. It is a refusal to permit any longer the course of heedless folly which, regardless of the committee's intentions, divides the Nation and plays into the hands of our enemies.

When I say "plays into the hands of our enemies," I mean just that. Did you read the President's remarks at his press conference yesterday about the dangerous "Cliveden set" here in Washington that seems more interested in creating conflict between us and Russia than in beating the Axis? Read what the President said; you know it is all too true. And then turn, if you will, to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28. There you will find a speech by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] raking up old hatreds and implying that our most dangerous enemy today, our most sinister fifth column, is Russian and not German or Japanese. Read, too, and reread many times, the great reply made that day by another gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]. After Mr. DIES had spoken, Mr. SUMNERS reminded us, and I quote him:

We must not knowingly insult any nation which is now engaged in this war as an ally of our own.

And he said that "if we are seeking to kick Russia, if that is what we are trying to do," then there is "mighty good sense" in the proposals of Mr. DIES.

That is only a part of the picture. There is another part of it which is equally black and which fits in perfectly.

Last week I placed in the RECORD a letter written by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I urge you to read that letter, which will be found on page A505 of the Appendix of the RECORD. Summarized, the letter states that the chairman of the Dies committee has been frequently and favorably quoted on Axis propaganda broadcasts beamed to this hemisphere.

Defenders of the committee may urge that the report about Axis broadcasts was made by a subversive employee. Well, the employee in question was not employed by the F. C. C. when the report was made; and the Dies committee's definition of "subversive" is so fantastic as to defy belief.

Listen to me for a moment while I tell you what the Dies committee calls un-American activities. The other day there was spread in the RECORD the Dies committee file on a number of Government employees—men and women whom the committee apparently believes to be subversive and wishes to see fired. There is a column for Communist-front organizations which the suspected person is supposed to have belonged to, and there is a column for the actual subversive activity which was alleged to have been under-

taken. What does the Dies committee consider are un-American activities? Here is an example taken from the committee's own files—endorsement of the American Youth Act. If you endorsed that proposed legislation, you are subversive. Among the endorsers of the American Youth Act were Warden Lawes and several Members of the House, including a member of the Dies committee itself. Subversive fellows, these. And yet the Dies committee has blacklisted people and called them un-American because they joined Warden Lawes and our colleagues here in behalf of this proposed legislation.

And what does the gentleman from Texas call an un-American or Communist-front organization? Let me give you an example. William E. Dodd, Jr., according to the Dies committee, is subversive because his father—get that, his father, Ambassador Dodd, not he himself—was a member of something called the Council Against Intolerance. Here are some of the traitorous, subversive men who formed that council. Its co-chairmen were Senator Barbour, of New Jersey, George Gordon Battle, and William Allen White. Members of the council included Attorney General Biddle, Senator Bennett Clark, of Missouri, Thomas E. Dewey, Frank Gannett, Josephus Daniels, Governor Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, and the Reverend Maurice E. Sheehy, of Catholic University, who spoke over the radio under the auspices of the council. It is alarming to note, too, that in this subversive Communist-front organization—members of the council itself—were Alfred E. Smith and Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia.

How can we stand for this kind of thing? It is just silly, and it makes the House look utterly ridiculous. We are told to blacklist a man because his father served on a council with such sinister, dangerous, revolutionaries as Josephus Daniels and CARTER GLASS. We are told that an organization is a Communist front when its spokesman over a national network is the head of the department of religious education at Catholic University. When a House committee does a thing like this, insulting statesmen and clergy alike, it destroys its own value, and it should make the whole House thoroughly ashamed.

But it is worse than shameful. Seriously, it is dangerous. The Dies committee makes up lists of subversive employees like this and urges the Federal Bureau of Investigation to send its investigators out to find out more about them. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when we are in a deadly war with dangerous enemies our Government investigators should not be sent by the Dies committee on a never-ending round of fools' errands.

And I mean fools' errands. Just take those few names that were in the RECORD the other day. One "Mary Johnson," a minor clerk, is listed, or rather blacklisted, because somebody named Mary Johnson drew a picture for a Communist paper 6 years ago. It is not the same Mary Johnson, but that does not matter to the Dies committee. There are thousands of Mary Johnsons, but, obviously, they had better not work for the Gov-

ernment; the Dies committee will get them.

And while the House's special committee urges the Federal Bureau of Investigation to set its bloodhounds on the trail of Mary Johnson, the great ship *Normandie* goes up in flames and is a total loss. Did somebody once say something about putting first things first?

Then, on that list in the RECORD, there is George Saunders, of the Office of Civilian Defense. He is on the blacklist. The committee's file says that he is a Communist living in Pittsburgh. Actually the George Saunders in the Office of Civilian Defense lives in San Francisco, where he was active in the Junior Chamber of Commerce. His former professor, Senator ELBERT THOMAS of Utah, tells me he is a Roman Catholic. But our eagle-eyed committee tells the F. B. I. to track him down just the same.

And while they demand the scalp of this Catholic layman and call him a Red, do you know what is happening only a hundred miles away? George Deatherage, the frank American Fascist who used to head up the Knights of the White Camelia and who planned a Fascist coup to seize the Government, is executive engineer at an immense naval construction project right down here at Norfolk. But our alert Dies committee did not know about that; they were too busy worrying about Mary Johnson and that revolutionary organization headed by Al Smith and Governor Saltonstall and Father Sheehy.

As a matter of fact, the Dies committee has never done much about the Fascist front organizations. The chairman has said a lot about them, but the record is largely one of words, not action.

For instance, on July 16 of last year the chairman promised to make public "soon," as he put it, a document relating to fascistic, anti-Semitic groups. The document has never appeared.

On March 8 of last year he was reported to have evidence concerning a huge organization to promote Nazi ideology. There has been no mention of this since then.

Fourteen months ago he promised to expose Nazi money-raising campaigns in the United States, and said that the committee has seized records containing 220,000 names. Has anyone ever seen the names or heard of that exposure?

The Philadelphia Inquirer quotes him on November 30, 1940, as promising to reveal, "next week," a plot of the Bund to sabotage American industry. But to this day the plot remains unrevealed.

And on September 18, 1939, in a radio speech, the gentleman from Texas said he had evidence of cooperation between the Bund and some native Fascist groups, including, by the way, Mr. George Deatherage's Knights of the White Camelia. But no action by the committee followed, and the Knight of the White Camelia has turned up in a key defense job.

I could go on with this for a long time, for the committee's record on Fascist organizations is a sorry one of big promises and little or no performance.

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

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. When George Deatherage appeared before the Dies committee he refused to answer any questions as to membership or anything else pertaining to his organization, yet the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] brought no resolution before this House asking for the punishment of Mr. Deatherage for contempt of a committee of Congress. On the other hand, when members of the Communist Party refused to answer questions, this House was called upon to vote on resolutions calling for contempt proceedings against them. Mr. Deatherage was thus protected by the Dies committee.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I decline to yield further, Mr. Speaker.

Now a word as to American Communists whose first loyalty inexplicably is to another country. Perhaps we should have a committee to investigate all these things. It could serve a useful purpose. Once in a while, even the Dies committee has brought to light facts that are worth knowing—most conspicuous being the financial link between the Communists and the erstwhile League for Peace and Democracy. But the committee made the huge mistake of assuming that all the members of that league, and even the people who were merely on its mailing list, knew of that secret financial link. They did not. People whose only interest was in doing something to stop the Nazis joined that organization—people, Mr. Speaker, who are no more Communist than you or I.

Why, Mr. Speaker, only last week, at a public hearing of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] implied that A. F. Whitney was a Communist because he belonged to the League for Peace and Democracy. And who is A. F. Whitney? He has been for years the president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, one of the best established, most loyal American workingmen's organizations in our history. When the gentleman from Georgia said Mr. Whitney was "linked with Browder"—and that is what he said, I heard him say it—he was accusing not only Mr. Whitney but thousands of good Americans who belong to that organization, who know Mr. Whitney well and have elected and reelected him as their president.

Yes, the Dies committee finds a few facts now and then, but promptly loses regard for facts and indulges in what the New York Herald Tribune has described as the "unvarnished smear." Let me cite some more "unvarnished smears."

Here is a Government employee named Gauld—I never heard of him before—who is labeled un-American by the Dies committee because he was a member of a committee headed up by former Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes.

Here is a group labeled "Communist Front"—the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League. They call the Anti-Nazi League un-American. Since when was it un-American to be anti-Nazi? The Dies committee calls this Anti-Nazi League a Communist Front organization, and yet this is what somebody said about the

Anti-Nazi League right here on the floor of the House:

I have personal knowledge of the league. It is a very substantial organization and is not one that is engaged in propaganda. It is a fine organization of Americans.

The Dies committee calls it a Communist Front group, but the gentleman from Massachusetts, whose remarks I have just quoted, the distinguished majority leader, JOHN W. McCORMACK, calls it a fine organization of Americans. How long are we going to continue to put any stock whatever in the accusations of the Dies committee?

Here is another subversive group—the China Aid Council. A Government employee is put on the blacklist because he belonged to that. Well, the China Aid Council is a part of United China Relief, and the honorary chairman of United China Relief is Mr. Wendell Willkie. Are we seriously trying to prove that Mr. Willkie is some kind of a "pink"?

Finally, here is an activity which the Dies committee considers subversive. Yes; this is an activity listed in the Dies committee files and charged against United States employees as un-American—signing a petition against the Dies committee. Anybody who opposes the continuation of the Dies committee is ipso facto un-American. I need not comment on the dangerous implications of a thing like that. It is enough to point out the amazing and smug self-righteousness of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this Dies committee has become a dangerous and expensive luxury. We make a great row about a harmless \$4,600 dancer, yet we are asked to fork over \$100,000 to perpetuate a committee that has done little good and much harm.

And when we read the record and think the thing through we know that that is the truth. Perhaps another committee could have done or would do a really helpful job in this field. But we know in our hearts that this Dies committee has a record of high-handed hearings, high-sounding promises, very little accomplishment, and endless, ridiculous, unforgivable smearing of decent and loyal Americans. They have cried "Wolf!" so heedlessly that they cannot be trusted to guard Americanism any more than the shepherd boy who cried "Wolf!" should have been trusted to guard his flock.

There is one more thing which I have time enough only to mention this afternoon. But think it over. Think over the attacks on President Roosevelt's policies by the chairman of this committee. Think of the false charges brought against the men the President and the country trust. Think of the accusation, thinly veiled, that the Dies committee could have prevented the Pearl Harbor tragedy if the President had not interfered. Think of the need for solidarity among the United Nations against our enemies. Think of these things, and remember how desperately the country needs a unified leadership, how much the President has to depend on us, how much we do depend on him.

We will be on trial when this resolution comes up next week. The easy thing, the politically safe thing, would be to let it go

through. Safe for whom? Not for the country. The future is pretty dark and we would not brighten it by perpetuating a committee which is only a source of futile confusion, suspicion, absurdity, doubt, and hatred. We would simply make things worse. The Dies committee is a dangerous plaything. Our duty is not easy, but it is clear and it needs to be done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield for unanimous-consent requests.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders for the day I may address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from PM daily.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WE MUST BE FRANK WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if there were any groups or individuals in the United States who believed the Nation could pursue business as usual, work as usual, strikes as usual, life as usual, the fall of Singapore, the escape of the German Fleet through the Straits of Dover, the impending fall of the Philippines, despite the heroic, almost superhuman, efforts of MacArthur and his men, the reverses in the Dutch Indies and the Pacific generally should have driven such ideas from their minds.

If any such groups or individuals still cling to the idea that the deadly peril of this Nation can be used as a cover for an internal social revolution, or the promotion of group or personal gains in powers or profits, such groups and individuals are traitors to their country and should be persuaded by the quickest means to lend their full and complete cooperation to the war effort.

There has been entirely too much glamor used to cover up the harsh facts about the actual condition of affairs; too much exploitation of individual heroic accomplishments, which lead the people to believe we are winning this war in the Pacific. When one or two American men risk death to capture 20 or 100 times their number of Japanese it sounds good in print. Such exploits properly thrill the American people. But if they are used to dull or gloss over the harsh facts that, in the over-all picture, we are taking a bad beating, and may continue to do so for

the next year and a half, then the publication of such heroic exploits will do more harm than good.

As I have said here before, we need more of Winston Churchill's blunt, fearless candor about the way the war is progressing. The American people have the stamina of character, the tough-fibered courage to take bad news with their chins up. Such news only causes them to pull up their belts a few more holes and work the harder to win this war.

Wishful thinking, coddling, concealment of bad news will not save the Nation, but it may result in its defeat.

The American people have plenty of courage. They have plenty of the spirit of never-say-quit. They will pull in their belts as many holes as necessary to win this war. What they want is to be told the facts—tragic as those facts may be. They want to be told what to do to win this war, no matter how hard the tasks may be, or how painful the sacrifices may be. The trouble is that our leaders have not had the courage to tell the people of mistakes; of overoptimism; of reverses, for fear of adverse political consequences.

The time has come when there has got to be a cessation of politics in the conduct of this war. If America loses this war, there will be no American politics; there will be no American business; there will be no free American enterprise and American profits; there will be no free American labor, and high wages, and comfortable American ways of life; there will be no more Constitution, no more Bill of Rights; this will no longer be known to the oppressed of other lands as the land of hope. There will be only the oppressors, their lashes, their bayonets—and an enslaved American people. That must never happen. It never will happen if the American people are told in time the facts—no matter how harsh, how unfavorable—and are led vigorously to the right efforts.

It is becoming apparent that America and Britain could be defeated by not knowing the facts. It is certain they cannot be defeated if the people are told the truth; if incompetents in every department of leadership are ruthlessly thrown out instead of being kicked upstairs into some other position of authority; if every consideration except the quickest possible winning of the war is sternly put aside. The only way in which the American and British and Russian people can be defeated in this war is the way in which France was defeated—by the leaders lacking the courage to risk the political displeasure of the people by frankly admitting facts and calling upon the people for the efforts and the sacrifices necessary to insure victory.

There is widespread feeling in this country that only a small part of the truth about Pearl Harbor has been told our people—facts the enemy already knows. The American people will not trust their leaders until they can feel with good reason their leaders trust them.

The secret of Winston Churchill's power with the British people is his attitude that the war is not his private war, or that of his political adherents, but

that it is the war of the British Empire, and must be fought and won by the British Empire.

This war is the war of the whole United States—of all the people, industrial managers and workers; farmers; white-collar workers; young and old; sick and well—all alike. If we win we all win. If we lose we all lose, and lose horribly. We must not lose. We will not lose. But the people must be told the facts. They must be made to understand that business, work, strikes, amusements, life as usual, all must be suspended until after this war is won and the ruthless, brutal, marauding aggressors are extinguished, crushed, smashed completely, and for all time.

Anything less than frankness and honesty with the American people now would be treason.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, have I not been recognized?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not know he wanted to speak.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Most assuredly, with three distinguished Democrats on the floor and the opportunity to address them as well as many Republicans I could not waive the privilege; and there are 26 people in the galleries.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am sorry; Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There are only two Democrats presents.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I beg pardon. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] calls my attention to the fact that there are only two Democrats on the floor. I assume that the gentleman from New York does not wish to be classified as a Democrat. I beg his pardon.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No. I said I want to be classified under my own party, the American Labor Party.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The whole of it?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The whole of it. The whole delegation is here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The whole of the American Labor Party is here. I do feel highly flattered.

Mr. Speaker, I envy the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT]. I envy him because of his youth, his vitality, his oratorical ability, the educational qualifications which he possesses in such a marked degree, but I regret to see him use his great talents in the way in which they were used this afternoon.

I have listened to many attacks upon the Dies committee, sometimes by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who is not a Democrat and who is not a Republican; sometimes by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT]; sometimes by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]. Many, many attacks have been made upon that committee by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]. I have read many attacks upon that committee in the Daily

Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party. There were several in that paper last week. But the plain people of the Nation, the common people, have faith in that committee and support it. It is significant that the most bitter and persistent attacks upon it come from the Daily Worker—from the Communists who seek the overthrow of our Government by force.

As I gather from the attacks which have been made, or the arguments which have been made—perhaps they should not be designated as attacks—from the arguments that have been made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], the great mistake so far as the Dies committee is concerned was the mistake made by the Speaker of the House when he did not put on that committee Messrs. DICKSTEIN, ELIOT, and MARCANTONIO.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I was not around here when that committee was started, so it is pretty obvious I could not have been a member of that committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There has been one vacancy on that committee.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Not since I have been here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of the gentleman's great ability, in view of the great service that he might render the people of the country, it would not have been amiss if someone had been asked to resign and the gentleman put on the committee.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I am always glad to be of service, and I am wondering why the gentleman himself was not appointed to that committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am one of the more ignorant, unsophisticated Members of the House.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. The gentleman would not say innocent, would he?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am just one of those who do not know what is going on. So it is said.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. That is not right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The *Normandie* has been destroyed. The Dies committee warned the Nation and warned the President about the activities of the Reds in New York Harbor and on the New York docks. After the Dies committee and the members on the minority side had time and time again called attention to those things, to the dangers to our shipping in the New York Harbor. I cannot understand why it is that we must have this criminal carelessness, as the gentleman from New York so ably pictured it today. I cannot understand why this carelessness, if it be nothing worse, is permitted right here in one of our own harbors resulting as it did in the destruction of that great vessel. It matters little whether it was sabotage or carelessness, it has caused a loss that we cannot replace.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield? He mentioned my name.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the authorities in charge over there in New York had heeded the advice of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and others, all that could have been prevented. Certainly they have been warned.

Undoubtedly the Dies committee has made mistakes. Who has not? If the Dies committee had made as many mistakes as this administration has made, then the criticism would come with more justice from the majority side.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I am glad the gentleman draws the line so clearly between the committee and the administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The mistakes of the committee have come from a lack of information, a lack of facilities to make further investigations, lack of help from the Department of Justice and other Government departments. They were mistakes in judgment. Many of the mistakes of the New Deal administration are mistakes of the heart, the result of deliberate acts—action taken in utter disregard of consequences—because they are trying to remake this country, a thing to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and most of us object. They are trying to destroy our constitutional government, these gentlemen who are connected with the present administration, while the Dies committee has been trying to get rid of the Reds and the Communists, has been trying to protect our Nation from the Reds.

The President's wife has been taking them in; taking them to lunch, feeding them, and sleeping them.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. What is that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure. Does not the gentleman know that?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I said the President's wife had taken them down here to the White House. She has been feeding them and sleeping them, giving them bed and board—maintenance, as they say in a divorce suit. What I am asking is that the Communists get a divorce from the bed and board of this Government until we get through with this war. Of course, I understand the argument at the present time that they are fighting a common enemy, and, of course, we are glad to have their help; but all the time this Government of ours should watch this ally at its side to see that they do not stick a knife in our backs or stick out a foot and trip us as we go forward. We should make sure that when the war is over they have not taken us over. It matters little to many of our people back in the sticks, where it is said—or, at least, thought—by the professors that we are so ignorant, where we have not the advantages of a Harvard education, which I greatly regret, whether Hitler gets us and skins us from the top down, or whether our ally, Joe Stalin, gets us and skins us from the heels up. We do not want to be taken over by either.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for a serious observation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am serious, even though my thoughts are not expressed in the fastidious, cultured language nor with the accent of a Harvard graduate. Out in our country a skinning is a skinning; and if the gentleman ever strays from his ivy-covered university into the West and gets a skinning, he will know it is serious.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I am not in favor of having Communists in the Government service, as I pointed out in my earlier remarks. I do believe, as I pointed out, that the Dies committee is not the agency which can best get rid of such Communists as there may be in the Government, because, as I pointed out, it so carelessly and heedlessly accuses decent, loyal Americans of being disloyal.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It may be true that the committee has made some mistakes. Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. That is all I said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Probably it is due to the chairman's enthusiasm. I do not know whether the gentleman has ever been accused of anything, but I have been accused of almost everything. Every man who is not colorless or lazy, who is active and earnest, is so accused. Maybe a lot of it is true. But my heart is in the right place, and my mistakes are due to a lack of intelligence and judgment; not to intention. I understand that a certain place is paved with good intentions. Too many of these folks down here in the executive department do not even have good intentions. Some of them apparently wish to follow the party line.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not for a speech.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not for a speech, but the gentleman mentioned my name. The gentleman said my position was based on the fact that I wanted to get on this committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, I did not say any such thing.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes, you did.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not hear correctly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You said I wanted to get on this committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, I did not say you wanted to get on the committee at all. I said that the mistake the Speaker made, perhaps, was in not putting the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dickstein], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Eliot], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Marcantonio] on the committee.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I assure you I am not a candidate to get on that committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not say you were.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not want any part of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The trouble with you is that so many times you do not hear correctly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. My hearing is good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then you do not understand properly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The trouble is you do not talk properly. You always talk too much most of the time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You read the Record tomorrow, and I will show you that I did not say anything about your wanting to be on the committee.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. After you correct the record, you will show it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a dirty, nasty, little insinuation, and you know it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Let us look at the record now. Let us get the stenographic notes now and we will see what you said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right; you can have a copy of them. I ask the stenographer now, when you get out that transcript, get out a copy of what I said about him, so he can have it.

Now, I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts in the utmost sincerity that I never questioned his good faith, not at all. We just see things differently; that is all. When the gentleman spoke about the smear campaign, now it may be that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dies] in his enthusiasm—and we all get enthusiastic; some of us get this crusading spirit—maybe he has that and is trying to do his best. Maybe he has smeared someone. As I mentioned a while ago, we all get a little smeared. But while the war is on let us take it. It does not really hurt us. Maybe it makes better legislators of us. But when you are talking about a smear campaign have you forgotten what Brother Flynn said a week or so ago, or within the last few days? He characterized the Republicans as being more interested in preserving their party and winning party success than they were in the fate of the Nation. There is no sense in that kind of a statement. It was untrue, and Flynn knew it.

Then just a few days later when the Communist Party of Ohio sent the President a resolution of support, the President's secretary, by direction of the President, thanked them.

Flynn, the President's chief, tries to kick the Republicans out of the defense picture, while the President would take the Communists in. Dies is hitting the Communists, and hitting them hard, and that is the reason for their opposition. If he fails to expose other subversive individuals and groups, it can truthfully be said that he has had little help from either the administration or his critics. The people have faith in that committee. Let this Congress refuse to continue it and the storm which will descend on us will make the protest against our pension legislation seem like a gentle summer breeze.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KLEBERG, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. GEARHART, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. BUTLER, indefinitely, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. HARE, for 1 day, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 329. An act for the relief of Lulu Heron;

H. R. 446. An act for the relief of the estate of Opal June Lindsay, Luck A. Lindsay, Thelma Louise Lindsay, and Laura Kathleen Lindsay;

H. R. 1905. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Michael Lewenczuk;

H. R. 2724. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary E. Philpot, Sandra G. Philpot, and Mrs. R. L. Keckler;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Dale L. Barthel and others;

H. R. 3539. An act to provide for the deposit and expenditure of various revenues collected at schools and hospitals operated by the Indian Service in Alaska;

H. R. 3542. An act to authorize the purchase from appropriations made for the Indian Service of supplies and materials for resale to natives, native cooperative associations, and Indian Service employees stationed in Alaska;

H. R. 3647. An act for the relief of the San Diego Consolidated Gas & Electric Co.;

H. R. 3823. An act for the relief of Edwin B. Formhals;

H. R. 4179. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States;

H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of John King;

H. R. 4354. An act for the relief of D. H. Dantzer;

H. R. 4773. An act for the relief of Brooks Equipment & Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4831. An act for the relief of Katherine McCue;

H. R. 4993. An act for the relief of Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott;

H. R. 5040. An act for the relief of William Robert Shaneyfelt and Mildred Shaneyfelt;

H. R. 5056. An act for the relief of the Burlington Auto Co.;

H. R. 5206. An act for the relief of Nettie Woolfolk Montague and Jerry L. Woolfolk, and others;

H. R. 5230. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5282. An act for the relief of J. W. Daughtry;

H. R. 5337. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna M. Paul;

H. R. 5572. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940, approved April 23, 1941;

H. R. 5773. An act for the relief of Libby, McNeill & Libby;

H. R. 5984. An act for the relief of Solomon Brown;

H. R. 6145. An act for the relief of Mason C. Brunson; and

H. R. 6225. An act for the relief of certain individuals in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1133. An act to authorize the transfer of lands from the United States to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission under certain conditions, and to accept title to another tract to be transferred to the United States;

S. 1368. An act relating to lands of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians;

S. 1521. An act to provide that the Navy ration may include canned or powdered or concentrated fruit or vegetables juices;

S. 1630. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps; and

S. 2192. An act to extend the time for examination of quarterly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Navy.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 329. An act for the relief of Lulu Heron;

H. R. 446. An act for the relief of the estate of Opal June Lindsay, Luck A. Lindsay, Thelma Louise Lindsay, and Laura Kathleen Lindsay;

H. R. 1905. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Michael Lewenczuk;

H. R. 2724. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary E. Philpot, Sandra G. Philpot, and Mrs. R. L. Keckler;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Dale L. Barthel and others;

H. R. 3539. An act to provide for the deposit and expenditure of various revenues collected at schools and hospitals operated by the Indian Service in Alaska;

H. R. 3542. An act to authorize the purchase from appropriations made for the Indian Service of supplies and materials for resale to natives, native cooperative associations, and Indian Service employees stationed in Alaska;

H. R. 3647. An act for the relief of the San Diego Consolidated Gas & Electric Co.;

H. R. 3823. An act for the relief of Edwin B. Formhals;

H. R. 4179. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States;

H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of John King;

H. R. 4354. An act for the relief of D. H. Dantzer;

H. R. 4773. An act for the relief of Brooks Equipment & Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4831. An act for the relief of Katherine McCue;

H. R. 4998. An act for the relief of Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott;

H. R. 5040. An act for the relief of William Robert Shaneyfelt and Mildred Shaneyfelt;

H. R. 5056. An act for the relief of the Burlington Auto Co.;

H. R. 5206. An act for the relief of Nettle Woolfolk Montague and Jerry L. Woolfolk and others;

H. R. 5280. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5282. An act for the relief of J. W. Daughtry;

H. R. 5387. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna M. Paul;

H. R. 5572. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or dam-

aged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940, approved April 23, 1941;

H. R. 5773. An act for the relief of Libby, McNeill & Libby;

H. R. 5984. An act for the relief of Solomon Brown;

H. R. 6145. An act for the relief of Mason C. Brunson; and

H. R. 6225. An act for the relief of certain individuals in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 19, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold public hearings on bills pending before the committee to repeal retirement provisions for elected officials. Hearings will be held Thursday, February 19, 1942, at 10 o'clock a. m., in Room 246, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10:30 a. m. on Thursday, February 19, 1942, for consideration of S. 2222.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 19, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6554, to amend war-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort.

POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON H. R. 6503

This will advise you that the hearings previously scheduled for Tuesday, February 17, 1942, at 10 a. m., have been postponed until Thursday, February 26, 1942, at 10 a. m., on the following bill: H. R. 6503, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, February 19, 1942.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 6156—land-grant rates with respect to Government traffic.

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Wednesday, February 25, 1942.

Business to be considered: To resume hearings on petroleum as outlined in Mr. Cole's memorandum of February 6, 1942.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs on Wednesday, February 25, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., for the continuation of hearings on S. 1476 (Florida tick bill).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1411. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the operations under sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1412. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 6, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Alkali Canyon, Oreg., for flood control, authorized by an act of Congress approved on June 13, 1934 (H. Doc. No. 631); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1413. A letter from the second vice president, the American National Theater and Academy, transmitting the Annual Report for 1941 of the American National Theater and Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5016. A bill to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. 1795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5360. A bill declaring certain lands to be a part of the public domain and providing for the administration thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5719. A bill to abolish the Guilford Courthouse National Military Park Commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1797). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6531. A bill to suspend the effectiveness during the existing national emergency of tariff duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous-metal scrap; with amendment (Rept. No. 1798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 6548. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1799). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6620. A bill to authorize service in the armed forces during the present war of certain veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1942

(Legislative day of Friday, February 13, 1942)

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

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Heavenly Father, Thou only companion of man's soul, who didst condescend to walk this way with us, assuring us thereby of heaven's friendship and Thy watchful, shepherding care: Our hearts turn wistfully to Thee, that in these days of preparation, so necessary for each one of us, we may feel the tenderness of Thy compassion, the long-suffering of Thy love, despite our oft-delayed repentance, which in the Psalmist's words we now offer from each individual heart:

Have mercy upon me, O God, after Thy great goodness; according to the multitude of Thy mercies do away mine offences.

Wash me thoroughly from my wickedness, and cleanse me from my sin.

For I acknowledge my faults, and my sin is ever before me.

Against Thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight; that Thou mightest be justified in Thy saying, and clear when Thou shalt judge.

But, lo, Thou requirest truth in the inward parts, and shall make me to understand wisdom secretly.

Thou shalt purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; Thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.

Turn Thy face from my sins, and put out all my misdeeds.

Make me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from Thy presence, and take not Thy Holy Spirit from me.

O give me the comfort of Thy help again, and establish me with Thy free Spirit.

Thou shalt open my lips, O Lord, and my tongue shall sing of Thy righteousness, and then shall my mouth show forth Thy praise. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be. World without end. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Wednesday, February 18, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 18th instant,

The following message was received from the House of Representatives during the recess of the Senate:

That the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6548) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1942, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) amending section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 268. An act for the relief of James Wood;

H. R. 2712. An act for the relief of the Branchland Pipe & Supply Co.;

H. R. 2780. An act for the relief of O. C. Ousley; and

H. R. 4537. An act for the relief of H. D. Bateman, Henry G. Conner, Jr., executor of the last will and testament of P. L. Woodard, and J. M. Creech.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 793. An act for the relief of Marie V. Talbert and her sons James Osborn Talbert and Dewey Talbert; and

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Hiram O. Lester, Grace D. Lester, and Florence E. Dawson.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3141. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder; and

H. R. 4622. An act for the relief of Catherine Schultze.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6548) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to

By Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6621. A bill permitting the naturalization of certain aliens having sons or daughters in the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 6622. A bill to provide for the planting of guayule and other rubber-bearing plants and to make available a source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6623. A bill to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6624. A bill to provide for the planting of guayule and other rubber-bearing plants and to make available a source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 6625. A bill granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6626. A bill to grant pensions to certain World War veterans 64 years of age or over; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VORYS of Ohio:

H. R. 6627. A bill to incorporate the Postal Ex-Service Men's Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6628. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6632. A bill to penalize the divulging of the contents of confidential Government documents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 6629. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia A. Layman and Dorothy J. Layman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 6630. A bill for the relief of the Waldrop Heating & Plumbing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6631. A bill for the relief of Curtis Pope; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2452. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the grand jury of Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif., urging the Attorney General and Department of Justice to immediately find means to evacuate all alien Japanese from the Pacific coast area; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2453. Also, petition of the Highland Park Christian Church, of Highland Park, Calif., requesting the President of the United States, as a protective measure insuring food essentials, to eliminate the manufacture of alcohol during the emergency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.