war as members of the armed forces of the United States shall receive the same preference as veterans receive with respect to continued employment on Work Projects Administration projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6738. A bill to limit the initial base pay of $21 per month for enlisted men in the Army and Marine Corps to those of the seventh grade; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6739. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water-pumping station and pipe line; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 6740. A bill to provide for a 15-percent increase in the compensation of postmasters and other employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads

By Mr. TERRY:

H. R. 6741. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the prosecution of flood-control projects in the White River Basin; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R 6742. A bill to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 6743. A bill to amend section 420 (a) of title 18, United States Code (48 Stat. 479) and section 420 (d) of title 18, United States Code (48 Stat. 980); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 6744. A bill to amend section 1001, title X, of the Social Security Act to include needy individuals who are permanently crippies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 6745. A bill relating to the classification of substitute post-office clerks and substitute city letter carriers in the first- and second-class post offices and substitute laborers in the Postal Service and Railway Mail Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 269. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the birthday of Madame Sklodowska Curie by proclaiming a national war on cancer week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 454. Resolution for the investigation of the Dies committee report; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEITER:

H. R. 6746. A bill for the relief of Carmela Maureillo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 6747. A bill for the relief of M. C. Roberts and Robert Roberts (collectively); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PADDOCK:

H. R. 6748. A bill for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VORYS of Ohio:

H. R. 6749. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Schakett; 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:

2525. By Mr. HANCOCK: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Onondaga County, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 6316; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2526 By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of the Highway Engineers Association of Missouri at its thirty-fifth annual convention, recently held at Kansas City, pledging to our President the loyal and faithful services of the association and its individual members in any manner or capacity in the present national emergency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2527. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the Michigan Association of Road Commissioners, opposing legislation empowering Interstate Commerce Commission to determine maximum weights and sizes of commercial vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2528. Also, resolution of the Michigan Association of Road Commissioners, favoring use of Work Projects Administration employees on county highway maintenance under supervision of county road commissions; to the Committee on Roads.

2529. Also, concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the Congress of the United States to designate as a military road a highway from Detour to Sault Ste. Marie in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; to the Committee on Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, MARCH 7, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

Blessed Lord God, send out Thy light for every day of labor, trial, and temptation. Oh, breath of God, illuminate our minds that we may see Thy will clearly with the spirit to accept it. Beset by difficulties and confronted with questions of momentous importance, do Thou gird the Congress with wisdom and strength other than its own. As all the good of this marvelous world gathers about Thee, grant that all that is noble and inspiring in our human lives may have their inspiration in our Heavenly Father upon earth.

Do Thou bless all our homes; we pray that about every hearthstone there may be the radiance of peace, happiness, and the bonds of pure love. Living in the enjoyment of Christian faith, may it be verified in those noble graces of serenity and forbearance as they stoop for love's sweet sake. As human interest is supreme in these hours, grant that they be citadels of comfort and not of worry; be Thou beside them, dear Lord of grace, and keep them ever so. In the name of Saint Mary's holy Child. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 4, 1942:

H. R. 691. An act for the relief of Richard Bove;

H. R. 2718. An act for the relief of Jean N. Burton and Laura Jones;

H. R. 3032. An act for the relief of J. G. Fox;

H. R. 3697. An act for the relief of John E. Newman;

H. R. 3829. An act for the relief of Lonnie Bales;

H. R. 4414. An act for the relief of Andrew Wichmann;

H. R. 5026. An act for the relief of the Louis Puccinelli Bail Bond Co.;

H. R. 5573. An act for the relief of Mrs. Noel Wright and Bunny Wright;

H. R. 5605. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. J. B. Conm;

H. R 6003. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1938;

H. R. 6072. An act authorizing the States of Arizona and California, jointly or separately, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Colorado River at or near Needles, Calif.;

H. R. 6107. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit the vestry of Rock Creek Parish to utilize for burial sites certain land within its present holdings in Rock Creek Cemetery;

H. R. 6536. An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to acquire certain lands in Nassau County, N. Y.

On March 5, 1942:

H. R. 1060. An act to vest absolute in the city of Dearborn the title to lot 19 of the Detroit arsenal grounds subdivision, Wayne County, Mich.;

H. R. 1755. An act for the relief of C. M. Sherrod and Daisy Mimms, administratrix of the estate of Arthur Mimms;

H. R. 2428. An act for the relief of G. F. Brown;

H. R. 5481. An act to transfer Blair County, Pa., from the western judicial district of Pennsylvania to the middle judicial district of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5545. An act for the relief of H. Earl Russell;

H. R. 5865. An act for the relief of Builders Specialties Co.;

H. R. 6332. An act to revise the boundaries of the Chickamauga-Chattanooga National Military Park in the States of Georgia and Tennessee;

H. R. 6611. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to approve and authorize the continuance of certain payments for the hospitalization and care of Leo Mulvey, and for other purposes.

On March 6, 1942:

H. R. 2460. An act for the relief of Ruth Steward, administratrix of the estate of Luther F. Steward;

H. R. 3014. An act to accept the cession by the State of Michigan of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Isle Royale National Park, and for other purposes;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 3433. An act for the relief of Bessie Pearlman and George Roth;

H. R. 3761. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willie M. Maye;

H. R. 4336. An act to accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Olympic National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4386. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Isle Royale National Park, in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5646. An act for the relief of Joseph Simon, lieutenant commander (SC), United States Navy, and R. D. Lewis;

H. R. 6270. An act to amend subsections (b), (d), and (e) of section 77 of the Judicial Code so as to transfer the County of Meriwether from the Columbus division of the middle district of Georgia to the Newnan division of the northern district of Georgia, and to change the terms of the district court for the Macon and Americus divisions in the middle district of Georgia; and

H. R 6550. An act to extend and amend Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public, No. 677, 76th Cong.), approved June 29, 1940, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech, Highway Construction During and After the War.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping from the Knox County Citizen, of Frederickton, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a short résumé of the record of the R. E. A. in Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the Midwest Shippers' Advisory Board pertaining to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables to which I may refer in connection with the discussion of the bill today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Roland G. Swaffield, chief air-raid warden, city of Long Beach, Calif., on the question of direction and control of civilian defense.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I shall refer to in the Committee of the Whole today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's Post, United States bombers withdrew from Java because of a lack of airplane-fighter support. This same thing was true in many other instances. Where our losses occur it is mainly for lack of air power.

After all words are said, this is a result of the strikes carried on in this country by such traitors as Harry Bridges, the Lewises, and the Murrays outside of Government, with the cooperation of the Hillmans and Perkinses on the inside.

Is this group named above proud of its sabotage carried on against the United States now? Many of us said at that time that it was sabotage and clearly saw through their program, and stated they would rue the day that they did it. The record now speaks for itself. This is a sad record.

The traitor Harry Bridges is still at large. Hillman, a dollar-a-year man for Government, drawing $14,000 per year from the C. I. O., still carrying the destructive C. I. O. ball in Government, still putting us in the hole. The incompetent Perkins still hanging on. The Lewises and the Murrays still whipping the administration into the Socialist column. The Attorney General splitting hairs while the country is being destroyed, advising us to stick to social gains, which are now destroying us, and afraid to handle Bridges.

What this country needs today is some real, honest-to-God impeachment trials to take out of Government those who are afraid or incompetent.

In addition to this, many of the traitors running at large should be taken into custody and their too efficient sabotage stopped.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial from the Glennville Sentinel, a country weekly newspaper, edited by my very able friend, W. C. Curry, of Glennville, Ga.; and I call this editorial to the particular attention of the daily newspaper columnists to whom Mr. Curry in this editorial refers as the "bellyache squad." This may give them an idea as to what at least some of the country weekly editors think of their efforts as columnists.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may extend his remarks in the Appendix, but not at this point.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I make that request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening for many, many days here to attacks similar to the one just made by the gentleman from California, linking the name of Phil Murray with unpatriotic activities. It is just a little bit more than I can stand.

I have known Phil Murray for many years. I know that he has done and is doing everything possible within his power cooperating with the President in getting out war production, and I do not believe it is fair for any man to stand on this floor and place the name of Phil Murray in the same category with a certain name that it has been placed in. Philip Murray is a gentleman in every respect, and I am privileged to have him as a friend; and I do not think it fair to cast an unpatriotic reflection upon his motives.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE JAPANESE SITUATION ON THE WEST COAST

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the success of the Axis, and particularly the Japanese, is based on detailed preparation and a high-speed timetable. If the United Nations do not increase their speed of decision and action tenfold, and that immediately, the future is in serious doubt. Word has come to us from a source which has been heretofore reliable, though unheeded by our Government, that the Japanese timetable will bring the second phase of their plans into action about April 15. This includes a major attack on Hawaii, and the commencement of sabotage action on the west coast, in preparation for events to follow.

If our administrative officials do not stop diddling around with this Japanese problem on the west coast and get down to quick action to evacuate all Japanese and all other enemy aliens immediately—and that means now and not day after tomorrow—they may, by inaction, have committed so great a sin that even history may never forgive them. "Time and tide waiteth for no man," and the Axis is riding the tide on time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by the Better Government Association.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a poem by Mrs. V. P. Chambless, of Luthersville, Ga., entitled "Bound for Freedom," and an article appearing in the Bibb Recorder of February 20, 1942, by Walter Reynolds, entitled "Don't Waste Anything."

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

There was no objection.

HEROES IN PARAGUAY—WASHINGTON, HUEY LONG

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I think it proper to call to the attention of the House what has been done in Asuncion, Paraguay. The municipal council last week honored George Washington and the late Senator Huey P. Long, of Louisiana, by naming streets for them. After President Roosevelt, Long was perhaps the best known and most popular North American in Paraguay. He championed the cause of Paraguay in the Chaco war. A fort in the northern Chaco already had been named in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a clipping dealing with Brigadier General Chennault, leading the American volunteer flyers in China against Japan.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] termed the American Farm Bureau a parasite. I want to invite the gentleman from Michigan to some day take the time and come to my district in Minnesota and I believe I can change his mind so far as his viewpoint in reference to the American Farm Bureau Federation is concerned, showing him how intensely interested in its work are thousands of the actual dirt farmers of Minnesota and America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short resolution.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAY. 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 Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that I have never yet voted against any proposal to forward the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration. I have voted for everything it wanted. I am still for that agency, but I am opposed to the Rural Electrification Administration or any other organization of this Government, whatever its name or whatever its activities, interfering with the proper prosecution of the war program in which we are now engaged.

May I say further, Mr. Speaker, that at the proper time and under proper circumstances, when I may have adequate time to do it, I shall discuss the Faddis report on the floor of the House and I invite the attention of every Member to this discussion when and if I am privileged to speak upon it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If the gentleman mentions my name, please make his statements on the floor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent radio address delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System by Elmer Davis.

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

There was no objection.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ELLIS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am getting tired and I know the House is getting tired of this R. E. A. squabble, but I say to you that the R. E. A. is not to blame, neither are they who are supporting the R. E. A. The power companies are still fighting this contract of the R. E. A. to furnish power to a war-production plant in Arkansas. Neither is the R. E. A. in anywise interfering with the war program. The interference is coming from the Power Trust. On the contrary, R. E. A. is helping the war program and is doing more than the Faddis committee to support the war program right now.

As Donald Nelson pointed out yesterday, this R. E. A. line in Oklahoma and Arkansas is under construction to deliver 20,000 kilowatts of power, over and above what power companies could have delivered, to an aluminum plant in Arkansas. Thus R. E. A. is making a great contribution to the war effort and there is no waste of copper.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. PACE. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Minnesota in challenging the charge made on the floor yesterday with regard to the American Farm Bureau Federation. Of course, I can speak only for Georgia and Alabama, but I know that in those two States the leadership of the American Farm Bureau Federation is composed of men of ability and of the very highest integrity. The members of the American Farm Bureau Federation are practical farmers who till the soil. They are rendering the Nation a great service. I hope the activities of the American Farm Bureau Federation will continue until every farmer in this Nation is organized and will be in a position to sit across the table and demand equality for American agriculture.

In my own State there is a rapid increase in the membership of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Thousands of farmers in my own section have become members and through their counsel and advice they are proving very helpful to me in my work here and in my efforts to secure a fair share of the national income and a higher economic standard for those who till the soil and produce the food and fiber to feed and clothe the people of this Nation, our armed forces, and millions in other lands.

WOULD CALL 5-CENT COIN A "PADDY"

Mr. NELSON. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, when Donald M. Nelson, head of the War Production Board, was a student in the University of Missouri, from which he was graduated in 1911, his nickname was "Paddy," so R. L., "Bob," Hill, active in the Missouri Alumni Association and past president of Rotary International, has suggested that the new nickelless nickel be

called a Paddy. Referring to this, the Columbia (Mo.) Tribune says:

The new nickelless nickel, which will replace the old 5-cent piece under the war program will be called a Paddy if R. L. Hill, director of alumni activities at the university, has his way.

Nickel will be removed from the coin for use in necessary war tools and is to be replaced with a coin of mixed copper, silver, and any other alloy the Director of the Mint decides upon.

Naturally a new name is sought for the coin, and "sisco," "cosi," and "jit" have been suggested.

But Hill recalls that Donald Nelson, War Production Director, who could be blamed for taking the nickel out of a nickel, was nicknamed Paddy when a student at the university here. And since Nelson is "padding out" the nickel with other metals, Hill believes that Paddy would be a good name for the new 5-cent piece.

Mr. Speaker, I like the "Paddy" suggestion, now that we can no longer appropriately refer to the 5-cent coin as a nickel. Yes; and Missouri likes Donald Nelson.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a clipping from the Columbia (Mo.) Tribune.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program of today I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recent discussion in the Committee of the Whole on Agriculture Yearbooks, let me read a pastoral gem from the 1940 Yearbook which appears in the chapter entitled "Cultural Setting of Agricultural Problems," by Ralph Turner, economic historian of the Social Security Board. The excerpt will be found on page 1030. This ought to be edifying to the farmers:

However, once a subjective tradition breaks up, the new material operations may move quickly into the new integration, and subjective elements correlative with modes of living supported by the new material operations will coalesce into a new tradition. In this process, it should be emphasized, both old material and old subjective elements will survive, but they will be adapted to the new elements, not contrariwise.

To this process as a whole may be given the designation "cultural reorientation."

The culminating phase of cultural change then becomes the disorganization of the subjective values of an old culture and their reorganization, sometimes along with new subjective values, in a new cultural integration. In this form cultural development can be seen as consisting, in the main, of psychological movements; that is, thinking, feeling, and acting, which move from synthesis to synthesis, each synthesis possessing coherence in some form.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

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

There was no objection.

MINNIE C. SANDERS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 649)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3610, a bill for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders.

The bill proposes to provide for the payment of the sum of $3,000 to Minnie C. Sanders, of Union, N. J., as compensation for personal injuries sustained by her when she was struck by an Army motorcycle near West Point, N. Y.

The fact that the accident was due to the negligence of the driver of the Army motorcycle is not disputed by the Army authorities.

The actual physical injuries sustained by the claimant at the time of the accident appear to have been of a minor character. It is asserted, however, that a month later she developed certain nervous and physical symptoms which may or may not be ascribed to the accident. Medical testimony on this question appears to be uncertain. Even if, however, this doubt were to be resolved in her favor, it appears that her list of expenditures with which she seeks to charge the Government includes such items as $425 for a trip to Florida; the sum of $141.60 as the cost of five trips to Boston, for the purpose of receiving medical treatment in that city, although undoubtedly she could have received suitable medical treatment either in her home town or in New York City, which is nearby; and about $1,100 for the wages and board bills of two household maids hired by her for a period of about 9 months.

The fact that Mrs. Sanders actually expended this money is not in dispute. These expenditures are, however, items of a type for which the Government should not properly reimburse her under the circumstances of this claim.

In view of the fact that the proposed payment of $3,000 appears to be excessive, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 7, 1942.*

The SPEAKER. The objection of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill, and accompanying document, will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture 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. 6709, with Mr. RAMSPECK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] had offered a substitute for the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] is entitled to recognition for 5 minutes on the substitute amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 3 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask what paragraph the gentleman has reference to.

Mr. TARVER. The paragraph dealing with the labor activities of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. I have an amendment to offer on page 64, and that would not be affected by this request.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes, including the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the substitute

amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS as a substitute for the Dirksen amendment: On page 61, line 8, strike out all of line 8 down to line 13.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may the original amendment be again reported also?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSON].

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 61, line 12, after the word "statistics", strike out "$400,000" and insert "$25,000."

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I am asking to strike out all of this $400,000 because I have discovered since I have been in Congress that when you start anything of this kind you never get through with it and that is the reason I have asked to strike out the $25,000, so you will not start anybody on a job of this kind and add to the list of people who are already working.

As I understand from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] there are to be 125 people employed here to do work that I call your particular attention to can be done by the people who are going to do this running around and getting the crop and livestock estimates. There is not any reason in the world why these men cannot ask one more question, and that is if they know of any neighborhood where there are any unemployed. I may say to you that from my experience the farmer knows where the unemployed are at the present time. They are either on relief or W. P. A., and none of them will leave their jobs on W. P. A. to work on a farm because they get more on W. P. A. That is the situation, and I do not believe we need this for the reason stated here yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois. They have the Labor Department that is gathering these statistics and there is no use of adding to this. We might just as well cut out this $400,000 and let the Labor Department and the people who are mentioned here in the previous section, which has already been passed, do this work and save this $400,000 to the country. Another thing, if the Government agencies would leave the farmers alone for a while and not ask them to make out so many reports or answer so many questions, they would have more time to produce something for the war and for the country. This is true not only of farmers, but it is true of the businessman. The businessman today is spending a large percentage of his time or that of his employees in making reports for the Federal Government for some kind of work that he is writing me and telling me he does not get or want.

So I hope this substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois will be adopted by the House so that we may save $400,000 on work which can be done by others just as well.

I want to call the attention of the committee to another thing, and that is that a great many men are going to be called into service, and are being called into the service, and I do not know where you are going to get the men to do this work if you do pass the resolution. This is not only true of labor, but true of materials. We passed here yesterday a three and a half million dollar appropriation to build roads, and I know out in Brown County, or in my home county of Outagamie County, they cannot even get a road machine to repair the roads they already have on account of the priorities. That is true of other material we are voting here to supply when we know under the rules of the Government and on account of priorities you cannot get the material to do the work with, let alone get the labor.

So I hope this substitute amendment will be adopted and that we may save the Government and the taxpayers of this country at least $400,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this substitute will save $400,000, and stop another activity designed to interfere with the proper administration of the farm situation in this country. No people coming out from Washington, 125 of them, can do anything constructive toward supplying farm labor. If we keep the Federal Government from hiring too many boys away from the farm through the Agricultural Department and its committee and agencies, through the W. P. A. and the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A., we will be contributing a very large amount toward helping the farm-employment situation. When this item was started before the deficiency committee, I was opposed to it. I could see no good purpose to be served by it, and I can see no good purpose now. The chairman of the committee put the burden of defending it upon the deficiency committee. I do not have to defend it, because I never have been for it. I hope that the House will see fit to adopt this amendment and wipe out the whole activity.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, as stated yesterday, I am not a member of this subcommittee and, therefore, am not familiar with the facts that justify this appropriation, but I gather from statements made by members of the subcommittee they were advised that this is an agency needed in the war program in order that we may be able to carry on a farm program that will aid the defense program. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] suggests that if we will not take away too many people from the farms and put them in industry, there will not be any trouble. I agree with him; but how are we going to know how many are taken from the farms and put into industry, and other occupations, unless somebody is in a position to tell us. I know there is not a mail that comes to my office but has complaints on the part of farmers because of the lack of farm labor. Men have been leaving for months to go somewhere. I do not know where. I do not know whether the industry into which they are being taken is essential to the war program or not, and I do not know whether they are going into occupations that would be more essential than the farm in this war program. Therefore in the absence of any information to the contrary, I am willing to rely upon the interpretation of the evidence by the Committee as to whether or not this is necessary, whether it is vital, whether it is important, whether it is essential to the agricultural defense program. I do not know, and no one has suggested that he does, except to say he believes that possibly it should not be allowed.

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

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is a member of the Labor and Social Security Subcommittee, and is familiar with the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the broad field in the gathering of statistics that that organization covers. I am sure the gentleman is also familiar with the fact that the Congress appropriates an exceedingly large sum of money to enable that agency under the direction of Dr. Lubin to function. The question I ask is whether or not this proposal, which proposes, in the appropriation of $400,000 "to collect, compile, analyze, summarize, interpret, and publish farm-labor statistics" is not fundamentally the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, and cannot that organization effectively do this work without setting up a new organization in the Department of Agriculture to do the same thing?

Mr. HARE. And will the gentleman please allow me to give an answer to that? Evidently he does not know, or he would not be making the inquiry. He is also a member of the committee and is in possession of as many facts as I am, and if he does not know whether or not it would be able to do it, how would he expect me to know? I do know this, the Labor Department never seems to take much interest in the welfare of farm labor.

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

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I tried to state yesterday that this provision was not initiated by the subcommittee which is presenting this bill to the House. It is the baby of the Deficiency Subcommittee. It may be an illegitimate child. I tried as best I could to put the child on their doorstep, and asked them to take care of it. That committee is headed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who yesterday administered the coup de grâce to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics with the assistance of the economy twins, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit, I should be glad to explain the genesis of the baby.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, I ask the gentleman to wait a moment. I talked with the gentleman from Virginia this morning and asked him to give me his opinion, if he thought proper to do so, and he has not seen fit to do so.

The activity was instituted by Congress on the recommendation of the deficiency subcommitte in the fall of last year. Just what case they had for it they

have not told us. We are undertaking to attempt to justify it in the same volume as it was instituted by them, with a cut of $100,000. If you want to cut it out, if you feel the Deficiency Subcommittee has not justified this alleged extravagance which they began, then all I can say, "Help yourself to the mustard."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman lays the baby on my doorstep. All I can say is "It is a child of indiscretion and I am ashamed of it."

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended by the substitute was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards Acts: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to establish and promote the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, and for other purposes," approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 511-511q), and an act entitled "An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department of Agriculture," approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501-508), as amended, $646,660.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 64, line 4, after the word "amended", strike out "$646,660" and insert "$850,000."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he will not accept this amendment. The purpose of my amendment is to increase the amount provided for the Tobacco Inspection Act so as to conform with the figure set forth in the record by Mr. Kitchen, of the Department.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I have no authority from the subcommittee to accept the gentleman's amendment. I hope to have an opportunity to explain my own individual position with regard to it after the gentleman has concluded.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, in Mr. Kitchen's testimony before the committee in response to a question asked by Mr. TARVER, whose question was as follows:

How much money would be necessary in order for you to provide this service for all of the tobacco markets?

Mr. Kitchen replied:

We have only made rather general estimates, but if this appropriation were increased to around $850,000 or $900,000, with present operating costs, I think we can take care of the whole situation.

The 1942 Budget carried a figure of $665,575. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $671,660. Mr. Kitchen suggests that we need at least $850,000.

So that you may understand just how important this amendment is I would like to call attention to the fact that in the burley section there are 43 burley markets. All 43 of those markets have the benefit of this very valuable service to the tobacco farmers. In the fire-cured area there are 12 markets. All 12 of those have this service available. In the flue-cured area there are 75 markets and only 26 markets are able, under the present appropriation, to receive this service.

The committee has written into this law a provision which requires the Administration to distribute the money throughout the entire tobacco-growing area, which means just this, that in Kentucky and in the fire-cured area they may lose the service on one market or two markets, or more. If the service is extended to the flue-cured area, which will be most likely since the money has to be prorated throughout the entire area, you will have a bad situation in the burley area and the fire-cured area, because the service will have to be withdrawn from some of those markets which, according to Mr. Kitchen, will in all probability result in the market being closed.

I do not think it is necessary for me to undertake to sell this program to this House all over again. The matter was thoroughly discussed when the bill was passed. It is an invaluable service that is being rendered to the tobacco farmers. If you have read the record you can appreciate just how important this grading information is to the farmers of the country.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman means of course that unless the amendment is adopted this service to the different markets will be curtailed?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. MAY. And if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, then it will be uniform for all?

Mr. COOLEY. If my amendment is adopted the money will be sufficient to make the service available on all markets, but it does not necessarily mean that the service will be acceptable on all markets, because before it can be placed on the market, two-thirds of the farmers of that particular marketing area have to vote in a referendum in favor of the service.

If I may be permitted to read just one excerpt from Mr. Kitchen's testimony you will better understand what I mean.

Mr. Kitchen's statement is as follows:

I might state here just as a matter of information, that we, of course, do not check all resales, but we did compile records of 719 resales last year, and out of those 719 resales where the original bids had been rejected, 592 of them netted an increase of $3.94 per hundred pounds, or 27.2 percent more than the original bid. In 64 cases there was practically no betterment in the return, and in 63 resales, the resale price averaged $3.24 per hundredweight less than the original sale. But for the 719 resales, there was a net return upon resale of approximately 23 percent over the price originally offered.

For the 719 resales, there was a net return on resale of approximately 23 percent over the original price offered. You can see from this what it means to the farmer who puts his tobacco on the floor. He has no idea on earth about the grade, because the companies keep their grades and those grades are not made available to the farmer. A farmer brings his tobacco to the warehouse floor and unless he has this inspection service he is absolutely and completely at the mercy of the buyers. The buyer comes along and he grades it and places a bid on it and the poor farmer stands there in amazement and wonder and does not know what to do. But here on these markets where they have inspections the Government man comes along and grades his tobacco for him and tells him what it is worth. He can turn the tag on it, see what it is worth, and sell it on the same warehouse floor on the same day; and, as pointed out by Mr. Kitchen, get what his tobacco is worth. I think the service is valuable in all tobacco-growing areas and that the amount of money involved here should not be denied to the tobacco farmers, because it provides only the same opportunity on all of the markets of the country.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. EDMISTON. If the gentleman's amendment prevails this same service will be extended to all tobacco areas?

Mr. COOLEY. To all tobacco areas, and it will not result in crippling or curtailing the number of markets having the service in some sections of Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky and other places where they now have the service.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. As I understand the situation, unless this amendment is adopted the burley markets will be cut about three-eighths.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know exactly what the results will be.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. In other words, the burley market would be without inspection service and would be closed; and when you come to the Dark tobacco about three-quarters of the markets would lose inspection service.

Mr. COOLEY. I assume the gentleman's figures are correct. I would like to refer to just one other statement from Mr. Kitchen, in which he said:

For a time I think they actually had to close the markets for a few days, because there was such a severe protest from the producers because of the lack of inspection facilities.

I hope this amendment will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking particularly in opposition to the amendment or in favor of it. I simply want to give you the facts in regard to this subject matter as I understand them to be.

This is another child of the indiscretion of the deficiency subcommittee. The

subcommittee on agricultural appropriations last year provided an amount for this tobacco-inspection service which was increased in the Senate by $211,000.

We went to conference on the matter and finally agreed on an increase of $94,000, and the conference report was adopted. We provided in our bill as has been done theretofore that these inspection services should be prorated to markets for the several types of tobacco in proportion to the total number of existing markets for each type in the several areas. After our bill had been passed, gentlemen from the burley and fire-cured tobacco areas went before the deficiency committee, first I believe in the Senate, although I may be mistaken as to that, and secured an additional appropriation of $131,000 for this inspection service. The members of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, as far as I know, with the possible exception of the then chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], knew nothing about the procedure before the deficiency committee.

It was provided in connection with the report of the Senate committee, that that $131,000 should be used altogether for the burley and fire-cured tobacco markets. The result has been that an appropriation in excess of that recommended by this subcommittee was procured through the deficiency committee; and, in addition, full inspection was provided for all of the fire-cured and burley markets. Twelve fire-cured markets and 43 burley markets have been serviced in full, 100 percent. The flue-cured markets and the dark air-cured markets, and the Maryland markets have not been serviced in full.

The flue-cured markets number 75, and constitute more than 50 percent of the total number of markets. Because of this provision made through the instrumentality of the deficiency bill, the flue-cured markets are having only a 35-percent service; that is, 35 percent of their markets are served, whereas the fire-cured and burley markets are served 100 percent.

When our committee came to view the subject matter again in connection with the pending bill, we thought we ought to restore the basis for the distribution of these funds which had existed before the deficiency committee took action; so we provide in our report that the amount of this appropriation shall be prorated to the several markets in proportion to the total number of existing markets of each type in the several areas. The representatives of burley markets recognize the fairness of that proposal, but they feel that all the markets should be served. So do I. I feel it is unfair to the tobacco growers of one area in the United States to say to them that you can only have 35 percent of your markets served with this inspection, yet in other areas of the United States 100 percent of the markets may be served. I think this is a very beneficial service. I think it is of very great value to the tobacco producers and, being of such great value, there is no reason why any markets should be accorded any different treatment from that accorded others.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not see any reason why one area should be accorded full measure of inspection and other areas only substantially one-third of their requirements. So far as I am concerned, and I am speaking only as an individual member of the subcommittee, not being authorized to speak for my colleagues, in fairness this service should be provided in equa measure for all of the tobacco markets of the United States. In my opinion, it is discriminatory to provide it for some and not provide it for all. In view of the very great reductions which have already been accomplished in this bill in connection with other matters, it seems to me that fairness to these people would justify the adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'NEAL. The effect of the amendment is to carry out just what the gentleman has said; that is, give inspection to all of them?

Mr. TARVER. That is right. Certainly if inspection is not given to all of them, then the funds ought to be prorated among the different types of tobacco on the different markets equitably.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that under this provision calling for the funds to be prorated unless my amendment is adopted it will probably result in irreparable injury to some of the markets that now have the service?

Mr. TARVER. It will result in the taking away of the inspection from some of the markets and giving it to markets of other types of tobacco. We can prorate the service equitably, as had always been done before the deficiency committee acted in this matter.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEAVY. May I say as a member of the subcommittee that I am in accord with the position the gentleman has taken. I would not feel justified in opposing the pending amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, I know that the membership of the House wants to treat the tobacco growers fairly. Since the inspection service has been inaugurated on the tobacco floors, there has been a marked improvement in the price the tobacco grower gets for his tobacco. This service has furnished the tobacco grower, the dirt farmer, with expert knowledge as to just what grade his tobacco should be put in, and when the buyer offers him a price not in keeping with what that particular grade should bring he has a right to turn his tag and have a resale. Heretofore the tobacco grower was absolutely at the mercy of the purchaser, because, for instance, taking burley tobacco, there are sixty-some grades. The tobacco growers did not know those grades. They had no way of obtaining the knowledge and they did not know whether they were receiving a fair price or a price that was not fair; consequently, before we had the grading service, two farmers on adjoining farms, raising the same grade of tobacco, one would get 15 cents for his tobacco and his neighbor would get 25 or 30 cents for tobacco of the same grade.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I am not certain I heard the amendment read so far as the amount that it is proposed to increase this item is concerned.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It is about $200,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman address himself to the amount of the increase in this appropriation?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I will do that now. It is about $200,000, and if we succeed in securing the adoption of this amendment we will be able to put the inspection service on all of the floors for which graders can be obtained. Of course, it takes time to train graders, and even if we had sufficient money to put graders on all floors, we could not find the graders.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that although we are increasing the amount by $200,000 there is not any likelihood that the entire amount will be actually used because the amount used will depend upon the availability of qualified inspectors?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. You can only put inspectors on these floors as they are trained. Here is where we will suffer irreparable injury: Let us take the burley growers who have been interested in this service over the years.

We have 100-percent inspection service on the burley floors. If the amendment is defeated and the money appropriated prorated, you will curtail the burley inspection service three-eighths; in other words, three-eighths of the burley markets will be without inspection service. Three-fourths of the dark tobacco inspection service will be eliminated. When you eliminate this service from a market you absolutely destroy that market, because the farmers will take their tobacco hundreds of miles to get to a market that has the service.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I suggest to the gentleman that he might also remind the House that this product has paid annually and will pay this year approximately $700,000,000 into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think the House is familiar with the fact that the tobacco tax has been putting into the Federal

Treasury year in and year out from $650,000,000 to $700,000,000, and this year, I understand, the tax will bring in about $800,000,000.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish to commend the gentleman's statement. I wonder if the gentleman would develop the fact that the buyers of this tobacco are limited to some four or five great concerns in this country, and without the grading the tobacco grower will be at the mercy of the large tobacco buyers.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is exactly right. Most of the tobacco is bought by three or four large companies. They have expert buyers on every floor that know tobacco from A to Z and can tell the grade as soon as they cast their eyes on a basket. They are on one side of the tobacco row when the sale takes place, and the poor old dirt farmer on the other side, who, without this service, does not know what grade of tobacco he has.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. If the service is cut to the point that the grading service cannot be extended to all the markets, how will the Department of Agriculture decide just which markets it will hold and which will be crushed; and will not that be the result?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not know how the Department would make that determination. At best it would be an unfair determination, and it would practically destroy the markets off which the inspectors were taken.

Let me impress upon you that the tobacco grower has to work about 13 months a year to produce a crop of tobacco. The Government never did a better thing for the farmer, especially the tobacco farmer, than to pass the Inspection Act, which put the tobacco grower in possession of knowledge as to the grade and the type of his tobacco when he offered it for sale.

If you have ever been on a tobacco market, I do not have to tell you that tobacco is sold at a rapid rate by an auctioneer who speaks in an unknown tongue. Here is an expert on one side representing the great tobacco companies, and on the other side are the poor old tobacco growers, who, unless given inspection, are not in possession of knowledge as to the grades of their tobacco. If any class in America needs protection a little more than another class, it is the tobacco growers when their tobacco is being sold on the warehouse floors. All we ask is that they be protected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment is adopted. In my deliberate judgment, in the light of my knowledge of the conditions existing in the sections of the country where tobacco is grown, this amendment will mean additional millions of dollars to the growers.

As has just been stated, unless you have ever attended a tobacco auction you do not know what it means. There are long rows of the tobacco in the baskets. The farmers who produce the tobacco troop along behind the auctioneer, and he speaks in an unknown tongue. The grower is absolutely at the mercy of the auctioneer and the four or five buyers.

The inspections that have been afforded under appropriations similar to this one furnished the grading of tobacco so that the farmer has known what his tobacco was worth. Under this system of inspection imposition cannot be practiced upon the farmer. By this increased appropriation an inspector will be afforded for every market, and thereby the little fellows will have protection. Most of the men who grow tobacco in my country grow from two-fifths of an acre to an acre of tobacco, and it is the principal source of cash income to them. For that reason, I hope this amendment is adopted.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, with whose valuable help it has been my privilege to wage a fight for the past several months in behalf of the tobacco growers of Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. May I compliment the gentleman on being a valiant and never-failing soldier when it comes to fighting for the welfare of the little tobacco farmers whom he represents. Will the gentleman not point out that all the burley tobacco markets already have this grading, and if this is taken away it will crush the markets which do not have it? Unless the farmers have their tobacco graded it is not possible for them to obtain a loan through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is absolutely true. The graders will be withdrawn from these markets, and the loan privilege withdrawn.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much is the appropriation being cut under what we had last year?

Mr. JENNINGS. It is cut $25,000. However, the markets have increased, and the inspections have been extended now under the act to markets that heretofore have not had them, and they are taking away the inspections from the burley tobacco. In other words, unless this amendment is adopted, many of the burley tobacco markets that have heretofore had Government inspection will, during the coming selling season, have no inspection. The growers in Tennessee, Virginia, and Kentucky, and perhaps other States, will be deprived of this help.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. All of this tobacco must be sold at one of these markets where the auctioneer uses an unknown tongue.

Mr. JENNINGS. Absolutely. You have to get into the various markets to sell your tobacco. And if inspection is withdrawn from some of them the farmers will have to haul their tobacco many miles farther to reach a market where inspection can be had.

Here is another fact. These markets are, as a rule, owned by the farmers themselves. Then there is this additional reason for the adoption of this amendment. Farm labor is being siphoned off the farms by the increased wages paid in industrial enterprises, and the cash that this tobacco crop brings the small farmer and the tenant farmer helps to induce labor to remain on the farm. The income from the sale of tobacco comes in during December and January and, as I have stated, is the small farmer's chief cash crop. The protection afforded the tobacco farmers by this amendment and by the Government inspection made possible by it is necessary; it is necessary in helping the farmer to make his contribution to the increased production of food. Our people are having trouble to keep their farms going because they cannot compete with five- and eight- and ten-dollar-a-day labor.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Without proper inspection, the tobacco farmer is entirely in the hands of these four or five great tobacco concerns that control the markets, and unless his tobacco is inspected he does not know its grade.

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; that is true. And that is one of the reasons why this amendment should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN.]

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect even to attempt to add anything to what has already been said by these gentlemen who are so thoroughly conversant with this problem.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. I was interested in the statement by my friend from Tennessee and I was wondering whether or not this call that is put on over the radio is an exaggeration of what actually takes place in these warehouses.

Mr. JENNINGS. It is an exact duplication except that it is not as bad over the radio.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I may answer the gentleman by saying that that act is put on by auctioneers who actually sell tobacco on the tobacco markets that are being discussed here today.

Mr. HAINES. I do not see how the tobacco farmer can understand what they say.

Mr. CHAPMAN. They cannot.

Mr. HAINES. Has there been a change in the method of selling tobacco since this inspection service has been established?

Mr. CHAPMAN. There has been no change since the inspection service was established.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. Yes.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Will the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky inform us in what manner this will help our defense efforts?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Yes. There is no group of people in America that contributes more to the defense effort than does the agricultural population. We have been talking in terms of millions and billions. This product alone pays this year approximately $700,000,000 in taxes to the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say that during my 17 years of service on this floor I have advocated many measures which I believed were of great importance to the welfare of the tobacco growers of this country, but never have I spoken on one which I believe was more important than is the adoption of this amendment here today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $163,481 for personal services in the District of Columbia, c. the Bureau of Home Economics for conducting either independently or in cooperation with other agencies, investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, and for disseminating useful information on this subject, $368,890.

THE BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture is the agency chiefly responsible for taking care of the interests not only of the farm wife but of the homes of America. The studies which are being made are required for an all-out war effort.

Listed below are some of the high lights of the work as it relates specifically to defense activities. The Bureau of Home Economics is the only Federal research agency that can answer questions from the home front such as those listed below. It has the research staff to furnish the basic data for replies to homemakers' questions.

How can families conserve food—how can and dry foods take the pressure off factories and freight?

How can homemakers stretch the family supply of woolen garments?

How can they conserve equipment?

How adjust family budgets to meet higher cost of living, pay higher taxes, and buy Defense bonds?

How plan family living in wartime so that essentials for health are provided but nonessentials are given up to help win the war?

How can the homemaker feed her family adequately in wartime when there are some food shortages?

What sort of food should the defense worker have?

The Bureau also helps war agencies—War Production Board and others—by providing fundamental facts based upon its accumulated research. Examples are given below:

Facts about food are provided the Lend-Lease Administrator in order that he may know about the nutritive value of what is being shipped as compared to alternative foods, the value of concentrates, dehydrated products, and the like.

Information as to wearing qualities of wool mixed with rayon and cotton, in order to help manufacturers use the limited supplies of wool for civilians most effectively.

Use of cotton for hose and other garments, replacing silk, nylon, and possibly rayon.

How to prevent mildew—facts as applicable to soldiers' tents as to household goods.

Information for O. P. A. as to what farm families need, so that scarce materials can be allocated where necessary, such as how many families have sewing machines—facts needed for providing materials so that repairs can be made.

How many farm families must have rubber boots and the like.

Following is a more detailed statement of the types of information which have been supplied by the Bureau to defense agencies on their requests. Some of these data can be compiled from past studies. In many cases this requires additional laboratory studies. The research program of the Bureau of Home Economics has been completely redirected to meet these and other problems which have arisen in connection with consumers' part in the war effort.

BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS SERVICES TO OTHER AGENCIES

WAR DEPARTMENT AND OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

1. Cost-of-living data for village families, including formulation of maintenance budgets and determination of present costs.
2. Data on family expenditures for shoes, on rents, on standards for consumers' goods, etc.
3. Data on use of aluminum in household equipment, and recommendations for substitutes.
4. Treating and testing samples of fabrics for mildew-proofing properties.
5. Consumption data that applies to defense problems.
6. Data on refrigerator ownership.
7. Nutritive value of commercial and home-baked breads, cost of home-baked bread, commercial-bread substitutes.
8. Figures on family food consumption.
9. Statement on zinc needs for home canning.
10. Estimate of consumption of furnishings and equipment.
11. Value and consumption of bananas.
12. Estimates of sugar consumption.
13. Lists of household equipment compiled showing materials and features of construction to assist them in regulating design during the emergency.
14. Prepared statistical information on the saturation of washing machines, the number manufactured in 1940, and anticipated number of homes to be wired for electric service in 1941.
15. Tabulation of results of survey made to determine the essential characteristics to be retained in household equipment.
16. Cost of maintenance budget.
17. Information on mildew research.
18. Preparation of an article for consumer prices.
19. Preparation of information about buying school clothes.
20. Conference on floor coverings.
21. Discussions on colorfastness.
22. Discussions on the problem of cooperative work on textile standards.
23. Classifications and definitions for upholstery fabrics.
24. Table showing median income for cities in money-disbursement study.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

1. Furnishing plans on kitchen units for Navy housing.
2. Ran tests for mildew resistance and for bacteriostatic and bactericidal properties of chemically treated fabric and of rubber under washed, unwashed, and sterilized conditions.
3. Computation of nutritive value of rations.
4. Information on fabrics given on antibacterial treatment.

AMERICAN RED CROSS

1. Aid in selecting cooking equipment to be sent to Britain.
2. Requests for knitting instructions.
3. Collecting and assembling material on bedding.
4. Vitamin analyses and tests of quality for special foods to be shipped abroad to refugees or prisoners of war.
5. Information on nutritive value of special foods to be shipped abroad to war zones and assistance on manuscript for teaching Red Cross nutrition workers.
6. Information on clothing.

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

1. Summarizing the vitamin content of foods for use of committee studying food needs of Nation in relation to national defense This entails a review of world's literature in this field.
2. Investigation of the vitamin values of processed, dehydrated, and concentrated foods in preparation for national emergencies.
3. Nutritive value of Army Ration C.
4. Preparation of food budgets for diets meeting the new standards issued by the foods and nutrition committee. (Also requested by the Vice President.)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION IN DEFENSE

1. Assistance in formulating national program and preparing for national nutrition conference, including radio talks, preparation of technical material for committees, assembling bibliographies and data from various research studies.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

1. Statement on saving of nutritive value in whole wheat.
2. Revision of minimum standards for storage space and equipment with plans to

illustrate different types of kitchen arrangement.

3. Prepared specifications for electric washing machine.

4. Tested the home mill for grinding wheat in the farm home.

5. Tested the electric drier for the drying of fruit and vegetables in the farm home.

6. Prepared recipes from wheat flour ground in electric farm mills.

UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY

1. Methods of evaluating home-produced food.

HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORPORATION

1. Check material for utensil publication.

BRITISH FOOD MISSION

1. Estimate of animal protein needs.

NATIONAL CHILD RESEARCH CENTER

1. Assisted by supervising installation of new kitchen and pantry equipment and lighting.

SELF-HELP EXCHANGE

1. Instructing and supervising the community canning.

CENTRAL HOUSING COMMITTEE

1. Minimum standards for storage space and equipment with plans to illustrate different types of kitchen arrangement.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

1. Tested samples of felt.

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

1. Data on standards of living.

2. Cooperation in work on budgets for aged.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

1. Checked statement on German diets in 1937 versus 1927.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

1. Farm material for version of farm wife buying.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

1. Information on clothing consumption.

2. "Oxol" tested for its stain-removing property.

3. Information on testimony regarding Oxol.

4. Data on calories.

5. Furnishing information regarding certain consumer goods.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

1. Data on radio ownership.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

1. Data on standard budgets.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

1. Facts for formulating policies for State grants for food and clothing for old-age assistance.

2. Furnishing data on ratio of net to gross farm income.

3. Revision of cleaning manual to meet home economics education needs.

National Youth Administration

1. Planning kitchen for National Youth Administration centers, and preparing lists of equipment.

2. Plans for lodges, houses, etc.

3. Information on clothing; selecting and making up illustrative material on clothing; and selection and preparation of patterns.

4. Plans for resident kitchens and lists of equipment needed.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

1. Data on family expenditure in villages weighted for North and West.

2. Tested samples of overcoating.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

1. Information on statistical data available concerning family expenditures for Commerce regional staff offices.

2. Furnished information on weights and yarn numbers of cotton hosiery; on the quantity of cotton required for yarns, weights of completed hose, yarn numbers, and machine gages.

National Bureau of Standards

1. Helped with a study of fabrics in relation to their weave and weight.

2. Data on test for mildew resistance.

3. Data on fluidity test.

4. Data on classification of upholstery fabrics.

POST DEFENSE PLANNING COMMITTEE

1. Work on nutrition program.

NATIONAL CONSUMER RETAIL COUNCIL COMMITTEE

1. Preparing informative label for household refrigerators.

BRITISH SUPPLY COUNCIL IN NORTH AMERICA

1. Worked out formula for an ice cream that does not use cream or milk.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Office of the Secretary

1. Data on pressure cookers.

2. Estimated income distribution of farm families in 1940.

3. Assembling and discussing food estimates.

4. Food distribution report.

5. Table on nutritive values of vegetables.

6. Estimate of metal need for home canning.

7. Participation in goals for agriculture work.

8. Computing increases necessary to meet 1942 goals for agriculture.

9. Contributions to recipients' diets made by surplus foods.

10. Nutritive value of German and American dietaries in Monthly Labor Review article.

11. Plans for county agriculture building.

Farm Security Administration

1. Garments bought and prices paid by low-income farm families.

2. Data on nutritive value per pound of selected food materials and revision of food standards for farm family living.

3. Food budgets and diet plans for Puerto Rico.

4. Information on farm-family expenditures.

5. Information on family living and food budgets.

6. Food budget advice.

7. Standard budgets.

8. Preparation of hand-iron specifications.

9. Identification of fibers in two fabrics.

10. Planning and making low-cost coat for child.

Extension Service

1. Computing total annual food requirements for farm family living.

2. Table showing relative value of different kinds of vegetables as sources of minerals and vitamins.

3. Income data for Southeast.

4. Assistance in formulating plans for studies of extension methods in home management.

5. Preparation of report on vegetables for garden conference.

6. Furnishing comparative lists of kitchen utensils suggested by different authorities.

7. Preparation of bibliography on home improvement.

8. Equipment films.

9. Exhibit for the national 4-H Club camp.

Surplus Marketing Administration

1. Expenditures for food of various-sized families and recommendations for orange stamp purchases by families with $100 or more per month income.

2. Determination of money value of home or community center canned surplus fruits and vegetables produced and canned by Farm Security women for school lunches.

3. Metal needs for home canning.

4. Family food record for S. M. A. dietary study.

5. Nutritive value list for 18 fruit products.

6. Furnished material for film strips and accompanying lectures.

7. Supplied information on waterproofing farm fabrics.

8. Furnished specifications for corduroy.

9. Tested breaking strength of duck.

10. Tested food products for shipment abroad and domestic consumption.

11. Series of consumer publications on foods distributed through blue stamp plan; for example, eggs in low-cost meals, dried fruits in low-cost meals, green vegetables in low-cost meals, and dried beans and peas in low-cost meals.

Agricultural Adjustment Administration

1. Statement on egg consumption.

2. Material for Consumer Guide on clothing, equipment, and food

3. Income data for Southeast.

4. True-false questions for Guide.

4. Material on family-food consumption to be used as a basis for food-production goals.

6. Information on mildew-proofing cotton linters.

Forest Service

1. Information on mildew resistance.

2. Consultation on mildew-preventing treatments that could be used for seed bed covering fabrics.

Bureau of Animal Industry

1. Furnished information on textiles.

2. Supplied information on patents and on suiting samples.

3. Supplied information on cotton hosiery.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

1. Price data on furnishings and equipment.

2. Table showing census data for consumer purchases study farm sections.

3. Table showing sources of Southeast farm income.

4. Data on money income of farm families.

5. Estimates for medical care for farm families.

6. Food budgets.

7. Standard budgets.

8. Surplus and deficit consumption for different units.

9. Material from consumer purchases study files.

10. Reviewing manuscript.

11. Data from furnishings and equipment tabulations to be used in constructing weights for index of electrical equipment purchases by farm families.

12. Information on retabulation of farm income data and use of punch cards.

13. Consumer purchases study data on home-produced food.

14. Estimate of rubber rings required for home canning.

Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering

1. Data on heating facilities.

2. Approximating the anticipated amount of different materials to be used for household equipment in the coming year.

3. House plans.

4. Information supplied on mildew research.

5. Furnished information on starch and cellulose.

6. Treated and tested cotton bagging, jute, and osnaburg for resistance to rotting.

7. Furnished tables on vitamin values.

Agricultural Marketing Service

1. Furnished information on stripping wool.

The Clerk read as follows:

General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses for general administrative purposes, including the salary of the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $501,315: *Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for expenditure if any emergency appropriations are made available for administrative expenses in administering the funds pro-

vided in regular appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 71, line 6, strike out "$501,315" and insert "$250,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my two other amendments be reported to the Committee at this time for information.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. DIRKSEN:

On page 71, line 19, strike out "$1,314,429" and insert "$700,000."

On page 72, line 3, strike out "$20,510,812" and insert "$10,510,812."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the three amendments that were just reported all relate to the curtailment of the activities of the Soil Conservation Service, which was created by Congress in 1935. If these amendments are adopted, they will decrease the amount for salaries and expenses by $250,000 and will decrease the amount for soil-moisture investigations by $700,000, and decrease the amount for project operations in the field by approximately $10,000,000, making a total saving of approximately eleven and one-half million dollars. Let me advance 10 reasons why I believe all of these amendments ought to be adopted. The first reason is that the dirt farmers are for these amendments and the American Farm Bureau Federation and organized agriculture so stated to the committee that this activity can be curtailed to the amount suggested in the amendments, so that the saving of $11,000,000 can be made.

The second reason is that here you have an ideal example of an expanding bureaucracy in the Government service. They have had 905 people working in Washington; they have 1,583 people in the regional offices; 838 persons in the area offices; and they have 11,216 on the projects, making for 1942 a total of 14,544 persons. That is the size of 2 small Army divisions, working on the subject of soil conservation. In their over-all pay roll they have expended for personal service last year $35,449,000, and the amazing thing about that figure is that it is far in excess of the amount carried in this bill. I will tell you where they got the rest of their money. They got $2,000,000 out of land utilization; they got $11,000,000 from the Civilian Conservation Corps; they got $227,000 out of the water-facilities fund; $350,000 out of the emergency water facilities; and $128,000 from farm forestry; flood relief, $1,028,000; emergency relief, $1,600,000. Here is a grand army of 14,544 persons who in 1942 have been engaged in the business of soil conservation and related activities. Let me make it clear that this does not deal with soil-conservation payments. This money is for personnel, and for soil moisture demonstrations, and for projects operations on the land.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would emphasize that these are not soil-conservation payments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. These are not soil-conservation payments. This is wholly for soil projects on the land and work on soil erosion. The fourth reason is that since 1937 we have expended over $3,000,000 in the administration of this agency, over $9,000,000 for soil-moisture investigations, and over $145,000,000 on project operations. The fifth reason is that it is a duplication. It is a duplication of the extension stations we have everywhere in the country, and page 299 of the hearings reveals a break-down of the number of county agents in the country under the Extension Service. We have 9,277 people in the Extension Service, and here is a duplicate army of over 14,400 people.

The sixth reason is that, if we save this money, we can buy 130 bombers or 150 medium-sized tanks. The seventh reason is that the permanent personnel of the Soil Service for 1943 will be 7,438 persons. That represents an increase of 16 percent in the amount of the personnel over 1940. The eighth reason is that the Budget Bureau has classified Soil Conservation Service in the lowest class from the standpoint of defense priority, namely, classification 5. The ninth reason is that they are doing the same identical work that they were doing when they first came for an appropriation several years ago, namely, investigations on moisture service, watersheds, irrigation, economics of conservation, the theory of sedimentation, the development of soil-erosion plants, and the operation of nurseries, all of which is duplicated in the Government today.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly.

Mr. TABER. How many professors and authors have they got to write all these fancy articles?

Mr. DIRKSEN. All you have to do is to look in the justification sheets and see. It is a long list of technical, informational, and sociological personnel.

I want to emphasize that the Farm Bureau Federation, and that means organized agriculture, one of the most stable organizations in the field, has stated to the committee, as you will find on page 616, that this duplication can be eliminated and that these amendments ought to be adopted.

On their project operations, for which they are asking $20,000,000, which I propose to cut by $10,000,000, they have an item of $1,315,000 for mapping, for cardographic work, multilithing, and multigraphing; $956,000 for administration. They have $16,000,000 for cooperative operations; $1,000,000 for cooperation with the Civilian Conservation Corps; $1,125,000 for operation of nurseries.

To show you that this is duplicating work I read Mr. Myer's own testimony, who came and testified in behalf of this soil-conservation agency. It is found at page 938 of the hearings. He is one of the administrative chiefs who gave us this testimony:

This program will be carried on in cooperation with 43 State experimental stations at 128 locations throughout the country and rendering service to operations programs.

Extension Service and experimental stations already have been doing this work. They did it before the Soil Conservation was born. They have thousands in the field to do it now. They are tooled up to do it. They have the skill to do it. Are we going to leave another 14,000 people, the size of two army divisions, operate in the field of conserving the soil when the first job before the country for the farmers is to conserve the Nation in the hour of crisis? That is our problem.

You can join with me today in voting up all three of these amendments and save $11,500,000 for a dispensable service which the Budget Bureau gave the lowest classification as a defense operation, and curtail an activity that is being duplicated by other agencies of the Department of Agriculture today.

I bespeak of you the support of these amendments because they have the support of the American Farm Bureau Federation. They have the support of the men who till the soil.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am astounded by the proposal which is advanced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If in his judgment it would be wise to destroy the Soil Conservation Service I think you would agree with me that as a member of the subcommittee which heard the evidence relating to that subject, which prepared this bill, it would have been proper that his viewpoint with regard to these tremendous reductions should have been presented to and considered by the subcommittee prior to its being presented and considered by the House.

There is not anything that can possibly justify the adoption of the gentleman's amendments unless you want to justify it by the bomber argument which has been advanced so frequently during the course of the debate on this bill and which, as I pointed out yesterday, means nothing. All of us know that it means nothing. We know that the full production of the defense industry in the United States is going to be made available to the Government no matter what we do with the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Now, I want us to look into this matter very carefully. Evidence discloses, as most of you know, that if the erosion of our soils, if the destruction of our natural resources through erosion, continues for the next 200 years at the rate at which it has progressed during the last 200 years, at the expiration of that time the United States will be as barren as

the desert of Sahara. Protection of our soils from this erosion danger was deemed by Congress to be a matter of such vital importance that it enacted legislation which undertook to set up a comprehensive plan of dealing with it, and it invited in that legislation the cooperation of the States and made a promise to the States of certain assistance in the event they should, by State legislation, provide for the necessary measure of State cooperation.

I wish you to look at page 941 of volume 1 of the hearings, as to the number of these soil-conservation districts which have been set up under State law. They are servicing this year, with technical assistance, 600 soil-conservation districts. The farmers of the country are organizing new districts so rapidly that they will have for the next fiscal year 910 districts to be serviced, an increase of 50 percent, with no addition provided in the amount of funds available for that purpose in the Budget estimate. So that if we are going to carry out this plan of soil conservation upon which we embarked several years ago, if we are going to make good on our expressed promise to the farmers of the country with regard to Federal cooperation in the work of conservation, then as a matter of fact we ought to not only make available the sums which have here been provided but additional sums also in considerable amount will be necessary

But your committee has not sought to raise the Budget estimates. On the contrary, it has reduced the Budget estimate for soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations by $100,000. The bill in that item is $100,000 below the Budget. We felt that this investigatory work might be curtailed for the time, in view of the conditions which exist in this country today. But as far as the cooperating work is concerned, the furnishing of technical assistance to these soil-conservation districts which has been promised expressly and impliedly, the committee did not feel that we ought to reduce the amount recommended by the Budget.

Now, there is not anything in the hearings to justify the assertion that this agency is duplicating in any way the work of any other agency of the Government. Until I heard the remarks of my friend upon the floor today I was under the impression that it was generally recognized as one of the greatest organizations of the Department of Agriculture.

I am not familiar with the advancement of any criticism of the execution of this program from any responsible quarters and had not heard any until I heard the speech of the gentleman from Illinois. I believe the people of the United States are pleased with this program. I believe that nobody, whether he is a resident of the farming sections of our country or a resident of the cities would approve the substantial destruction of this very valuable agency headed by Dr. H. H. Bennett, one of the most outstanding men in Government today, a conscientious man, a capable man, a man whose ability to deal with this problem in a practical way is transcendent and is generally recognized.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. The people of my State from whom I have heard are enormously pleased with the soil-conservation program. How does the committee's recommendation compare with the treatment this item received a year ago?

Mr. TARVER. The committee's recommendation approves the Budget recommendation which proposes to make available $3,005,963 less for the soil and moisture conservation operations, demonstration, and information than was carried in the bill for the present fiscal year. The committee's recommendation as to the first item, soil and moisture conservation and land use investigations, is, as I have said, $100,000 under the Budget, and the Budget is some $86,000 under the amount which was available for the present fiscal year.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman that this service rendered gives the farmers of this country more benefits from the money spent than any other service we have. Several of these districts are in my State and in my district. We have only one technician in a district and he shows the farmers how to diversify, how to plant. One particular aid in my district is in the propagation of Japanese kudzu. We cannot get any more Japanese kudzu, and we need to conserve and increase propagation as to what we have, and we greatly need all of the services rendered by this agency. I think we get more service for less money than in anything else done by the Government for the farmers. I do not believe we should cripple it in any way.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does this agency use the services of the county and township committeemen; and if so to what extent?

Mr. TARVER. I believe the gentleman is confusing this Soil Conservation Service with the payment of soil-conservation benefits, is he not? This item has nothing to do with the $450,000,000 for payment of soil-conservation benefits.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But does it not for the costs of operating the Soil Conservation Service?

Mr. TARVER. Not that part of it, but the cost of operating this portion of the work of the Soil Conservation Service is, of course, included in these estimates.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has indicated that the subcommittee reduced the amount of this item by $100,000.

Mr. TARVER. The first item, the item "Soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigation."

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman indicate what prompted the committee to reduce that item $100,000, and will he state also how it is to be allocated?

Mr. TARVER. This is the item which provides for investigation to determine proper methods of dealing with these soil-erosion problems. The committee felt that the work done in undertaking to investigate this problem ought to be reduced even under present emergency conditions. We did think that this study of these problems for the purpose of devising methods by which they may be properly handled might be, in view of the very extraordinary national emergency, reduced as recommended by the committee, and therefore provided for the reduction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. 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. TARVER. It may be that the gentlemen coming from sections of the United States where the soil is still fertile, where damage caused by erosion is not apparent, and who have not had an opportunity to investigate conditions in the major portion of the country where such damage is very severe are not impressed with the value of this soil-conservation work; but I have not the slightest doubt that there is not a Representative on the floor of the House who comes from a district wherein there is any considerable amount of soil erosion who does not recognize the very great value of the work which is being accomplished under the jurisdiction of Dr. Bennett.

In my own district, which is, unfortunately, in one of the sections of the United States where considerable erosion damage has occurred, it is possible simply by traveling over the district without leaving the highways to look at the farms on the hillsides and in the valleys and determine that untold and inestimable advantage has accrued to those farmers by reason of the operation of this program.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I recall that during the hearings before the Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation an official of this organization admitted that if a farmer had the wire and the posts they would put up his fence for him. I said, "Is it not your main duty to show them how to stop soil erosion?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Why do you not show them that instead of putting up fences around their farm?"

Mr. TARVER. I may say to the gentleman that I have been serving on this committee for several years and I never heard a charge of that nature made against the officials of this Service before. I would not be surprised if the gentleman were confusing this matter with the so-called shelterbelt in the West.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Admitting all the gentleman said about the value of this Service to be true, is it not a fact that today, because of the scarcity of farm labor, the good land, the fertile land still in this country, is not being cultivated? In other words, we are not using the fertile acres we have?

Mr. TARVER. I do not think the gentleman is correct about that. I have not time to enter into a discussion of that with the gentleman. I know there is a farm-labor shortage and that it is very severe. At the same time I do not know of any fertile acreage in my country that is not being used.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are 210 acres right in my own little township.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the items that would clearly come within the category mentioned by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], yesterday when he said that there were certain places in the bill that substantial reductions and postponements could be made without in anywise hurting the program or hurting the farmer. It is not proposed here to destroy the Soil Conservation Service. It is proposed to leave them, after these amendments are adopted, $10,000,000 to carry on this service wherever it can be justified. However, it is suggested that in view of the emergency, in view of the dire straits financially to which our country is pressed, this agency as well as others should be curtailed, not only to save money but to turn loose the personnel engaged in it in order that they may engage in the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, we talk about erosion of the soil, but I want to tell you today that the thing which threatens this country more than erosion of the soil is erosion of our fiscal situation.

I am not saying a word against the good features of the Soil Conservation Service. Certainly it has performed a good function, and I would not vote to destroy it. They have 14,000 agents in the field. We can take half of that number and not hurt it. We can release half of them and put them to useful work in the war program. The American Farm Bureau Federation favors this kind of an amendment. It is for the farmers. I have voted for every farm bill ever passed by this House. You cannot name one I have not voted for. I voted for expenditures for them, but I say to you that I am not afraid to ask the farmers of my district to make a sacrifice along with the other people of the country who have to sacrifice in this tragic hour.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman voted for the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1938 carrying provision for parity payments?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I voted for the act, but I voted against parity payments.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman did vote against parity payments?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I did. I do not believe in the principle of parity payments, and if it was ever needed, it is not needed now.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. The gentleman states he is following the Farm Bureau in this matter. Does not the gentleman know that one of the cardinal principles of the Farm Bureau was advocacy of the parity payments? Why does not the gentleman follow the Farm Bureau on that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am following my own judgment and my own intelligence, but I cited the Farm Bureau as saying that they would not advocate a reduction in the agricultural bill if it was against the interest of the farmer.

Mr. Chairman, in the language of Holy Writ, we have been sowing to the wind, and shortly, I very much fear, we will be reaping the whirlwind.

In a few hours, the Ways and Means Committee will report to the House, and we will pass legislation raising the national debt limit from $65,000,000,000 to $125,000,000,000, and all of us know that before the war is over there will still be a further increase in the national debt. In addition to that, very soon the same committee will present, and we will pass, a tax bill which will dig deep in the pockets of every American citizen. Not only the corporations and the income-tax payers, but the man in the street, the farmer, and the worker, and the housewife will help pay this bill. Americans know that to win this war we are going to have to spend huge sums of money, and for the purpose of winning the war I believe they are quite willing to make that sacrifice, but they have the right, and in my judgment they will demand, that we as legislators curtail and postpone nonessential expenditures and that we discontinue costly social experiments.

Pay day is going to come for the national debt, and we have one or two alternatives. We can wipe it off the books by the shameful procedure of repudiation or printing-press money, or we can do what you and I know we will do—we will pay the bill and it will come out of the hides of the American people. It will take toll of the sweat of the laboring man and the farmer just the same as it will draw upon the dividends of the businessmen. It is just as necessary today that we preserve our fiscal integrity as it is that we prepare to take the fight to our enemies on the battlefield. Unless we preserve our economic stability, our victory will be empty indeed.

The ringing challenge in this House today is that we go "all out" to win the war and stop legislating for groups and factions. We should lay aside, at least for the time being, our efforts to favor the farmer and the laboring man or the industrialist or businessman. We should declare a truce on our effort to perpetuate the New Deal or to reinstate the old deal. We should have one objective and one purpose and that is to win the war and we must win it quickly. By doing so we not only save dollars but we save American lives.

Mr. Chairman, for years, as one crying in a wilderness, I have stood in the Well of this House and urged that we set our fiscal house in order; that we try to bring our income and expenditures more nearly in balance. The records of this body will show many such appeals.

On May 22, 1939, over a Nation-wide radio hook-up, I made such an appeal in discussing our economic ills, which are accentuated today. I said in part:

> I do not know what the answer may be to these economic problems. I am very definitely of the opinion that they cannot be permanently solved by legislative action alone. I am very emphatically of the opinion that the problem will not be solved by putting all of the workers on the Federal pay roll and by subsidizing all of the farmers of America. I feel very positive that we cannot continue to borrow and spend, and spend and borrow, unless we are reconciled to meet head-on some day the "fiddler" when he comes to collect his pay, and come he surely will.
>
> There is one thought I would like to get over right here. There seems to be an impression in certain quarters that it's all right to plunge right along to pile up a terrific public debt—that the worker and the farmer will get the assistance and "somebody" will pay taxes enough "sometime" to pay the bill. Who is going to pay it, and when? Taxes can only come from national wealth. National wealth can only come from labor and production. The worker and the farmer have been the producers in this land of ours, and you can be very sure, my fellow countrymen, that when pay day comes, a large part of this bill will come out of your hides. Don't ever think for a split second that the tax gatherer will pass you up. You may not recognize the gentleman. He may slip in the back door; he will probably disguise his voice; but, nonetheless, he will take from you his toll.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if there may be an agreement as to a limitation of debate. Will the Chair ask the gentlemen who wish to speak on this amendment to stand, and ask the Clerk to count them?

Will the Chair, instead of asking those who wish to speak, ask those who do not wish to speak to stand, so we can get a better idea? I believe I shall withdraw the request for the present and see if we can get an agreement later on.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there any way under the rules of getting Members over here?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not consider that a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments en bloc.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois propose to cut about 50 percent off the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service. In my opinion, the Soil Conservation Service is one of the best programs that

has ever been developed, not only for the agriculture of this country but for the whole American people as a nation. Unless we can preserve our soil our country will go the way of China and all the other countries whose topsoil has washed down the rivers into the sea.

Dr. Bennett, the head of the Soil Conservation Service, has made the American people soil conscious. Mr. Claude Wickard, the Secretary of Agriculture, has told us that we must produce a greatly increased amount of food to win this war. The Soil Conservation Service is one of the prime movers in the movement to increase the production of food. Without soil conservation and the practices it inculcates we cannot increase our production.

I call your attention to the fact that we shall not have a great many of the fertilizers we have heretofore had, but shall have to depend more and more upon contours and other soil-conservation practices to take the place of the fertilizers and those things which make the land more productive.

If you fly over parts of this country and look down on the broad landscape you will be able to distinguish between the regions where we have had soil conservation and those where we have not.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, for which organization I have the greatest respect, has advocated that the administrative and field service of this program be reduced and that it be turned over to and be administered and carried on under the control of the extension service of the various States.

Last year when President O'Neal came before the committee and advocated that the Soil Conservation Service be turned over to the Extension Service as an economy measure, I said, "Mr. O'Neal, you know, of course, that the work that is done by these men is technical in its nature. You know that they have to have a large personnel technically trained. Do you think the Extension Service can do the work that all these men in the Soil Conservation Service are doing?" He said, in substance, "No. I realize that, but we should put in the Extension Service such additional technically trained men as are necessary to carry on the Soil Conservation Service." We all know how much work the Extension agents are now doing and how difficult it would be to add additional work to this already overburdened service.

I say to you that if you have to increase the Extension Service to do the work that is now done by the Soil Conservation Service, what is the need of taking the work out of that agency and putting it under another agency?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman think that conservation of the soil is properly to be designated as a social reform, or does he think it is for the protection of an indispensable and irreplaceable resource?

Mr. TERRY. I answer the gentleman from California by saying that I was rather astounded when, a few minutes ago, I heard soil conservation designated as a social service, when soil conservation is a basic program with which is bound up the future prosperity of this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, as compared with the 1942 appropriations of $25,527,109, we have reduced this appropriation by $3,005,963 for soil- and moisture-conservation operations, demonstrations, and information; $9,019 for administration and $185,571 for soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations, or a total of $3,200,553.

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

Mr. TERRY. No; if the gentleman will excuse me; I will not have time.

I call to your attention the fact that in 1940 we had 237 soil-conservation districts. These districts are created by State statute. There are in more than 44 States in the Union laws under which farmers have taken advantage of the soil-conservation program, and under which soil-improvement districts have been created after a vote of the farmers in the areas. In 1940 we had 237 districts, and in 1943 we shall have 956 districts. We have in 1942 only a 16-percent increase in personnel over 1940 and a 24-percent increase in funds; but we have over a 300-percent increase in the work this Service must do.

Talk about social service and Washington bureaus. When you consider that these improvement districts are organized by the votes of the farmers back in the districts, I tell you this is one of the most democratic programs that we have with us today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, the case for this amendment has been clearly made by two members of the Committee on Appropriations who have studied the details of this matter and both of whom are apparently in sympathy with the general principles of soil conservation. This amendment spells limitation and does not contemplate extermination. I make reference to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a Republican, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], a Democrat. There is no politics involved. We all want to do the right and the best thing for our country in this its greatest hour of peril. We realize that the national debt is now more than $65,000,000,000 and that next week the legal amount is to be raised to $125,000,000,000. In these circumstances only essential appropriations are warranted. It is not a question of desirable expenditures. It is a question of necessary expenditures. The emphasis should be placed on the word "necessary."

This amendment is not a proposal to destroy the soil-conservation program. The purpose is to assist in conserving the Nation, to avoid national bankruptcy, which surely awaits us unless this profligate spending is stopped. This is no time to expatiate about the farmer. There are too many farmers' friends just before election. My district is one of the best farming districts in the country, and I am sure that I am the friend of the farmer in voting to limit spending at this time for essentials only.

I have a letter from a constituent, a school teacher, who has just made his first income-tax return. He has just paid his first income tax. The amount was $87. This means much to him and his wife. He says he is glad to pay it, but he does inquire about his neighbor who, he says, received a check the other day for $89—$2 more than the income tax paid by my constituent. That check came as an unexpected windfall to his neighbor because his neighbor had complied with the A. A. A. program. This was a bonus to the neighbor for doing the things which he has always done on his farm, which he was doing, which he intends to do, but which the Federal Government was paying him a subsidy or a premium for doing.

The letter which I received from my constituent, and to which I have referred, is as follows:

> Today I had the opportunity to help our country in its hour of need by paying my income tax, the first that my wife and I have ever had to pay. It was with a great deal of pride that we made this payment, which, though small perhaps, represents a certain amount of sacrifice, which we are willing and ready to make. Further than that, we stand willing to make any contribution that will help to defeat our common enemies and assure the safety of all that means America. We feel that our bit is, indeed, a small enough contribution to make in payment of the blessings which our country has given us.
>
> At the same time, I am much discouraged and not a little disgusted upon a certain bit of news which was given to me this same day. Briefly it is this: A certain farmer friend of mine received through the mail recently a check from the United States Government in payment of, apparently, his cooperation with the soil-conservation program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. This man did not know that he was to receive this check, and had not been expecting any such windfall. The check was for the amount of $89, which was about $2 more than I paid today in income tax for the calendar year of 1941. To make matters worse, as far as my opinion is concerned, this man is in a much better financial condition than we are or ever hope to be. It is, therefore, extremely galling to me to know that the money which I am willingly paying to the United States should be used in this manner, especially when this Nation needs to use every resource at its command to defeat the Axis Nations arrayed against us.
>
> I cannot help but wonder whether certain bureaus of our Government in Washington realize that we are now engaged in this terrible war, and especially those which continue to waste the Government income in this manner. Isn't it about time that some of those who feed from our National Treasury become aware of this fact and try to do their part toward the winning of the war?
>
> I realize that you yourself do not condone such actions and have steadily fought against such. I am writing to you, though, in the hope that you, through your position, may be able to let the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and kindred bureaus know how this one taxpayer feels about their actions.

My word to them is this: Read the newspapers and learn what peril we are in, and then see if they themselves can't find ways to help pay for this war.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER E. DAY.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have had for consideration a number of amendments to this bill. Many of them have been relatively unimportant. It is necessary for us to distinguish between important amendments and those that are not so important. The amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois go to the very vitals of the most important program of the farmer in America today, the problem of soil conservation. I make the prediction that many of those who have voted for other amendments which have been offered will not vote for these amendments. I make the prediction that the man who has most frequently offered amendments, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], will not vote to sacrifice our soil-conservation program. He has a sincere interest in the cause of agriculture.

I do not believe anyone will vote for these amendments who knows how the farmer lives on the farm and who has thought deeply and truly on this vitally important subject. The gentleman from Michigan has pointed out that the case has been made and that there is nothing more to do but to vote, because, he says, members of the Appropriations Committee have spoken. Well, let us follow that thought a little. They have spoken. They began their hearings in November and they concluded them a short time ago. There was no politics in that committee, says the gentleman, and say the gentlemen on both sides—no politics—and what did that committee do after giving days and days to the study of this bill? They came in here and recommended a reduction all right, but they recommended the figures in this bill. That is what they thought then, and that was the nonpartisan viewpoint of those who know the most about it, and there is no questioning of that statement. So let us then give heed and concern to that determination which was made, that the farmers of the Nation would suffer and suffer badly if a further cut were made in these items for soil conservation.

I think when the history of this era is written and when the reforms of this period have been discussed, some of them good and some of them bad, the historian will say that one of the greatest movements in the 1930's and 1940's in this country in its effect upon the future was the increased emphasis toward preserving the soil of the Nation, upon which our civilization rests.

I am not a world traveler, but I have seen where the Yellow River throws its fertility into the China Sea, and I think I know something about the destruction of the soil throughout this broad country of ours, even within shouting distance of this Capitol, and I am not willing to add my voice or my vote to anything that would tend to promote and encourage a further destruction of the most precious thing we have in this country except our manpower. So I hope on these vitally important amendments the true friend not only of the farmer, but the man who is thinking deeply about the security of our own people, will forget politics and walk down the line and give a vote to the country and to the generations yet unborn.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think one of the most important things they are doing in these soil-conservation districts is the growing of Japanese kudzu. We cannot get any more of that grass from Japan. That might be regarded as a part of national defense, and the skill of these technicians is required to show us how to plant it because the average farmer cannot do it. This service alone is enough to justify the entire appropriation for the soil-conservation districts.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. This is no subsidy handed out to the farmers. The farmer gets no payment out of this program, but the farmers of the Nation spend millions of dollars as a whole, while the Government is spending thousands of dollars on the soil-conservation program.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. I call attention for a few moments to the position of the farmer, as compared with the position of other people engaged in our economic structure.

The farmer takes the chance. He plows his land in the fall of the year or in the spring, prepares his seedbeds and plants his crops. He does not know when he does this whether his grain will sprout and grow. He does not know, if it does grow, whether the winds, the storms, or the hail will destroy it. He does not know what kind of a season he will have, whether it will rain or not. He does not know what he will receive for his crop if he raises one. He goes on year after year working, raising, producing, and filling the bread basket of the world. The only source that he can trust entirely is his God. My colleagues, he is the one who is taking the chances. He is the one this afternoon who is made a political football—being kicked around all over the lot for political purposes. Oh, yes; let a bill come in here for the farmer and hear these great clarion voices raised for economy, and in the other side of their mouths they appear to be friends of the farmer. Such rot.

A year or so ago you heard debated here the question of lifting the profits from those engaged in war industries. They were not going to take any chances; they wanted their profits fixed in advance. The Government of the United States does not have to ask the farmer to go out and take a chance. He takes it. He is the only one who does.

I call attention to another thing. Your mines and minerals may become exhausted and leave only gaping wounds in the earth, your oil wells become dry, and the future generations, unborn in this country, will have to depend upon the soil for their livelihood, and we cannot, we dare not, at the expense of generations yet to come, permit the depletion of our soil simply for the mere fact that some of us here this afternoon are trying to drive a wedge into this administration and say that we are not doing the right thing by the American people. For the time being we are their trustees. We must not say that money means more than humanity and more than our country. That is what it comes down to. You men ought to be ashamed of yourselves who make such talks as you are making today against the improvement, against the building up of our soil. I have never heard anybody, Republican or Democrat, who wanted to be honest with our country, who would say we should abolish this program. Of course, there are holes in it that ought to be chinked up and will be in time.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is not only the matter of restoring the soil of this country, but of saving the soil. In the Mississippi Valley millions of acres of soil, topsoil, have gone into the Gulf of Mexico, that are gone forever, because we did not have a program like this to save the soil for future generations.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is right.

Mr. MURRAY. Since the gentleman stated they had $300 a year for farms in his State and in many States less than $19, I am wondering how many farms in the gentleman's State have had fertility maintained on them in the last 5 years?

Mr. O'CONNOR. First, I did not say anything about $300 or any other sum. Of course, you can find holes in this. We have promised the American farmer parity payment, and equal protection of the law for 150 years, and this administration is the first one that has ever even attempted to keep its promises to him.

Mr. MURRAY. I would say that that is reflected in the fact that butter has been at 25½ cents the first 10 years this House has been dominated by the present administration, and John Lewis is now out trying to organize the butter farmers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. When this administration came in, wheat was selling at 23 cents a bushel and hogs for 2 or 3 cents a pound, and beef was practically given away.

Mr. BURDICK. And has not the soil-conservation program in the gentleman's State and my adjoining State, which constitute a part of the "dust-bowl" area, contributed largely to forestalling devastation?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, it has; it has done so immeasurably. The topsoils are no longer lifted into the heavens to be found as far east as New York. There is no doubt about that. There is nobody out here who does not want to make a record for himself politically, who wants this program repealed.

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

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee that participated in the writing of this bill, if we are

going to decide this bill on how sides were taken, I think you will find that three-fourths of us who wrote the bill at least were for the figure in the bill itself. On page 933 of the hearings, and the following 20 pages, you will find the entire history of this appropriation, and my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who now offers the amendment that would virtually destroy this Service, never asked a single question of the man, Dillon Myer, who is in charge of it, when he appeared before the committee.

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

Mr. LEAVY. Yes; I must, since I have mentioned the gentleman's name.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was so much more important for me to listen to their testimony. They condemned themselves.

Mr. LEAVY. If the gentleman had some fault to find with the Service at that time, there was an opportunity to make a record that would stand forever and be of value to those who think as he does.

Now, there is great confusion concerning this item. I am not criticizing any Member for being confused. There is, however, a vast difference between the Soil Conservation Service and the A. A. A. benefits. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] made reference to someone receiving a check. That was not a Soil Conservation Service check. That was A. A. A. benefits. The A. A. A. benefits in this bill amount to nearly 55 percent of the bill, $450,000,000. If you want to make a saving there—and I am not for it because I think it serves a purpose—but there you could offer amendments that might cut millions That is a different situation. But here we are considering a Service that saves America. It conserves the soil upon which the Nation depends.

I am not going to attempt to wax eloquent about it, since it too eloquently speaks for itself. Five years ago when we inaugurated it as a policy and it came into being as a law, we said to the various States of this Union, "Enact legislation and you can get the benefits of this act." Forty-five States have passed laws and corporations have been set up within those States. Those soil-conservation districts are just as much a municipal corporation as an irrigation district, a drainage district, a dike district, or any similar corporation. The service rendered to those 45 States, wherein there are 900 districts, is an advisory and directory service. Much work has been done by the Civilian Conservation Corps camps in this service. Nearly 400 camps a year ago were in this service. There is a prospect now that in another year they will have none. All of this work is under way. Twenty-seven million dollars was allotted to it 2 years ago; $23,000,000 for the current year; $20,000,000 here. Are you going to say now that you are now not only going to cripple it but destroy it?

Soil Conservation Service is a service that reaches into the homes of practically every American farmer that lives anywhere on a piece of land that has a slope to it.

We gave as grants—and I am glad that I had an opportunity to vote for them—$23,000,000 to one State in the last 5 years to take care of destitute farmers driven out by windstorms in this so-called "dust bowl." That was only one State. The Soil Conservation Service would have taught the lesson, and is teaching a lesson, how to conserve America and its soil and save us from just such disasters as I have mentioned in some of the Western States.

Personally, I think it is a grievous error and a falacious argument to say you are going to take from an appropriation as important to America as is this Department of Agriculture bill, which the committee itself has cut 33⅓ percent, or a half a billion dollars, that you are going to take from it little bits here, bigger bits there, and completely cripple the Service. That is what this would do. That is what a number of these amendments will do. This great Service must be operated by the Department of Agriculture, which is the agency provided by law to fix policy and operate the Service, and it must not be directed by any private farm organization, whether that be the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers Union, or any other private organization.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment which proposes to strike from the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service, indirectly if not directly, affects every man, woman, and child in the United States. I make that statement with studied judgment.

Do you know what the Soil Conservation Service does? I wonder if the opponents of the Soil Conservation Service and the proponents of this amendment know what it does? It is so unfair to intimate that its function is to give away money to the farmers. Five years ago when this Service was set up, when Dr. Bennett talked about what could be done to conserve the soil of this country, it sounded almost fantastic, because he painted a picture of broad acres over the United States, millions and millions and millions of acres, the productive topsoil of which was being destroyed by rain and wind erosion.

He said:

> From the scientific study I have made, if the people of the United States will follow a well-laid-out system and plan, we can stop all the erosion.

So the Service was set up, and they started. Here is what they do under the Soil Conservation Service. They go out to a farm, and they find that by poor crop practice the fertility of the soil has been destroyed. Then they let a piece of land lay out. Then the ravages of washes start through it; little trickling gullies are started. Year after year the water rushing down these little rivulets that start as a stream no larger than your finger, finally they have washed out great gorges and ditches in the land to the point where that land had to be taken out of production. It would produce nothing. They found varied degrees of that. It was under this Service the farmers were taught to farm on the contour, to plow around a mountain instead of up and down it; taught how to plant grasses and leguminous crops that would give back life to the soil and productivity to the soil. Five years ago, if you had flown over this country you would have seen millions of acres of the United States washed to the bone. Now, if you will fly over it, there is not a large section of the United States where you will not find direct benefit of the soil-conservation activities where contours and well-laid-out farms stand as everlasting evidence to the wonderful work done under the direction of this Department. On every farm where soil-conservation practices have been followed under the direction of this Department, the productivity of the soil has been increased from a very small percentage to a thousand percent.

You talk about cutting this out as a nonessential item. One distinguished member of this committee said a moment ago that we had to cut this sort of items in order to spend money for the national defense. In the name of common sense, this is the very basis not only of national defense, but of national livelihood. To stop a thing which is causing more foodstuff and more grain to be produced in this country to feed the armies and the navies and the populace, than any other single thing is to be ridiculous, if you strike at that you strike at the very basic fundamental thing, which goes away beyond national defense and means literally the lifeblood of this Nation.

I am sure that you thinking men will not support this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make another effort to see if we can limit time for debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at 3 o'clock.

The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOOK) there were—ayes 83, noes 4.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present—a quorum.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that we shall be breaking faith with the States, the farmers, and other people who are interested in soil conservation if we pass this amendment. Congress, by legislative act, encouraged the States to pass laws that would permit the creation of soil-conservation districts, and in pursuance of those laws, which we encouraged, 45 States have passed laws permitting the creation of soil-conservation districts, and 910 districts have been created. Service is being rendered to 200,000 farm families. So, after en-

couraging them to pass these laws and create these districts, if we then seriously reduce the appropriation we are breaking faith with them.

You have often heard it said that a stitch in time saves nine. I believe that the money spent for soil conservation goes much further than that. You have heard that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. I say to you that it is better to spend a few pennies per acre in the effort to conserve the soil of this country than it is to be required to spend dollars and hundreds of dollars in the future for the purpose of trying to rebuild that soil. This is a very important part of this bill. This goes to the question of waste. It is always justified to appropriate money for the prevention of waste. It is just as necessary to prevent the waste of our land as it is to prevent disease and pests and insects destroying our plant life, our trees, our cattle, and our human beings. It is just as necessary to protect and preserve this country in the interior as it is from without, in that if we permit our land to be eroded to where it is worthless, our country will be worthless.

I have heard Dr. Bennett, who is the chief of this great bureau—and he made it great—say many times that poor land makes poor people; and poor people, of course, will necessarily have poor land, because they are not able to rebuild that land. Since this is an effort to prevent waste and to work in cooperation with the States that have induced these agencies to join up with the Federal Government, and since this is an effort to cooperate with the 200,000 farm families that have been induced by legislative acts passed by this Congress to grant aid with their cooperation, I not only believe it would be breaking faith, but I believe in the interests of future generations it is our duty to spend these few pennies, so to speak—pennies in comparison to the great good—to prevent the enormous waste that will be caused if this money is not spent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is recognized.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, a little history with regard to how the Department of Soil Conservation received its name might be enlightening at this time. You all remember when the A. A. A. was declared unconstitutional. The heads in the Agricultural Department gathered together to rearrange the program. It just so happens that there were and still are a goodly number of the old reactionaries in the Department of Agriculture who, back in the old days, never did anything for the farmers. When this program was discussed those reactionaries from former days had the nerve and, might I say, political foresight enough, to suggest this as an idle land program. Right in the beginning they knew if they could dub this as an idle land program they could scuttle it very easily and then consign it to a political graveyard. So this keeps on; it is going on today; but there is a different method pursued now. The pressure and backstage activity is still being felt here this afternoon. They want to sabotage by the back door by trying to cripple this program through cutting down on its appropriations. I just heard the gentleman from Michigan mention the fact that they spent $4,000 in two counties.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; in one county.

Mr. HOOK. In one county.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In 2 months.

Mr. HOOK. I have been over there in the sand dunes of the area referred to. I have seen the sand dunes and the wind that blows that dust of yours around on your farms. If they can straighten that out for $4,000, then they certainly are magicians.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman made a misstatement.

Mr. HOOK. They would have to be magicians to do that. The farmers of that area should thank God that the United States Government and the Democratic Party has had foresight enough to come in there and help your people to conserve their farms and keep the soil from blowing away.

They talk about John L. Lewis and the C. I. O. I will tell you why John L. Lewis is organizing the farmers in the C. I. O. John L. Lewis does not like either Philip Murray or President Roosevelt. John L. Lewis is the biggest detriment to labor and the American people that ever existed in this country, and I say that he is trying to organize the farmers for nothing else than to be able to embarrass, smear, and revenge himself on President Roosevelt. Farmers should be careful what union they join, and be sure John L. Lewis is no part of it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say, first, that if the Members who the other day arose in their seats and voted for the principle of no work without extra pay per hour above 40 hours per week and said it was all right for labor unions, organized labor, to receive time and a half for overtime will get up now and vote for the appropriations given in this bill for soil conservation and parity payments, it will carry by a huge margin. Just examine your own conscience. Is the farmer entitled to parity with industry and labor, or must he rest content with 85 percent of what he is entitled to?

Back on our farm this spring we have corn which today is worth 64 cents. I am told by Secretary Wickard, who, in turn, was told by the President, "You cannot get more than 85 percent parity for your corn because it is necessary that the feeder and dairyman have cheap feed so that they can make a profit on producing beef, pork, and butterfat." Parity is 82 cents. Mr. Wickard claims that we are receiving parity because of benefits through the soil-conservation program and the A. A. A. in making up the difference. If that is true, is it fair to knock down these payments, which supposedly, but never will, give me 82 cents for my 64-cent corn?

Are you Members going to be willing this afternoon to tell me, a corn farmer, or my neighbor, a wheat farmer, that we must be satisfied with 85 percent of parity when, on the other hand, you arose majestically here the other day and proclaimed that you are willing, if necessary to secure vitally needed defense production, to give organized labor 150 percent? I ask you that question. Just yesterday on a trip to Camp Dix soldiers asked me what is being done here to assure them the supplies. Only by fair treatment of all of our industrial groups, farmers and labor, will we obtain the necessary production. The farmer will produce at a loss if necessary, but not while labor gets time and a half or double time.

Mr. Chairman, just remember that this appropriation bill has been cut by the committee, prior to coming before the House, tens of millions of dollars beneath last year's appropriation. The farmer has already taken his cut but nevertheless I have gone along in reference to shaving off minor administrative items not absolutely essential. I have voted for many of the economy amendments proposed, but you are coming now to the heart of the bill This part of the bill means a little money in the pockets of the farmers throughout the Nation, a little money to help make up in part that 15 percent deficiency. I cannot agree with the President when in his comment upon this matter the other day he termed the farmers of our country grasping just because they ask for parity on the two great crops, wheat and corn. Nor can I agree with the feeders and dairymen who want to buy corn and wheat under parity for feeding purposes. I cannot accept the theory that one group of farmers should produce feed at a loss for the gain of other farmers.

In conclusion, I want simply to ask this question of the President, Secretary Wickard, and you Members of this House. Does parity mean parity? Shall we say to the wheat and corn farmers, who produce two of the greatest food crops in America, that they must always be satisfied with 85 percent of parity, while other agricultural groups are in position to profit from their labor?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I come from the Pacific Northwest. I have been in that territory 59 years. We grow about one-sixth of all the wheat grown in the United States, a little more than 100,000,000 bushels, usually, and three-fourths of that is grown on land more or less rolling.

My attention was called 40 years ago to the fact that the tops of the hills were washing away. Years ago I concluded that that erosion was a serious menace. We could not see any help for it. It was discussed at various Grange meetings among the farmers. We tried to find land that was level. I did find it. Most of my wheat was grown on land practically as level as that described by the gentleman from Peoria, Ill., who offers these amendments. However, the bulk of it is grown on rolling land.

The storms commenced to wash that soil away, until the hills were denuded on the top. Little rivulets became gullies. We could not cross them with our headers or our harvesting machines, so there was tremendous loss in that country. It became alarming. As the humus had left the soil, since there was a constant cropping of wheat, the condition grew worse.

When the soil-conservation program arrived 5 years ago my country was very doubtful about what could be done. Men trained in doing things to save the soil came into the country. The C. C. C. camps came in. They commenced to put little dams into those gullies to stop the water, and our farmers commenced to farm around the hills, to sow grass on the tops of the hills, to plant legumes, and to increase the cattle in the country. The sheep came and the milk cows came, the things that we had needed. There is nothing that has so transformed the hills of the Pacific Northwest as the soil-conservation program.

I deeply regret that there is any attempt to cut this appropriation beneath the figures given in the bill. The men who sat for weeks on the Committee on Appropriations listening to this program are, it seems to me, the men we should follow on this question. The committee has already cut one-half billion from the Budget estimate. I am extremely anxious that these attempts to cut down these appropriations be beaten on this floor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to vote for some reduction in this bill for the Soil Conservation Service, but I am fearful that the gentleman from Illinois has gone too far. It seems to me the committee that has studied this question and given every thought to it should be followed in this instance rather than reduce it by one-half.

The Soil Conservation Service is making an effort to reduce some of its expenditures, and it should be commended for so doing. In fact, we insist that they make every reduction possible.

I recall full well that only a few years ago I stood in the Well of this House along with other Members from the Central West and pleaded for aid for the great "dust bowl," which, I thank God, has disappeared since that time. In fact, that section is all green and now covered with grass and vegetation. The Soil Conservation Service rendered real aid in this area. I would be neglectful of my duty if I did not this afternoon appeal to this House to protect this item from too great a reduction.

The soil-conservation item we are considering reducing today does not go strictly to agriculture. If I am not misinformed, this agency supervises the purchase of land for Army camps. It has bought over 7,000 tracts of land, valued at over $21,000,000. It has made investigations of thousands of acres of other tracts. It is now conducting a topographic service for the Army covering 5,000 square miles. Therefore this is not strictly an agricultural item, and I trust you will give consideration to that phase of it.

As I have watched this bill proceed through the House the last 4 or 5 days I have begun to wonder if the cuts in nondefense activities are not going to be made wholly at the expense of agriculture. I have been voting for these cuts every time I thought cuts should be made, but in this instance I cannot go along, and sincerely hope the House considers this matter seriously before we vote this reduction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, if our farmers could but listen to the debate that has taken place here this afternoon, they would be able to more readily understand why it is so difficult to get sound farm legislation through this House, and they might begin to understand why every year the economy effort of this House begins and ends with the agricultural appropriation bill. Some of the Members who have spoken seem to have no conception of the difference between the Soil Conservation Service and the soil-conservation checks that are handled by an entirely different bureau. They are not included in this appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service. I was surprised and shocked a few minutes ago when the gentleman from Michigan, who generally shows such a wide knowledge of affairs stood on this floor and exhibited a soil-conservation payment check and tried to get this House to believe that this appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service included the funds for the payment of that check. The appropriation we have before us now is merely to continue the work of the great Service that has been conserving our soil, the only Service that has done this work on a national scale. It does not involve in any way the direct payments that are made to cooperating farmers in connection with the farm program. This is the work agency, and if Members of Congress have not familiarized themselves with the different functions of different agencies any better than some of the previous speakers have, there is little hope for a fair bill.

There has been some suggestion that there are other agencies that could do this work. Possibly you could set up another agency to take the place of this one, which in time would do the work that this one is now doing, but the fact is that this is the only agency now in existence that is ready, able, and capable of doing the job. It is doing the job, doing a job that is necessary in peace and more necessary in war; doing the job of protecting the fertility of our soils; doing the job of making our soils capable of producing the quantities of foodstuffs that are so absolutely essential to the successful war effort of this Nation.

If you want to drag agriculture down to a position where it will be impossible for it to cooperate in the war effort, as it must if we are to win this war, then cut out the work of the Soil Conservation Service and destroy the fertility of half the soil of this Nation; and by doing so you will have done more to help the enemies of this Nation than you could do in any other way by an appropriation bill. The statistics all show that soil-conserving practices increase the productivity of farm land, and that in most cases it is possible by proper conservation practices as taught and carried out by the Soil Conservation Service to substantially increase the productivity of land even the first year. I realize that in the eastern parts of this country fertilization of the land is necessary to the increase of yields. I realize that in connection with many crops insect control is absolutely vital to quick and substantial yield increases. But, in every section it is essential that the soil be held in place, and that in areas of too much moisture that the land be properly drained. In the great central and western food-producing areas of the Nation it is of vital importance that the moisture that falls be saved. The Soil Conservation Service is showing us how to do this. With its able assistance the yield of many farms has been materially increased the first year. We cannot dare destroy this agency at a time when our Nation needs this added productivity so desperately.

I want also to call attention to the fact that there have been those who have suggested here in this discussion that we can just cut this appropriation half in two. When we seek to cut an appropriation half in two without any consideration, we are doing a very dangerous thing. This committee has given serious study to this matter. I think the committee has done a good job. It has cut half a billion dollars off of this agricultural appropriation bill, far more than we have cut off of any other appropriation bill or from all of the appropriation bills this year. All the cuts are coming off of agriculture, as is so often the case. The committee has made some intelligent cuts, and some large ones. I have not protested against such cuts. We must save every cent we can. There have been some cuts made or the floor. I did not hesitate to vote to cut down some of the travel expenses I thought were exorbitant, but when I see a proposal made simply to cut, without rhyme or reason, one of the most essential agencies of productivity in this Nation, then I feel I would be negligent in my duty if I did not rise here to protest against it.

I know that the Soil Conservation Service has not in the past been able to do nearly all the work that our farmers have wanted it to do—and certainly it has never had enough money to do nearly all the work of this type that was needed. Next year, without this amendment much less money will be available than was available last year. The gentleman from Illinois who offered the amendment has himself explained how substantial sums, probably equal to 50 percent of the total pending appropriation for this service, were available last year from the C. C. C., and so forth. These funds will not be available next year, and the great reservoir of needed labor in the C. C. C. will not be available either. The bill as written will materially reduce the work of the Soil Conservation Service. I do not believe that it would be good for the

country to further curtail the work of this Service. Just a few years ago we asked the States to create soil-conservation districts. Forty-five of the 48 States have done so. Every acre that I represent is in one of these districts. We have led the farmers to believe that we would furnish them with trained leadership through the Soil Conservation Service if they would organize these districts. Even now it is impossible to assign a trained man to each local district. Should this amendment pass practically every soil district in the United States would cease to function, and it would take many long and weary years to rebuild what we now have in farmer interest and cooperation. I hope these three amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up very much of your time, but I would like to call your attention to what it has cost in the past to operate the Department of Agriculture. It started back in 1848 when we appropriated $3,000 for this purpose. This was gradually increased until 1860, when we had $60,000. In 1881, it totaled $353,000. In 1888 it had reached $1,028,000. By 1901 it had reached $4,023,000. Seven years later the amount reached $9,437,000. During the next 9 years, or up until 1917, when we entered the World War, we had only increased this amount slightly, but on account of the demand for food stimulation, the amount appropriated that year reached $40,000,000, and dropped to $38,000,000 in 1918.

Now we have that sort of situation facing us here today. If the farmer has not learned how to conserve soil in the last 9 years I do not think he will ever learn how.

This money has been spent for soil conservation, and this is a time when I think the farmers of this country are perfectly willing to say they have learned enough in the last few years about the conservation of soil so that they can get along without it for a few years, and from now on I am going to try to cut down every appropriation bill that comes in here, along with the farm bills. It is just too bad we did not start with the bills that have been passed here by cutting them down, because they have been increased and added to in their appropriations for the last 8 or 9 years. If we do not start cutting them down now, we will never get them back to a place where the taxpayers of this country will be able to appropriate enough money to meet these obligations. You have got to take some of these men out of the service that are working in the Department of Agriculture and other departments down here in Washington and let them get into this war and help win it. They can do better winning it there than they can sitting down here in swivel chairs in these departments trying to tell the farmers how to run his farm at the present time. All he wants is an opportunity to do so, and give him good prices so that he can operate his farm on a basis with the businessman and he will be satisfied. All he wants is just that consideration and that he is entitled to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill, would it not be wise for this body to listen to and consider the recommendations of the farmers themselves—the Farmers Union—and the true representatives of the farmers—the Congressmen—who are familiar with the farm problems? The citizens live for two things: First, the spiritual; and, second, the physical or worldly enjoyment. The farmers raise the products which make the worldly part of our lives worth while during our brief stay on earth. The farmers furnish the laborers, soldiers, businessmen, the defense workers, the women and children with clothes with which to keep their bodies warm, shoes to protect their feet, and the food to give them life and strength.

The farmers are now and will be confronted with a severe shortage of farm labor, increased wage rates, higher freight rates, and transportation costs; also a serious shortage of farm implements. They will have priorities for only 80 percent of the 1940 needs when, as a matter of fact, 120 percent of the 1940 requirements is needed to produce the amount required in connection with the vital food for defense program. The farmer is faced with price control and problems caused by the dumping of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks held by said Corporation under loan. The dumping of these products on the market has caused a decrease in the prices which a farmer might receive for the products of the soil.

The farmer is faced with increased costs of the goods he buys as well as increased taxes.

The farmer is faced with the problem of conserving the soil, and we must support the Soil Conservation Service program in order that we may preserve the soil for future generations.

With reference to this bill, may I state that the committee having well considered this matter for 3 months has heretofore cut millions of dollars from the 1943 Budget and by further reducing it drastically below the 1942 appropriations about $2,000,000 below the Budget estimate.

Therefore I think it unwise to consider further arbitrary reductions from items essential to agriculture, beneficial to the farmer, and vital to defense. You will appreciate the full value of the Soil Conservation Service if you will take a few flights over the country in an airplane. We must cut from other appropriation measures such items as are not essential to our program of winning the war.

I voted against a $34,000,000 appropriation for a building just across the river here, which is almost twice as much as all the appropriations for the soil-conservation program in the entire United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if this were a simple question of getting rid of "swivel-chair holders," and "cushion riders," it would be a lot simpler than the matter that confronts us on this amendment. As I have observed the Soil Conservation Service, I think that it is less open to the charge of being a swivel-chair proposition than almost any other bureau of the Department of Agriculture. It is as near to being a "grass roots" proposition as there is in the Department. I do not know what the proper cut should be in this item. I do not believe that the average Member can sit here and listen to 3-minute speeches, made mostly from a point of view, with little specific detail, and determine what a proper cut would be.

The committee has recommended a cut of something over $3,000,000 from the bill last year, which is less than the amount of their funds that were impounded this year, I understand. On the other hand we know that the soil-conservation districts in the country are increasing. Nothing of the kind has grown as rapidly in our section of the country as the voluntary organization of soil-conservation districts under State law. And it is the operation of the Soil Conservation Service which enables these local districts to function. In them, a group of farmers in a given area, get together and work out a common program to use a watershed or a drainage area economically. They have increased production. They have helped to save the soil. The farmers use them but the farmers want to save money, too.

Personally I am inclined to think some additional cuts could be made. I do not know where they should be made, from the limited information before us. I think it is unfortunate just to say that we are going to cut these appropriations in half without giving the chapter and verse as to where and why the cuts should be made. The Soil Conservation Service has appraised something over 10,000 tracts for acquisition by the War Department, and how much of this should be charged to the Department of Agriculture, I do not know. No one has offered any information what should be charged to acquisition for the War Department.

Mr. NELSON. While my colleague is in doubt as to the amount of cut that should be made, he has no doubt as to the value of soil saving, has he?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; I have not. Here is an organization in which I think an arbitrary cut would be unfortunate, and this is nearer grass roots than almost any other branch of the Department of Agriculture. It seems that the best the most of us could do would be to rely on the studies of the committee in charge; I hope the Committee will suggest a practical cut, one that will save money yet not destroy or lose the valuable work in food and livestock production that is accomplished by this Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I believe in conservation, but I do not believe in foolish conservation. It has been demonstrated by this agency of the Government that it has done a good job for many years. I have traveled over many

areas in which they have produced results. I have seen with my own eyes the results of their efforts. It has been successful, and, as time goes on, it will be a monument to good administration. As on example of foolish conservation, I call to the attention of the House a remarkable fact which has come to my attention today. A month or so ago I went to the O. P. M. to secure priority ratings on sheet metal for the production of tobacco flues, to save the tobacco in a particular area that brings in some $700,000,000 every year to the Treasury. We fought around and shadow boxed, and I finally got the O. P. M.—or now the War Production Board—to give us a rating of A-1. The War Department immediately stepped in and said, "Oh, no; you cannot do that; that is steel or iron metal." The whole truth is it was cold sheet metal for making flues, very similar to ordinary stovepipe. They objected and cut us down to A-5. We, by another appeal, secured a rating of A-3, and we are about now to get some materials. Here is the foolish part of conservation. The War Department is building on the Atlantic coast a great air base. This field is a salty, sandy area on the Atlantic coast, in a salty atmosphere. They have specified steel drain pipes, iron pipes, which will rust out within a year, where they could use wood-box pipes, terra cotta, or concrete pipes. If that is the way the conservation of our raw materials is going on, then the War Department should wake up and take notice. All of us are ready to give way to sound judgment. But this is unsound and should not be permitted by the W. P. B.

If this effort today is an effort for conservation, then the farmer and those who are interested in farming, interested in the preservation of natural resources of our country, should wake up and find out that to approve this amendment would be foolish economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to discuss the subject of cutting appropriations just on the eve of our national holiday, "taxpayers' day," March 15, and just before we are going to present to you, from the Ways and Means Committee, a bill to raise the debt limit to $125,000,000,000.

I am for soil conservation, but for cutting out all this "window dressing."

Two or three minutes is a short time in which to discuss the trimming of $11,000,000 from any bill, so we have to do the best we can under the circumstances. The Farm Bureau, that great farm organization, is for these amendments. So am I. I would rather trust the judgment of a dozen good farmers than even a dozen good Congressmen. I think they are the most level-headed type of men we can go to for good, sound advice on nearly any subject. I do not have any doubt, when I go back to my district and talk with any average 12 good farmers, especially land-owning farmers, about what they would say about cutting out $11,000,000 even from this Soil Conservation Service, and especially when we start cutting it from "soil conversation," which is what we have chiefly had in debate this afternoon. They would rise up and cheer any tax saving, any appropriation cutting we do here.

This is a time to be sensible. We are in a war, not in a big picnic. It is serious. It seems to me men ought to stand up and be counted for economy. Fourteen thousand employees scattered all over this land under Soil Conservation, one small division of only one department of Government. Here is a chance for a play on words—"soil conversation." Down in my district we have as many or more Federal employees in the county courthouses than we have county officers. They are crowding the county officers out. Mr. Myer, of the Soil Conservation Service itself, testified that they were cooperating with the experiment stations to work out this whole problem. We can easily cut out this money and not destroy our farms or hurt our farmers. It will help cut their taxes. If we cut it all out for the period of the war, this soil is still going to be here. That land will still be here 4 or 5 years from now. I think we ought to be saving money in the face of our enormous debt, in the face of what we have confronting us, and spend only for the actual, bare necessities of Government.

In 1910 we had 90,000,000 people; in 1940, about 130,000,000; but our expenses of Federal Government rose from seven hundred million in 1913 to nine billions—exclusive of the emergency defense—in 1940. From thirty-eight million for the Department of Agriculture in 1918 to one and one-half billions in 1938. Just when and where are we going to stop. Here is one place to start.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, you are here voting upon an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to reduce from $501,000 to $250,000 an appropriation for the bureaucrats in Washington who have charge of this program.

Now, what is the situation in this country today? We are at war. We need every bit of money strength that we can get to take care of the situation. Just to give you a picture of a major item in here which will follow, the second amendment after this, the Budget estimate and this estimate call for $20,000,000, and the amount the Budget let them have to spend this current fiscal year, according to page 941 of the hearings, was $15,798,000. In other words, with the War Department taking a considerable part of their personnel to perform its buying operations and paying them out of the War Department appropriation and not out of this appropriation, we are providing for an increase, the way the committee reported the bill, of $5,000,000 over this year, in this major item.

Is there any intelligence in our building up this outfit at a time when we ought to cut it down and save whatever dollars there are which could be put into the Treasury and used for defense work?

Now, there is not anyone who can tell us that they need $500,000 to operate this situation. On page 616 of the hearings, part 2, among other items, the Farm Bureau organization recommended that the regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service be eliminated and that the research and experimental work be transferred to the State agricultural experimental outfits; that the educational and demonstration work also go to the State extension services.

The farmers are not in any such position as they were 8 or 9 years ago. They did not have any income then. Today we are spending probably $3,000,000,000 for farm products to send out of the country, with Government money. That is help for agriculture.

In addition to that, you have another situation. They are getting much better prices than they were getting before, and they are in a position where they can finance improvements to their own properties much better than they could 7 or 8 years ago. Therefore we do not need to spend so everlasting much money.

Now, let us think for a moment. Let us think where we are getting off, when we figure to vote for an item that will result in giving them more money by almost $5,000,000 than they had this current year, after the Budget had impounded their funds. The item that they had available after the Budget had impounded their funds was reduced to that amount. Because of all the items in the agricultural budget they believed this could be most easily impounded.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all three of the Dirksen amendments be voted on at one time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall have to object, Mr. Chairman, because I think it will be necessary to have some clarification as we go along.

Mr. TARVER. There can be no further debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the other two amendments are not pending before the committee as I understand.

Mr TARVER. Debate has been concluded on the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But these other amendments are to another paragraph of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The other two amendments, the Chair will state to the gentleman from Georgia, were read for information only

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be read so we may know what we are voting on.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 71, line 6, strike out "$501,315" and insert "$250,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 74, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations: For research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil and moisture conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage); and for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, $1,314,429.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 71, line 19, strike out "$1,314,429" and insert "$700,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment proposes to reduce the amount for soil and moisture investigations from $1,314,429 to $700,000. For 6 years they have asked for this identic money for the identic purpose which was submitted to the committee. They are going to use this money for eight different purposes: To investigate the principles involved in soil and moisture conservation—they have done that for 6 years. For watershed investigation—they have done it for 6 years. For investigation of sedimentation resulting from erosion—they have done that since the beginning of this program. For investigations of geographic and climatic factors—they have done that since 1937. For investigations of the economics of the soil, investigations of erosion-resisting plants, for farm-irrigation investigation, and for farm drainages—they have spent $9,300,000 for those studies since 1937. I am rather amazed that the committee does not go along with these amendments, particularly so when organized agriculture is for them. You received telegrams from some farm organizations that are opposed to some of these proposals. Those two organizations have never bothered to come before the subcommittee. The only large organization that has ever troubled and does trouble itself year after year to come not only with an argument but with a constructive program is the American Farm Bureau Federation with over 550,000 family memberships, involving more than 2,000,000 people identified with the soil. You will find what Mr. O'Neal, the head of that organization, said on page 615 of the hearings.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I might point out that this $1,314,000 which the gentleman seeks to curtail is not for soil-conservation projects but merely for investigation and experimental work.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. Investigation of soil moisture and land use, $1,314,000. This will take out a slice and it will not hurt the farmers, and the farm organization is for it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the debate that has already been had on these amendments, I wonder if we cannot agree to close debate at this time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, it is not the desire to forestall the offering of another amendment to the paragraph?

Mr. TARVER. I am not trying to forestall anything. After having debated the matter for an hour and a half, it is my opinion it may be well to vote.

Mr. RICH. Is there going to be any disposition whatever on the part of the majority party to economize in the bill? If you are not and if you have the votes, and you have corraled the votes, we might as well pass the bill and go home.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee, as I am. May I say that this bill has been cut more severely in its appropriations for the next fiscal year than any bill reported by the gentleman's subcommittees.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, let us make it 10 minutes, reserving 2 minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are only three or four of us. Why does not the gentleman make it 20 minutes?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman made a speech a while ago, so did I, and so did other Members. Why speak on the same subject again?

Mr. TABER. Why not make it 12 minutes?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 12 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, there have been quite a few statements made to the effect that there are no politics in the vote on this proposition. My distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] pointed out in very forceful language that there were no politics in it. In light of that statement I think it might be interesting to look at the vote just taken by division. You can depend on it because I counted these small figures and they are correct.

The yeas were 74 for the amendment; 11 Democrats joined in that vote. The nays were 99. Five Republicans joined in that vote.

This item is for experimentation and research. All right. Do you remember the "dust bowl?" Do you remember when dust was flying so thick all over the United States that it even got into the operating rooms of hospitals in the East just a few years ago? Well, it was under this Department that the experiments were conducted which stopped the dust, and it stopped your eating sand in your cream of wheat in New York because of the dust that blew in from Kansas, Colorado, and Oklahoma. It was this Department, through this experimental service, that found ways and means to plant sorghums and other grains in the "dust bowl," let it fall down, and discovered that native grass would grow under the protecting cover of the sorghums, thereby stopping the erosion of ground in the "dust-bowl" area. Was that a good job? Was it worth the money expended? They will do just as important work in the future.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, there are quite a number of Members who think this amount should be reduced, and there is no question but what it should be reduced some. I shall offer a substitute amendment for the Dirksen amendment in which I will ask to cut down the amount only $5,000,000. If we cannot do that in times like this, then there is something wrong with the Congress, and I hope there is not anything wrong with it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is talking about the other amendment, not the one pending before the Committee now. This is the item of $1,304,000.

Mr. JOHNS. I am talking about the gentleman's second amendment, the $20,000,000 amendment. That is the one I am talking about reducing $5,000,000.

I think the people of this country feel that the Congress should do something here. At least, the people in my district feel that way. These items ought to be cut down where there will be no more harm done than here. I appreciate what has been done along experimental lines and what has been done for the farmers in the conservation of his soil, which is worth a great deal, but this is a time when the farmer will have to go along for a few years with the rest of us in cutting down expenditures.

I hope you will cut this amount down, and also the amount that is to be used here in Washington. I have asked that it be cut down $5,000,000 and the other down to $15,000,000, and I hope the Committee will go along on that basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I think there are two or three things that ought to be said.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who offers these very drastic amendments, was unable, as I recall, to attend the hearings of the subcommittee when the representatives of the Soil Conservation Service were before us and, therefore, did not hear the evidence which was adduced concerning this particular subject matter. I am not saying this in criticism of the gentleman. There is undoubtedly some good reason for his not being in attendance because he is ordinarily faithful in that particular. However, I am calling attention to the

fact that, according to my recollection, he did not participate in those hearings nor hear the evidence with regard to these items.

The second thing I want to say is with regard to the Farm Bureau Federation. It has an organization in every county in my congressional district composed of men of the highest type, farmers who are among the leading farmers of my State. I have the utmost respect for them and the utmost respect for Mr. O'Neal and his associates. However, if you will recall, last year Mr. O'Neal and his associates appealed to this subcommittee, headed then by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], to bring about certain consolidations in the field work of the Department of Agriculture, including the placing of the Soil Conservation Service under the Extension Service and the county agents. The committee, because it felt that in some particulars those recommendations were not sound, and because it also felt that in such particulars as they were justified they ought to be covered by legislation reported from an appropriate committee and not undertaken by the Committee on Appropriations, did not provide for that consolidation.

The Farm Bureau Federation, as you all know, has a great deal to do with the selection of the county agents in a great many States of the Union, so that the suggestion that the Soil Conservation Service be put under the jurisdiction of the county agents in the field was a suggestion that the Farm Bureau Federation have more to do with the administration of the Soil Conservation Service. The committee, as I have said, did not accord with that suggestion. If it is the will of Congress that that should be done, it ought to be done by the reporting of proper legislation from the Committee on Agriculture and not through the direction of the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations. So the American Farm Bureau Federation, particularly the higher officials, not necessarily the members of the federation in the field, have some feeling that if this soil-conservation appropriation can be brought down it may eventually result in the transfer of this activity to the Extension Service, where their influence would be more effective.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 70, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Soil and moisture conservation and land-use operations, demonstrations, and information: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and moisture, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of erosion nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, $20,510,812: *Provided*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery stock shall remain available for expenditure for not more than 3 fiscal years.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 72, line 3, strike out "$20,510,812" and insert "$10,510,812."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition only long enough to reaffirm what I have heretofore said, that this would save $10,000,000, enough to buy 100 bombers or 110 medium tanks.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 77, noes 91.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. TARVER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 88, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 72, line 3, strike out "$20,510,812" and insert "$20,040,485."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me that I may make an effort to get a unanimous-consent agreement?

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

Mr. TARVER. This is the gentleman's usual travel amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. This is the traveling-man amendment, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 7 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply seeks to save almost half a million dollars of Government money that is being spent by the Soil Conservation Service for travel expense. If you make this cut of $500,000, I do not believe the purposes or the usefulness of the Soil Conservation Service to the farmer or to the land will be interfered with one iota. It will still leave them $500,000 to travel around on to get the job done as they see fit.

In regard to saving our precious crops on the farm lands of America, I have been pleased to support the committee on the soil-conservation amendments, because I know personally from field experience the vital, useful effect the expenditure of money will have, providing it is wisely and prudently spent.

However, I do believe this agency or any other agency downtown can effect a saving of at least 50 percent in its $1,000,000 travel expenses during this time of great emergency.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. I did not hear the gentleman's amendment read. Does this amendment go only to funds for travel, and nothing else?

Mr. MONRONEY. The amendment seeks to cut half of the funds for travel instead of half of the entire appropriation for the Service.

It may be urged that it is necessary for the Soil Conservation Service to hire private cars or to take extra train service to get around to see these terraces and the other work they are doing, but may I point out that the Soil Conservation Service has 1,814 cars listed under its agency, the largest number that is maintained by any service in the Department of Agriculture. This travel expense is separate and apart from these cars, hence this reduction would not curtail the effectiveness of their farm work a bit. On top of these 1,814 Government cars, I would like to point out that they have access to all of the C. C. C. cars that go with the C. C. C. soil-conservation camps. Now, surely with the great reduction of soil-conservation camps, of which during last year there were 1,500, reduced now to 600, we can economize just one little bit in this bill and say to the country that we will reduce by one-half million dollars the excessive travel expense.

Here is one sure place that we can save almost a half million dollars and still not curtail the functions of the agency.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is evident that the item for travel in this matter looks large—nearly $1,000,000. Remember this is all a service. The entire personnel is given to service. It would be highly inconsistent to vote $20,000,000 for a service to 900 municipal corporations scattered in 45 States and then deny the opportunity for those who must render the service to move from place to place where the service must be rendered.

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

Mr. LEAVY. I have only 2 minutes, and I cannot yield.

For this reason, it would seem to me, inasmuch as my friend from Oklahoma voted for the $20,000,000, he could not be consistent and refuse to vote the money so that these people who must render the service may be given the opportunity to go from place to place to render such service. A lot of this service is naturally expert service.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONRONEY) there were—ayes 61, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: Page 72, line 3, strike out "$20,510,812" and insert "$15,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman will yield to me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNS. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I understand this committee only had $15,500,000 for use this last year. This is a compromise here, and it only reduces the amount $5,000,000. I do not know whether the Members of this House realize this, but I gave you the figures a moment ago. We appropriated for the Department of Agriculture $38,000,000 for the year 1918. This item is over one-half of what we appropriated for the Department in 1938. Now, getting down to 1931, we increased the appropriation to $200,000,000 and also $89,000,000 for roads, or $289,000,000. In addition to this, $150,000,000 more was appropriated for marketing funds and another $45,000,000 for relief of farmers, or a grand total of $484,000,000. In 1932 we appropriated $269,000,000, and in 1933 we appropriated $176,500,000 for the Department. In 1935 there was appropriated $6,000,000 to the Department and $15,000,000 for Agricultural Adjustment and $2,389,000 for Farm Credit Administration, or another grand total of $83,389,000 in a period of 7 years. This year we have increased that so that on July last they had over $1,300,000, and this year the bill calls for $834,000,000.

Now, you can realize the grand total of these figures during the last few years. If anybody thinks that agriculture has been benefited to that extent, all he has got to do is go back and look at the records of 1938. We would not have the prices we are getting for agriculture today, with all this experimentation, with all this suggestion, and all this help that has been handed out from the millions of dollars if we were not in a war. With the law of supply and demand governing the prices of what we have to sell, together with the negotiations of the Department of Agriculture, I think we ought to be able to reduce this amount $5,000,000. With the tremendous amount that the farmer has received during this year, together with the prices he is going to receive for his products next year, he is not going to miss this $5,000,000, and we really need it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. And is it not true that the Budget Bureau impounded about $8,000,000, so they are going to have just as much money this year as last year?

Mr. JOHNS. I am not positive about that, but perhaps the gentleman from New York is familiar with it, and if he says so, of course, that is true.

Mr. REED of New York. Fifteen million dollars is all they get this year, so they would not be losing anything.

Mr. JOHNS. The gentleman from New York says they are not losing anything, so I think altogether we can reduce this $5,000,000. It is a compromise between what the gentleman from Illinois has asked for and the amount in this amendment; there are some Members who think that that is a large reduction, so let us cut it down $5,000,000 and quit there.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNS) there were—ayes 65, noes 74.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. JOHNS and Mr. TARVER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 81, noes 88.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g-590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281-1407) (except the making of payments pursuant to sections 303 and 381 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $50,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, newspapers, $450,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1944, for compliances under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1942 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942, inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of such amount shall be available for carrying out the provisions of section 202 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and not to exceed $4,000,000 shall be available under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of said act, including research on food products of farm commodities: *Provided further*, That no part of such amount shall be available after June 30, 1943, for salaries and other administrative expenses except for payment of obligations therefor incurred prior to July 1, 1943: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1943 programs or plans now or hereafter authorized under section 7 or 8, or both, of said act of February 29, 1936, or under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of the General Accounting Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary of Agriculture in the 1942, 1943, and 1944 programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and likewise the amount appropriated under this head for the fiscal year 1942 shall be available for such purchases for such grants in the 1941, 1942, and 1943 programs under such act; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for fertilizers, seeds, lime, trees, or other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, furnished by such agency; and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof: *Provided further*, That beginning with the fiscal year 1942 each appropriation to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect any program administered through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be reimbursed out of the then current appropriation for the agency affected, for a fair share of the administrative expense, as estimated periodically or in advance by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration of maintaining registers of indebtedness and making, out of such Agricultural Adjustment Administration appropriation, set-offs under the order entered by the Secretary on May 8, 1937, as heretofore or hereafter amended, in favor of any other agency of the Government.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I think we have done enough work on this for today and it is my purpose to move that the Committee rise. First, I ask unanimous consent that all amendments which Members propose to offer to this paragraph may be sent to the desk and printed in the RECORD for the information of the House. That, of course, does not mean that points of order are waived, but simply that the House membership would have the benefit of reading those amendments between now and our next meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all amendments to the section just read may be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Do I understand that all of us who have sent amendments to the desk already, without saying anything on the floor of the House, will also have their amendments printed in the RECORD?

Mr. TARVER. My request is that these amendments shall be printed in the RECORD for the information of the House.

Mr. REED of New York. Will not the gentleman have to make that request in the House?

Mr. TARVER. I do not think so.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Is it to be understood that only those amendments proposed by Members will be sent to the desk for the information of the Committee as requested by the gentleman from Georgia and that all points of order to those amendments may be made when offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The understanding of the Chair is that this does not exclude anyone's right. It is a matter of information only. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Does that refer to amendments only to this paragraph, or the next paragraph?

Mr. TARVER. The request did not cover amendments to the following paragraph, but I think the gentleman's suggestion is wise. I now request, Mr.

Chairman, that all amendments to the following paragraphs in the bill that have not yet been considered may be sent to the Clerk's desk and may be printed in the RECORD for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that any amendment to be proposed to the remaining sections of the bill may be printed in the RECORD, for information. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. The fact that someone's amendments are published, and those of someone else not, will have no effect upon the right of anyone to offer the amendments when a particular paragraph is read, will it?

Mr. TARVER. Certainly not. This is just an opportunity to have the membership acquainted as far as possible with the amendments that are to be offered, but it does not preclude anyone from offering any amendment that is not sent to the desk.

Mr. HOOK. That still allows points of order to be made to amendments when offered?

Mr. TARVER. Certainly. They are printed simply for the information of the House, and points of order may be made to them when offered.

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

There was no objection.

The amendments referred to are as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: Page 73, line 16, after the colon following the word "inclusive", insert *"Provided*, That no total payments for any year to any person, firm, or corporation under this section shall exceed $500. *And provided*, That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share-renter of payments not exceeding $500 to which he would otherwise be entitled In the case of payments made to any individual, firm, or corporation, or estate on account of performance on farms in different States, Territories, and possessions, the $500 limitation shall apply to the total of the payments for each State, Territory, or possessions for the year and not to the total of all such payments."

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: Page 73, line 16, after "inclusive", strike out period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further*, That not more than $500 of the sum appropriated in this paragraph shall be paid to any one individual, partnership, or corporation."

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Page 75, line 13, after the word "Government", and before the period, insert *"Provided further*, That no payment or payments hereunder, to any one person or corporation, shall be in excess of the total sum of $1,000."

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSSETT: Page 75, line 13, after the period insert the following:

"That the last paragraph of section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'The total payment that would otherwise be made to any person for any year pursuant to this section shall be reduced by 25 percent of the amount thereof in excess of $1,000. No total payment to any person for any year shall exceed $5,000, but in applying these limitations there shall be excluded amounts representing a landlord's share of a payment made with respect to land operated under a tenancy or sharecropper relationship if the division of the payment between the landlord and the tenant or sharecropper is determined by the local committee to be in accordance with fair and customary standards of renting or sharecropping prevailing in the locality. In the case of payments to any person on account of performance on farms in different States, Territories, or possessions, the 25-percent reduction and the $5,000 limitation shall be applied to the total of the payments for each State, Territory, or possession for a year, and not to the total of all payments.' "

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: On page 78, line 24, insert the following:

"Provided further, The provisions of this act shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity to or by the Agricultural Marketing Administration for distribution exclusively for relief purposes, nor to grain which has substantially deteriorated in quality and is sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of alcohol, or commodities sold to farmers for seed."

Amendment offered by Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts: On page 78, line 20, after the words "as amended", strike out all further words on page 78.

Amendment offered by Mr. GILCHRIST: Amend page 78 of the bill by striking from lines 22 and 23 thereof the following words, to wit: "Government-owned stocks of farm commodities," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following words, to wit: "Farm commodities, except such as are distributed for relief purposes, and grain which has substantially deteriorated in quality, and grain which is sold for the manufacture of alcohol."

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: Page 79, beginning with line 12, strike out everything in the paragraph running through line 19.

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 79, line 12, strike out "Sugar Act of 1937", and lines 13 to 19, inclusive.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSPECK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6709), the agricultural appropriation bill, fiscal year 1943, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this minute in order that we may know from the majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Next week, of course, will be a very busy week. I do not expect that all I announce will be accomplished, although it is important, in view of certain hopes and expectations of the leadership the latter part of the month, with which the gentleman from Massachusetts is acquainted, that the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill be finished on Monday. It is very important in connection with what we have in mind at the end of the month.

We have every hope and expectation, and the expectation in part will be carried out, but if the legislation is prolonged—and that is not said in any criticism—it means that the period we have in mind will be thereby reduced.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman means, in other words, that we have a certain number of bills to pass, and when that is done it is possible there will be a short breathing spell.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I hope at least for a breathing spell of 2 weeks. I am hopeful of that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It depends on how the work is?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. Now, we will continue with this bill on Monday. After the termination of this bill there is the civil-functions appropriation bill, which carries an important item, with which the House is acquainted, and it is very important that that be taken up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is immediately after this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That comes up after this bill. Then the bill providing for an increase in the debt limit, which will not take long.

Then the bill introduced by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Then the bill extending the Dies committee.

The Appropriations Committee will hold important hearings on Monday in connection with a recommendation for an appropriation of $100,000,000 to meet the situation arising as a result of workers displaced through changing over from peacetime to wartime activities.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does that take the place of the so-called $300,000,000?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will there be any District of Columbia legislation on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Unless it can be passed by unanimous consent; no.

Then there is the legislative appropriation bill.

There is another bill from the Ways and Means Committee. I do not know its status just now, but it will be reported in connection with the problem of State sales taxes with reference to Federal purchases during the war.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. According to the program, that will never be reached next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I am afraid not. Perhaps some of the others will not be reached. But it is very important in connection with what we have in mind the latter part of the month that the present bill be disposed of on Monday if possible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein figures on cot-

ton-crop-insurance participation in Louisiana for this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have an article which appeared in Look magazine on February 24 entitled "Hitler's New Scapegoat, the Catholics," which I would like unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today and include therein the minority report filed by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a Government table showing the average retail price by manufacturers of sugar from the period 1913 to 1941, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial appearing in today's Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WARTIME CENSORSHIP

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered, but there is one special order pending.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if there is one type of news that would actually be of aid and comfort to our enemies it is news about American convoys proceeding on the high seas. For what it may be worth I want to protest the items appearing in the press today under a London date line about American convoys in the Pacific. It seems to me that if censorship is worth anything at all it should apply in a case of this kind. Just why the lives of our men, safety of our ships, and success of our naval campaign should be endangered for the sake of a news story of this kind I am utterly unable to see. I earnestly hope steps can be taken to prevent such a thing happening again.

LIMITATION ON SOIL CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A PRACTICAL AND FAIR WAY TO EFFECT A HUGE SAVINGS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to advise Members with reference to one of the several amendments that will be considered to the pending bill to make the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, when we resume consideration of this measure next Monday. Yesterday, I sent to the Clerk's desk an amendment to limit the amount of soil-conservation payments to any one individual or corporation to $1,000.

If you will recall, the House, by an overwhelming majority, passed a measure sponsored by the former chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Hon. Marvin Jones, placing the limit at $5,000. Because, however, of pressure of some of the so-called big shots who farm the farmers, it failed of passage at the other end of the Capitol.

I am assured by those in a position to know, that my amendment, if adopted, would enable Congress to reduce this appropriation approximately $50,000,000.

Last year the appropriation for these payments alone amounted to $499,000,000. The committee has cut these payments $50,000,000 for the ensuing year, which means that unless a reasonable limit is placed in the bill that the small-family-type farmer will bear the brunt of the cut.

I am asking the Department of Agriculture to furnish me with the latest list of all farmers and others in the various States who now receive payments in excess of $1,000. I now have a partial list that I propose to present when consideration is resumed Monday. It is a long, bunglesome list, although not complete to date. I am confident, however, that Members will be astonished and amazed to see the huge list of people, a majority of whom do not actually farm, who are now receiving over $1,000. Let those who cry economy vote against this amendment if they wish.

It will be recalled that a few years ago Congress and the country were astonished to find that one corporation received over $1,000,000 in Government payments. Yet, Members of Congress had letters from officials of that same outfit criticizing what they called wasteful extravagance and urging a policy of "cruel economy," and now an examination of a long list of those who are pulling down Government checks in excess of $1,000 in my State reveals that some of them are complaining because Congress does not economize. I submit that this is a most excellent opportunity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a copy of an address made by Colonel Styer to the West Coast Lumbermen's Association.

The SPEAKER, Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include several letters received from farmer constituents on the subject of the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER, Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on three subjects and to include in one an editorial.

The SPEAKER, Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a newspaper column written by my predecessor, Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill.

The SPEAKER, Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke in the Committee of the Whole today on the agricultural appropriation bill may be granted permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this long-sought opportunity to address the membership of the House on the activities of the Dies committee. I could spend hours here discussing many things of the past, but that would not be practicable. However, I do want to devote the time that has been allotted me to a discussion of two most important phases which raise very serious questions. The answer to these questions and the decision on the issues raised, in my opinion, should determine whether or not this committee should be continued.

If we recall, during the debate on the so-called amendment offered to the Foreign Agents Act which the Committee on the Judiciary had before this House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] stated that he had information which, had he been permitted to reveal it, would have prevented the tragedy at Pearl Harbor. I remember that statement very well, and when I appeared in opposition to the resolution continuing the life of the Dies committee then pending before the Rules Committee, I pointed out if that statement were true, since it came from the gentleman in his capacity as chairman of one of the most publicized committees of the House, then a charge of dereliction had to be placed at the doorstep of the administration. If, on the other hand, that statement was not true, then certainly this committee stood guilty before the country of the grossest dereliction in the history of this Nation.

I immediately made my own inquiry. I recalled that during his speech the gentleman from Texas, in referring to the departments that had prevented him

from revealing this information, specifically referred to the Department of Justice and to the Department of State. He, of course, generally referred to the administration. I communicated with Mr. Sumner Welles. I pointed out to him that statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, 1942, page 800. Mr. Welles informed me that he would let me know. This took place on February 10, 1942, the day prior to the hearing before the Rules Committee. The following morning, February 11, Mr. Sumner Welles phoned my office. I was not available, as I was testifying before the Rules Committee. However, I called him back. He stated that he had read the statement of the gentleman from Texas in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that he had conferred with the President, that he had conferred with the Secretary of State, and that I was authorized to state for the White House, for the Secretary of State, and for the State Department, that the statement made by the gentleman from Texas was not true.

Then I made inquiry at the Department of Justice, and I was informed that a letter had been written to the gentleman from Texas on August 13. The letter recited that the then Acting Attorey General, Mr. Biddle, had learned from the press that the gentleman from Texas was reported to have stated that he had information with regard to Japanese espionage and sabotage activities. The gentleman from Texas was also reported to have said that he had turned over this evidence to the Department of Justice. The Attorney General wrote that he had not received this evidence and called upon the gentleman from Texas to turn over that evidence.

Mr. Biddle received an answer on August 27 from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and in that letter the gentleman from Texas advised the Attorney General:

> I assume that with the hundreds of agents which you have you would have no difficulties in getting the facts.

That is the record. It is in black and white. It is in the form of correspondence, and I believe the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] has today placed that correspondence in the RECORD. The gentleman from Texas also placed it in the RECORD of March 4, page 1921.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I have not yet placed it in the RECORD, but I ask unanimous consent, if the gentleman will yield, to place it in the RECORD, together with a copy of similar correspondence dated February 7 from the Attorney General asking for information, and the reply, dated February 16, from the gentleman from Texas, saying that he would send a copy of his report to the Attorney General when printed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, when you read that correspondence there is one thing that stands out; you cannot get away from it no matter what anybody says and no matter what anybody tries to do. There are two outstanding facts—one, as far back as August 13 the Attorney General asked for the evidence; and two, up to this date that evidence has never been turned over to the Attorney General.

I therefore submit to the House that, on the basis of the statement of Mr. Sumner Welles, on the basis of the statement from the White House and from the State Department through Mr. Sumner Welles, on the basis of the only law-enforcing agency of the Government, the Department of Justice, a department which is entrusted with the enforcement of our laws against spies and saboteurs, and on the basis of the fact that this evidence was never turned over to the Department of Justice, despite the fact it was specifically requested; that the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], that if he had been permitted to reveal the evidence, facts, and information he said he had the tragedy at Pearl Harbor would have been averted, is not true.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down. It refers to statements made by a Member on the floor.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. What is the use of wasting time? Let me withdraw the words "Is not true" and let me say that Mr. DIES' statement is inconsistent with the facts, with the record, and with the correspondence. Does that satisfy the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the words.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. In a letter placed in the RECORD, written to me on February 20 by the Attorney General, it is stated, and I believe I can quote it from memory, that there was never any suggestion that the facts in the possession of the comittee be not revealed.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; I prefer to continue. I will yield to the gentleman later.

That meets the first issue. I repeat: on the basis of this record, since the gentleman from Texas raised the question here of dereliction of duty, I say that dereliction in this matter rests at the doorstep of his committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down. He is charging a committee of the House with not having performed its duty. I think that is a violation of the rule.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I can take so much and no more. I am discussing dereliction. The gentleman from Texas raised the issue of dereliction. I say that in view of the record and the correspondence, the responsibility for dereliction rests at the doorstep of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York used these words:

> I say that on the basis of this record, since the gentleman from Texas raised the question here of dereliction of duty, I say that dereliction in this matter rests at the doorstep of the committee.

The Chair thinks that if he were to hold upon as fine a point as that, at some time free debate in the House of Representatives might cease. The Chair holds that the language does not violate the rules of the House.

The gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In all fairness to the gentleman from Texas, I want to state that the gentleman from Texas bases his statement that he was not permitted to reveal the information on a letter from the Office of the Attorney General dated September 8, 1941, exhibit No. 1 of the recent report of the committee, the report on Japanese activities. This letter is from the acting Attorney General, Matthew McGuire. In this letter it is stated that—

> The Attorney General has discussed the situation with the President and the Secretary of State, both of whom feel quite strongly that hearings such as yon contemplate would be inadvisable.

The word "hearings" is described in a previous paragraph, which states to Mr. DIES,

> In your letter of August 27, 1941, addressed to the Attorney General you stated that if the Attorney General had no objection you would suggest to your committee the advisability of conducting public hearings.

I submit that there is a great distinction between conducting public hearings that might impair an international relationship and using information in such a manner that it would have prevented the tragedy of Pearl Harbor.

Certainly, inasmuch as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was advised not to hold public hearings, what was there to have prevented the gentleman from Texas from whispering his information in the ears of the law enforcement department, in the ears of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, and in the ears of the Attorney General, and giving to them this information which he stated would have prevented the tragedy of Pearl Harbor if he had been permitted to reveal it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request, so I shall not interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. All right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks I may address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say to the gentleman that I may need a few more minutes, possibly, to conclude my remarks.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did not ask for it now, I asked for it at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I mean after I have concluded my 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California may proceed for 10 minutes at the conclusion of

the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did not the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] or the committee inform the Attorney General that the agents of the Dies committee would furnish that information and cooperate with them?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I say that the gentleman said that the committee had this evidence. Certainly the committee must have the evidence that its agents possess. Having that evidence, and since that evidence has been described to be of such a nature that if revealed it would have prevented the tragedy of Pearl Harbor, since it was so important, I say that it was the duty of the chairman of the committee to have transmitted that evidence, even in a confidential manner, without benefit of the press, to the law-enforcement agency of the Government of the United States. I submit you cannot get away from that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did not the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] say the other day that that information was with the agents on the west coast, that he had advised the Government agencies that they could get it there, and that his agents, the agents of the Dies committee, would cooperate with the departments of the Government?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman is a very experienced legislator and an able attorney.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why does not the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am answering the gentleman's question. The gentleman should know and does know that when the Attorney General of the United States asks the chairman of a committee to turn over information which it possesses, he is not referred to committee employees. You turn over that information immediately to the Attorney General, particularly if it is of a serious nature and of a serious character, and if devastating consequences would result from not placing that information with the Attorney General.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But right there let me ask you this question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I would like to proceed, if I may be allowed to do so, as I have completely answered the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But you mistake the situation, which was that Mr. DIES did not have the information. The information was in the hands of these agents and he told the Government Departments to get it there.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. DIES stated repeatedly that he had the information, and now let us look at this picture you now paint and see how amazing it is. You are chairman of a Committee and your agents have this information——

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I do not have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And you do not have it. What do you do? You send for your agent, you get that information and you give it to the Attorney General. Is that not the reasonable procedure. Does not patriotic duty compel you to follow it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I tell the Attorney General to talk to the agents.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; you do not. You get the information from your agent and turn it over to the Attorney General. You cannot get away from that.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. DIES admitted the other day that his agents on the west coast could merely furnish the agents of the F. B. I. or the Department of Justice, with certain leads and no direct information, and absolutely no evidence.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And is that not the evidence which he stated he had and which, if he had been permitted to reveal, would have averted the tragedy of Pearl Harbor?

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman, a member of the Dies committee.

Mr. MASON. Yes; and I am proud of that fact.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And my reference to the gentleman was simply to describe his position; that is all.

Mr. MASON. I want to say this: The information was made available to the Justice Department. That is the first point I want to make, and I want to make a second point, which is this: It was not only leads, but it was the facts that were made available.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then does the gentleman contend that the Attorney General is not telling the truth?

Mr. MASON. I contend that the Attorney General said——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The Attorney General asked for this evidence in a letter dated August 13; and the question is, Was this evidence ever turned over to the Attorney General? The facts speak for themselves. The facts reveal that the answer is, No; it was never turned over.

Mr. MASON. The facts are that the information, which consisted of leads and facts, were made available to the Justice Department through their agents on the west coast who were in contact with ours.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And again I say that as chairman of a committee whose agents, assuming it was the agents that had the evidence which had not as yet been submitted to Washington, it was the chairman's duty when the Attorney General specifically asked him for this information to have obtained that evidence from his employees and to have turned it over to the Department of Justice.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; and this is the last time I am going to yield for a while, because I want to go on to other matters.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Bearing on more less what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] just said, the gentleman from Texas stated on the floor of this House about 6 weeks ago that "We had all the facts."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order it is not proper to refer to remarks of a Member of the House previously made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair could not sustain that point of order.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. He said he had all the facts in the possession of the committee last summer, and that is what the gentleman from Illinois has brought out.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is also in Mr. DIES' speech of January 28.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. But the gentleman at the same time indicated at several different places in his speech that he had not been permitted to reveal those facts. It is the tenor of that statement that is included in the Attorney General's letter to me.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And, again, I say, and then I am going to leave this point, because I think it is adequately covered, the Attorney General asked for the information in a letter dated August 13, and that information was never turned over and that evidence was never turned over. That is the record, those are the facts, and let the House draw its own conclusion, and let the people of the country draw their own conclusion.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for an observation, I want to refer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] to the RECORD of Wednesday, page 1923, in which I said:

> In his report he [DIES] states firmly and clearly that the evidence has been turned over to the Justice Department for prosecution of the ring members. That statement is in error; is it not?
>
> Mr. DIES. I immediately denied that statement to the Attorney General.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think that covers it. So much for not permitting the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] to reveal information, the revealing of which would have prevented the tragedy at Pearl Harbor. I contend that the dereliction rests now on the doorstep of the Dies committee.

Let us now deal with the information. That information is contained in the Dies committee report issued a week ago today entitled "Appendix 6, Report on Japanese Activities." The most important information, the result of investigation by the committee, this report says, the most spectacular, the most interesting, are charges with regard to the plans of Japan against the United States.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I want to say that what is contained here against the Japanese, and what has been said against the Japanese is absolutely true. It is my conviction, however, that several portions or many pages of this report would indicate that the information revealed, that the words used, that the punctuation used, that the work for which the committee seeks credit, that the translation for which this committee seeks credit, are not the work, investigation, translation, words, or punctuation of the committee but the work, investigation, translation, words, and punctuation

of somebody else. I shall now prove that to my colleagues of the House. If gentlemen have a copy of the report before them, I now present the conclusive proof of my charge.

Take page 1737. I now read from the report:

Once hostilities begin our first move will be to attack the Panama Canal. * * *

I now read to you from a publication called News Letter, published by the News Research Service, Inc., 727 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif., dated July 16, 1941. I have read you the first sentence of the report. Please follow me closely. I now read from the News Letter published on July 16, 1941:

Once hostilities begin, our first move will be to attack the Panama Canal. * * *

I now read you the next sentence from the report:

We have submarines capable of traveling 10,000 miles without refueling. * * *

I now read you from the News Letter:

We have submarines capable of traveling 10,000 miles without refueling. * * *

I now read from the report:

The Midway Islands can be taken within one day. Then we must attack Hawaii. * * *

I now read from the News Letter:

The Midway Islands can be taken within one day. Then we must attack Hawaii. * * *

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will not yield until I get this proof in the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is not going to yield at all?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Let me complete my statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When the gentleman is making a statement of that kind——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does the gentleman want to stand back of me and check whether I am reading correctly?

Mr. HOFFMAN. What I want to say is, admitting all that——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield at this time.

To continue, I read from the report. This is without any quotes. The committee is now speaking:

These statements and many others of the same tenor appear in a book published in Tokyo in October, 1940, entitled "The Triple Alliance and the Japanese-American War".

I read now from the News Letter:

These statements and many others of the same tenor appear in a book published in Tokyo last October entitled "The Triple Alliance and the Japanese-American War."

Mr. MASON rose.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am sorry, Mr. MASON, but I cannot yield at this time. I hate to do that to the gentleman; he is such a fine person.

There is here one difference between the news letter and the report. After the words "Japanese-American War" in the news letter we find the words "illustration on this page," in parentheses. We have the illustration in the news letter. The words "illustration on this page" are left out in the report, evidently to conceal the identity of the source. Now, I continue:

In December 1940—

Says the report—the News Letter says last December—the News Letter is dated July 16, 1941.

Now, I go back to the report:

In December 1940 a retired Japanese naval captain Otojiro Endo, and a retired Japanese Army major, Masichi Sugihara, visited the Pacific Coast States in America and held secret meetings with leaders of Japanese-American citizens.

Now I go back to the News Letter:

Last December a retired Japanese naval captain, Otojiro Endo and a retired Japanese Army major, Masichi Sugihara, visited Pacific Coast States in America and held secret meetings with leaders of Japanese-American citizens.

The same punctuation, the same comma, the same letters, the same words.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not at this time.

Now I continue from the report. Remember this is the committee that is revealing all this to you. This is the committee that is giving this astounding information as to Japanese activities:

Purpose of the tour was to inspire courage among sabotage and espionage agents, and to recruit new men for the Japanese-American Trojan horse brigade.

I continue from the News Letter:

Purpose of the tour was to inspire courage among sabotage and espionage agents, and to recruit new men for the Japanese-American Trojan horse brigade.

The same comma and the same period in the report.

I continue from the report. The committee is again giving you Members of the House and the country the amazing and astounding report of its investigation of Japanese activities:

In their discussions, frequent use was made of the book, The Triple Alliance and the Japanese-American War.

Back to the News Letter:

In their discussions, frequent use was made of the book, "The Triple Alliance and the Japanese-American War."

I ask you to follow this, and follow closely. We go back to the report. I think this is very, very revealing:

A few copies of this volume were given out, only to the most trusted leaders.

We go back here to the News Letter:

A few copies of this volume were given out, only to the most trusted leaders.

Now, there is a difference, and I want to give credit to the committee for this difference. I want to be honest about it. Here is the difference. In this next sentence, now reading from the News Letter, it says:

NRS.—

Meaning News Research Service, Inc.—

succeeded in obtaining one of these.

The difference between the report and the News Letter is that the report says:

The committee succeeded in obtaining one of these.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I decline to yield.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I decline to yield. I must complete this evidence.

Now, I continue. As far as obtaining one of these books, there is a difference. The News Letter says:

NRS succeeded in obtaining one of these;

The committee says:

The committee succeeded in obtaining one of these.

Now the News Letter says:

A translation was made.

The committee translated it too. The committee says:

A translation was made,

The committee continues:

And even the most casual perusal suggests immediately.

This means the committee perused this book. "And even the most casual perusal suggests immediately that this is a textbook for Japanese espionage." This is the opinion of the committee.

Let us see what the News Letter says:

A translation was made, and even the most casual perusal suggests immediately that this is a well-camouflaged textbook for Japanese espionage.

The committee report does not contain the words "well camouflaged." With that difference, both are identical.

Now what does this mean? There is not a question of infringement of copyright. Some gentleman on the committee may say they were authorized by the author of this News Letter to use the material contained therein. I repeat, this is not a question of copyright violation. The point is that anybody could have used this. The News Letter is not copyrighted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, to make this statement: All of this farce is unnecessary, because——

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, just a minute. I ask that those words be taken down.

Mr. MASON. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. HOOK. I certainly do since this point of order was made against me once and insisted upon.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I have permission to revise and extend my remarks before they take me off the floor, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The country is going to be more interested in obtaining the truth because of all these efforts to suppress it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that certain members of the Dies committee want the gentleman from New York to proceed, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to state to the gentleman that it is a sad reflection on this House that a Member of this House can speak only if it is done with permission of members of the Dies committee. I say it is a reflection on the liberties, privileges, and rights of the membership of this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will kindly suspend. He has not been granted any additional time yet.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I gladly withdraw the word "farce" and substitute the word "spectacle" or "facetious," whichever the gentleman would prefer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the gentleman to withdraw the word "farce" is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to complete my statement before I am taken off my feet; that is, that the material that has been quoted from the report and from the News Letter is material that was obtained from the same source and authorized by the same person who gathered it but did not want to be quoted. The source for the News Letter was the same as the source for the reports; they are the same.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, let us get this unanimous consent request acted upon; then the gentleman may yield if he wants to. I insist on the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands the regular order. The regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that he may continue for 10 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Just for a moment; yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is any credit given in the report for copying from the News Letter?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. None whatsoever; none whatsoever.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell the House how much a copy of that News Letter costs?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You can get it for $5 a year; 10 cents a copy. The committee report is the report of a committee which has cost $385,000 to date, and now seeks some more.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; I want to answer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. He says this was from the same source; that they came from the same source. Even assuming that to be true—and we do not know it—is there any doubt in the mind of the gentleman from Illinois that the report used word for word, and copied—copied, I say—copied from the News Letter which could be obtained for 10 cents?

What is this report? What is this report supposed to be? What do you gentlemen of the committee hold out this report to Congress and to the country to be? You hold it out to be a report of the activities, a report of the investigation, a report of your activities, your investigation, Mr. Committee, your translations, Mr. Committee, your work, and we find that is what? Not your work, Mr. Committee, not your translations, not your investigations, Mr. Committee, not your words, but the words, the translation, and the work which was published in the News Letter of July 16, which could be purchased for 10 cents. As far as the author wanting to conceal his identity is concerned, the fact is that he did not conceal his identity, but, on the contrary, published the News Letter, offered to the public for sale for $5 a year or 10 cents a copy.

Furthermore, the question is one of lifting the words and substance from the News Letter and placing it into the report, thus reporting to the Congress and the country that the words, work, investigation, and translations of the News Letter are the words, work, investigation, and translations of the committee. Is there any doubt in anyone's mind that this was done?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman recall when three members of the administration in one week made the same speech word for word?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now, does the gentleman want me to believe, and does he want the Members to believe——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am asking the gentleman a question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am answering the question. I do not know anything about that. Does the gentleman with all of his shrewdness, his intelligence, and uncanny ability to dot an "i" and cross a "t" want us to believe that somebody else besides the person who wrote this News Letter sat down at a typewriter, looked in a crystal ball, and happened somehow or other or by some manner or method of mesmerism to type the same identical words and punctuation in the committee report?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. The gentleman knows more about the crystal ball and mesmerism than I do.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman reminds me of an old steamboat up in the East River that had a 2-inch boiler and a 6-inch whistle. Every time the whistle blew the boat stopped. Every time we mention the Dies committee the gentleman just stops.

I now give you more conclusive proof of lifting. I could go on and read, but I am going to extend my remarks, so I will include more samples of this lifting. I ask you to make your own comparisons. I think you all have a good idea already. I have pages and pages of this copying, the lifting of words, punctuation, and everything else, with the exception that in one instance the report takes one section of the News Letter, a matter with regard to a certain newspaper Rafu Shrinpo and instead of putting it in the order it appears in the News Letter, we find it in as a separate section of the report. In this attempt to conceal the identity of the source, the committee report contains a very significant error which establishes the copying and the lifting beyond any doubt. In the News Letter there is a statement "Illustration on this page" in parentheses. There is an illustration. In the report they copied the words "illustration on this page," but there is no illustration. They left out the illustration. What was omitted? What really was omitted, was not only the illustration. What the gentlemen who did the copying forgot to omit were the words "illustration on this page" in parentheses.

Here is another proof of lifting and copying. "See editor's note," appears in a section of the News Letter. In the report there is "See editor's note," but there is a difference. I want to give credit to the report for that. In the News Letter the word "editor" is abbreviated, "Ed." In the report it is spelled, "Editor."

Now, there is a serious phase to this you will see. I want to give the committee the benefit of all doubt on this question. As a Member of this House I do not seek to cast any aspersion or raise any issue as to the integrity of any Member or any committee of this House. I am the last one who is in position to do that. I am a minority, all by myself down here. But I say there is a very serious phase to this matter.

Assuming that the author of this News Letter went to the committee and said, "Here, use this stuff," all that this would absolve the committee from is violation of the copyright. However, this report purports to be a report of the work, the activities of this committee and of its investigation, since a perusal and comparison of both the News Letter and the report, demonstrates beyond any reasonable doubt that sections of the report are copied word for word from the News Letter. I say there has been an imposition on the country and on the Members of this House when the committee reports the words in the News Letter, the work contained in the News Letter, the investigation and the translation contained in the News Letter, as though it were the work, the translation, and the investigation of the committee itself.

Mr. Speaker, this report was printed on the front pages of the leading newspapers of the country. These are not the only examples of lifting. There are others and I am going to reveal them in due time before a vote is taken on this committee. I submit that what I have revealed today is more than enough to warrant an investigation of this report.

If this report is not what it purports to be, if this report is not a report of the work, investigation, and translations of this committee, if time and time again

the words and the punctuations of this report are not the words and the punctuations of this committee, then I say the integrity of the House is involved. It is a question involving the integrity of the House of Representatives. We are all on charge before the people of this country. It is a question involving the confidence of the people of America in their House of Representatives and the committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Let us get down to the facts. I say it is the duty of the Rules Committee, to which my resolution, introduced yesterday, calling for an investigation of this report, was sent, to give me a hearing.

Let us have an investigation. From what other source was the information lifted for this report, words lifted, report of activities and investigations lifted? Where else? Let us have the truth. Let us have it before the Congress before we vote on this committee.

With these charges I have made, which I have proven, with the doubts that I have raised as to the other material contained in this report, this House cannot in all propriety, in all fairness, pass on the question of whether or not the Dies committee shall be continued until we first investigate and inquire into the entire report. My charges are true, and I say that the very privileges of the House are involved, the integrity of the House is placed in issue, and the integrity of the committee is placed in issue. Let us investigate and let us have the whole truth before we vote on this committee.

Mr. PATRICK. Does the gentleman specify a committee to investigate the Dies committee?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The Rules Committee may do it. My resolution provides for an investigation of this report, a committee to be appointed by the Speaker. It was referred to the Rules Committee.

The American people expect an investigation of this report before we decide to continue this committee.

I submit the following samples of lifting and copying.

NEWS LETTER

(Published by News Research Service, Inc., 727 W. Seventh Street, Los Angeles, California, Vol. 6, No. 154, July 9, 1941)

AMERICANISM—AS TAUGHT IN JAPANESE-AMERICAN SCHOOLS

Teachings, perpetrated in the name of "Americanism", are various and sundry—but too many of them are of malicious nature, designed deliberately to undermine American unity. "Japanese Schools in West to Stress Americanism"—thus read the caption of a story, dispatched from Los Angeles, printed in a recent issue of "The Japanese American Review" (illustration on this page). Other articles in the paper were laudatory of all efforts of the totalitarian powers and of men like Ralph E. Townsend, exposed in News Letter #109, author of many pro-Axis books. Investigation by NRS of the "Americanism", allegedly "stressed in Japanese schools in the West", revealed the exact opposite to be the case.

Painstaking examination of the facts revealed that there are 248 Japanese language schools in California, with 454 teachers and 19,310 pupils. It is estimated that there are approximately 90,000 Nisei—American citizens of Japanese ancestry—on the west coast, two-thirds of whom possess dual citizenship, according to qualified observers.

"TO THE LEFT WE HAVE * * *"

Investigation disclosed the amazing fact that two sets of textbooks exist for the schools. One set, usually shown to curious Occidentals, contains no objectionable text whatsoever. It was approved several years ago by the Department for Public Instruction. However, practically every page of the other set preaches loyalty to Japan and treason against the American government. NRS tried for a long time to obtain both sets (illustration on page 2), and finally succeeded. Reproduced on page 3 is a facsimile of receipt issued by the Gosha-Do Company, 1698 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif., for a complete set of those textbooks which are available only to "trusted" Japanese.

Random excerpts from textbooks which are for the exclusive use of Japanese, are unmistakable in purpose as they are flowery in wordage. National language and patriotism are stressed almost to the point of exaggeration:

Reader IV, Junior High School, Lesson #30

"In the unification of the Japanese people who possess the proud and noble Yamato spirit, the genuine Japanese language has always been the most important instrument. The Japanese language is the spiritual blood that circulates in all Japanese. Through it, they are unified.

"This bond is so strong that it perpetuates an unbreakable chain. If a great crisis should arise in the nation, the people would gladly combine their energy for the country's best, despite hardship and even death. And, if there is good news for us, the Japanese people from the south and the north will sing the national anthem, 'Kimigayowa,' and bless the nation for its fortune.

"The Japanese language is like a lovely mother to all our people. From our birth, this mother has held us on her lap and taught us nationalism and appreciation of country. Passionate love of this mother is like the sun in the sky. As citizens of this country (Japan) and offsprings of this (Japanese) nation, we admire its brilliance.

"Our national language cannot be forgotten in our hearts, not even for a single day, especially if we remember that we are children of gods.

"The objective of Japanese education, no matter in what country it may be, is to teach the people never to be ashamed of their Japanese citizenship. First comes language, and then history. We must never forget—not even for a moment—that we are Japanese citizens."

Loyalty to the Emperor is, indeed, next to Godliness, if not Godliness itself, according to the teachings of the textbooks:

Reader V, 5 Grade, Lesson # 1

"Our heavenly ruler has governed our empire for ages past and we are his subjects. The Emperor's great predecessor, the Sun Goddess, in ancient times went to her descendant Ninigi No Mikoto and issued a divine command, telling him to go forth and found an empire upon the islands of Japan. * * * The Imperial House is the center of our country and our nation. * * * With unified hearts let us pursue the path of loyalty and patriotism. There is no other country with such a royal lineage. Be thankful you are a Japanese, and worship the Imperial family."

To become a good Japanese, it seems, one must set Japan and its rulers above all else in the world.

Reader V, 5th grade, lesson # 27

"Our great Japanese Empire has been ruled for thousands of years by our Heavenly Prince. Being his subjects, we all most continue steadfastly on the road of our predecessors. No other country in the world can compare with ours. It is our duty to carry on the great spirit of loyalty to the Emperor and the Empress, and to achieve their aims. We must also try to understand the government of our nation and the problems confronting it. We must really try our utmost in this, at all times, for it is our duty and our job. We must do it with a big heart. We must love our country and our Emperor. We must strengthen our body. We must study everything and be diligent. We must never forget what we learn. If we do all this, we will become good Japanese."

The eighth-grade pupils are given to understand that although Hawaii belongs to the United States in body, the spirit and living habits are Japanese:

Reader VIII, 8th grade, lesson # 21

"Hawaii is known as a possession of the United States of America, but here the Japanese language is spoken just as you hear it in Yokohama. Besides this, you see that about half of the entire crowd, welcoming you, are Japanese. Also, you see among them many women in the Japanese kimono and with the obi tied around their waists.

"In the hotel, after you take a Japanese bath and get dressed, you can hardly believe you are in a foreign country. Of Hawaii's 380,000 population, 150,000 are Japanese. They are engaged in farming, fishing, commerce, and all sorts of business ventures. Hawaii's development to its present stage is due to the Japanese. The fish this hotel serves is caught by Japanese fishermen. . Coffee, sugar, pineapple and all other fruits are produced by the hands of the Japanese."

The power of the Japanese language is stressed as extending in its far-reaching importance even to North and South America:

Reader IX, 9th Grade, Lesson # 28

"The Japanese residing in the United States of America and Brazil have established Japanese-language schools to teach their children the Japanese language.

"Under a God-Emperor of unbroken lineage, our nation became matchless in the world, and it continues to move forward. * * * The Japanese language is a ring of wedlock between the feelings and spirits of our forefathers and ourselves, thus tying us together, today, as one community of citizens. Had it not been for our Japanese language, our ideals would by now have been scattered from place to place. Thus, as we march forward in the time of national difficulty, we shout "banzai" to cheer our emperor, proud of our Japanese language and heritage. * * * And so the Japanese language holds together all its citizens, no matter where they may reside.

"Those who forget the Japanese language are no longer Japanese. Respect the Japanese language. Love the Japanese language. The national language is the place where the spirits of citizens reside."

Post-graduate course

Once the Japanese-American leaves the Japanese language school, contact with him is maintained through an unending flow of pro-Japanese and anti-American literature, and through lectures from Nipponese government officials who travel in this country as private citizens. Typical of the many books placed at the disposal of Japanese-Americans is "The Future Road of the Nisei" (illustration on this page); edited by Tsunegoro Horota, endorsed by General Sugiyama, Chief of Staff, Japanese Army: and by Takashi Zuzuki, Director of Kimon Gakuin, leading Japanese language school of San Francisco. On pages 155 to 157, under the caption "Activities of Nisei for Japan," appears:

"According to recent reports, several hundred lectures have been delivered on the China incident by Nisei in America. Many

Nisei also returned to Japan with a mass of material, collected in California.

"Things of this sort are typical of the work performed in the past by the Nisei for Japan What they gain and what they do is by no means unimportant. The Nisei have made significant contributions to Japan, but in many cases these facts must remain hidden. For example, when the Seventh International Education Conference was held in Tokyo, the Nisei proved themselves most valuable in many respects.

"When the China incident occurred, it became necessary to broadcast to the world the true news in the English language. At this most crucial moment, the Nisei did the work by assuming responsibility as is befitting great patriots.

"In connection with the rapid growth of cultural societies in recent years, the Nisei have played an important part through their work as translators, lecturers, travelers, etc. The role of the Nisei, at the present moment, is of utmost importance, for it is up to him to introduce Japanese culture and Japanese propaganda abroad. Nisei always take the leadership. In the world where English language newspapers and magazines are most influential, the Nisei are in an excellent position to do their share. We have seen to it that they shall be well prepared for their task.

The Nisei spirit is fostered in Los Angeles by the Rafu Shimpo, a weekly newspaper also known as the "Los Angeles Japanese Daily News". This paper, printed in English and in Japanese, has a dual policy, similar in nature to that of the two different sets of textbooks. The English section reeks of patriotic sweetness, while the Japanese section shows the true spirit of the paper Typical is the following article, printed in Japanese, captioned "Nisei Oversea Division":

"We must help our oversea brethren to accomplish the aim of the Fatherland, the establishment of a Greater Asia. In the creation of an enlightened Asia, every Japanese, all over the world, must become a unit of one in the march forward.

"Education of the Nisei, obviously enough, cannot be neglected. Therefore, the Imperial Education Association has appropriated 100,000 Yen for the purpose of positive Nisei education all over the world, beginning this year.

"In cooperation with the Ministry of Education, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and the Greater Asia Assisting Office, a committee has been formed whose program will be (1) to make a careful study of the present status of Nisei education and of the teaching staff abroad; (2) to build a firmer foundation for Nisei education; and (3) to send the most competent teaching staffs to all parts of the world.

"Many presently engaged in Nisei education abroad, desire to return home. At the same time, a large number of teachers at home are anxious to go abroad. Well planned handling of this situation will be most advantageous. Everyone is anxiously awaiting the changes which have been announced."

NEWS LETTER

(Published by News Research Service, Inc., 727 W. Seventh Street, Los Angeles, California, Vol. 6, No. 155, July 16, 1941)

SPY MANUAL FOR JAPANESE-AMERICAN QUISLINGS

"Once hostilities begin, our first move will be an attack upon the Panama Canal. * * * We have submarines capable of traveling 10,000 miles without refueling. * * * The Midway Islands can be taken within 1 day; then we must attack Hawaii. * * *" These statements and many others of the same tenor appear in a book published in Tokyo last October entitled "The Triple Alliance and the Japanese-American War" (illustration on this page), by Kinoaki Matsuo.

Last December, a retired Japanese naval captain, Otojiro Endo, and a retired Japanese Army major, Masichi Sugihara, visited Pacific Coast States in America and held secret meetings with leaders of Japanese-American citizens. Purpose of the tour was to inspire courage among sabotage and espionage agents, and to recruit new men for the Japanese-American Trojan-horse brigade. In their discussions frequent use was made of the book, "The Triple Alliance and the Japanese-American War." A few copies of this volume were given out, only to the most trusted leaders. News Research Service succeeded in obtaining one of these; a translation was made, and even the most casual perusal suggests immediately that this is a well-camouflaged textbook for Japanese espionage.

The table of contents in itself is most revealing. Following are the translated chapter headings and sub-titles, as they appear in the table of contents:

I. Crucial Moment for Japan and America.
  (1) The China Incident and the United States
  (2) Pacific War—A Hard Struggle.
  (3) The Second World War and the United States.
  (4) The United States and Canada.
II. Expansion of the American Fleet.
  (1) Illusioned America.
  (2) Battleships in Construction.
III. History of the Japanese-American Struggle.
  (1) The First Anti-Japanese Question.
  (2) U. S., Japanese and Manchurian Conflict.
  (3) Imperialistic Foreign Diplomacy of U. S.
  (4) Long-delayed Destruction of London Conference.
IV. United States-Japan War Inevitable.
  (1) United States-Japan Friendship a Delusion.
  (2) Pacifists and the Fear of the American Question.
  (3) United States-Japan War Costs.
V United States Naval Strength.
  (1) U. S. Capital Ships.
  (2) U. S. Cruisers.
  (3) U. S. Destroyers.
  (4) U. S. Aircraft Carriers.
  (5) U. S. Submarines.
  (6) U. S. Naval Bases.
  (7) U. S. Present Military Strength.
  (8) U. S. Naval Developments.
VI. New U. S. Weapons and Mechanized Units.
  (1) New U. S. Weapons.
  (2) Fear of Chemical Warfare.
VII The Great Air Force of the United States.
  (1) Brief Sketch of U. S Air Force.
  (2) Present U S. Air Force.
VIII. War Plans of the United States.
  (1) U. S. Plans for Attack.
  (2) U. S. Plans Attack on Western Pacific.
IX. Immediate War vs. Prolonged War.
  (1) Immediate American War Decision.
  (2) Immediate Japanese War Decision.
X. Time of Conflict.
  (1) Lightning Military Movements.
XI. Japan's Attack on the Philippine Islands.
  (1) The Philippine and Asiatic Fleet.
  (2) Occupation of Guam by the Japanese Fleet.
XII. The Fall of Manila.
  (1) Japan's Flag Hoisted in the Philippine Islands.
XIII. Fear of Destruction of Foreign Trade.
  (1) Japan Plans Foreign Trade Destruction.
XIV. Singapore and Hong Kong.
  (1) Problem of Singapore Army Base.
  (2) What Becomes of Hong Kong?
XV. The United States Fleet in Hawaii.
  (1) Pacific Battle Force and Military Strength.
  (2) Entire Fleet Concentrates at Pearl Harbor.
XVI. Japan's Surprise Fleet.
  (1) United States Plans for Crossing the Ocean.
  (2) Activities of the Surprise Fleet.
XVII. American Naval Expedition to Japan.
  (1) Japanese Expedition.
  (2) Destruction of U. S. Fleet.
  (3) Movement of Japan's Fleet.
XVIII. United States Air Force Attacks Japan.
  (1) U. S. Bombing of Japanese Cities.
  (2) Defense Against Air Attack.
XIX. U. S.-Japanese Great Battle in the Pacific.
  (1) Attacks of U. S. Capital Ships.
  (2) Withdrawal of U. S. Fleet.
XX. Occupation of Hawaii and Closing of Panama Canal.
  (1) Japanese Occupation of Hawaii.
  (2) Japanese Closing of Panama Canal.
XXI. Japan-Germany-Italy Alliance and the United States.
  (1) Establishment of the Triple Alliance.
  (2) The Meaning of the Alliance.

"THE JAPANESE SURPRISE FLEET"

Under that subtitle, the author of the book reveals Japan's plans to employ long-range submarines on the American side of the Pacific, and to take and use the Midway Islands as a submarine base:

Chapter 17, Page 279

"In the future, our submarines must be able to operate alone in the West Pacific; their ability to attack and to make long journeys is vitally important. Submarines which can travel 10,000 miles could easily cross the Pacific. There are very small type subs which could accomplish a lot on the American side of the Pacific.

"Our navy will quickly occupy the Midway Islands, and a submarine base will be established at once. It is only 1,160 miles to Hawaii, a very convenient distance for our surprise fleet. To this surprise fleet belong * * * mine layers of type * * * model 21. This type is capable of carrying a heavy load of mines for distribution in American sea routes of merchantmen and battleships. We can then strike the enemy fleet at a most opportune time and cut off communication lines as well as merchantmen. (Editor's Note: The number and type of mine layers are not given in the original text.)"

In discussing "Japanese Occupation of Hawaii," the book optimistically foresees that a Japanese naval victory would be sufficient incentive for the Japanese in Hawaii to immediately organize a volunteer army:

Chapter 21, Pages 322–324

"In the Japanese occupation of Hawaii, cooperation between army and navy is most important. The Midway Islands must be taken before we attack Hawaii, for they would give us a good foothold. It will be very easy to take Midway Islands, which are practically defenseless; in fact, it would require only about one day's bombardment to take them.

"In Hawaii, there are about 150,000 Japanese one-half of whom are 'Nisei' (Japanese descendants of foreign citizenship). Once the news of Japanese naval victories reaches Hawaii, the Japanese there will quickly organize a volunteer army. There is no doubt but that Hawaii will come into our hands."

Of course, the Japanese strategists have devoted much thought to the Panama Canal. Under the sub-title "Closing the Panama Canal," one reads:

Chapter 21, Pages 330–332

"The remaining question is: What will become of the Panama Canal? Panama is a little over 4,600 knots from Hawaii and about 8,000 knots from Japan, so an attack is not an easy matter and will require a considerable navy force. If, at the outbreak of war, we proceed immediately to attack and close the Canal, we could cut off the Atlantic

from the Pacific. It would prove an invaluable asset to our war strategy."

"If the Panama Canal falls into Japanese possession and there is another Japan-America war, the United States will certainly strike at Panama; however, while Japan controls this area, the American Fleet will be divided—one part in the Pacific, the other in the Atlantic—and the two fleets cannot combine. American imperialism depends upon the strength of her Navy, for without it her imperialistic ambitions cannot be realized. Once we control the Canal, we can enforce peace. Besides this, it will bring to an end American threats against Mexico and all other small nations in Central and South America.

"Japanese possession of the Panama Canal has a direct bearing upon future peace; therefore, by all means, Japan must take the Canal and keep it even after the war. However, inasmuch as Panama is fortified, it will not be easy to take."

The "Meaning of Triple Alliance" carried a subtle threat as to what America may expect as the result of a united attack from Japan, Germany, and Italy:

Chapter 22, Pages 350–351

"The purpose of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo alliance is to secure the best possible cooperation in dealing with all kinds of military, political, and economic problems, and to assist one another in the strongest sense of the word. Should America become involved in the war, she would be subjected to a gigantic united attack by Japan, Germany, and Italy.

"Only the flag of the sun, which symbolizes our nation, would fly over the Pacific. On the Atlantic, the swastika, which also symbolizes the sun and life, will be active with might. In addition, the meaningful flag of Italy would flash. In the face of all this, if America comes against Japan and tries to block her, it would be no more than a pin prick."

THE VOICE OF RAFU SHIMPO

Rafu Shimpo, the bi-lingual "Los Angeles Japanese Daily News", carries many articles in the Japanese language, designed specifically to encourage Nipponese faith in the might of the Mikado's Empire. Said Rafu Shimpo recently, under the caption: "Two-Ocean Navy and Pacific":

"Battleships of more than 35,000 tons cannot pass through the Panama Canal. Only ships whose width is 106 feet or less can pass through it. Four ships of *Iowa* class, built in 1940, were of 45,000 tons each. Ten battleships now under construction are too large. * * * Therefore, the two-ocean navy really is a one-ocean navy.

"President Roosevelt is very much concerned as to how America can match German armaments which have been prepared for seven years. America might launch a battle against us, with 15 capital ships, 6 aircraft carriers, 18 heavy cruisers, 17 light cruisers, 80 destroyers, 45 submarines, comprising a first line navy. But it would be very dangerous to attack Japan several thousand miles away * * * for it would be fatal for the American navy to fight so far from its base.

"If capital ships constitute power, look at what Germany does before our very eyes! It is so clear that there is no need for further explanation. Japan will not sit idle while America prepares."

While the Japanese government exploits the racial ties to foster loyalty to the home-country among Japanese-Americans, gullibles in the United States are worked upon with propaganda brochures prepared in scholarly style. The latest such literature, received gratis from Tokyo, is a volume entitled "Introductory Studies on the Sino-Japanese Conflict" (illustration on this page), by Kiyoshi Miki and Karoku Hosokawa, published by the Japanese Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations. This Institute has achieved a position of great prestige in American and British diplomatic, academic and industrial circles.

The well-indexed book, over 100 pages long, presents the Japanese version of imperialist expansion in China on the part of the European powers and the United Stats. Throughout the book, the reader is led to believe that the authors were prompted only by a feeling of compassion for "poor, abused China." In the first pages, the authors tread lightly, but in conclusion, they assert, under the subtitle "The 'Open Door' vs. Japan's Continental Policy":

"The clash between the ambitions of Western powers and Japanese continental policy, both of which are seeking to advance in China, would seem to be inevitable unless one is forced to submit to the superior power of the other, as long as the semi-colonial China continues to exist as in the past, or as long as the present world order prevails."

Note the clever strategy of the authors in placing alleged "ambitions of Western powers" in juxtaposition with the "Japanese continental policy," as if it were the Western powers and not Japan whose ambition is responsible for the Chinese-Japanese war. The authors continue:

"The present Sino-Japanese incident, with utmost insistence, demands a solution to the question of creating a new and true world order, and of making a clean sweep of the semi-colonial condition of China."

To reach her goal, as detailed in last week's NRS release, Japan relies not only on her military arms and her Axis allies, but also upon Japanese-American Quislings who will gladly volunteer.

Thus, Japan falls into line with the Axis cry for a new order; thus, Japan prepares for the day when—so bluntly stated in "The Triple Alliance and the Japanese-American War"—only the flag of the Rising Sun will wave over the Pacific, and the swastika, which also symbolizes the sun, will rule the Atlantic.

[From the Report of the Dies Committee on Japanese Activities, page 1737 ff]

"Once hostilities begin, our first move will be an attack upon the Panama Canal. * * * We have submarines capable of traveling 10,000 miles without refueling. * * * The Midway Islands can be taken within 1 day; then we must attack Hawaii. * * *" These statements and many others of the same tenor appear in a book published in Tokyo in October 1940 entitled "The Triple Alliance and the Japanese-American War," by Kinoaki Matsuo.

In December 1940, a retired Japanese naval captain, Otojiro Endo, and a retired Japanese Army major, Masichi Sugihara, visited Pacific Coast States in America and held secret meetings with leaders of Japanese-American citizens. Purpose of the tour was to inspire courage among sabotage and espionage agents, and to recruit new men for the Japanese-American Trojan horse brigade. In their discussions, frequent use was made of the book, The Triple Alliance and the Japanese-American War. A few copies of this volume were given out, only to the most trusted leaders. The committee succeeded in obtaining one of these; a translation was made, and even the most casual perusal suggests immediately that this is a textbook for Japanese espionage.

The table of contents in itself is most revealing. Following are the translated chapter headings and subtitles, as they appear in the table of contents:

I. Crucial moment for Japan and America:
  (1) The China incident and the United States.
  (2) Pacific War—A hard struggle.
  (3) The Second World War and the United States.
  (4) The United States and Canada.
II. Expansion of the American Fleet:
  (1) Illusioned America.
  (2) Battleships in construction.
III. History of the Japanese-American struggle.
  (1) The first anti-Japanese question.
  (2) United States, Japanese, and Manchurian conflict.
  (3) Imperialistic foreign diplomacy of United States.
  (4) Long-delayed destruction of London Conference.
IV. United States-Japan War inevitable:
  (1) United States-Japan friendship a delusion.
  (2) Pacifists and the fear of the American question.
  (3) United States-Japan War costs.
V. United States naval strength:
  (1) United States capital ships.
  (2) United States cruisers.
  (3) United States destroyers.
  (4) United States aircraft carriers.
  (5) United States submarines.
  (6) United States naval bases.
  (7) United States present military strength.
  (8) United States naval developments.
VI. New United States weapons and mechanized units:
  (1) New United States weapons.
  (2) Fear of chemical warfare.
VII. The great air force of the United States:
  (1) Brief sketch of United States Air Force.
  (2) Present United States Air Force.
VIII. War plans of the United States:
  (1) United States plans for attack.
  (2) United States plans attack on western Pacific.
IX. Immediate war versus prolonged war:
  (1) Immediate American war decision.
  (2) Immediate Japanese war decision.
X. Time of conflict:
  (1) Lightning military movements.
XI Japan's attack on the Philippine Islands:
  (1) The Philippine and Asiatic Fleet.
  (2) Occupation of Guam by the Japanese Fleet.
XII. The fall of Manila:
  (1) Japan's flag hoisted in the Philippine Islands.
XIII. Fear of destruction of foreign trade:
  (1) Japan plans foreign trade destruction.
XIV. Singapore and Hong Kong:
  (1) Problem of Singapore Army base.
  (2) What becomes of Hong Kong?
XV. The United States Fleet in Hawaii:
  (1) Pacific battle force and military strength.
  (2) Entire fleet concentrates at Pearl Harbor.
XVI. Japan's surprise fleet:
  (1) United States plans for crossing the ocean.
  (2) Activities of the surprise fleet.
XVII. American naval expedition to Japan.
  (1) Japanese expedition.
  (2) Destruction of United States Fleet.
  (3) Movement of Japan's fleet.
XVIII. United States Air Force attacks Japan:
  (1) United States bombing of Japanese cities.
  (2) Defense against air attack.
XIX. United States-Japanese great battle in the Pacific:
  (1) Attacks of United States capital ships.
  (2) Withdrawal of United States Fleet.
XX. Occupation of Hawaii and closing of Panama Canal:
  (1) Japanese occupation of Hawaii.
  (2) Japanese closing of Panama Canal.
XXI. Japan-Germany-Italy alliance and the United States:
  (1) Establishment of the triple alliance.
  (2) The meaning of the alliance.

THE JAPANESE SURPRISE FLEET

Under that subtitle the author of the book revealed Japan's plans to employ long-range submarines on the American side of the Pacific and to take and use the Midway Islands as a submarine base:

"Chapter 17, page 279: In the future our submarines must be able to operate alone in the west Pacific; their ability to attack and to make long journeys is vitally important. Submarines which can travel 10,000 miles could easily cross the Pacific. There are very small-type subs which could accomplish a lot on the American side of the Pacific.

"Our navy will quickly occupy the Midway Islands, and a submarine base will be established at once. It is only 1160 miles to Hawaii, a very convenient distance for our surprise fleet. To this surprise fleet belong * * * mine layers of type * * * model 21. This type is capable of carrying a heavy load of mines for distribution in American sea routes of merchantmen and battleships. We can then strike the enemy fleet at a most opportune time and cut off communication lines as well as merchantmen. [Editor's note: The number and type of mine layers are not given in the original text.]

In discussing "Japanese Occupation of Hawaii," the book predicted that a Japanese naval victory would be sufficient incentive for the Japanese in Hawaii to immediately organize a volunteer army:

"Chapter 21, pages 322-324: In the Japanese occupation of Hawaii, cooperation between army and navy is most important. The Midway Islands must be taken before we attack Hawaii, for they would give us a good foothold. It will be very easy to take Midway Islands, which are practically defenseless; in fact, it would require only about 1 day's bombardment to take them"

"In Hawaii there are about 150,000 Japanese, one-half of whom are Nisei (Japanese descendants of foreign citizenship). Once the news of Japanese naval victories reaches Hawaii the Japanese there will quickly organize a volunteer army. There is no doubt but that Hawaii will come into our hands."

Of course, the Japanese strategists devoted much thought to the Panama Canal. Under the subtitle, "Closing the Panama Canal," they said:

"Chapter 21, pages 330-332: The remaining question is, What will become of the Panama Canal? Panama is a little over 4,600 knots from Hawaii and about 8,000 knots from Japan, so an attack is not an easy matter, and will require a considerable navy force. If, at the outbreak of war, we proceed immediately to attack and close the Canal, we could cut off the Atlantic from the Pacific. It would prove an invaluable asset to our war strategy.

"If the Panama Canal falls into Japanese possession and there is another Japan-America war, the United States will certainly strike at Panama. However, while Japan controls this area, the American Fleet will be divided—one part in the Pacific, the other in the Atlantic—and the two fleets cannot combine. American imperialism depends upon the strength of her Navy, for without it her imperialistic ambitions cannot be realized. Once we control the Canal we can enforce peace. Besides this, it will bring to an end American threats against Mexico and all other small nations in Central and South America.

"Japanese possession of the Panama Canal has a direct bearing upon future peace; therefore, by all means, Japan must take the Canal and keep it even after the war. However, inasmuch as Panama is fortified, it will not be easy to take."

The "Meaning of Triple Alliance" carried a threat as to what America might expect as the result of a united attack from Japan, Germany, and Italy:

"Chapter 22, pages 350-351: The purpose of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo alliance is to secure the best possible cooperation in dealing with all kinds of military, political, and economic problems, and to assist one another in the strongest sense of the word. Should America become involved in the war, she would be subjected to a gigantic united attack by Japan, Germany, and Italy.

"Only the flag of the sun, which symbolizes our nation, would fly over the Pacific. On the Atlantic, the swastika, which also symbolizes the sun and life, will be active with might. In addition, the meaningful flag of Italy would flash. In the face of all this, if America comes against Japan and tries to block her, it would be no more than a pin prick."

[From the Report of the Dies Committee on Japanese Activities, page 1886 ff]

* * * Investigation has revealed that in December 1941 there were 248 Japanese language schools, with 454 teachers and 19,310 pupils. * * *

Investigation disclosed the amazing fact that two sets of textbooks exist for the Japanese language schools. One set, usually shown to curious occidentals, contains no objectionable text whatsoever. It was approved several years ago by the Department for Public Instruction. However, practically every page of the other set preaches loyalty to Japan and treason against the American Government.

Excerpts from textbooks which are for the exclusive use of Japanese are unmistakable in purpose. National language and patriotism are stressed to the point of exaggeration.

Concerning the Japanese language, one of these textbooks says:

"In the unification of the Japanese people who possess the proud and noble Yamato spirit, the genuine Japanese language has always been the most important instrument. The Japanese language is the spiritual blood that circulates in all Japanese. Through it, they are unified.

"This bond is so strong that it perpetuates an unbreakable chain. If a great crisis should arise in the nation, the people would gladly combine their energy for the country's best, despite hardship and even death. And, if there is good news for us, the Japanese people from the south and the north will sing the national anthem, 'Kimigayowa,' and bless the nation for its fortune.

"The Japanese language is like a lovely mother to all our people. From our birth, this mother has held us on her lap and taught us nationalism and appreciation of country. Passionate love of this mother is like the sun in the sky."

"As citizens of this country (Japan) and offsprings of this (Japanese) nation, we admire its brilliance.

"Our national language cannot be forgotten in our hearts, not even for a single day, especially if we remember that we are children of gods.

"The objective of Japanese education, no matter in what country it may be, is to teach the people never to be ashamed of their Japanese citizenship. First comes language, and then history. We must never forget—not even for a moment—that we are Japanese citizens."

Loyalty to the Emperor is absolutely paramount according to the teachings of the textbooks:

"Our heavenly ruler has governed our Empire for ages past and we are his subjects. The Emperor's great predecessor, the Sun Goddess, in ancient times went to her descendant Ninigi No Mikoto and issued a divine command, telling him to go forth and found an empire upon the islands of Japan. * * * The Imperial House is the center of our country and our nation * * * With unified hearts let us pursue the path of loyalty and patriotism. There is no other country with such a royal lineage. Be thankful you are a Japanese, and worship the Imperial family.

"Our great Japanese Empire has been ruled for thousands of years by our Heavenly Prince. Being his subjects, we all must continue steadfastly on the road of our predecessors.

"No other country in the world can compare with ours. It is our duty to carry on the great spirit of loyalty to the Emperor and the Empress, and to achieve their aims. We must also try to understand the government of our nation and the problems confronting it. We must really try our utmost in this, at all times, for it is our duty and our job. We must do it with a big heart. We must love our country and our Emperor. We must strengthen our body. We must study everything and be diligent. We must never forget what we learn. If we do all this, we will become good Japanese."

The eighth-grade pupils are given to understand that although Hawaii belongs to the United States in body, the spirit and living habits are Japanese:

Hawaii is known as a possession of the United States of America, but here the Japanese language is spoken just as you hear it in Yokohama. Besides this, you see that about half of the entire crowd, welcoming you, are Japanese. Also, you see among them many women in the Japanese kimono and with the obi tied around their waists.

In the hotel, after you take a Japanese bath and get dressed, you can hardly believe you are in a foreign country. Of Hawaii's 380,000 population, 150,000 are Japanese. They are engaged in farming, fishing, commerce, and all sorts of business ventures. Hawaii's development to its present stage is due to the Japanese. The fish this hotel serves is caught by Japanese fishermen. * * * Coffee, sugar, pineapple, and all other fruits are produced by the hands of Japanese."

The power of the Japanese language is stressed as extending in its far-reaching importance even to North and South America:

"The Japanese residing in the United States of America and Brazil have established Japanese language schools to teach their children the Japanese language.

"Under a God-Emperor of unbroken lineage, our nation became matchless in the world, and it continues to move forward. * * * The Japanese language is a ring of wedlock between the feelings and spirits of our forefathers and ourselves, thus tying us together, today, as one community of citizens. Had it not been for our Japanese language, our ideals would by now have been scattered from place to place. Thus, as we march forward in the time of national difficulty, we shout 'banzai' to cheer our Emperor, proud of our Japanese language and heritage. * * * And so the Japanese language holds together all its citizens, no matter where they may reside.

"Those who forget the Japanese language are no longer Japanese. Respect the Japanese language. Love the Japanese language. The national language is the place where the spirits of citizens reside."

POSTGRADUATE COURSE

Once the Japanese-American leaves the Japanese-language school, contact with him is maintained through an unending flow of pro-Japanese and anti-American literature, and through lectures from Nipponese government officials who travel in this country as private citizens. Typical of the many books placed at the disposal of Japanese-Americans is The Future Road of the Nisei, edited by Tsunegoro Horota, endorsed by General Sugiyama, Chief of Staff, Japanese Army; and by Takashi Zuzuki, director of Kinmon Gakuin, leading Japanese-language school of San Francisco. On pages 155 to 157, under the caption "Activities of Nisei for Japan," appears:

"According to recent reports, several hundred lectures have been delivered on the China incident by Nisei in America. Many

Nisei also returned to Japan with a mass of material, collected in California.

"Things of this sort are typical of the work performed in the past by the Nisei for Japan. What they gain and what they do is by no means unimportant. The Nisei have made significant contributions to Japan, but in many cases these facts must remain hidden. For example, when the Seventh International Education Conference was held in Tokyo, the Nisei proved themselves most valuable in many respects.

"When the China incident occurred, it became necessary to broadcast to the world the true news in the English language. At this most crucial moment, the Nisei did the work by assuming responsibility as is befitting great patriots.

"In connection with the rapid growth of cultural societies in recent years, the Nisei have played an important part through their work as translators, lecturers, travelers, etc. The role of the Nisei, at the present moment, is of utmost importance, for it is up to him to introduce Japanese culture and Japanese propaganda abroad. Nisei always take the leadership. In the world where English-language newspapers and magazines are most influential, the Nisei are in an excellent position to do their share. We have seen to it that they shall be well prepared for their task."

The Nisei spirit is fostered in Los Angeles by the Rafu Shimpo, a weekly newspaper also known as the Los Angeles Japanese Daily News. This paper, printed in English and in Japanese, has a dual policy, similar in nature to that of the two different sets of textbooks. The English section reeks of patriotic sweetness, while the Japanese section shows the true spirit of the paper. Typical is the following article, printed in Japanese, captioned "Nisei Oversea Division":

"We must help our oversea brethren to accomplish the aim of the Fatherland, the establishment of a Greater Asia. In the creation of an enlightened Asia, every Japanese, all over the world, must become a unit of one in the march forward.

"Education of the Nisei, obviously enough, cannot be neglected. Therefore, the Imperial Education Association has appropriated 100,000 yen for the purpose of positive Nisei education all over the world, beginning this year.

"In cooperation with the Ministry of Education, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and the Greater Asia Assisting Office, a committee has been formed whose program will be (1) to make a careful study of the present status of Nisei education and of the teaching staff abroad; (2) to build a firmer foundation for Nisei education; and (3) to send the most competent teaching staffs to all parts of the world.

"Many presently engaged in Nisei education abroad, desire to return home. At the same time, a large number of teachers at home are anxious to go abroad. Well planned handling of this situation will be most advantageous. Everyone is anxiously awaiting the changes which have been announced."

[From the Report of the Dies Committee on Japanese Activities page 1938 ff]

THE VOICE OF RAFU SHIMPO

Rafu Shimpo, the bi-lingual Los Angeles Japanese Daily News, carries many articles in the Japanese language, designed specifically to encourage Nipponese faith in the might of the Mikado's Empire. Said Rafu Shimpo recently, under the caption: "Two-Ocean Navy and Pacific":

"Battleships of more than 35,000 tons cannot pass through the Panama Canal. Only ships whose width is 106 or less can pass through it. Four ships of *Iowa* class, built in 1940, were of 45,000 tons each. Ten battleships now under construction are too large * * *. Therefore, the two-ocean Navy really is a one-ocean Navy.

"President Roosevelt is very much concerned as to how America can match German armaments which have been prepared for 7 years. America might launch a battle against us, with 15 capital ships, 6 aircraft carriers, 18 heavy cruisers, 17 light cruisers, 80 destroyers, 45 submarines, comprising a first-line navy. But it would be very dangerous to attack Japan several thousand miles away. * * * for it would be fatal for the American Navy to fight so far from its base.

"If capital ships constitute power, look at what Germany does before our very eyes. It is so clear that there is no need for further explanation. Japan will not sit idle while America prepares."

While the Japanese Government exploits the racial ties to foster loyalty to the home country among Japanese-Americans, gullibles in the United States are worked upon with propaganda brochures prepared in scholarly style. The latest such literature, received gratis from Tokyo, is a volume entitled "Introductory Studies on the Sino-Japanese Conflict" (illustration on this page), by Kiyoshi Miki and Karoku Hosokawa, published by the Japanese Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations. This institute has achieved a position of great prestige in American and British diplomatic, academic, and industrial circles.

The well-indexed book, over 100 pages long, presents the Japanese version of imperialist expansion in China on the part of the European powers and the United States. Throughout the book, the reader is led to believe that the authors were prompted only by a feeling of compassion for "poor, abused China." In the first pages, the authors tread lightly, but in conclusion, they assert, under the subtitle "The 'Open Door' versus Japan's Continental Policy":

"The clash between the ambitions of western powers and Japanese continental policy, both of which are seeking to advance in China, would seem to be inevitable unless one is forced to submit to the superior power of the other, as long as the semicolonial China continues to exist as in the past, or as long as the present world order prevails."

Note the clever strategy of the authors in placing alleged "ambitions of Western powers" in juxtaposition with the "Japanese continental policy", as if it were the western powers and not Japan whose ambition is responsible for the Chinese-Japanese war. The authors continue:

"The present Sino-Japanese incident, with utmost insistence, demands a solution to the question of creating a new and true world order, and of making a clean sweep of the semicolonial condition of China."

To reach her goal Japan relies not only on her military arms and her Axis allies, but also upon Japanese-American "Quislings" who will gladly volunteer.

Thus, Japan falls into line with the Axis cry for a new order; thus, Japan prepares for the day when—so bluntly stated in The Triple Alliance and the Japanese-American War—only the flag of the rising sun will wave over the Pacific; and the swastika, which also symbolizes the sun, will rule the Atlantic.

REPUBLICAN RIVER COMPACT

Mr. WHITE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5945) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My purpose is to ask the gentlemen from New York, who just preceded the gentleman, just why in all these preceding years he has always opposed the Dies committee?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have opposed the Dies committee, because I have felt it to be my American and patriotic duty to oppose a committee which has been subversive of the constitutional liberties of the American people.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of this committee. My shoulders have grown broader with the months.

May I say with regard to a question being asked of a Member of the House as to why he opposes the committee, I do not feel that any Member of the House is required to answer that question. I think any Member of the House has a perfect right to oppose the committee if he sees fit to do so.

I hope that in this 10 minutes I can say a few things that will clarify some of the matters. The facts of the matter are, as usual, between the two extremes. I put in the RECORD on February 25 my own statement about the work of this committee, in which I went rather fully into what my own views about the matter are.

In the course of that discussion I said, among other things with regard to the Pearl Harbor matter, that it was not my opinion, and never had been my opinion, that the committee had information which could have prevented the Pearl Harbor disaster. Certain it is I never saw any information of that character. I think it was unfortunate for any such impression to have gone out.

I also said in my remarks of February 25—and this I also believe; I have been assured of it over and over again—that the files of the committee, and the information which the committee has at its disposal, are at all times open to any representative of the Department of Justice, the Army Intelligence, the Navy Intelligence, or any other properly qualified representative of a Government agency.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Is the information open to any Member of the House of Representatives?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am glad the gentleman asked me that. First of all, I want to be sure my first point is clear. If anybody can show me that any information in the possession of this committee was not available at any time that a representative of the Department of Justice or the Army or Navy Intelligence came after it, I should be both surprised and inclined to resign my position on the committee; but my understanding is that that information is always so available.

In answer to the gentleman's question, and referring also to my remarks of February 25, I will say this: On certain occasions it would appear that information that the committee might have has been available to any Member of Congress. I am frank to say that I do not believe that that should be the case unless the committee as a whole approves, and unless that information is given to such Member with a complete explanation on the part of the committee itself as to what it signifies.

It is my further opinion that there has been great injustice done because of the fact that Members have on certain occasions called the committee and asked for a list of things about so-and-so, Tom, Dick, or Harry, gotten such a list, and then used it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without explanation or analysis on the part of anybody who understood what those things meant. I think that inevitably creates an injustice, and I do not think that should be done.

There will be Members who would object to my saying that, I have no doubt, but I feel that by the very fact that there is so much in the committee's files it is obviously impossible for it to be fairly used except under the most careful circumstances.

Mr. HOOK. I just wanted to be sure on that point.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Can the gentleman explain to the House who was responsible for the drafting of this report, which I understand was subscribed to by the full membership of the committee?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish the gentleman had not asked me that question, because it is my intention, in fact, one of the main purposes for asking this time, I should say, to make the statement, because it is true, that, so far as this report is concerned, it was approved by the membership of the committee, and I take my responsibility for it to the extent that that goes. I have not come to this report yet, I may say.

Mr. KEEFE. My reason for asking it should be perfectly obvious to the gentleman. The report is very voluminous and I take it no individual Member in his capacity as a member of this committee could very well have prepared that report, and I assume it must have been prepared by the secretarial service, or the drafting service, or somebody in the employ of the committee.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. And I think the Congress is entitled to know the facts in reference to it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true, but the report was submitted to the members of the committee before it was released.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on the point he was just speaking about a moment ago?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; and then I would appreciate it if the Members would let me speak for a minute or 2.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The question I want to ask the gentleman is this. Does not at least a part of the difference of opinion grow out of the fact as to whose duty it was to get this information into the hands of the Department of Justice; that is, as I understood the gentleman who just preceded you, he thought the Dies committee should take it down there, while some others think if the Department of Justice wanted it they could have called for it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am coming to that, if I may have the opportunity.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have already one question before me, I will say to the gentleman, and I would rather answer that one first.

I can refer to some of my own efforts in the past, in answer to the gentleman from Michigan, which have been to this effect. The job was given to me of attempting to work out the relationships between this committee and the Department of Justice. My own belief about the matter is very simple. The Committee on Un-American Activities can do certain things which the Department of Justice cannot do. The Committee on Un-American Activities can subpena witnesses and take testimony and hold hearings and issue reports regardless of whether there has been any violation of law or not. The purpose of the committee is to draw to the attention of the Nation such facts as relate to activities of people who are enemies of the Nation and of its basic institutions—not people who want to solve the unemployment problem or assure us against depression, I would like to say with emphasis. The job of the Department of Justice, on the other hand, is to apprehend people who violate the law and see to it that they are tried and, if guilty, convicted. Now, my whole position on this matter is that, in my judgment, the Committee on Un-American Activities, if it comes upon any information which would be of such a nature as to make possible the prosecution of offenders against the law, should bring it to the attention of the Department of Justice and that the Department of Justice, on its part, if it has information which cannot be used for prosecution purposes, might well bring it to the attention of the committee in order that it might go into the matter in the manner available to it, but not, in the nature of the case, to the Department. As a practical matter, the most practical way to handle the whole proposition is for the Department to have people constantly perusing the files of the committee and securing any information which may be there which they may desire.

Now I am not in position to state, I wish I were—I think as a member of the committee, perhaps, I should be able to, but it would take 29 hours a day if I were in a position to say whether there has never been anything or any time when the committee did not immediately go to the Department with something that might have been of significance. I can say that I do not know of any case where the committee has had any inclination to withhold information from the Department.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Now, could the gentleman tell the House who dictated or who wrote the report?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will do that right now if the gentleman will permit me. This report is obviously a book which is supposed to contain major matters about the activities of certain Japanese who, working under the direction of the Japanese Government, in one way or another, have for a period of time been attempting to serve the interests of that Government and, perhaps, to prepare for that Government's attempt to attack the United States. I may add that I personally do not believe that material in this report applies to by any means all of our citizens of Japanese descent. I believe there are a very large number of them who are sincerely loyal to the United States. But with our country at war with Japan it seems to me a proper thing to bring to light all matters relating to the manner in which the Japanese Government has attempted to use people of Japanese descent or Japanese aliens or others in this country in order to harm and if possible to defeat us. That is the reason I approved the report. I think it is a good reason.

That is what the booklet is supposed to be. To say that the booklet is written by all members of the committee is obviously not true. Of course it was not written by the committee. The booklet is a compilation of a lot of material from a lot of different sources, and, as far as I am concerned, I felt sure that that was frankly understood.

Mr. McGRANERY. Can the gentleman tell the House who dictated this report?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What does the gentleman mean by "who dictated the report"?

Mr. McGRANERY. Who was it that sat down and dictated this report? I do not suppose that every member of the committee submitted a portion of that report?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is correct.

Mr. McGRANERY. Who dictated the report?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I can tell the gentleman with perfect honesty that I do not know who did. It was written in the committee offices by somebody. I do not know exactly by whom, but my responsibility was to take the report and go through it and see as near as I could if there was material in it which I felt should not be there and then to approve or disapprove its release.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman, for whom I have great

affection, explain why he approves section 2 of the report, which implies very clearly that it is a secret and important Japanese naval map, showing our American battle stations around Hawaii, when in fact the map was published in 1935 by a popular magazine which is or was filed as second-class mail matter in the Los Angeles post office?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say that I had never seen that map until it was brought to my attention in connection with this committee report, and, furthermore, it is my understanding there are a great many people in the United States, some of whom might have needed to know about that map, who also did not know about the map. In any case I cannot see that even had I known it was published in a Japanese magazine in 1935 there would have been any reason at all for my objecting to its inclusion in the booklet.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I simply want to get the gentleman's position clear. Is it the gentleman's contention that the language contained in this report is not advanced to the country as the language of the committee, as the report of the committee as to its activities, as to its work, as to its investigation, and that the translations are not the translations of the committee and its employees?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The book is what it obviously appears to be.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It appears to be a report of the committee and the words of the committee.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is a collection of material upon Japanese activities. That is what it is.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then the language is not the language of the committee?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman has had 30 minutes in which to make that point, and it is apparently true, which I did not know when the report came out, that that material which the gentleman refers to was material which came from the News Letter the gentleman refers to. I happen to know something about that News Letter and about the work that goes into its publication. I happen also to know that the gentleman who put it out did say what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] said, namely, that he wanted the committee to make free use of that material, and I am informed that he preferred not to have it quoted. I would say this much further, that, in my judgment, it would have been better had the committee made positive effort to get this man's permission to give his News Letter credit for that part of the report. That is my personal opinion, and I want to say this in that connection. It seems to me that there are bigger and more important matters to be considered in this whole business. The main one is that we are at war and must do all we can to win it. I feel exposé of activities of enemy nations in this country helps to accomplish that. I think it is undeniably true that it is unfortunate and a mistake whenever a committee of this kind makes any statement which is too broad or which in any way tends to go beyond the most conservative conclusion which the facts justify. I believe that applies to members of the committee too, for it is dealing with what may be termed very inflammable material.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is also true that in attempts to oppose the committee there have been quite extravagant statements made, and I honestly feel in many cases that there have been exaggerations and distortions of what were the real facts regarding the committee's work.

I would like to speak a little further about what my views are about this Pearl Harbor matter. Obviously if this committee had evidence which could have prevented Pearl Harbor the committee should have gone to any possible lengths with regard to it. The fact of the matter is that the committee's material is in this book. Anyone can see for himself that it is not of a character to enable anyone to predict military movements or attacks or anything of that sort except in the most general way. On the other hand, I do believe it possible that had open hearings been held and all this material laid before the country—because some of it I think you will admit is pretty impressive—it might have created a greater degree of awareness on the part of a lot of people in the Nation. That awareness might have made a difference. No one knows for sure. However, I do not for one moment personally criticize the State Department for requesting that open hearings be not held and for this reason. The State Department, for good reason, was attempting to postpone a clash with the Japanese. I do not blame them at all. Indeed, I am of the opinion that I probably would have used the same judgment that they did under the circumstances had I been in their position.

After what happened on December 7, after we saw what the fact was—I think as a matter of passing judgment after the fact, it might have happened that had greater publicity been given to some of these things——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. After Pearl Harbor it might be easy to say that had the hearings been held it might have increased the awareness of the country and helped out. I do not know about that. I do not think anybody can judge. I think that some of the material that the committee had was important. Some of it I believe extremely revealing indeed, and I understand very considerable use of it has been made by other departments of Government. I do not think any of it was of such a nature as to determine definitely what the Japanese were going to do and when they were going to do it, or anything of that sort.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. We all agree that the Acting Attorney General urged the committee not to hold public hearings in September. However, the chairman of the committee has said that all the facts were in possession of the committee in September and he was not permitted to reveal them. Why were public hearings the only way in which they could have been revealed?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Now, that is a play on words. It is a question of what the word "revealed" means. To my mind, if it could be shown that the committee withheld any information from the Department of Justice, that would be one thing. But for it to be said that it was not to be revealed through public hearings is a different matter. I have already stated it as my personal opinion that I do not criticize at all the fact that the committee was advised not to hold these hearings. I do not.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. McGRANERY. There is one thing I feel the gentleman would agree with me about. I do not suppose the gentleman agrees that it was the proper thing for whoever wrote this report to say that they had submitted certain evidence to the Attorney General and that he failed to prosecute. The reading of those words would indicate that the Attorney General deliberately suppressed evidence. Then the chairman of the Dies committee on the floor of this House said that he had, in effect, told the Attorney General that that was not so. But that was in the latter week in August, and his report was only printed the other day. Why did he include that in his report, do you know?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; I am sorry. I do not recall any such thing in the report.

Mr. McGRANERY. Would the gentleman have signed the report had he read that in the report?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know what the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. McGRANERY. I think those are the exact words, that certain evidence was submitted to the Attorney General.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know where that is in the report.

Mr. McGRANERY. Would the gentleman have signed the report if he knew that to be in there?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to see the reference in the report. I certainly do not recall any statement like that on the part of the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, March 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on H. R. 6444, to provide for the registration of labor organizations, business, and trade associations, etc. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1461. A letter from the acting executive officer, National Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1462. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1942 amounting to $316,500, together with an amendment to the Budget for that Department for the fiscal year 1943, involving an increase of $718,000 (H. Doc. No. 650); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1463. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $2,035,000, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 651); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1464. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $30,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 652); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1465. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1942, in the amount of $5,800 (H. Doc. No. 653); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

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. WHITE: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 5945. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1878). And ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. DOUGHTON introduced a bill (H. R. 6750) to promote the prosecution of war by exempting from State, Territorial, and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property and services for use in performing defense contracts, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas introduced a bill (H. R. 6751) for the relief of J. C. Baker, 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:

2530. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the National Maritime Union of America, Providence Local, Congress of Industrial Organizations, approving the work of the Farm Security Administration and urging its continuance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2531. Also, resolution of Local No. 28, Journeymen Tailors Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Providence, approving the work of the Farm Security Administration and urging its continuance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2532. Also, resolution of Local No. 92, Providence Fur Workers Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations, approving the work of the Farm Security Administration and urging its continuance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2533. Also, resolution of Local No. 288, Peacedale T. W. U. A., Congress of Industrial Organizations, approving the work of the Farm Security Administration and urging its continuance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2534. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Angeles Forest Protective Association, appraising the Secretary of Agriculture and the congressional delegation from California of the flood danger in the area of San Diego, and urge that an immediate and detailed flood-control survey of the watersheds in the vicinity be made; to the Committee on Flood Control.

2535. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Los Angeles County Defense Council, through action by special committee, relative to the Japanese and alien enemy situation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2536. Also, resolution No. 2456 of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, Calif., memorializing Congress to fix premium rates of war-risk insurance so that insured persons in all parts of the United States shall share equally the burden of such insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2537. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Potash Workers Union, Carlsbad, N. Mex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passing of legislation relative to excess profit tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 5, 1942)

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

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in Heaven, whose voice in the heart of man bids him to prayer, urging him to make known his every request: Remind us, we beseech Thee, of the dignity of prayer, since Thou dost therein bring us, who are but dust and ashes, into Thy very audience-chamber; reveal to our complacency the necessity of prayer, since without it all religious life will fade, even as the flowers upon which the dew has ceased to fall; and, at this sacred moment, grant to us the consolation of our prayer, by which we may cast the heavy burdens of the day and hour upon Thy loving heart, where we may find refuge from the world's oppression and bathe the ruffled plumage of the soul in the ethereal and divine forgiveness of the Christ.

Our sins and shames, remember them no more; help us to merge our separate desires in adoration, that we may lose them all in the ocean of God's love. Teach us that there can be no devotion to country apart from a devotion to supreme goodness, and that patriotism becomes increasingly noble as it rises above the narrow pettiness of the individual. And now, with hearts aflame and purposes subdued unto Thy will, we pray with fervent minds:

O God, stretch forth Thy mighty hand and guard and bless our Fatherland.

In our Saviour's Name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 5, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

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 March 5, 1942, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2282) 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2198) to provide for the financing of the War Damage Corporation, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. GIFFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6511) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal