Adjustment Administration payment for the growing or nongrowing of any crops, livestock, etc., requesting that money paid for crop conservation and pay roll under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program be retained by the Treasurer of the United States to be spent for guns, planes, food, and other necessary equipment for winning the war and for the men in active service in the United States armed forces. Also setting forth their belief that the farmer should raise more foodstuffs and should refrain from taking money for doing so; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2717. By Mr. MACIORA: Petition of the Labor Nonpartisan League of Connecticut, signed by 5,000 workers in Connecticut industries declaring that Connecticut labor in war industries will not strike during the emergency; that Connecticut labor will cooperate fully to increase production; and that a change in the present labor laws will not increase production, but will only cause disunity and strife; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2718. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, relative to the State Guard, adopted April 2, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2719. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the Sheet Metal Contractors Association of Wisconsin, urging enactment of legislation to prevent discrimination against any American citizen employed or seeking employment in any industry turning out, or servicing, or transporting any requirements for which the taxpayers' money is to be expended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1942

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

The Chaplain, Very Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite source of truth and justice, who hast made us what we are and dost ever rule and govern us: We commit ourselves to Thee, believing in Thy gracious purposes concerning us, trusting that our aspiration after goodness is but the echo of that transcendent goodness which is the distinctive revelation of Thyself. Is it not Thy shadow wherein Thou art conveyed to us, for often, when in the light of day Thou hast been far from us, the gathering gloom has seemed to bring Thee nigh? Again we are baffled and perplexed, and Thou beginnest to be murmured in the soul, as when far inland in the stillness are heard the distant voices of the sea. So do we thank Thee for the burden of the mystery of that wisdom which shall make us strong for duty and patient in trial, the wisdom out of whose fullness our wandering steps shall be guided into the way of everlasting peace. In our Saviour's name, we pray. 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, April 23, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Herring	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hill	Rosier
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Hughes	Schwartz
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Bulow	Kilgore	Smith
Bunker	La Follette	Spencer
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Byrd	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Danaher	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Doxey	Murdock	Wallgren
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on official business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

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

CONTROL OF THE COST OF LIVING
(H. DOC. NO. 716)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In certain ways the present world encircling war presents problems which were unimaginable during the first World War.

The theaters of combat today cover vastly greater areas. Many more millions of human beings are involved. The new factors of mechanical power, in the air and on the land and on the sea, have produced radical changes in basic strategy and tactics.

In this new war the nations resisting the Axis Powers face an even greater challenge to their very existence. They fight more powerful, more sinister foes; but their understanding of the magnitude of the task and the very firmness of their determination make victory certain in the long days to come.

In some other ways, however, the circumstances of today parallel those of 1917–18. Now, as in the last war, the common enemy has had all the advantage at the outset. Now, as then, bitter defeats and heavy losses must be endured by those who are defending civilization, before we will be able to establish the vital superiority in men and munitions which will turn the tide.

The United States was far better prepared for actual war on December 7, 1941, than it was on April 6, 1917. For over 2 years, by a succession of congressional acts, we had carried out or initiated safety measures for our own defense in growing volume and importance. There were the revisions of the neutrality laws, the adoption of the selective-service law and the lend-lease law, and the great increases of our Army and Navy and the instruments of war which they needed.

After Pearl Harbor, the American people adopted a national program of war production which would have been called fantastic by most people 2 years before. It has required the shifting of the major part of American industry from the products of peace to the weapons of war.

Inevitably, but with the full approval of the Nation, this enormous program is dislocating industry, labor, agriculture, and finance. It is disrupting, and will continue to disrupt, the normal manner of life of every American and every American family. In this we repeat the pattern of the first World War, although on a vastly greater scale.

During that earlier war there were certain economic factors which produced unnecessary hardships; and these hardships continued long after the signing of the Armistice. I use the word "unnecessary" because it is my belief that a very great deal of the suffering which was caused then can be avoided now.

These economic factors relate primarily to an easily understood phrase which affects the lives of all of us—the cost of living. Because rises in the cost of living which came with the last war were not checked in the beginning, people in this country paid more than twice as much for the same things in 1920 as they did in 1914.

The rise in the cost of living during this war has begun to parallel the last. The time has definitely come to stop the spiral, and we can face the fact that there must be a drastic reduction in our standard of living.

While the cost of living, based on the average prices of necessaries, has gone up about 15 percent so far since the autumn of 1939, we must now act to keep it from soaring another 80 or 90 percent during the next year or two—to hold it somewhere near the present level.

There are obvious reasons for taking every step necessary to prevent this rise. I emphasize the words "every step" because no single step would be adequate

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

by itself. Action in one direction alone would be offset by inaction in other directions. Only an all-embracing program will suffice.

When the cost of living spirals upward week after week and month after month, people as a whole are bound to become poorer because the pay envelope will then lag behind rising retail prices. The price paid for carrying on the war by the Government, and therefore by the people, will increase by many billions if prices go up. Furthermore, there is an old and true saying that "that which goes up must always come down"—and you and I know the hardships and heartaches we all went through in the bad years after the last war, when the Americans were losing their homes and their farms and their savings and were looking in vain for jobs.

We do not intend, after this war, to present the same disastrous situation to those brave men who today are fighting our battles in all parts of the world. Safeguarding our economy at home is the very least that our soldiers, sailors, and marines have a right to expect of us civilians in Government, in industry, on the farm, and in all other walks of life.

We must therefore adopt as one of our principal domestic objectives the stabilization of the cost of living, for this is essential to the fortification of our whole economic structure.

Relying on past and present experience, and leaving out masses of details which relate more to questions of method than to the objective itself, I list for the Congress the following points, which, taken together, may well be called our present national economic policy:

1. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must tax heavily, and in that process keep personal and corporate profits at a reasonable rate, the word "reasonable" being defined at a low level.

2. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must fix ceilings on the prices which consumers, retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers pay for the things they buy; and ceilings on rents for dwellings in all areas affected by war industries.

3. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must stabilize the remuneration received by individuals for their work.

4. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must stabilize the prices received by growers for the products of their lands.

5. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must encourage all citizens to contribute to the cost of winning this war by purchasing War Bonds with their earnings instead of using those earnings to buy articles which are not essential.

6. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must ration all essential commodities of which there is a scarcity, so that they may be distributed fairly among consumers and not merely in accordance with financial ability to pay high prices for them.

7. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must discourage credit and installment buying, and encourage the paying off of debts, mortgages, and other obligations; for this promotes savings, retards excessive buying and adds to the amount available to the creditors for the purchase of War Bonds.

I know that you will appreciate that these seven principal points, each and every one of them, will contribute in substantial fashion to the great objective of keeping the cost of living down.

It is my best judgment that only two of these points require legislation at the present time, for the very good reason that the Congress has already passed laws with respect to the others which seem adequate to meet the national policy enunciated.

I assure the Congress that if the required objectives are not attained, and if the cost of living should continue to rise substantially, I shall so advise the Congress, and shall ask for any additional legislation which may be necessary.

In the first item, legislation is necessary, and the subject is now under consideration in the House of Representatives. Its purpose is to keep excess profits down and, at the same time, raise further large sums for the financing of the war.

On this subject, I believe that the objective can be attained through tax processes. We are now spending, solely for war purposes, the sum of about $100,000,000 every day of the week. But before this year is over that rate of expenditure will be doubled. This means that a sum equal to more than half of the entire national income will be spent in the war effort. Almost the whole of these billions is being and will be spent within the United States itself.

Profits must be taxed to the utmost limit consistent with continued production. This means all business profits—not only in making munitions but in making or selling anything else. Under the proposed new tax law we seek to take by taxation all undue or excess profits. It is incumbent upon the Congress to define undue or excess profits; and anything in excess of that specific figure should go to the Government.

One of our difficulties is to write a law in which some clever people will not find loopholes, or in which some businesses will not be equitably included. I have suggested to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the House of Representatives that some blanket clause could well cover, by a special tax, all profits of any kind of business which exceed the expressed definition of the legal profit figure.

At the same time, while the number of individual Americans affected is small, discrepancies between low personal incomes and very high personal incomes should be lessened; and I therefore believe that in time of this grave national danger, when all excess income should go to win the war no American citizen ought to have a net income, after he has paid his taxes of more than $25,000 a year. It is indefensible that those who enjoy large incomes from State and local securities should be immune from taxation while we are at war. Interest on such securities should be subject at least to surtaxes.

I earnestly hope that the Congress will pass a new tax bill at the earliest moment possible. Such action is imperative in the comprehensive all-out effort to keep the cost of living down—and time is of the essence.

The second item, relating to price control, is, with the exception of farm prices, adequately covered by existing law, and I have issued instructions to put this into effect immediately. It is our effort to be fair in all phases of price control; and if our future experience reveals inequality or unfairness, corrections will, of course, be made.

In respect to the third term, seeking to stabilize remuneration for work, legislation is not required under present circumstances. I believe that stabilizing the cost of living will mean that wages in general can and should be kept at existing scales.

Organized labor has voluntarily given up its right to strike during the war. Therefore all stabilization or adjustment of wages will be settled by the War Labor Board machinery which has been generally accepted by industry and labor for the settlement of all disputes.

All strikes are at a minimum. Existing contracts between employers and employees must, in all fairness, be carried out to the expiration date of those contracts. The existing machinery for labor disputes will, of course, continue to give due consideration to inequalities and the elimination of substandards of living. I repeat that all of these processes now in existence will work equitably for the overwhelming proportion of all our workers if we can keep the cost of living down and stabilize their remuneration.

Most workers in munition industries are working far more than 40 hours a week and should continue to be paid at time and a half for overtime. Otherwise their weekly pay envelopes would be reduced.

All these policies will guide all Government agencies.

In regard to item 4, prices of farm products: For nearly 9 years it has been the policy of the Government to seek an objective known as parity—or, in other words, farm prices that give the farmer an assurance of equality in individual purchasing power with his fellow Americans who work in industry. Some of the products of the farms have not yet reached the stage of parity. Others have exceeded parity Under existing legislation a ceiling cannot be placed on certain products until they reach a level somewhat above parity.

This calls for the second legislative action which I have mentioned. Under a complicated formula in the existing law, prices for farm products—prices which housewives have to pay for many articles of food—may rise to 110 percent of parity or even higher. It is the fault of the formula. In the case of many articles this can mean a dangerous increase in the cost of living for the average family over present prices.

In fairness to the American people as a whole, and adhering to the purpose of keeping the cost of living from going up, I ask that this formula be corrected, and

that the original and excellent objective of obtaining parity for the farmers of the United States be restored.

It would be equally harmful to the process of keeping down the cost of living if any law were passed preventing the Government from selling any of its own surplus farm commodities at the market price. As a national policy, the ceiling on farm products—in other words, the maximum prices to be received by the producers of these products—should be set at parity.

With respect to item 5, the purchase of War Bonds, the American people know that if we would raise the billions which we now need to pay for the war and at the same time prevent a disastrous rise in the cost of living, we shall have to double and more than double the scale of our savings. Every dime and dollar not vitally needed for absolute necessities should go into War Bonds and stamps to add to the striking power of our armed forces.

If these purchases are to have a material effect in restraining price increases they must be made out of current income. In almost every individual case they should be big enough to mean rigid self-denial, a substantial reduction for most of us in the scale of expenditure that is comfortable and easy for us. We cannot fight this war, we cannot exert our maximum effort, on a spend-as-usual basis. We cannot have all we want, if our soldiers and sailors are to have all they need.

I have been urged by many persons and groups to recommend the adoption of a compulsory plan of savings by deducting a certain percentage of everyone's income. I prefer, however, to keep the voluntary plan in effect as long as possible, and I hope for a magnificent response.

With respect to item 6, rationing, it is obviously fair that where there is not enough of any essential commodity to meet all civilian demands, those who can afford to pay more for the commodity should not be privileged over others who cannot. I am confident that as to many basic necessities of life rationing will not be necessary, because we shall strive to the utmost to have an adequate supply. But where any important article becomes scarce, rationing is the democratic, equitable solution.

Item 7, paying off debts and curtailing installment buying, should be made effective as soon as possible now that money is becoming more plentiful. Those who comply with it will be grateful that they have done so, when this war is over. Elimination of private debts and an accumulation of savings will provide a form of insurance against postwar depression. The Federal agency responsible for the control of credit for installment buying is taking appropriate action.

Indeed, as to all the items which do not require legislation, the executive departments and agencies whose functions and duties are involved, are at work as expeditiously as possible in carrying out this whole broad policy.

The result will mean that each and every one of us will have to give up many things to which we are accustomed. We shall have to live our lives with less in the way of creature comforts than we have in time of peace. Our standard of living will have to come down.

Some have called this an economy of sacrifice. Some interpret it in terms that are more accurate—the equality of sacrifice. I have never been able to bring myself, however, to full acceptance of the word "sacrifice," because freemen and women, bred in the concepts of democracy and wedded to the principles of democracy, deem it a privilege rather than a sacrifice to work and to fight for the perpetuation of the democratic ideal. It is, therefore, more true to call this total effort of the American people an equality of privilege.

I firmly believe that Americans all will welcome this opportunity to share in the fight of civilized mankind to preserve decency and dignity in modern life. For this is fundamentally a people's war, and it must be followed by a people's peace. The achievement of victory in war and security in peace requires the participation of all the people in the common effort for our common cause.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 27, 1942.*

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 23d instant,

During the recess of the Senate the President pro tempore signed the following enrolled bills, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 201)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1943, totaling $203,451,885, together with a proposed provision pertaining to an item of appropriation contained in the Budget for 1943, all in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS AND REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, and also the Annual Report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Library.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, War (3), and Agriculture (6); The National Archives (3), the General Accounting Office, the Federal Works Agency, Executive Office of the President, and the Federal Security Agency, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A petition of sundry citizens of Williamsport, Pa., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Fort Scott, and members of the congregation of Trinity Methodist Church, of Ottawa, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. MEAD:

Memorials, numerously signed (forwarded by Harry B. Martin, secretary of the Central Trades and Labor Assembly, Elmira, N. Y.), of sundry citizens of Elmira, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation detrimental to the interests of labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BURTON:

The petition of Rev. C. L. Strecker and sundry other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Mrs. Helen Sidmore and sundry other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO INTOXICATING LIQUORS—PETITION

Mr. MEAD presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from Mrs. B. F. Palmer and sundry other citizens of Scio, and vicinity, in the State of New York, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be

printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached thereto, as follows:

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senator.

DEAR SIR: We, whose names are hereunto affixed, being duly qualified voters, respectfully request and urge you to work and vote, to have submitted to the States for ratification, the Sheppard dry enabling amendment, Senate Joint Resolution No. 21, giving Congress power to restrict or prohibit the whole beverage liquor traffic, in the United States.

Mrs. B. F. PALMER,
Scio, N. Y.

(And sundry other citizens of Scio, N. Y.)

THE WAGE AND HOUR LAW—RESOLUTION OF COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the Court of Common Council of the City of Hartford, Conn., on April 13, 1942, and ask consent that it be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE TOWN AND CITY CLERK,
Hartford, Conn., April 14, 1942.

This certifies that at a meeting of the court of common council held April 13, 1942, the following resolutions were passed, by roll-call vote of 16 to 0, and were approved by his honor the mayor, April 14, 1942.

"*Resolved,* That whereas misguided Congressmen who prior to the national emergency have consistently voted against all progressive legislation are promoting a change in the wage-and-hours law; and

"Whereas it is established by the testimony of Donald M. Nelson that overtime pay is not affecting war production; and

"Whereas any lowering of living standards will seriously affect the morale of American workers engaged in all-out production: Be it

"*Resolved,* That this court of common council request our Congressmen to accept the recommendation of Donald M. Nelson and refrain from legislation which would destroy standards of which the American people have been so proud, and for which labor and the sons of labor are now fighting."

Attest:

JOHN A. GLEASON,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF ADA (OKLA.) CHAPTER, NO. 150, VETERANS OF INDUSTRY OF AMERICA, ENDORSEMENT OF RECORD OF THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM OKLAHOMA

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, at Ada, Okla., the Veterans of Industry adopted a resolution which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we, as the official representatives of a constituent chapter of the Veterans of Industry of America, or V. I. A., of the great State of Oklahoma, have followed with pleasure the heroic support given by Hon. JOSH LEE in the United States Senate to the national administration and our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the effort of Senator LEE to aid in promoting well-nigh all of the humanitarian program of our great President; and

Whereas we have noted with pleasure that Senator JOSH LEE has generally taken the side of the underdog in most of his efforts to place upon the statute books of the Nation laws which have been intended to bring relief to those who have most needed help in the struggle of life; and

Whereas we have observed that Senator LEE has not only stood by the working classes, but he has given careful attention to the needs of the aged citizens of our Nation who have reached the point where they can no longer hope to have employment by which to provide earnings for the necessities of life, but who have nevertheless spent their younger years in an endeavor to do their part in the upbuilding of the Nation during the years of pioneering in this new land: Therefore be it

Resolved by the officers and members of the board of directors of Ada V. I. A. Chapter No. 150, at Ada., Okla., That we do hereby fully endorse the record of Hon. JOSH LEE in the Senate of the United States Congress and recommend him for renomination and reelection to a second term in that office; and we do so without intending any reflection whatever upon the character and standing of any other candidate for that honorable office.

Submitted to and approved by Ada Chapter, No. 150, in a regular open meeting this the 14th day of April Anno Domini 1942.

J. M. Massey, chairman; W. H. Hilliard, vice chairman; Franklin Bourland, Mrs. Ollie Cook, Edna French, members, one absent member.

Attest:

A. J. HENDERSON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE STATE OF WISCONSIN CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am in receipt of and ask consent to present three resolutions adopted by the State of Wisconsin Conservation Commission. These resolutions relate, first, to the contemplated appropriation concerning defense forest fire fighting control; second, to the use of surplus C. C. C. equipment now located in closed camps; and third, to the possibility of further reduction of C. C. C. camps. I ask that these resolutions may be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

Resolution of the State of Wisconsin Conservation Commission relating to a contemplated appropriation concerning defense forest fire control; ordered to lie on the table.

Resolution of the State of Wisconsin Conservation Commission relating to not making of further reduction of Civilian Conservation Corps camps; and

Also a resolution of the State of Wisconsin Conservation Commission relating to surplus Civilian Conservation Corps equipment now located in closed camps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF THE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The following reports of the Committee on Military Affairs were submitted:

By Mr. WALLGREN:

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of Dayee Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 1273).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2446. A bill to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1274).

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2477. A bill to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength; with amendments (Rept. No. 1275).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2480. A bill for the relief of W. V. Coile; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2481. A bill authorizing employees in the Veterans' Administration and other Government agencies to accept or reject quarters and subsistence furnished by the Government; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2482. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of California over certain naturalization proceedings in the case of John Charles Thorn; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 2483. A bill to amend section 32 of Public Act No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2484. A bill to safeguard the health of persons in military service by requiring that registered pharmacists be placed in charge of Army dispensaries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 2485. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:

S. 2486. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and maintenance of a building for, and for the operation of, the petroleum experiment station of the Bureau of Mines at Laramie, Wyo.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2487. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to requisition motor vehicles driven at speeds in excess of the rate of 40 miles per hour; and

S. 2488. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution for the relief of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CLARK of Idaho submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the control of predatory animals and injurious rodents, from $700,000 to $1,000,000, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6845, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CLARK of Idaho submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6709, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, 1943, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 45, line 11 (in the item for Forest management), to strike out "$556,500" and insert "621,500"; and

On page 45, line 20, in the item of Forest survey, to strike out "$202,629" and insert "$250,000."

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 4, in line 3, before the period, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the salary of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be at the rate of $12,000 per annum effective on the date of the enactment of this act."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 20, line 23, before the period, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That all necessary expenses not exceeding $150,000 in the aggregate (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1943, by the Authority shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 72, at the end of line 22, before the period, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That commencing July 1, 1942, all proceeds derived by the Board of Directors of the Authority from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Authority, and from any other activities of the Authority, including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States monthly, and shall not be expended until subsequently appropriated by the Congress."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 74, in line 13, after "247)", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That the said construction fund shall be available for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112 of March 26, 1942."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to 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 following amendment, namely:

On page 79, after line 25, insert the following:

"Disposal of surplus commodities: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of such section 32, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, there are hereby reappropriated, to be available until June 30, 1943, the budgetary reserves of the appropriations made for carrying out the provisions of such section during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. The funds reappropriated by this paragraph shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any funds appropriated by such section or any other funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of such section: *Provided*, That so much of such section as prohibits the devotion to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof of any amount in excess of 25 percent of the funds available under such section shall not be applicable to amounts devoted to a stamp plan for the removal of surplus agricultural commodities from funds made available hereby and by such section, and, notwithstanding expenditures under such stamp plan, not in excess of 25 percent of the funds made available hereby and by such section may be devoted to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof under plans other than a stamp plan."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6709, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to 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 following amendment, namely:

On page 79, after line 25, insert the following:

"Disposal of surplus commodities: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of such section 32 and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, $53,000,000 together with the budgetary reserves of the appropriations made for carrying out the provisions of such section during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. The appropriation made by this paragraph shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any appropriation made by such section or any other appropriation made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of such section: *Provided*, That so much of such section as prohibits the devotion to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof of any amount in excess of 25 percent of the funds available under such section shall not be applicable to amounts devoted to a stamp plan for the removal of surplus agricultural commodities from funds made available hereby and by such section and, notwithstanding expenditures under such stamp plan, not in excess of 25 percent of the funds made available hereby and by such section may be devoted to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof under plans other than a stamp plan."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6709, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT—CORRECTION OF ASSOCIATED PRESS ARTICLE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I want to take a minute or two of the

time of the Senate to correct the records of the Associated Press.

On Thursday evening, April 23, with several Members of the Senate and House, I spoke briefly at a dinner meeting of the National Small Business Conference. In reporting the meeting an Associated Press reporter quoted me as having said that "it is all very well to talk about economy in government, but in wartime government has to be 'expensive and extravagant.'"

The quotation, which was printed in the press of my State, reads as follows:

Senator MALONEY (Democrat, Connecticut) said it was all very well to talk about economy in government, but in wartime government had to be "expensive and extravagant."

I did not say that. I did not say anything like that, and I hold exactly the opposite view. As a matter of fact—and my colleagues who were present would so testify—I expressed the feeling that there was extravagance in certain places, and that extravagance should be curtailed. I do not now want to take up the time of the Senate to discuss the matter, but for a long time past, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, as well as here on the Senate floor, I have endeavored to curtail nondefense spending.

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

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to say, with respect to the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut, that I attended the dinner to which he referred, and that the Senator made no such statement as that which was attributed to him in the press.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his statement.

EDUCATIONAL CONDITIONS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on many occasions I have called the attention of Selective Service officials and others in charge of selecting men for service in our armed forces to conditions existing in South Carolina.

It is with extreme regret that I must admit that a number of our people are illiterate, and another large number of our people have not attained a fourth-grade education. Hence, in the selections for the armed service of our country many of our people have been rejected because of lack of education. However, these people are efficient and capable.

It has been no fault of theirs, nor has it been any fault of the people of South Carolina, that this condition exists. The principal reasons for it are the small per capita income and the poverty that have existed in our State in the past. This poverty is reflected in a lack of appropriations properly to educate our youth.

Statistics show that the number of our youth in comparison to per capita population is among the largest in the Union, while our per capita wealth and income are at the bottom.

It is my opinion that Selective Service and other organizations of the United States Government should give attention to this problem. This I have requested, and I shall continue to use my efforts, with the hope that the proper aid and support will be given to the education and use of so many of our citizens who at the present time cannot qualify for service.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by a distinguished South Carolinian, Mr. Robert Quillen.

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

ROBERT QUILLEN

When we take our car to the dealer's garage, it is serviced by a young Negro. He is built like Joe Louis and probably weighs more. He works with the grace and skill of an expert, never wasting a motion, for he has the inborn sense of rhythm peculiar to his race. Whether repairing a puncture, changing tires, oiling the car, or giving it a coat of wax, he does the job quickly and dependably.

He had no special training, but simply picked it up—which means that he learned by doing, which is the best way to learn. It also means that he is smart.

Yet this young man, sound and sensible and a joy to any employer, is rejected by the Army as unfit for service. He can't read or write.

Thousands of such young men, especially in the South, have been deferred for the same reason. They are a privileged class because they didn't go to school.

Some genius has ruled that men who haven't the equivalent of fourth-grade schooling are not intelligent enough to obey orders.

Among the deferred are many white youths from tenant farms. Most of them are good shots. They are physically tough. They can make traps, repair guns, do rough carpentry, and ordinary blacksmithing. They are good at improvising—at making things do. And they are not illiterate because of stupidity, but simply because they didn't go to school. A regiment of them, properly led, would lick its weight in wildcats. You will find some mention of their kind in the history of the Civil War.

That war was a mere skirmish compared with the job we face now. This is a life-or-death struggle, which is harnessing the whole world's energy, and the side that can endure most and hold out longest will come out on top.

Before this summer ends, we'll find ourselves dangerously short of manpower. The shipbuilding program alone will require 800,000. We dare not leave a single man idle.

In fact, we must enlist every man and woman, boy and girl, who is physically and mentally sound. If a man isn't doing war work, and is fit to carry a gun, some woman must take his job.

This is not an exaggeration or a theory.

It is hard, grim, live-or-die fact. For all our great effort in the last war, we didn't even supply our own needs, and this time we must supply all of our Allies. It is the greatest chore in all history, and we must do it while building an unbeatable Army and Navy and air force.

The illiterate, if mentally sound, can learn to be soldiers. Why reject a good Jap killer because his grammar is faulty?

SALE OF UNITED STATES SAVINGS BONDS AND DEFENSE STAMPS—STATEMENT BY COL. EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by Col. Edwin A. Halsey, Secretary of the Senate, in promoting the sale of United States Savings Bonds and Defense Stamps.

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

America's history is America's glory. In the immortal words of Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death," and Abraham Lincoln's utterance, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth," rings the spirit embodied in the hearts of all Americans today. Commodore Perry thrilled America with his statement, "We have met the enemy, and they are ours," and John Paul Jones voiced the stamina and courage of his country when he said, "I have not yet begun to fight."

These sentiments of the pioneers and patriots of our country were but the forerunners of the patriotism and loyalty that surge through our hearts It is this sacred feeling we have for our country and the great reverence we have for our Government that prompt all of us to contribute our best in whatever way we can. Those of us who do not actually participate in the armed services may give substantially by purchasing War Savings Bonds, which, like national unity, will assure security and preserve for us, as President Franklin D. Roosevelt has so fervently and appropriately said, "Liberty under God."

THE ITEM VETO

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this morning I made a statement before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in respect to my pending constitutional amendment dealing with the item veto. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed as a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

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

I recently presented to the Senate a strong letter from the President of the United States in which he expressed his great desire that the right of item veto should be established by law—that is to say, the right of the Chief Executive to discriminate between items in general appropriation bills and to use his discretion in rejecting items which thereupon would return to the Congress for a two-thirds vote if subsequently validated. The need for the item veto has been reemphasized by the legislative habit of attaching general legislative riders to general appropriation bills. This latter practice obviously robs the Chief Executive of an opportunity to use his independent Executive judgment upon such general legislation, as certainly contemplated by the Constitution, except as he is willing to jeopardize general appropriations upon which the very continuity of government itself may depend. President Wilson was forced upon at least two occasions in World No. 1 to take this precise hazard, but he subsequently commented that the risk was far too great and that an opportunity for Executive discretion ought to be created by law.

There have been two schools of thought regarding a legitimate approach to the problem. One school believes that a constitutional amendment is required, because the existing constitutional veto provisions define a right of veto related only to bills as a whole. The other school of thought has argued that this Executive discretion, which is not the creation of a new Executive power but merely the efficient implementing of an existing Executive power, can be created by simple statute. In President Roosevelt's letter to me (which will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on p. 2153), he associated himself with this latter school of thought; and I undertook to

test the issue by immediately offering the equivalent of an item veto amendment to the pending independent offices appropriation bill. I also filed a notice to suspend the Senate rules so that this proposition might be submitted to the Senate as a whole, although it was a paradox to offer it in the form of a rider when it is, in fact, directly aimed at riders.

The Senate Appropriations Committee rejected my statutory amendment. Meanwhile, my own further investigations have driven me to the irresistible conclusion that the statutory process cannot be invoked for this purpose. In the interim, the Senate legislative counsel has made an exhaustive investigation of the matter and reports to me that there is no shadow of a pretense to sustain the creation of the item veto by direct statute or by direct legislative action. Therefore, we are driven to the method of constitutional amendment; and I am forced to return to my own previous viewpoint as expressed in various constitutional amendments which I have introduced for this purpose during the last 6 years. I have accordingly made a statement to this end on the floor of the Senate, which will be found at page 3784 in the proceedings of April 23, 1942. In this statement I have pointed out that while the item veto exists under State government in 39 out of 48 States, it has been created in every instance by a provision in these State constitutions. All of these 39 State provisions are identified in my statement on page 3670 of the RECORD. I may add that wherever an attempt has been made in the States to create any sort of an item veto by direct statute, the State courts have checked such process as being unconstitutional. While I am not a lawyer myself, I cannot escape the conclusion that our only recourse in establishing the item veto is by constitutional amendment, and this conclusion is further justified by the historical fact that practically every effort in Congress to establish the item veto since President Grant first sought it has been by the process of constitutional amendment. I am therefore urging that your subcommittee proceed with least possible delay to bring my item veto constitutional amendment through the Judiciary Committee to the floor of the Senate for speediest possible action.

I refer again to the highly significant fact that 39 Governors of 39 States possess the right of item veto. Thus, it certainly lacks any serious innovation so far as the American system of government is concerned. The only States without an item veto are Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Vermont. It has been repeatedly used in the States to the advantage of the public weal. Perhaps the most famous user of the item veto was GOV. HIRAM W. JOHNSON during his incumbency as chief executive of the State of California. It is interesting to note in passing that the item veto probably first appeared in the constitution of the Confederate States.

Entirely aside from the question of "riders" on general appropriation bills, the item veto is necessary if the President of the United States is to be held responsible for any effective economy in governmental expenditures and if he is to have any practical means of exercising effective discretion in respect to the appropriation of public funds. The average general supply bill contains literally thousands of unrelated items which obviously vary in their degree of validity. The Congress has an opportunity to pass upon the relative validity of each item. It can vote the item up or down. But the President must say "Yes" or "No" to the entire omnibus. He must sanction the bad (if any) in order to achieve the good. Since the continuity of government itself depends upon these general supply bills, the President may have to jeopardize the continuity of government itself in order to attack a questionable item. He usually hesitates to do so—and his hesitation is ordinarily justified. Therefore, the existing process clearly is not in the interest of public economy. It is not in the interests of the taxpayers. Conversely, the constitutional amendment which I propose is in the interest of economy and is in the interests of the taxpayers. This contemplation takes on infinitely increased importance at a time when appropriation bills are infinitely larger than they have ever been in the history of the country, and when the need for conservation is more pressing than ever before—a prospectus which is not calculated to change for a long time.

I wish to refer in conclusion to the question of delegation of power. It is well known that I am one of the most jealous Members of the Senate in the matter of retaining all of the congressional prerogatives assigned to us by the Constitution. But I insist that the item veto does not create a new Executive prerogative; it merely implements an existing prerogative and permits it to operate more efficiently in the spirit of the Constitution and in the interests of the public welfare. It does not create one single additional affirmative Executive power. It only permits the Executive to require of the Congress that it shall review any item which the President deems objectionable and to revote it by a two-thirds majority. The presumption in almost every case will be that an item which cannot withstand this scrutiny ought not to pass. Furthermore, from what we all know about our own legislative habits, I think it may fairly be said that the theory of the item veto will contribute to orderly legislative procedure within the clear intent to the American system of government.

I respectfully request earliest possible action upon this proposed constitutional amendment which is now pending before your subcommittee. If a hearing is deemed desirable—although there is little or nothing I can add to this brief—I am entirely at your service.

JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the National Jewish Fund, New York City, November 30, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON THE PROBLEMS OF THE WAR

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Kiel, Wis., April 18, 1942, on the subject These Critical Days and the Problem of the War, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY—"REPUBLICANS—HEED THE NATION'S CALL"

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Ashland, Wis., April 16, 1942, on the subject Republicans—Heed the Nation's Call, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY CHARLES M. HAY ON AMERICA'S WAR EFFORT

[Mr. GUFFEY, on behalf of Mr. TRUMAN, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Charles M. Hay, of St. Louis, before the Wisconsin Victory Conference, April 18, 1942, on the subject What's Right With America's War Effort? which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME PRAYERS BY BISHOP McAULIFFE AND RABBI FELDMAN

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two wartime prayers, one by Most Reverend Maurice F. McAuliffe, D. D., Bishop of Hartford, and one by Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, of Temple Beth Israel, which appear in the Appendix.]

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the New York Herald Tribune dealing with the importance of giving Negroes a fair chance in the Army and Navy, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 836. An act for the relief of John C. Crossman;

S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson;

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard;

S. 1424. An act for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree;

S. 1619. An act for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clyde Kingery;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of John Snure, Jr.;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes S Hathaway;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson;

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filing of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey;

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro;

S. 2017. An act to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes;

S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias;

S. 2175. An act for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer;

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Tom G. Irving; Thomas G. Irving, Sr.; J. E. Irving; Mata D. Irving; L. T. Dale; and Amelia Dale;

S. 2202. An act to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of Regular Army;

S. 2212. An act to suspend during war or a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, relating to certain leases;

S. 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; and

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

MINOR CHILDREN OF MRS. JESÚS ZAMORA FELIX, DECEASED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of

Representatives to the bill (S. 1765) for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesús Zamora Felix, deceased, which was, in line 14, after the word "children," to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF DEALERS IN AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER RATIONED ARTICLES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2315) for the relief of dealers in certain commodities rationed under authority of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the unfinished business before the Senate is Senate bill 2315, a bill for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States.

The bill was introduced by the chairman of the Small Business Committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], for himself, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. The bill as recommended to the Banking and Currency Committee is substantially the bill which the committee reported.

The bill is primarily designed to provide relief for dealers in automobiles, tires, and such other articles as are rationed at the present time. However, it is so drafted, and its language is such, that it would provide relief to dealers and those who finance dealers in all articles heretofore or hereafter rationed by any Government authority. In substance, it provides a loan, upon a very liberal basis, to any dealer who has such goods on his floor.

The loan is authorized, it is not expressly directed; but the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is the agency which would handle such loans, gives assurance that loans will be made in all necessary cases. We did not make an express direction because of the fact that there are many small articles of comparatively minor value held by dealers which could be made the basis for a loan application which ought to be handled by ordinary financial institutions. However, if the quantity of goods is substantial the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will make the loan.

The main relief provided in the bill, in addition to loans on all rationed articles, is that when goods remain on the floor of a dealer—and I think we may talk particularly of automobiles, because they are the main subject of the pending legislation—for 18 months or longer from the date of the rationing order, which in the case of automobiles was January 1, 1942, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as a Government agency, is required, at the option of the dealer, to purchase the goods or make a loan upon them to the amount of the full retail value of the goods, including transportation and such other costs as go to make up the retail price. The fair retail value or price, on what might be called the f. o. b. basis, would be fixed by the Office of Price Administration. The transportation costs from the point of manufacture to the place where the goods are then located, and such other costs as would be fairly included in the price, are the basis of the purchase or loan. The great majority of rationed goods will be disposed of. Every one knows that in the case of automobiles a very greatly liberalizing order was made last week, and there will probably be a further liberalization along that line; but if after 18 months any dealer is left with rationed goods on hand, the Government, in effect, must take them over.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. When must the Government take over the automobiles?

Mr. BROWN. Eighteen months after January 1, 1942. That would be July 1, 1943, if they have not theretofore been disposed of. The Government will take them over at the full retail price at the point where the automobiles are located.

Mr. McNARY. The bill applies to new cars?

Mr. BROWN. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. It does not apply to second-hand cars?

Mr BROWN. No.

Mr. McNARY. Or tires?

Mr. BROWN. I think it would apply to new tires.

Mr. McNARY. And to new and unsold automobiles?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; and to all other new and unsold articles which are subject to rationing orders. For example, if a rationing order on cook-stoves were issued on July 1, 1942, 18 months thereafter they could be taken off the hands of the dealers under the provisions of the bill.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I notice that the bill as originally drawn not only authorized, but directed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to proceed with this program. I notice that the direction has been stricken out. I recall that once before we authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to help with business loans, and nothing of any particular import ever happened. What is the implication in withdrawing the direction and leaving merely an authorization?

Mr. BROWN. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed to purchase the articles after 18 months. The word "authorized" is not contained in that section. The language is—

> Such purchases and loans shall be made—

There is no question that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed to make such purchases.

With regard to the loans which are contemplated in section 5h, the reason a loan is authorized rather than directed is that an administrative difficulty is involved. If an article of very small value were rationed, in which the dealer had invested a small sum such as $5, $10, or $15, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would be required to go to the expense of making a loan on an article of that small value if the word "directed" were contained in the statute.

In the testimony there was ample evidence directly from the Federal Loan Administrator, Mr. Jones, that he would consider this section a direction insofar as any substantial amount in value of goods in the hands of a dealer is concerned. The committee reported the bill unanimously. I may say that the committee felt that the word "authorized" would be better than the word "directed" in that respect.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator's interpretation is correct. Of course, it would be most unfortunate if dealers could not depend upon the subsequent commitment.

Mr. BROWN. I may say that the general counsel for the American Automobile Dealers Association was present when we wrote the language of the bill, and he was satisfied with that language, and with the statements made by the Federal Loan Administrator before the committee. Those statements are contained in the transcript of the hearings.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator's interpretation is conclusive. It seems to me that his explanation of the text is not so conclusive, because the words "and directed" are stricken out immediately preceding the order to purchase. So the elimination applies to purchases as well as loans. Then when we reach the subsequent section describing "such purchases and loans" I assume that those simply refer to whatever purchases and loans are made under the additional authority. It seems to me that there has been stricken out the direction in respect to purchases as well as loans.

Mr. BROWN. I am satisfied, from a reading of the entire bill, that the intent clearly set forth is, first, that the loans for the temporary period shall be authorized; second, that the purchase or loan, after the goods have remained on the floor for 18 months from the date of the rationing order, is directed, and not merely authorized. I may say that the sponsors of the bill who are present are in agreement with my position in that respect.

Furthermore, we were given ample assurance by the Federal Loan Administrator that where merely the authority is given it will be exercised in the most liberal manner. We were all friends of the bill. The friends of the bill who were present were satisfied with that assurance.

I may state further that this language has been carefully gone over by the House committee, which has, in effect, adopted the language of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The bill is a very salutary measure and, in my humble opinion, has been too long delayed. The only question I have about it is whether the period of 18 months in the case of automobiles which stand on the floors of the dealers is too long a period. I have had contact with a good many automobile dealers in my State. I had a personal meeting with them a few days ago, and they told me that in a period of 18 months the tires on the cars will substantially deteriorate. The use of the cars for the life of the tires is contemplated subsequent to the 18-month period. They might have been on the floor of the dealer for an appreciable time even before the rationing order went into effect.

It is possible that a car might have been on the dealer's floor for 3 months before the rationing order went into effect. Under the terms of the bill 18 months would necessarily elapse after the rationing order went into effect. That would represent a total of 21 months. So the tires would go into use in the hands of the private owner after having stood for 21 months on the floor of the dealer.

Mr. BROWN. A tire might deteriorate in its use value; but so far as price is concerned, there is no question that the dealer would receive the full retail price for the car, plus the tires, in perfect condition.

Mr. PEPPER. I realize that; but why would not a period of a year in respect to automobiles be satisfactory?

Mr. BROWN. We had considerable discussion in the committee over whether we should make the period 1 year or 2 years, together with some other differences of opinion between us. After the Senator from Michigan had talked with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], with Mr. Bishop, the representative of the American Automobile Dealers' Association, and with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], a member of the Small Business Committee, we rewrote section 4 and fixed 18 months as a reasonable period.

The Senator understands that 3 months of that period have already passed. In other words, the automobile rationing order was made January 1, 1942. Therefore, there are only 15 months remaining. At any time after that 15 months' period has elapsed the dealer may obtain from the R. F. C. the full retail price; and it was felt that that was a fairly reasonable compromise between differing views. I may also say to the Senator that the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], who has long been intimately connected with the automobile business and I think knows more about this subject matter than any of the rest of us, was a major factor in the consideration of this bill in the committee; and he likewise agreed that the 18 months' period was satisfactory, in view of the fact that 3 months, indeed almost 4 months, have already passed. On the first of May it will be 4 months.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Let me make a further comment, and then I will conclude. I have always understood, since I have been driving an automobile, that tires deteriorate relatively as rapidly when they are not in use as they do when they are experiencing reasonable use.

We are no more severely pressed in the scarcity of automobiles than in the scarcity of automobile tires. This rubber is going to be standing idle on the floors of the dealers of the country. If a man does not have an opportunity in 12 months to sell a car which is on his floor, it is not moving in private channels, and it ought to be taken over by the Government, and the tires either taken off it and put to some other use without waiting for another 6 months of idleness to pass, or the car itself, with the tires on it, should be put by the Government to some other use that would be in the public interest. I wonder if it has not been the experience of the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] that the tires do deteriorate when idle comparably to the way they deteriorate when they are experiencing reasonable use.

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, there is no doubt of that. If kept on unreasonable time, tires deteriorate in greater degree without use than they do by use; but, if they are properly stored, 24 months is not an unreasonable time. We tried to get the period fixed at 1 year, but there was objection to that on the part of Mr. Jones. We were confident that the matter would work itself out within 12 months.

Mr. PEPPER. I am interested in that statement. It was Mr. Jones, mind you—it was the lending agency, Mr. Jones, the Senator has now disclosed—who did not want the period to be a year. The Senator from Iowa and the members of the committee wanted it to be a year, because of the consideration the Senator from Iowa has just indicated. It looks as if we ought to have greater regard for the dealers and the conservation of the rubber supply than for Mr. Jones' idea, if he had a contrary idea about the lending period.

Mr. HERRING. We were more concerned with getting a definite date for the dealer, so that he would be assured that at a certain time he would get his retail price for the car and his carrying charges. We were concerned with his getting that; and it was for that reason that we yielded the 6 months, and, in consultation with the representatives of the American Automobile Dealers Association, we agreed that 18 months was a reasonable time.

Mr. PEPPER. What was Mr. Jones's reason for wanting to make the period 18 months instead of 12 months?

Mr. HERRING. I do not know. The Senator will have to ask him.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Florida that I think the general tenor of his remarks indicates a misapprehension of the situation. There is nothing to stop the Government of the United States from buying these cars in 2 months, 4 months, 6 months, or any length of time. The Government may buy them at any time by paying the price the Government and the dealer agree upon.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. The only point in subsection (4) is that the dealer is absolutely guaranteed 100 percent of the retail price, plus transportation costs, at the end of 18 months, if he has not theretofore disposed of his car.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, right on that point——

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me ask why the committee chose the language "the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator * * *." Why is it necessary to send the dealer all around town looking up one agency after another, and finally succeeding, after weeks and weeks and weeks, in getting a decision, when it might be done directly? If Mr. Jones can make loans and take over these automobiles, he certainly should be able to know what the fair retail price is.

Mr. BROWN. It is my judgment that the fair retail prices are already fixed, and that they are contained in price orders which have been heretofore or will be hereafter published. If the Senator from Georgia were eligible to buy a Mercury or a Ford or Chevrolet or a Cadillac, when he got his purchasing order, he would find that the price had already been fixed by the Price Administrator.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not understand that it is fixed; but, as this bill is written, a man would have to get the Price Administrator to fix the value before he could get a loan, would he not?

Mr. BROWN. No; I do not think he would have to get the Price Administrator to fix the value. The bill provides that he shall fix the retail price.

Mr. GEORGE. Well, he would have to get the Price Administrator to fix the retail price before he could either sell the car or borrow on it; would he not?

Mr. BROWN. There can only be certain definite factors involved: the f. o. b. Detroit price, plus transportation——

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, I know the Senator thinks there can be only certain relative factors involved, but we are putting an additional burden on a business that has already been outrageously treated by the Government. Why do it? Why not merely say "the retail price"?

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that we were faced with the language which was stricken out in the committee, appearing in subsection (4), on page 3, lines 6, 7, 8, and 9:

> plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity.

We felt that we were going a long way when we said to the dealer, "You do not have to take a second-hand car. You do not have to take any chances with financing an automobile. You do not have to make any arrangements with a

finance company. If you cannot sell an automobile on terms which you consider favorable during the 18 months' period," and only 14 months are now left, "we, the Government of the United States, will absolutely guarantee you 100 percent of the established and fair retail price, plus transportation costs"—because the language contained in the bill is for the commodity, wherever located.

It seems to me that that is going a long way. There were some members of the committee who felt that we were going too far, and that we were being a little too liberal; but I recognize what the Senator from Georgia has just referred to—that is, the fact that this particular group of businessmen probably has been hit harder than any other group in the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, certainly; and there never was any reason for it. There is no basic philosophy at all back of it.

Mr. BROWN. I do not want to argue that question with the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not, either.

Mr. BROWN. But we are faced with a condition.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that we are faced with a condition. What I want to know now is why the committee wants the retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator to control the Reconstruction Finance Corporation when it is making a loan or taking over the product. If the Price Administrator has fixed the price it is an established price, and he will have to deal with that price anyway. We need not write it in here. When we put it in here we are simply making the businessmen of the country go to another Federal agency and spend days trying to get a ruling from the Price Administrator.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator that counsel for the American Automobile Dealers' Association sat with us during the latter part of the hearing and when we went into what was substantially executive session, in which the testimony was not all taken down, and he was fully satisfied, in behalf of the automobile dealers, with this arrangement.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but I am still asking the Senator why is it necessary that the Price Administrator fix the retail prices? Is there any special reason?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; because I think there is a standard price that has been fixed.

Mr. GEORGE. If it has been fixed, it is fixed.

Mr. BROWN. I think that is the case.

Mr. GEORGE. It does not make any difference how it is fixed. If it is fixed by law, it is there; it is written; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would have to regard it. I do not see why this additional burden should be added.

Mr. BROWN. It seemed to us to be better to have a fixed and established price as the basis rather than a haggling between the R. F. C. and the dealer based upon the many charges that are set forth in the language that is stricken from the bill from line 6 to line 9. We thought we could cover it all by simply saying "the fixed and established price" of a Chevrolet automobile, for instance, plus the charges of transportation from, we will say, Michigan to Georgia—a fixed and established price against which no one could have any complaint. I say again that in the committee everyone seemed to be satisfied with that provision.

Mr. GEORGE. I was asking for information, and I shall move to strike out the words "as fixed by the Price Administrator," because they seem to me to be wholly useless. I think that when we recall the experience of the past we are bound to know that it takes a long time to get a ruling; sometimes it takes a day to have a telephone conversation started.

Mr. BROWN. I may misconceive this matter entirely, but I understand at the present time—and I am so informed by the gentleman at my right, who is very familiar with the situation—that the price of a Ford, the price of a Chevrolet, the price of a Cadillac have already been fixed and established, and no new price-fixing orders are contemplated. Those prices are already established.

Mr. GEORGE. Then, why not simply say the established price, and not say as fixed by some other agency, because we are not going to accomplish anything by it except another interminable red tape process?

Mr. BROWN. I do not think it would ever have to be referred to the Price Administrator. I think every automobile dealer knows what the fixed price is, just as the dealer in every other article knows the priced fixed for it.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not understand that the Price Administrator has fixed the price of automobiles. Rationing orders have been issued; restrictions have been applied; but I do not understand that he has fixed any price. If there is an established price, we might as well say so, it seems to me.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator that price regulation No. 85 fixes a ceiling upon the prices of all automobiles.

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps it does.

Mr. BROWN. I will be pleased to place that price regulation in the RECORD.

Mr. GEORGE. Why not say, then, "as fixed by price regulation No. 85," or whatever it may, and not force the dealer to go to another agency, because it will be simply a useless thing for him to do, and will take a great deal of time.

Mr. BROWN. I fear that if I should yield to the Senator in that respect we would have such a situation that the price of an article which ought to be changed could not be modified. The price fixed would not be the price on one car but would be the universal price applicable all over the United States. I think that it may be necessary to change the price of some of these automobiles, and, if we simply stated that price regulation No. 85 should govern we would be freezing into the law the regulation, which was not, perhaps, in the first instance intended to be permanent.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not want to take the Senator's time, but I wanted to know if there was any special reason why, when we are authorizing one Federal agency to make a loan, we go further and say that it shall be based upon the findings of another Federal agency, when that is precisely the heart of the trouble with the whole production program at this time.

Mr. BROWN. I can see the Senator's point, but I do not think it applies here, because we base it upon prices that already have been established.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. SMATHERS addressed the Chair.

Mr. BROWN. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as a member of the committee, I should like to say that there are two factors which influence me with reference to the language concerning which the Senator from Michigan has reported. One deals with the question propounded by the Senator from Florida. Mr. Jones told us, when he testified before the committee, that he had every reason to believe that the situation would and could be worked out entirely satisfactorily within the period of 18 months. It was Mr. Jones' testimony that it could be worked out within that period.

As to the second point made by the Senator from Georgia, I would recall to the mind of the Senator from Michigan the fact that when we adopted the Price Control Act we provided the basis upon which prices should be established. Any dealer who chooses may take an appeal from any ruling fixing a price. Moreover, a price, when fixed, must be accompanied by a statement of the considerations upon which it was fixed—all of which has, thus far, been done in accordance with price order No. 85 to which the Senator from Michigan referred. So, after we canvassed the situation fully for many long hours, both on the floor and in conference, when that bill was worked out, we set up a mechanism which does apply, which has worked—and is working—and within the skeleton outline of which it can be expected that we will proceed in the future. It is because of the factors already created by and known to the law that I personally feel that the language which the Senator from Michigan urges should be adopted.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to say that I agree most heartily with what the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] have said in regard to this matter. Leon Henderson, the great Administrator, surrounded with the experts of the country, took such action that, in my State, a farmer could not buy a truck to use in his farming operations; he could not buy tires for use on machines used on the farm. It is all because Henderson's department is still wrestling with a policy, and I think the shorter time he is given to act the better off the country will be.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I do not want to be diverted from this bill; I am one of those who had hoped that we would have a general price order much earlier than we have gotten it. I understand it is to be issued either today or tomorrow. When Senators see that order—and I have had what might be called a slight preview of it—they will be amazed at the amount of work that was

necessary in order to prepare a price-ceiling order which covers retail prices and wholesale prices upon practically every commodity that is handled in the sale of goods in the entire United States.

The price-control bill became a law on January 30. It has taken the months of February and March and the better part of April in order to prepare this price-control over-all order. One with any slight contemplation of the economic picture in the United States must realize that the mere detail of writing down the price, wholesale and retail, of every commodity that is sold in the United States is a tremendous task. I wish it could have been done sooner, and I became impatient from time to time at the failure of the price-control office to prepare and issue this general price order, but it will be issued in a matter of hours rather than a matter of days, and I think when it is issued, the people will realize that it involved a tremendous task.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Let us get away from the question of automobiles for a moment. The Senator has stated, very correctly, that this bill applies to all articles that may be rationed. What would be the effect of section 4 in its application, for instance, to articles which have been in a dealer's possession and because of being shelf-worn or outmoded, or for any other reason, are unsalable? Under this provision, would the R. F. C. be required to take them off his hands at a fair retail price fixed wherever the article may be located?

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that was a question which disturbed me a great deal. I try to think in a dimensional way about this subject and not have my mind solely trained upon the automobile question or the tire question, for there are a great many commodities involved. If the Senator will look at subsection (b) on page 3 he will find that—

> The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may prescribe additional terms and conditions with respect to such purchases and loans as it deems to be necessary and consistent with the purposes of this section.

I think possibly as to shop-worn articles which have remained unsold for a long period of time, some authority is there vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I may instance, for example, galluses made of rubber, a very necessary article, and, of course, subject to the rubber-rationing order. They deteriorate rather rapidly, but with regard to the regular stock of the merchant, which he is unable to move by reason of the stringent and drastic, and, I may say, heretofore unexampled, order of the Government due to the emergency we confront, we want to lean to the side of liberality toward him. I think that is the idea of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is the author of this bill. Therefore, if we make any mistakes, we want to make them in behalf of and on the side of the dealer in these goods and articles.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator has indicated the spirit which characterized the action of the committee, and I know it does. In that case, why not allow an amendment to be inserted right at the end of line 11, for example, at the conclusion of paragraph 4 on page 3, in the following words:

> Any dealer may require the purchase of such article or articles held by him at any time after 12 months from the date of the rationing order.

If that were the law, if at the expiration of 12 months from the issuing of the order, a dealer did not think he could sell an article, and if he had not been able to sell it, he would have the option of having the Government take it over. I cannot see how the Government could sustain any injury, because for the space of the interim the Government money is out, and the article is kept out of commerce, and in the case of tires that is a disadvantage. Would the Senator be willing to accept such an amendment?

Mr. BROWN. In view of the fact that the committee fully considered the 12-month period and fully considered the 2-year period, and compromised, with the assent of representatives of the dealers who were present, who were fully satisfied with 18 months, I feel that it would not be appropriate for me to consent to any such amendment.

I wish to read to the Senator from Florida a statement which I repeat with some personal misgivings, but I do it because of the fact that we had a rather strenuous battle in the committee over this subject matter. I may say the Committee on Banking and Currency battles things out pretty thoroughly in the committee, and after a discussion among the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], Mr. Jones, and several members of the committee, which I would not say was acrimonious, but which was certainly intense, the following colloquy occurred. Mr. Bishop, representing the dealers, said:

> If I might make a suggestion, the expiration of the period of the commitment is May 31. I would be willing, and I think my group would be willing, to have the time changed to a year and a half.
>
> Senator BROWN. I was going to propose a compromise here which I have worked out. I would like to have the committee see what they think of this. Commencing on line 25:
>
> "Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity that has been in the stock of one or more dealers for an aggregate of 18 months or longer after the beginning of the rationing an amount not less than the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located."

Which is now the language of the bill as amended. Then this occurred:

> Senator TAFT. It sounds all right to me.
>
> Senator HERRING. It sound all right to me.
>
> Mr. JONES. That is perfect. It sounds all right to me.

All these gentlemen were contending vigorously with each other—the R. F. C. representative, the representative of the American Automobile Dealers' Association, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is a very difficult gentleman to convince at times, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], who knew more about the subject than anyone else, and when, after 2 days of hearings, they agreed upon the language, I think the Senator from Florida should accept it.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Michigan had sat, as the Senator from Florida did, with a group of 25 or 50 automobile dealers in Florida, and they gave him contrary advice and petition, I am sure the Senator would expect me to pay more attention to the practical advice of these Florida dealers than to that of my able friend, the Senator from Michigan. After all, of the group to which the Senator has referred, the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] was the only one who might be called an automobile expert, unless the Senator from Michigan has that virtue, and he has stated here, as I understood him, that if it were a matter of preference, a year would be preferred over 18 months.

If the Senator wants to give the break to the dealer, I do not see any reason why the dealer should not have an option, at the end of 12 months, to call on the Government to take over the article, if he has not been able to sell it by that time. He has had his floor space used for 12 months by a rationed article which he has not been able to sell, he is paying interest every day on the money, and this bill would make him pay interest probably 6 months longer, because if he could not sell the article in 12 months, it is not very probable he would be able to sell it in 18 months.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware, who is a member of the committee.

Mr. HUGHES. I am a member of the committee, and I went into the committee hearings with my mind pretty well made up that a year was the proper time to fix, and I think Senators will recall that I expressed that view in the committee.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator even had misgivings about the reporting of the bill.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; and I reserved my right not to be bound by what the committee did. But after I had consulted others whose judgment I was willing to take, and had heard the statements and the arguments which were presented, I became firmly convinced that the language now in the bill, providing for a period of 18 months, is better and fairer than that providing for a year. So I am satisfied with the bill as it is, and I shall support the change which was made.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that during the interim, the 18 months, the dealer

will be allowed to sell only under the rationing provision.

Mr. BROWN. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. The rationing provision itself is pretty stringent. With all the pressure brought to bear on us not to make purchases, to do nothing but contribute what we have to the prosecution of the war, it looks to me as if forcing the dealer to use his space for the storage of articles and preventing him from disposing of them would be unjust.

Let me give an illustration. I was in Savannah some time ago and accidentally drove into a warehouse, a place half as big as this Chamber, though the roof was not quite so high. It was chock-full of brand-new tires. I said to the proprietor: "What are you doing with these tires?"

He said, "I have in the neighborhood of $20,000 invested in these tires and cannot sell one. They are deteriorating every day, and I am paying insurance, storage, and interest on the money."

I just took that as being an accident. Then I went to my own home city and had occasion to try to get some nails, to be used in the erection of some garages. I was told by a dealer that he could not sell me nails, and he said, "Come in and I will show you something." I found that his place of business covered about the same space embraced in the warehouse to which I just referred, and it was stacked clear to the ceiling with $22,000 worth of brand new tires. He was paying insurance, storage, and interest on the money involved.

For the life of me I cannot see that there is any common sense in preventing the distribution of materials fit for just one use, which never will be of value for anything else, which in a comparatively short time will not be worth half what they are now worth. When one is out of them, he is out.

Mr. BROWN. So far as concerns the tires about which the Senator is speaking, the policy now, I take it, is that all the $22,000 worth of tires which the gentleman in Savannah has he may turn over to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at cost to him, that is, the entire cost to him, I take it, the wholesale price, plus the cost of transportation, plus any other reasonable charges, and then to that amount is added 10 percent. He may do that now, without the benefit of the pending bill. So he is entitled to a flat 10-percent profit on the tires which he has in stock, over and above all fair and reasonable expenses.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator means above all overhead to him?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. So I think the problem is adequately taken care of.

Mr. PEPPER. But he cannot do that with the tires on automobiles.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that if one buys a new automobile which has a spare tire, the Government confiscates the spare tire.

Mr. BROWN. But pays for it.

Mr. SMITH. Here we are, 4 months in actual war, with all our boasted wealth and resources, rationing sugar, rationing gasoline, rationing everything. Where is our boasted production of raw materials, and our capacity for fabrication? It does not make sense that with all our wealth we have to go hungry, barefooted, and naked. Why is it necessary? The people are asking that question. We had better begin to deal in a kind of liberal way with the people, who, up to the present, have run the Government. The Government is running the people now, and must of necessity do it during the war; but I am amazed that, with all our boasted wealth and resources, we are put on starvation rations right now, one man saying "You cannot have an automobile tire," another saying "You cannot have gasoline." I understand there is a plethora of gasoline in the West, but that we cannot have it in the East because adequate transportation is not available. Mr. President, where are our boasted facilities for transportation?

I desired to have some factories established to make the essential elements of nitrates. "No," I was told, "You cannot get the wherewithal to build them. You cannot get the steel. You cannot get this and you cannot get that."

I know that no Senator present is more anxious for the country to win the war than am I. I am willing to make any kind of sacrifice necessary to that end; but why should our effort be aggravated by nonessential things? Let us as a body get together and investigate what is essential and what is not essential. We are delegating our powers to a great number of men who may know as much as we do—I hope and trust to God they do—but the situation is becoming aggravating. It hits at the very foundation of our Government. Our problem is how we are to get our people mobilized, how we are to get our stuff to the markets, and how products are to get from the market to us, in view of all the restrictions which are placed upon them. We are making Washington the great commercial center of America, and a few men are appointed to dictate the terms under which we shall commercialize our products.

Mr. President, I think some of us cannot see the forest for the trees. I am afraid that is what is the matter with us.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, with reference to what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said a moment ago, I will say that I have the order before me, and I wish to read to him the pertinent parts of it. The order, No. 85, was issued on February 2.

MAXIMUM RETAIL PRICE FOR NEW PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES

On and after February 2, 1942, regardless of the terms of any contract of sale, or other commitment, no person shall sell, offer to sell, deliver, or transfer a new passenger automobile with standard equipment as of October 15, 1941, at retail, at a price higher than the maximum retail price for the automobile, which shall be the sum of the following items:

The manufacturer's list price at the factory—

That is commonly known as the f. o. b. price—

as of October 15, 1941—

I may say there are only two automobile manufacturers who have changed their prices since that time, and those two changes have been taken care of in the order. Plus—

(b) The Federal excise tax.

(c) An allowance for transportation, which shall not exceed the actual rail freight charge for the transportation of the automobile from the factory to dealer at carload rate.

(d) An allowance of 5 percent of (a) and (c) above, or $75, whichever is lower, which includes the charge for handling and delivery.

Plus an amount equal to 1 percent per month, or $15, whichever is lower, for each calendar month, or the greater part thereof, after January 31, 1942, which elapses prior to the sale of the automobile to the purchaser.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was not aware of the terms of the order.

Mr. BROWN. They are very liberal, would not the Senator say?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. Rigid restrictions are in force, and the manufacture and sale of automobiles have been practically stopped. I did not know that a price order had also been issued. Let me ask the Senator a question. The Senator's interpretation, and that is the committee's understanding, is, as I now understand, that the Price Administrator will not be called on to redefine the fair market value?

Mr. BROWN. Not at all.

Mr. GEORGE. Or the retail price?

Mr. BROWN. Not at all.

Mr. GEORGE. The reference in the measure is to established prices?

Mr. BROWN. Prices already fixed.

Mr. GEORGE. Through that particular agency?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. If that is true, it is all right.

Mr. BROWN. That was the understanding all of us had.

Mr. GEORGE. If the committee so interprets the provision, then it is all right. There can be no objection to it. But if there must be a redefinition——

Mr. BROWN. I would fully agree with the Senator from Georgia in that respect. We are referring to price schedules already issued of a general nature.

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, I wish to confirm what the Senator from Michigan states. It was our understanding that the basis should be the list price, plus the transportation charges, as fixed in this order——

Mr. BROWN. Plus 1 percent per month in addition to these prices, for each month the car is held, or $15, whichever is lower.

Mr. HERRING. Yes. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] the fact that if the dealer wishes the cars to remain over the full period he may make his loan, and keep his cars if they are not allocated by the Priority Board. At the end of the 18 months he is assured of the full retail price, plus the transportation charges. He is accustomed to turn over his stock of automobiles every 60 or 90 days. Nevertheless, business now is not as usual, and I know the automobile dealers are just as willing to do their part as is anyone else. It was not intended to give them the full retail price and let them sell their cars in 3 or 4 months.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr BROWN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator regard this language as sufficiently flexible to allow the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy these cars at this price in a period shorter than 18 months if it should determine to do so?

Mr. HERRING. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN. There is no question that the Senator's statement is accurate.

Mr. PEPPER. At the same price as fixed in subparagraph 4?

Mr. HERRING. At cost price plus 1 percent a month to carry the automobile.

Mr. PEPPER. Suppose the Loan Administrator should determine for the purpose of conserving the rubber on the cars, we will say, and putting them into the most immediate and necessary use, that at the end of the 12-month period he would like to take over these cars.

Mr. BROWN. He could make an agreement with the dealers to do so at any price they would agree upon. There is no question about that.

Mr. PEPPER. That is all right.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, price order No. 85 is very long and very detailed. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks all of page 27, all of page 28, and on page 29, down to "1360.56. Notices to be posted", be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRICE SCHEDULE NO. 85: NEW PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES

TITLE 32: NATIONAL DEFENSE

Chapter II: Office of Price Administration

Part 1360: Motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment

The complete diversion of automobile manufacturing facilities to war work has brought the production of passenger automobiles to an end. Rationing Order No. 2 of the Office of Price Administration restricts the sale of new automobiles to those persons who can show a need related to the public interest. This schedule establishes maximum wholesale and retail prices for new passenger automobiles as a measure of coordination with the rationing program.

Prices announced by automobile manufacturers at the beginning of the 1942 model year represented an average advance of 14 percent over 1941 prices. At the request of the Office of Price Administration, each manufacturer agreed not to change the announced prices without prior consultation with the Office. This schedule serves to formalize that agreement.

An investigation undertaken by the Office of Price Administration with respect to retail prices showed a general upward trend although there was a wide variation in prices among dealers. The rise in price had been effected not by an increase in the list price but by means of an advance in charges for handling and delivery for services to be rendered after delivery, and for transportation. This schedule fixes the maximum amount which may be charged at retail, based on the list price established by the manufacturer, and the maximum charges which may be added for transportation and handling and delivery.

Because dealers and manufacturers may be obliged to carry their inventories over an abnormally long period due to the rationing program, the prices established are subject to monthly adjustment upward to compensate for the added burden.

Accordingly, under the authority vested in me by Executive Order No. 8734, it is hereby directed that:

1360.51. Maximum wholesale prices for new passenger automobiles:

(a) On and after February 2, 1942, regardless of the terms of any contract of sale or purchase, or other commitment, no manufacturer, distributor, or exporter of new passenger automobiles shall sell, offer to sell, deliver or transfer a new passenger automobile to any person at a price higher than the maximum price. The maximum price shall be the highest price prevailing for the same make and model between October 1, 1941, and October 15, 1941, for the same class of purchaser, except that, in the case of the Packard Motor Car Co. and the Crosley Corporation the maximum price shall be the highest price prevailing on the effective date of this schedule.

(b) In the event that the automobile is without equipment which was standard on October 15, 1941, the maximum price shall be reduced by the wholesale value of the equipment removed.

(c) To the maximum price may be added an amount equal to 1 percent of the list price of the automobile, or $15, whichever is lower, for each calendar month or greater part thereof, after January 31, 1942, which elapses prior to the sale of the automobile by the manufacturer, distributor, or exporter.

1360.51 to 1360.61, inclusive, issued pursuant to authority contained in E. O. Nos. 8734, 8875 (6 F. R. 1917, 4483).

1360.52. Maximum retail price for new passenger automobiles: On and after February 2, 1942, regardless of the terms of any contract of sale, or other commitment, no person shall sell, offer to sell, deliver or transfer a new passenger automobile with standard equipment as of October 15, 1941, at retail, at a price higher than the maximum retail price for the automobile, which shall be the sum of the following items:

(a) The manufacturer's list price at the factory for the automobile with standard equipment as of October 15, 1941, as shown for each make and model of automobile in appendix A hereof, incorporated herein as section 1360.61.

(1) If the automobile is without equipment which was standard on October 15, 1941, the list price shall be reduced by the retail value of the equipment removed.

(b) The Federal excise tax.

(c) An allowance for transportation which shall not exceed the actual rail freight charge for the transportation of the automobile from the factory to dealer at carload rate.

(d) An allowance of 5 percent of (a) and (c) above, or $75, whichever is lower, which includes the charge for handling and delivery, for which the dealer shall render all of the services customarily performed in order to prepare the automobile for delivery to the purchaser and all of the factory recommended get-ready and delivery operations.

(e) An amount equal to 1 percent of the list price of the automobile, or $15, whichever is lower, for each calendar month or greater part thereof, after January 31, 1942, which elapses prior to the sale of the automobile to the purchaser.

1360.53. Less than maximum prices.—Lower prices than those set forth above may be charged, demanded, paid, or offered.

1360.54. Evasion:

(a) The price limitations set forth in this schedule shall not be evaded either by direct or indirect methods in connection with the sale, delivery, or transfer of a new passenger automobile, alone or in conjunction with any other consideration or by way of any commission, charge for transportation, for equipment, for handling or delivery services, or by the removal of parts or equipment from an automobile.

(b) No buyer of a new passenger automobile shall be required, as a condition of the sale, to agree to purchase any equipment other than standard equipment as defined by the manufacturer, or any after-delivery services. The price demanded for any such equipment or services shall be separately listed on the invoice or bill of sale given to the buyer, and on any price tag, display sign, or other advertising used by the dealer in connection with the sale or display of a new passenger automobile.

The State and local taxes imposed on the transaction and payable by the buyer, and the charge imposed under section 1360.52 (e) hereof, shall also be separately listed on the invoice or bill of sale.

Nor shall any buyer of a new passenger automobile be required, as a condition of the sale of a new passenger automobile, to agree to make payment over a period of time, nor to finance the purchase of the automobile through any lending agency, nor to agree to a transfer to the seller of a used car, in part payment of the purchase price.

1360.55. Records and reports:

(a) Within 20 days of the effective date of this schedule, each manufacturer shall file with the Office of Price Administration a list of standard equipment as of October 15, 1941, for each make and model of passenger automobile manufactured by him.

(b) Every manufacturer, distributor, or exporter of, or retail dealer in, new passenger automobiles after the effective date of this schedule shall keep for inspection by the Office of Price Administration, for a period of not less than 1 year, complete and accurate records of each sale of a new passenger automobile, showing the date thereof, the make and model, the name and address of the buyer, the price paid, and the make, model, model year, and valuation of any automobile which may be accepted in part payment of the purchase price, and any other consideration which may be accepted in payment of the price of the new passenger automobile.

(c) Persons affected by this schedule shall submit such reports to the Office of Price Administration as it may, from time to time, require.

Mr. BROWN. That, I would say, covers the substantive part of price order No. 85, without going into the tremendous detail which is contained in the remainder of the order, and which would require a great deal of printing.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to add on the subject of the 12 months that that was actually suggested by the representative of the Automobile Dealers Association himself. It was not suggested in the first instance by the Senator from Michigan. I asked Mr. Bishop the question:

Do you think it should be 1 or 2 years?

And his answer was:

It is a question of policy what that term should be. It seemed to us that 1 year was reasonable, and it coincides with the expression of the Rationing Administrator. * * * I think 2 years is too long. I would not be averse to seeing a reasonable compromise between 1 year and 2 years, if that would be more satisfactory under the circumstances.

And again on page 49 of the hearings he said:

If I might make a suggestion, the expiration of the period of the commitment is May 31. I would be willing, and I think my group would be willing, to have the time changed to a year and a half.

So it was entirely his own suggestion, as the compromise after discussion, and it seems a reasonable period.

Mr. BROWN. I may say when I read the excerpts from the record, in connection with which I referred to my good fortune in getting the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the R. F. C. Loan Administrator, and Mr. Bishop together, that I did read first Mr. Bishop's suggestion along that line, which I may say to the Senator from Ohio had been in my mind, but had not been expressed definitely, and when the expression was made I leaped at it as an opportunity to compromise these differences, which resulted as I have stated.

Mr. TAFT. I also should like to call the Senator's attention to the record on the question of the elimination of the word "directed." It must be remembered that this provision applies to all kinds of articles, and it is a pretty stiff direction to say that as to any article which is rationed or "frozen," the Administrator must do certain things. The direction may not fit in all cases. We know what we want to do with respect to automobiles. The following colloquy took place, as set forth on page 35 of the hearings:

Mr. JONES. On the first page, line 10, we would eliminate the word "directed."

Senator TAFT. That is, if a policy is fixed in this bill, you would go ahead; you would have a little more freedom, perhaps, in making your adjustment if a legislative policy were established?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

I took that as a commitment on his part that if this bill were passed without the word "directed" he would regard it as a legislative policy which he would follow. There might be questions as to exactly how it should be done, but he would not avail himself in any way of the fact that the word "directed" was stricken. We can therefore assume that that policy will be definitely established, even though the word "directed" is not included.

Mr. BROWN. And the members of the committee who were likewise members of the Small Business Committee accepted that understanding and statement on the part of the Federal Loan Administrator, Mr. Jesse Jones.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I regret to intrude upon the Senator's discussion. I was unable to be present during the latter part of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee, and, of course, was not familiar with the amendment until I came on the floor today. After listening to the explanations which have been made, I feel in accord with the Senator who has presented the bill.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. I believe that the amendment meets with the approval of the representatives of the automobile industry generally. I have not heard any objection. I have been in touch with them, and I believe they are entirely satisfied with the way the bill was worked out before the committee. Therefore I shall not interrupt the Senator, who is presenting the bill in such an able manner.

Mr. BROWN. Let me say to the Senator from Montana that the bill differs in no substantial manner from the form in which it was originally introduced by him. The Senator from Montana is certainly entitled to great credit for the manner in which he has presented this matter to the people of the country and to the Senate. I refer particularly to the problems of the small businessman, which are intensified with respect to automobile dealers, and which will be intensified with respect to dealers in other articles. Probably such dealers will not be affected to the degree that automobile dealers are affected, but nevertheless the general effect will be most unfortunate. It must be remembered that this bill is not only an automobile dealers' bill. The Senator's bill will provide relief for all dealers whose business is affected by rationing orders.

Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency was, on page 1, line 10, after the word "authorized", to strike out "and directed", so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 5g thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5h. (a) In order to prevent and relieve distress among dealers in articles or commodities which are rationed in connection with the war effort, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting directly or through any of its subsidiary corporations, is authorized to purchase or make loans upon the security of any article or commodity the sale or distribution of which is rationed under authority of the United States, subject to the following terms and conditions:

"(1) Such purchases and loans shall be made only in the case of articles or commodities which have been rationed in a manner and under circumstances which have resulted or are likely to result in a substantial number of dealers being unable, in the ordinary course of trade or business, to sell within a period of 6 months from the beginning of such rationing the stocks of such articles or commodities which they have in stock."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, at the beginning of line 14, to insert "a substantial part of"; and in the same line, after the word "whose", to strike out "principal", so as to read:

(2) Such purchases and loans shall be made only in the case of, or for the purpose of aiding or assisting, dealers a substantial part of whose business consists of dealing in and servicing rationed articles or commodities of one or more kinds.

(3) Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity which he has on hand an amount not less than its cost to him (to the extent that such cost is a reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business), plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 4, after the words "aggregate of", to strike out "one year" and "18 months"; in line 6, after the word "price", to strike out "plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity", and insert "as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located", so as to read:

(4) Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity that has been in the stock of one or more dealers for an aggregate of 18 months or longer after the beginning of the rationing an amount not less than the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 14, after the word "and", to strike out "shall" and insert "may", so as to read:

(5) Such purchases may be made from and such loans made to such dealers or credit agencies furnishing credit for such dealers, and may be made upon the request of any dealer having title to the rationed article or commodity or having the right to acquire title thereto upon the discharge of his credit obligations with respect thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 5, after the words "expiration of", to strike out "1 year and 30 days" and insert "19 months", so as to read:

(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may prescribe such additional terms and conditions with respect to such purchases and loans as it deems to be necessary and consistent with the purposes of this section: *Provided*, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not be required to purchase or make a loan upon the security of any article or commodity which is not in a salable condition, or which has suffered substantial damage or deterioration as the result of negligence or lack of proper care. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to sell at public or private sale, with or without competitive bidding, any article or commodity acquired by it pursuant to this section: *Provided*, That, until the expiration of 19 months after the beginning of the rationing of such article or commodity, no such sale shall be made except to a dealer in such article or commodity. In the event any such sale is made to another department or agency of the Government, such other department or agency is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to pay for such article or commodity any price not in excess of a fair retail market price as of the date of such sale.

(c) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make such agreements or arrangements as may be necessary and appropriate for carrying out the purposes of this section, including agreements to pay to those from whom it acquires articles or commodities a portion of the proceeds realized by such Corporation from the sale of such articles or commodities. For the purposes of this section, an article or commodity shall be deemed to be rationed whenever its sale to the general public in the ordinary course of trade or business has been restricted or prohibited by any regulation or order made for the purpose of aiding in the more effective prosecution of the war effort or for the purpose of conserving the supply of such article or commodity.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments which meet with the approval of such members of the committee as I have been able to consult. Both of them have been added to the House bill which I understand will be reported to the House tomorrow.

The first amendment, in substance, provides that no authority, limitation, or restriction contained in the bill shall be construed to limit, modify, or otherwise affect any of the powers now vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The general counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation believes that this amendment is necessary in order to protect existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

(d) No authority, limitation, restriction, or other provision contained in this section shall be construed to limit, restrict, modify, or otherwise in any way affect any authority or powers now or hereafter vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or in any corporation created or organized by or at the instance of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. The second amendment provides that in connection with these loans there shall be no recourse to the dealer. I myself have accepted the amendment. I have consulted with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is agreeable to it. It seems to me that under all the circumstances it is fair that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should depend upon the automobiles, and not upon the personal obligation of the dealer. That is the purpose of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 1, after the word "care" and before the period it is proposed to insert *"And provided further,* That if, upon the sale of any article or commodity acquired pursuant to the terms of any loan contract entered into hereunder, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any subsidiary corporation thereof shall not recover, by reason of any limitation upon sales price imposed pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, the full amount of any such loan, no recourse on account of such deficiency shall be had against the borrower."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was called from the Chamber while the Senator was discussing the amendment on page 3, in line 6. I understand from the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] that some explanation was made to the effect that striking out the language in lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, which provided for a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carriage charges, and other expenses, was really not intended to eliminate the consideration of those items. I find the following specific statement on page 2 of the report filed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan:

The general rule provided by the bill is that purchases and loans thereunder shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on a basis which will enable dealers to secure for an article or commodity not less than cost (to the extent that such cost is a reasonable one incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business), plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity.

The question is whether striking out those factors in the bill means that that sentence should also be stricken out of the report so far as the meaning of the bill is concerned.

Mr. BROWN. No. The first sentence in the report after the heading "Terms of relief" refers to the loans contemplated rather than the purchases. In that respect it was felt that each of these items should be detailed in the statute, because we have no price-fixing order to cover those items. When it comes to the purchases which are provided for in subsection (4) on page 3, by striking out the language referred to and fixing the retail price according to the terms and conditions fixed by the Price Administrator we thereby include every item which the Price Administrator includes in his statement, which I inserted in the RECORD during the absence of the Senator, I believe, which items include not only the f. o. b. price at Detroit, for example, on a Ford automobile, the transportation, which is the rail freight in carload lots, and the servicing charge of $75 for each car, which is generally agreed upon between the industry and the Price Administrator; but in addition, in the calculation of the retail price, 1 percent a month, or $15, whichever is lower, for each month the dealer keeps the car on the floor. So there is no question that this language was stricken out merely for the purpose of preventing duplication. If we should include the language "plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs," and so forth, and then refer to the Price Control Administrator's order, we should be referring to the subject matter twice.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not quite understand the standard which governs the Price Administrator.

Mr. BROWN. The Price Administrator has already issued his order on retail prices of automobiles. As to the prices, there was no difficulty between the Price Administrator and the dealers' representatives.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That order has already been issued.

Mr. BROWN. That order has already been issued, and it has been inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not an order which he may change at any time?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. We must take that chance. However, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that there is no danger that the order will be changed, except in accord with a change in the factory f. o. b. price. That is the basis for the price order. After this agreement was made the prices on Packard automobiles, and perhaps on one of the Chrysler models, were raised, and the Price Administrator immediately changed his price order in accordance with the fundamental f. o. b. Detroit price.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that I am quite satisfied that it would be the intention of the Office of Price Administration to take into consideration the various factors; but as I recall existing legislation, there is no legislative standard to guide him in fixing those prices.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; he has adopted quite definitely the period October 1–15 in his price-control order respecting automobiles; but, as the Senator knows, as no automobiles are being manufactured, there has been no change in that price. I assure the Senator, with all the confidence I possess in respect to this bill, that he need have no fear upon that subject matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are so many circumstances which enter into a complicated problem of this kind—circumstances which cannot be foreseen—that it seems to me to be highly necessary that we should carefully scrutinize the language of the bill.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My attention was called the other day to a circumstance which illustrates how difficult it is to foresee everything which may happen. The order with respect to freezing sales of automobiles, for example, provided that no 1942 automobiles could be sold. This incident occurred: A young man living in my State bought a 1942 automobile late in 1941. He was engaged in the ranch business, and in using the automobile he was not at all moderate, I suppose, in his driving, to put it mildly. In any event, when he was called for the draft this year, the automobile had traveled more than 20,000 miles. The tires were practically worn out, or at least they were no longer new tires. He was buying the automobile on the installment plan. He went into the Army. His mother did not want to purchase the car, it was of no use to her, so the finance company repossessed this 1942 automobile which had traveled over 20,000 miles. The finance company in turn had recourse to the dealer who had sold the car, and required the dealer under the old contract to pay the amount due on the car. Now the car is in the possession of the original dealer; but, because it is a 1942 car, it cannot be sold.

Obviously, that is a situation which is not fair. It is not just, and some correction should be made, and I assume that eventually some correction will be made.

In circumstances of that kind, however, when we find these factors which are of the greatest importance to that automobile dealer stricken out, and the matter left to the discretion of the Price Administrator, one naturally rises to question. I am satisfied from what the Senator says that he is convinced that automobile dealers will have these factors taken into consideration in their applications for loans.

Mr. BROWN. I am sure that when the Senator reads the price order which I have had inserted in the RECORD he will be satisfied, too. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has just discussed the question of the price order which has been inserted in the RECORD. Let me ask a question. Does the Senator believe that the price order will limit or narrow the factors which have been stricken out?

Mr. BROWN. No. Every factor included in the language which was stricken out is included in the price order, plus a definite amount for an additional carrying charge—1 percent per month of the wholesale price, or $15, whichever is lower.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the amendment broadens rather than narrows the factors which are included, which are all-important in connection with this amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I think it does. I think it not only broadens them, but it clearly defines the make-up of the charges, to the satisfaction of the automobile dealers themselves.

Mr. LUCAS. And the only question involved would be that of changing the order, which probably would not happen? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; in view of the fact that no cars are being made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). If there be no further amendment proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6293.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The CHIEF CLERK called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Herring	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hill	Rosier
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Hughes	Schwartz
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Bulow	Kilgore	Smith
Bunker	La Follette	Spencer
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Byrd	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Danaher	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Doxey	Murdock	Wallgren
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis

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

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. DANAHER. I will not ask for recognition until action is had on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to have the motion put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6293.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

FISHERIES OF ATLANTIC SEABOARD—INTERSTATE COMPACT

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask the forbearance of the Senator from Utah for a moment, as I am due at a conference committee meeting to be held at 2 o'clock. With the Senator's permission, and by virtue of his consideration thus extended, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider at this time Calendar No. 1307, House bill 6020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should like to reserve objection, and ask if I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for the purpose indicated by him, will the regular order be displaced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not if it is done by unanimous consent.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Then I should like to accommodate the Senator from Connecticut, and will be happy to yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill requested by the Senator from Connecticut, which the clerk will report by title?

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6020) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries—marine, shell, and anadromous—of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Commerce, through the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] has reported Order No. 1308, Senate bill 1972, a bill which I introduced and which sought the approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the utilization of the fisheries along the Atlantic seaboard. However, the other House passed House bill 6020, and it is now on the calendar as Order 1307. Since action would normally come first on the House bill, and since it is preferable because certain protecting amendments were adopted by the House which I believe to be highly desirable, I respectfully ask that the Senate act upon House bill 6020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House bill is already before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Connecticut to explain the bill, and particularly to explain in what respect, if any, the House bill differs from the bill which has been approved by the Senate Committee on Commerce. I may say that it would appear from the calendar that the House bill has never been considered by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate. If, therefore, there are any differences between the two measures, it ought to be made clear to the Senate what they are, and that they would have the approval of the Senate committee.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly.

Mr. BILBO. As chairman of the subcommittee that handled this bill before the Commerce Committee, I will say that the full committee had the House bill before it when passing on the Senate bill introduced by the Senator from Connecticut, and we incorporated in the Senate bill all the amendments which had been adopted by the House. Therefore in effect the Senate bill as reported by the committee in full is identical with the House bill which is now on the calendar, and the Senate committee has endorsed the House bill.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his very real helpfulness.

Let me say further to the Senator from Wyoming that on page 2 of the House bill has been added the State of Virginia, which the Senate bill originally did not include, and on page 8 of the House bill there is a reference, as I recall to the amount of the additional contributions to be made by each of the States in order to create a fund under which the act will become operative. Those are the only changes the Senate Committee on Commerce approved. So far as I know there is no objection from any source to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Utah for his courtesy.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, just a word of explanation as to the parliamentary situation respecting House bill 6293 before I proceed to discuss the provisions of the bill. The House of Representatives has passed two bills on the same general subject, one relating to a women's corps in the Army, and the other to a women's corps in the Navy. The bill affecting the Army was passed with a provision that the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps should be set up outside the Army. Then the House passed the bill providing that the Women's Reserve Corps in the

Navy should be set up in the Navy. The action in regard to the Women's Reserve Corps in the Navy is the later action of the two.

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs reported the House bill providing for the establishment of a Women's Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army but not as a part of the Army. I shall offer a substitute for that bill, the spirit of which can best be explained by reading the title as it is proposed to be amended.

Amend the title so as to read: An act to establish a Women's Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States.

I make this explanation because there is pending, and it becomes the proper order of procedure, an amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] to the bill as reported by the Senate committee. The amendment is the nondiscrimination amendment, which is generally offered to military bills, and provides that there shall not be discrimination because of race, religion, and so forth. If the substitute which I shall offer is accepted for the bill the Senate Committee on Military Affairs reported, the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey would not be necessary, because the setting up of the Women's Auxiliary Corps within the Army would be in accordance with the rules governing the Army of the United States at the present time, which rules prohibit the type of discrimination mentioned. There are, of course, colored units in the Army of the United States, and there undoubtedly will be colored units in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

Mr. President, with this explanation, I must ask the Chair how I should proceed.

Mr. McNARY. I understand from the remarks of the able Senator from Utah that the bill which he has moved to consider, which motion has been agreed to, has been modified, by expansion, to include the Navy.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is hardly correct.

Mr. McNARY. Then I have been misinformed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The bill having to do with the Navy has not come to the Senate as yet, but it has passed the House.

Mr. McNARY. In any event, the Senator states that a substitute is to be offered in lieu of the bill now pending?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. What has necessitated that? Is it a change in the substance of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The change, in a general way, is simply this, that the bill as reported provided for the setting up of the women's unit outside the Army. The women in the unit would not have Army rank, they would not have Army privileges, they would not have Army enlistments.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator for his courtesy, but he is not arriving at the point of my inquiry. Does the Senator desire to change the substance of the bill by the adoption of the substitute, or does he wish to offer an amendment? I make the inquiry because the able junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] has an amendment he wishes to offer. Does the Senator wish to offer his proposal as an amendment to the pending bill or as a complete substitute?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As a complete substitute for the pending bill.

Mr. McNARY. It is necessary to do that in order to meet the Senator's objective?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is.

Mr. McNARY. Then, in the absence of the able Senator from New Jersey, I shall offer the amendment which was offered to the original bill, unless its substance is included in the substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. One word of explanation as to that. Personally I shall not object to the amendment, but I should say that I think the proposed substitute amendment itself covers the provision, because the nondiscriminatory prohibitions are already in the rules governing the Army. If, however, the Senator from Oregon wishes to be sure, I have no objection in the least to accepting the amendment, or allowing the amendment to be added to the proposed substitute.

Mr. McNARY. I think it probably should be taken to conference, in order that the conferees may study the whole matter. I am advised by the secretary of the able Senator from New Jersey that he would like to have me offer the amendment. Therefore, I must do so.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That will be perfectly agreeable to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I am interested in the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. I had prepared an amendment similar to it, but I am quite satisfied with his amendment being offered. I think it should be agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. If the substitute amendment is before the Senate, I wish to offer to it the amendment to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute is not yet before the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. I present the amendment, to be offered to the proposed substitute when it is before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Would a motion to offer my proposal as a substitute for the bill be in order at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I offer and ask to have stated an amendment in the nature of a substitute for House bill 6293.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

There is hereby established in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States a section to be designated the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, female citizens of the United States may enlist in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and upon such enlistment shall be subject to all applicable laws and regulations pertaining to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and such other regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That no member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be called upon to engage in combat: *Provided further*, That the total authorized strength of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall not exceed 150,000.

SEC. 2. The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps may be officered by women who shall be appointed and commissioned as officers in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the act of September 22, 1941 (Public Law 252, 77th Cong.).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the amendment just stated the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] offers an amendment on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Utah it is proposed to insert at the proper place the following: "*Provided*, That in the enrollment and appointment of women under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, as I have stated, I had intended to offer an amendment similar to that proposed on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], but since his amendment has been offered, I shall not offer mine.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am not inquiring particularly about the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, to which I have no objection, but I am inquiring what is involved in the Senator's general substitute, which seems to take this proposed corps out of its detached status as contemplated by the House measure, and put it directly into the Army service. What is involved in the differentiation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Nothing is involved in the change because no start has been made in either procedure. The result will be that a start will be made by allowing the reserve corps of the Army of the United States to take enlistments of women and build up the Army auxiliary corps in the regular way in which the Army reserve is built up and then call them into active service after preliminary training. It will make for less confusion; it will make for better discipline; it should make for better training. It will make for better treatment of any women who might become sick or might be injured, because they will be taken care of in accordance with the regular military procedure.

The proposal provides also for bringing women into the Army in such a manner that their status cannot be questioned in any way, thus making it easier to bring about proper articulation and coordination and proper discipline in the Army and its different branches.

Personally, I think the substitute amendment will make for a very much stronger unit, and will give to the women the greater dignity to which they are entitled in connection with the service they are to be asked to perform.

The only limitation put upon them is that they will not be called upon for combatant service; but in the complex war

we are fighting today, who can draw the line between combatants and noncombatants? The women who are serving, for example, in listening stations will probably be part of a combat force. There is just no way of avoiding it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I notice that in the House bill the reference to officers seems to be in the nomenclature of first officer, second officer, third officer, and so forth. I apprehend that under the Senator's substitute we would have colonels, and captains, and the regular military ranks.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. In the bill passed by the House, in working out the titles of the various officers, the course was followed of giving them exactly the pay given majors, captains, and lieutenants. Under the Senate committee bill, if a woman is made a colonel, she will be commissioned and called a colonel in the Army, and will be subject to all the rules governing colonels in the Army of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Did the substitute go before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; it did not. The Senator from Utah consulted several members of the committee. He apologizes for the way in which the substitute is brought before the Senate now, but as was explained in the beginning, it is being pressed by the Army at the present time, and it has been shown that the passage of House bill 6807 by the House of Representatives, which would establish the Women's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy, was the last word of the House in regard to whether these women should be in or out of the service. Of course, if they are in the service in the Navy, they should be in the service in the Army. I should want them in the service anyway. So far as the Senator from Utah is concerned, he has been very much in favor of the substitute, was in favor of what it provides even before it was written, and I believe we will have a greater, finer, better respected, and better operated women's unit if it is made part of the Army.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. As I recall, the bill originally introduced in the House did not place the proposed organization in the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. And the general thought was that they were not to be placed in the Army, for reasons presented.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is very true.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. It appears that during my absence—I do manage to go away once in a while—action has been taken different from that originally taken in the committee. As I understand, the Senator has stated that the committee as a committee has not taken action on the proposed substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I am wondering to what extent the members of the committee who have been consulted have been familiar with all the provisions of the substitute, and to what extent the committee as a whole agrees to it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So far as the committee is concerned it already has all the information that anyone has with respect to the substitute, because the women's reserve organization will operate just as reserve organizations for men operate. No expanded information or new information is needed with respect thereto. General Marshall will immediately proceed to set up a small unit of women's reserves. Then he will call them into active service and training, and expand the unit up to 25,000 persons in the first year.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Have we had an expression from General Marshall of his own views with respect to the substitute?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah has had an expression, but the Senate has not.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I assume the Senator from Utah would advise us what that expression was.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The substitute meets not only with the War Department's approval but with the general's approval, and—I can be modest for a moment—was actually worked out by the War Department and not written by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. In the presence of this emergency I have always been agreeable to the proposals made by the Army, because the Army has got to win the fight.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. Has the amendment I offered been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it has not been acted on.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. May I ask the Senator from Utah, if the substitute which is proposed is adopted, will it take the place of House bill 6293?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. I have been necessarily absent from the Chamber, and I am not as fully informed as I should like to be, but I wish to be on record as being opposed to this very unusual procedure of creating, without committee study, or very much debate, a unit of women in the Army. I do not know of anything of that sort ever before having been proposed. We have not the slightest idea, and we cannot have, of the possible consequences if this proposal should become law. We would take 150,000 women to begin with, and put them into the active armed forces of the United States, with possible consequences that we cannot now anticipate. I do not know what might be done about it at this late hour, for there seems to be little apparent opposition to the measure, but I think we ought to be afforded the chance to give study to this proposal.

Mr. President, it is shocking to me to think of taking women and putting them into the Army of the United States without the slightest idea of the full meaning of the bill and without committee study. I myself am opposed to House bill 6293 as it stands; but this measure is so much more far reaching that I think it ought to have committee study. I make this brief statement in the hope that the measure may at least be referred to a committee before we attempt to take action on it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from Connecticut will not feel that way about the measure; but, if he does, it cannot be helped. Of course, there has been study of this matter. What would the Army of the United States do with 150,000 women who were attached to the Army of the United States?

Mr. MALONEY. That is what I should like to know.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In an indirect way, the Army would have to provide for them the same sort of facilities it provides for the men of the Army. It is proposed to make these women a unit in the Army of the United States, having all the rights and privileges of hospitalization, sick benefits, and of proper care.

Mr. MALONEY. Will special hospitals be provided?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not necessarily special hospitals, but hospitals arranged as they are arranged now. Having women in the Army is not a new thing, as the Senator knows.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to know what the women are going to do in the Army. I realize that we have women in the Nursing Corps in the Army, but what are these women to be called upon to do?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They will be called upon to do practically everything but engage in combatant service.

Mr. MALONEY. In the field?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Anywhere. They can be sent anywhere, of course.

Mr. MALONEY. Do I understand that these women will do everything in the Army that Army officers and enlisted men do, except shoulder guns?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In the armed service, Mr. President, there are many things of serious importance which women can do. For example, in the British Army at the present time the listening posts are operated almost entirely by women. Women are proving themselves to be just a little more efficient in that work than men are. When the lives of the people in whole counties depend upon getting the right kind of reports with respect to the coming of airplanes, it is time for us to choose the best persons we can get for that kind of work. The Army of the United States already has about 6,000 such women employed, carrying on work at listening posts. These women are entitled to the privileges and benefits referred to. The fact that they are women does not make any difference. Women are already in the service as nurses, assistant nurses, stewards, and assistants in hospitals.

Mr. MALONEY. In a civilian capacity?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In a civilian capacity, yes; but the Senator must understand how much better it would be, when they are sent out into the field, if they are sent in units, if they go as soldiers.

They would, of course, serve on a voluntary basis. There is no compulsion

involved. Women will enlist; they will be trained, and when they do their work they will be given the same honor that the men get for their work. I think we in the United States are at last recognizing what we failed to recognize for so long. Women in the last war did valiant work in hostess houses, as nurses, and in a hundred other ways; but still they have nothing to show for it. That is hardly fair.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me there?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator tells me that they have nothing to show for it. What does the Senator hope to get for the women by his proposal?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. A woman may get a ribbon. I do not discount what it means to be able to wear a ribbon upon one's breast; and the Senator from Connecticut does not discount it either. To have an honorable discharge from the Army of the United States is one of the greatest benefits, one of the greatest blessings, and one of the greatest privileges that can come to a citizen of the United States. If women do the same work as men to obtain an honorable discharge they ought to be entitled to it. That is all the proposed substitute would do. It would make it possible to take women who sacrifice and give their time and their talents, and after the war is over put them on the same level as their brothers.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know that I am now in a position to offer very definite or specific criticism of the proposal, but I want to lay emphasis upon the fact that it is shocking to me. I do not think it is fair for the Senate to accept the proposed substitute without further study. Of course, I have a very deep appreciation of the value of an honorable discharge, and what the Senator from Utah referred to as a ribbon, or a decoration; but I do not quite readily understand how women can be given a special dignity by taking them into the armed forces of our country. I understand that women in the British Empire have performed valiant services, but I do not know of any instance when they have gone into the field.

Accepting the exact language of the distinguished Senator from Utah, it is proposed to send the women, who would be recruited under this proposal, into the field of battle to do everything that a soldier might do, except to shoulder a gun. Probably—though God forbid—there will come a time when women will have to go as far as the Senator indicates he would have them go; but I am not ready to take that step, at least not today, Mr. President, and I am very hopeful, at least until such time as a committee of the Senate can study the matter very carefully, that the Senate will not accept the substitute proposal.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that in the first World War women were employed in the Army to do various clerical jobs and other jobs which otherwise would require the services of men taken from the front. For a long time the Army selected women in France and in other countries, but the results were not satisfactory. Finally the British, from their women's corps, in which women performed the same duties, loaned us several thousand women—perhaps 9,000—to do the very same kind of work that women will do if the bill is passed. So there is no real difficulty about what kind of duties they will perform, and the necessity for having them.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, there probably is no difficulty now, but after these women are members of the Army there might be a difficulty. In the last war they served in a civilian capacity. In such a capacity, if they find the work distasteful, they can go home. They can perform all the things which they are needed to perform in a civilian capacity now. There is sufficient patriotism among the women of America to do the civilian work which they can do and which they did in the last war; but I am not willing to delegate to some individual who may have charge of this corps the authority to direct women, as members of the Army, to go wherever soldiers are called upon to go, and if the substitute should become law these women, as members of the Army, could be sent everywhere except in the front lines with a gun. Probably what the able Senator from Utah has in mind is proper; but I for one do not want to vote for it until I have an opportunity to know more about what it would do. In my judgment it is too broad a suggestion to be accepted on the basis of a 5-minute discussion.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, the Senator does not mean what he says about a 5-minute discussion, because the Senator from Utah has been very frank. I hope that he will not be charged with trying to "put something over" in the Senate.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not mean any such thing. I am certain of the conscientiousness of the Senator. I am sure that he has studied the proposal and perhaps he can tell us why it has not been considered by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have already told that four or five or six times. I have explained the whole thing over and over and over again.

Mr. MALONEY. I am sorry. I did not hear the explanation. I apologized when I came into the Chamber for my early absence.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be glad to explain it again. We are charged with the task of presenting a bill which the War Department wants, which the commanding general wants, and which he says he needs. He says, "I must get started on this. Can you not have it enacted today?" I do not know how to be any more exact in my language. The commanding general says, "We have need of these things."

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Every woman who takes the place of a noncombatant solider releases that soldier to take his place as a combatant. The term "noncombatant" does not mean merely one who is not in the front line trenches.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I want to answer the question which the Senator put a minute or two ago. He said that the women could be sent everywhere except into the front line trenches. They would not be assigned to the combatant service at all. They would not be assigned to the line service, which may be ordered into combat.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may correct a misapprehension?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I said that, as I understood the Senator's explanation, women could be sent into the front line trenches. I did not charge that such a provision was in the bill. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If a person becomes a major in the Army of the United States, he does what he is told; but his commanding officer will not tell him to do anything which is not strictly in line with his duty. That is the way the Army operates.

Mr. MALONEY. I insist that according to the language which the Senator used in explaining the bill, women could be sent everywhere.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; everywhere except in the combat service. The Senator from Connecticut interprets "combat service" to mean the front line trenches. Women might be caught in the midst of battle. The people of Washington might be caught in the midst of battle if an air raid should occur tomorrow. If an air raid should be made over a listening post where women were serving, or over a telephone exchange where women were serving, or anywhere else where they were serving, they would be caught within the combat area, but they would not be combatant troops.

We must take into consideration what war actually means. Wearing the insignia of the Army entitles a man or a woman to certain consideration in case of capture. Sad to relate, many Americans have been captured. Both men and women have been captured; and they find themselves at a great disadvantage as war prisoners because they cannot wear the insignia of the soldier, and have not the letters "U. S." on their collars. My heart goes out to women in such circumstances. A member of an army who is captured in wartime is governed by a law which has been recognized since Civil War days, and which has been pretty generally lived up to; but a captured civilian is not so treated. Those taken at Wake Island and other places are discovering that if they had the uniform they would be better off.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. A moment ago the Senator said, in explaining the need for haste, if I understood him correctly, that Army authorities—and I am assuming he means high Army officers—have asked him to try to get this proposal accepted, because they need it in order to get going.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It was last week when they said, "Can you not have

it enacted today?" I have not seen anyone today.

Mr. MALONEY. Did not the Senator wonder why those officials, who believe women are urgently needed in the Army, did not take the matter up with the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. A bill which passed the House of Representatives and was reported by the Senate committee has been on the calendar for a long time. As I remember, it was placed on the calendar on February 9. Nothing has been done. One of the reasons why nothing has been done has been the very problem we are discussing. The question was whether to have them in the Army or to have them assist the Army. On the 20th of April the House of Representatives, in passing the Women's Auxiliary Reserve Act for the Navy, answered that question and put the women who become naval reservists in the Navy, with all the right, privileges, and obligations of members of the Navy.

Mr. MALONEY. When the Navy bill comes before us for consideration I shall offer the same opposition, and I hope to be better prepared. It is not yet before us. With the lapse of all this time, I cannot understand why the military authorities, who are so much concerned with this proposal, did not have the time or the inclination to go before the Military Affairs Committee in order that this substitute proposal might there be studied.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the main difference between the House bill and the substitute is in the fact that the House bill is quite an elaborate bill, consisting of 14 pages, in which an effort seems to have been made to set up rules, regulations, and various details about the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps outside the Army, whereas the Senator's substitute, to state it briefly, does not authorize the President to set up such a corps, but directs it. It establishes the Women's Auxiliary Corps in the Army, subject to the regulations which may be made by the Secretary of War concerning its government. Is that about the substance of it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. I am sure the Senator is familiar with the bill which was passed by the House. The Army regulations were followed exactly. The pay and duties in the various grades would be identical. The units would be exactly the same as they are in the Army. The proposed substitute is a very much better method in every way, and it would not create a great many new grades.

Mr. BARKLEY. Bringing this organization within the purview of the Army would make it unnecessary to go into great detail as to its organization, control, regulations, and so forth. It would go into the Army, and be subject to Army regulations.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The machinery is already set up for its work.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not also true that the original House bill was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Military Affairs on March 18, more than a month ago?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. On February 9.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was passed by the House on March 17, and apparently reported to the Senate on March 18. I think that is the date. At any rate, that does not matter. Is it not true that all the time since then, when the matter of bringing it up for consideration has been under discussion, it has been delayed from time to time in order that there might be evolved what was thought by some to be a more workable substitute for the House bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. This problem has been constantly in mind. The first idea was to take the women into the Army. We have again come around to that idea.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the Senator's substitute is really not a new matter which has not been discussed by the committee. As I understand, the whole subject has been discussed; and, while the committee did not meet formally and report the substitute offered by the Senator, the committee is entirely familiar with it and with the whole subject. Except for that formality, it has the approval of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. Of course, the proposed substitute follows the law as it operates today in regard to the Reserve. The only additional thing that will happen is that the Secretary of War or the commanding general will order those in charge of the Reserve Corps of the United States to accept enlistments of so many thousand women in the Reserve Corps for certain duties. After training they probably will be called into active service.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the able Senator from Utah whether any of the high Army officials appeared before any committee, either in the House or the Senate, and gave testimony as to the necessity for this bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. For the substitute?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. With respect to the original bill; yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking about the substitute amendment offered by the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not with respect to the substitute, but we have the word of one general——

Mr. LUCAS. I do not doubt that the Senator has discussed this matter with high Army officials, but I am wondering why it is that during all this time no one has appeared before any committee, either in the House or Senate, and given testimony as to the necessity of the substitute which is now offered by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I doubt whether that would be necessary, considering the purport of the substitute.

Mr. LUCAS. I think I have full realization of the purport of the substitute and what it would do. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] stated a moment ago, if there is anyone whose statements I would take on faith it is the Senator from Utah. However, we are asked to accept the substitute without a line of testimony from anyone in the Army or the Navy as to the necessity for forming a corps of this kind. I am of the opinion that it is probably necessary; but it seems to me that during all this time somewhere along the line someone could have come from the War Department or the Navy Department and given the Senate some testimony upon which it could rely in reaching a decision on such an important matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, we may be talking about two different things.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking about the Senator's amendment to House bill 6293.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The substitute, but the hearing was held on the original measure, House bill 6293.

Mr. LUCAS. Was anything said about the Senator's amendment in the hearings on the original measure, House bill 6293?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; to the extent that the opinion was expressed that it would be better if the members of this corps were in the Army.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator a further question. On page 2 of the Senator's amendment, it says:

> *Provided*, That no member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be called upon to engage in combat.

In view of the fact that if this amendment is adopted the women who will be called upon to serve in this emergency will not be called upon to engage in combat, will their status after the war so far as pensions and congressional benefits are concerned be the same as that of any other individual who has served in the armed forces?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It will be exactly the same as that of anyone who has served in the armed forces.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that in the House, hearings were held on the House bill. When it came to the Senate, the Military Affairs Committee held hearings on the House bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. During those hearings, certain Army officers expressed the belief that it would be better if the members of this corps were in the Army instead of independent, as set up in the House bill; but, notwithstanding that, the committee reported the House bill and it has been on the calendar of the Senate for some weeks.

Of course, the Senator from Utah knows, as all other Senators know, that it is not customary to hold hearings on a bill after it has been reported from a committee. Therefore, no additional hearings were had on this legislation after the committee reported it to the Senate. In the meantime, an effort has been made to draft what some members of the Military Affairs Committee, and probably some members of the Army, felt was a simpler and more workable

provision; and that has resulted in this amendment in the way of a substitute which the Senator has offered. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct, and then, if the Senator will carry further what would happen if my substitute were accepted, the substitute would go to conference, and, of course, the bill would be perfected there.

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly; and the fact that this amendment is offered as a substitute, providing that this corps shall be a part of the Army, obviates the necessity of going into a long legislative detail with respect to how the corps shall operate, their control, and every thing else. In other words, they are taken in as part of a set-up which is already in existence, subject to the same rules and regulations, except as to combat, and all other privileges enjoyed by other members of the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am sure we shall find it very much more simple and better.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee. I never have had the privilege of serving on that committee, and I do not pretend to have any expert knowledge, even as a layman, with regard to proper organization of the armed forces of the United States; but I am a humble Member of this body, and so far as I am concerned I want the RECORD to show that I emphatically disapprove of the methods which are being employed here in avoiding any committee consideration of this proposal.

Everyone knows that it is a far-reaching proposal. At least, I know that much about it. In all the years this country has been in existence and we have had armed forces, we have never taken such a step as this. The House of Representatives gave prolonged consideration to this proposal, and passed a bill which was entirely different from the one which is now proposed to be passed at the instance of my very good friend the senior Senator from Utah.

I do not want to have any part of the responsibility for taking this step unless and until those who are responsible and who are the experts of this country on the proper organization of the armed forces have come before a duly constituted committee of Congress and made a record in writing in which they endorse this proposal. If the men who are behind the proposal are willing to come here and go on record for it, so far as I am concerned I shall follow their advice and their recommendation. The only need for haste in this matter that I have been able to perceive, that seems plausible, arises from the fact that the House has already passed a bill which does the same thing in general terms so far as the women's section of the Navy is concerned; but that bill is still in the Naval Affairs Committee, still receiving committee consideration. For some reason it has not been reported in any great haste. Although I am not a member of that committee, I therefore must assume that they are giving it some serious consideration, and that there may be involved some problems upon which they have not come to any resolution of conflicting ideas.

Mr. President, I am as much in favor of recognition for members of the opposite sex in the law and in our civic and public life and in our economy as is any other Senator in this Chamber; but we are proposing here to give rank and position to women who are going to have to do obviously a different type of service than that which many of the present personnel of the Army will have to do. That is inherent in the Senator's proposal. He does not propose yet to put women into combatant service; so some male officers obviously will be carrying on combat service, while women who are in noncombatant service will have the same or higher rank than the men who are officering troops that are actually in combat service.

Perhaps that is a proper way to organize the Army; perhaps that is good for morale; I do not know; but I do not want to have any responsibility for such a step until the commanding general of the Army or some officer he may designate to represent him, comes before the Senate Military Affairs Committee and gives testimony as to his reasons for wanting this step to be taken.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that this bill and the pending amendment be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, of course, it would run into repetition for me to speak against the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin. I still hope, however, that the motion will not prevail. I can at least say that the so-called difficulty in regard to command, of course, is not a difficulty at all, because there is a well-understood theory in regard to command running through the Army at all times. It is not merely a matter of rank that governs. It is a matter of station in the rank; it is a matter of branch of service, and things of that kind. There will be no confusion under the substitute. There might be great confusion under the bill as it has been reported.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is a most conscientious Member of this body. When he offered his substitute for a bill which has been discussed in the House and has been considered by the Military Affairs Committee, it occurred to me that it ought to have not merely committee consideration, but if the women of this country want the bill, it ought to be a matter of record, and if the heads of the Army and Navy want the bill it ought to be a matter of record; and it ought to be here in fully stated form, so that the country may know what we are doing.

As I understand the substitute, it is simply a proposition that there be formed a new unit in the reserves which can be brought into active military service, subject to but one proviso, and that is that the women in this unit shall not participate in actual combat. I did not understand the substitute to say "combat service" although it may say that.

I do not know what women want this proposed law, but I should like to know. I do not know whether the Army of the United States as it is now officered, engaged in the greatest task in its history, want this measure. I should like to know, and I should like to have it a matter of record. It may be that the bill should be passed. It may be that this unit should be created at once. I assume that the Senator from Utah is convinced that it should be, and perhaps the whole Military Affairs Committee is so convinced; but I frankly submit that the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate ought not to bring here a bill of this character without a written record based on hearings.

That is a very reasonable proposition. Certainly those of us who do not know anything about the bill ought to have full information before we are called on to vote upon a measure of this kind. I do know, Mr. President, that if a unit in the reserves is formed and subsequently brought into active service, we shall simply have another unit in the Army of the United States. It may be that they will be excepted from actual combat service; but all the other applicable provisions of all of the military laws, pension systems, and everything else will apply, except such pensions as are based upon injuries and disabilities received in actual combat.

I think this bill ought to go back to the Military Affairs Committee. I think, moreover, that committee ought to hold a hearing, for I believe this subject should be fully explored.

We are doing many most extraordinary thins. Is it necessary? Is it proper? Does the womanhood of America that is representative of the women of America require this kind of recognition? If so, it is the first such requirement in the history of this Nation. I do not know, but it does not seem to me to be fair or right or advisable to put this kind of legislation on the statute books without a full record, without an actual hearing, at which all the facts may be developed.

It is true also, Mr. President, that if the substitute amendment should be adopted, and should go to conference, the conferees could write almost any sort of a bill they desired to write, and a conference report would be brought back to the Senate which would have a privileged status. Under what seem to me to be very lax rules of procedure, if the Senate should adopt the substitute amendment, which strikes out everything except the enacting clause, anything would be proper, anything would be possible in a conference report which would come before the Senate in a privileged status, so that practically the legislative hands would be tied and we must either vote it up or vote it down.

I certainly would give to women every recognition on earth for any type of service which they may perform, and would compensate them and grant them honors on an absolute parity with men who are performing like service or like duties,

but I do think that a distinction should be made when it comes to the formation of units in the Army and Navy of the United States without adequate, full and exhaustive hearings, which units may be incorporated into the armed services of this country, may be commanded to go wherever the officers at the head of the Army and Navy direct them and may be commanded to do whatever they may direct them to do, with the single exception of not engaging in combat service. Not only that, but they will not be free to go and come as they will; they will not be free to remain in the service in a civilian status; they will not have leaves of absence save when somebody in command over them wishes to grant leaves of absence.

Perhaps it is all right to do it; but certainly it seems to me that it ought not to be done until we have gotten all the information we can obtain and until we have had some expression from the people of the United States, even, I dare say, beyond the wishes of the Secretary of the Navy and of the Secretary of War, and even beyond the wishes of the military heads in a matter of this kind. It seems to me that a hearing ought to be had, and it ought to be an exhaustive hearing.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the proposed legislation, which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Military Affairs, was well considered. I myself sat in the hearings; I believe I heard every witness testify, and the table was surrounded by Senators who took great pains to understand this kind of legislation not merely because it was needed but also because it was brand new; it was a novel idea in our system of national defense, and great interest was shown. It is my recollection that when we agreed we were unanimous in reporting the bill.

In the bill, it seems to me, the central idea is found in section 12, which provides—

> The Corps shall not be a part of the Army, but it shall be the only women's organization authorized to serve with the Army, exclusive of the Army Nurse Corps. Nurses may be enrolled in the Corps but nothing in this act shall be construed to affect or change the Army Nurse Corps as now established by law.

In my opinion, that provision characterizes this organization as a unique feature in the prosecution of the war.

Concerning the necessity for such a measure, let me observe only one thing—and I believe the Senate will agree with me that for that one thing, if for no other, this proposed legislation is necessary—and that is that we now confront a new type of warfare. It comes through the air, and it comes with such rapidity that one must have warning of it long before one can see it. So, at strategic points in the continental United States and in our outlying possessions we have established a new ear, as it were, which is called a filter station, to which there come all the radio communications and signals which can be obtained by the transmission of the human voice and by the transmission of sounds caused by the vibration of engines. The information obtained in that manner is vital to the safety of our country, and is a strategic factor in the prosecution of any battle.

Now it is found that actually women are better qualified to operate these delicate instruments and to interpret these sounds than are men. So the significance of that one fact is sufficient to call for some sort of legislation which will put women who are engaged in this vital function under command and under discipline so that they may not leave when the baby cries. At present, about 8,000 women are engaged in this and similar services, but they are on a purely voluntary basis. Their noble work is effective, probably because they are consecrated to the cause, but it may be interrupted at any time at their own will; it cannot be held in strict coordination with the strategy of battle and the strategy of defense.

I believe that one who listens to officers who have had to do with this type of warfare, and hears them describe the kind of service women would be called upon to perform, must be convinced, as the committee was convinced, that there should be an organization which would not be footloose and free to go and come, but which would be responsible and would be under command.

The committee did not take the long step which would be taken if we should adopt the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Utah. For my part, I was so interested in the early consideration of this matter that I sat here a long time listening to ascertain, if I could, the full meaning of the proposed substitute, for this is the first time I have seen the substitute. One thing, however, is perfectly clear about it, and that is that it reverses the principle of the bill which the committee reported. The essence of the bill reported by the committee is the setting up of a female organization that could not be a part of the Army while the proposal of the Senator from Utah reverses that idea and creates a section of the Army that shall be known by a certain name. It makes no difference what it is called; it makes no difference that the members of the organization are exempted by the terms of the amendment from combat. It will be noted that it is nothing but combat; it is not combat duty.

So, Mr. President, although I deeply regret that the Senate is not passing this very day on the original bill which was reported by the committee, for time is as important as can be, yet, rather than vote upon this amendment with no study and no report by the committee, I shall favor the motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate on the motion, because, so far as concerns the argument that the matter has not had committee consideration, that is true, and that has been explained. I think it fair to the Senate, however, to read from a report of the Committee on Military Affairs which has been on the Senate Calendar for some time a letter from General Marshall, in support of the movement for a women's auxiliary corps, written in support of the contemplated proposal. General Marshall said:

> Urgent military business renders it impossible for me personally to present to your committee my recommendations regarding pending legislation to authorize a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.
>
> In my opinion this proposed organization would provide a sound and practicable method for meeting military requirements with respect to the employment of women. The percentage of our people employed in essential war industry is steadily increasing and I think it can be assumed that all of our available manpower and womanpower will be required, either in uniform or industry, to win this war. There are innumerable duties now being performed by soldiers that actually can be done better by women. Timely recognition of this situation and legislative action which will enable the Military Establishment to absorb and utilize its proportionate share of the available womanpower will contribute materially to the successful accomplishment of the task before us.
>
> The efficient use of women for noncombatant service with the Army requires systematic organization and training of this personnel under military supervision and control. In order that the available means may be applied to meet the existing military needs, I earnestly request that your committee support the legislation now being considered to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

The point I make is: In what better way can we bring the personnel under military supervision and under military control than by putting them in the military service? Are they not entitled to it? Should we not take into consideration that fact, which has been heretofore mentioned?

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNARY. What authority was the Senator citing? Was that a letter from the Chief of Staff, or from the Secretary of War?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. A letter from Gen. G. C. Marshall, Chief of Staff.

Mr. McNARY. When was the letter written?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The date is not set forth in the report.

Mr. McNARY. Does the letter appear in the report on the House bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It was a letter written to the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs at the time the committee had under consideration the House bill.

Mr. McNARY. It referred to the House bill, and not to the substitute now before the Senate?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; and it had reference to the proposal before it was put in the form of a House bill. I merely wish to make the point that military control and military supervision were all the time in the mind of at least General Marshall, and I think that if the Senator will read the report of the Secretary of War, he will find that it was in his mind as well.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. When was the letter to which the Senator is now referring sent to the House? Was it before or after the House considered the bill which was sent to the Senate?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It was sent to the House before the House committee had reported the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know why the House did not follow the suggestions of the letter?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not know. I think the original idea was to set up the Women's Auxiliary Corps as a branch of the Army. That is what I have been told.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the House give consideration to the letter to which the Senator is now referring?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Oh, yes; the committee used the general's letter in the report to the House, and the Senate committee used the same letter in its report to the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Notwithstanding the suggestions made, the House apparently did not follow the suggestions.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to point out that not only did the House fail to follow the suggestions outlined in the letter of General Marshall, but the substitute offered in the Senate contains this provision, on page 2:

Provided, That no member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be called upon to engage in combat.

That goes ever so much beyond the suggestion of General Marshal, if I read it correctly. This language verifies my earlier thought, and clears up for me the question of how far women might be called upon to go. They could be directed to do anything in the Army except to shoulder a gun. There was some question about that in the mind of the Senator from Utah during our earlier colloquy, but a reading of the bill clears it up definitely.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, at the request made to me privately by the Senator from Oregon, I shall withdraw my motion pending disposition of the amendment which he has offered, and as soon as that shall have been disposed of I shall seek recognition by the Chair to renew my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When this question shall be decided, and the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin shall be acted upon it will merely mean that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be sent back to the committee for its consideration. Will that bind the committee?

Mr. MCNARY. It would not bind the committee; it would simply make complete the document to be sent back to the committee at the desire of a majority of the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert the following at the proper place in the proposed substitute:

Provided further, That in the enrollment and appointment of women under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I move that the pending bill and all amendments thereto be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1086, Senate bill 2240, to establish a women's Army auxiliary corps for service with the Army of the United States, be recommitted to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAJ. PAUL A. LARNED

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, and ask for its consideration. I first request that the clerk read it for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the Vice President in signing the enrolled bill (S. 2202) to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army is hereby rescinded.

Resolved further, That the action of the Senate and the House of Representatives in passing the said bill is hereby vacated.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

DONALD WILLIAM BURT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2002) for the relief of Donald William Burt, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Public Law No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1941, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That notwithstanding provisions contained in the several appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942, prohibiting the payment of compensation therefrom to officers or employees who are not citizens of the United States, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of disbursing officers' accounts, and relieve certifying officers of liability for such payment for services rendered by noncitizen officers and employees, as are otherwise correct and legal, as are made in good faith, and as are found not to be due to any lack of good faith on the part of the payee.

"SEC. 2. If credit is allowed in disbursing officers' accounts in accordance with section 1 of this act, the officer or employee, or former officer or employee receiving payment shall not be required to refund the amount thereof; and any such amount which has been collected from an officer or employee, or former officer or employee, may be refunded to him.

"SEC. 3. That any person in the armed forces, or employed in a civilian capacity, prior to the enactment hereof, shall be paid for services rendered until January 1, 1942, out of current appropriation or fund otherwise available for the pay of said person, the compensation to which such person would be entitled but for the citizenship prohibition cited in section 1 hereof: *Provided*, That the head of department or agency concerned determines that such person entered said service or employment without fault on his part as to noncitizenship status."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend Public Law No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1941."

Mr. WALLGREN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CLAIM OF ALBERT M. HOWARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1563) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is a bill which has been passed by the Senate. All it seeks to do is to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment in a case involving an automobile accident. Albert M. Howard of Wheaton, Ill., is the claimant. He seeks to recover judgment for personal injuries and property damage sustained as the result of the automobile accident.

The bill was passed by the Senate and sent to the House of Representatives, and it has been returned to the Senate with an amendment, in line 14, after the word "Illinois", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That judgment shall not exceed the sum of $5,000."

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment, and that conferees will be appointed. The House of Representatives frequently takes action similar to this. It is commonly known among the lawyers of the Senate, as well as laymen, that no one can tell definitely what the damages, from the standpoint of personal injury, may be to any individual in any automobile wreck. The damages to Mr. Howard might be $1,000, they might be $5,000, they might be $10,000, depending upon the facts and circumstances surrounding the automobile injuries. It seems to me it is bad practice with respect to any claim that is passed by the Senate and sent to the House of Representatives for the House to return the bill with that character of a limitation upon the amount that the claimant might recover for an injury sustained. Therefore, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will announce the Senate conferees later.

Subsequently, the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1226. That is the last bill called on the last call of the calendar, but objection was made at that time, which I understand has been withdrawn. I therefore ask that the call of the calendar begin at No. 1226.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the bills on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 1226.

TRANSPORTATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

The bill (S. 975) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by amending certain provisions of part II of said act, otherwise known as the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, was announced as first in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I introduced the bill some time ago. It has been considered by the Interstate Commerce Committee. Hearings were held by a subcommittee, and the wording of my bill as it was originally introduced was changed. The bill is an endeavor to allow certain growers of products of the soil the same privileges in the matter of the transportation of their products as are allowed corn or wheat farmers. I see no particular objection that could be brought against the bill for the reason that it allows a man to transport the product in the first instance only after it is grown. In other words, a greenhouse owner or one who grows trees would not be left free from the provisions of the interstate commerce law after his product actually got into the trade, so to speak. The purpose of the bill is to allow the Interstate Commerce Commission to license the producer, and let him use his truck in the transportation of that which he grows. Does that cover the question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask that the bill go over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SELF-LIQUIDATING REVENUE BONDS OF HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 5962) to ratify and confirm act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FARM LOAN BOARD—ACT NO. 70 OF SPECIAL SESSION LAWS OF HAWAII, 1941

The bill (H. R. 6166) to approve Act No. 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INSTRUCTION STAFF AT THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The bill (H. R. 6641) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHOENIX CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATES

The bill (H. R. 4981) for the relief of the Phoenix Construction Associates, a partnership, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUARDIAN OF CHARLES JIRINEC

The bill (H. R. 5433) for the relief of the guardian of Charles Jirinec, an infant, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROY F. LASSLY AND G. F. ALLEN

The bill (H. R. 5857) for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALVIRA MANFREDI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5845) for the relief of Alvira Manfredi, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,000", and on page 2, line 1, after the word "Department", to insert "and to the Department of Hospitals, city of New York, the sum of $107, in full settlement of its claim for medical and surgical service rendered Alvira Manfredi."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

SAN FRANCISCO MOUNTAIN SCENIC BOULEVARD CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 244) for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment to insert at the end of the bill a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co. the sum of $15,500, as compensation to said company for the value to the United States of that part of a certain road constructed by the company within the Coconino National Forest in Arizona which will be used by the United States for the protection, administration, and development of said national forest: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE C. DEWEY

The bill (H. R. 1154) for the relief of George C. Dewey, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALICE R. SWETT

The bill (H. R. 4331) for the relief of Alice R. Swett, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALICE R. SWETT AND THE ESTATE OF ROBERT S. SWETT

The bill (H. R. 4408) for the relief of Alice R. Swett and the estate of Robert S. Swett, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARK COUNTY LUMBER CO.

The bill (H. R. 6063) for the relief of the Clark County Lumber Co., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IDEAL SERVICE STATION

The bill (H. R. 736) for the relief of Ideal Service Station, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES A. QUILLINAN

The bill (H. R. 3476) for the relief of James A. Quillinan, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OLIVE Z. RESSLER

The bill (H. R. 4413) for the relief of Olive Z. Ressler, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD KEATING AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 4180) for the relief of Edward Keating and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF VERNON CLEMONS, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 809) for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,835.50" and insert "$2,335.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TOMMY HUDDLESTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5596) for the relief of Tommy Huddleston, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the

word "amended", to insert "and supplemented by the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTATE OF ROMANO EMILIANI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5295) for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, before the word "taking", to insert "alleged"; in line 7, after the name "United States", to strike out "of approximately nineteen hundred acres"; on page 2, line 1, before the word "taking", to insert "alleged"; and at the end of the bill to insert the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That the court shall determine the exact amount of land alleged to have been taken, and compensation therefor, if any, shall be fixed at a sum per acre not in excess of the amount per acre of adjacent land as previously fixed by the Joint Land Commission, which had been constituted pursuant to articles VI and XV of the 1903 treaty between the United States and Panama."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. CECILE HERZOG AND LUCILLE HERZOG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5449) for the relief of Mrs. Cecile Herzog and Lucille Herzog (an infant), which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,500" and insert "$3,750", and in the same line after the word "and", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,250."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. MARILLA C. GRAY

The bill (S. 2190) for the relief of Mrs. Marilla C. Gray was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Marilla C. Gray, of Dadeville, Ala., as successor in interest to the Dadeville Cotton Oil Co., of Dadeville, Ala., the sum of $4,298.95, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the production of cotton linters produced by said company during the period January 1, 1919, to July 31, 1919, inclusive, pursuant to a contract with DuPont American Industries, agent of the United States Ordnance Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SALE OF LAND TO MARMET, W. VA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2109) authorizing the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, on page 4, line 24, after the word "America", to insert "its assigns and permittees, and there is likewise hereby excepted and reserved to the United States of America the perpetual easement and right to flood such part or parts of each of the two tracts of land hereinabove described as may be necessary so to do from time to time in the interests of navigation and flood control."; on page 5, line 22, after the words "shall be", to insert "the sum of $3,300, being"; and on page 6, after line 1, to insert "The deed of conveyance of such tracts of land to be executed by the Secretary of War shall contain appropriate provisions to provide for a reversion of such tracts of land to the United States in the event the grantee shall fail to use or shall cease using them for such purposes or shall alienate or attempt to alienate any part of them."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey, by quitclaim deed, to the town of Marmet, West Virginia, for the consideration, and subject to the reservations and conditions hereinafter contained, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to two tracts of land situated on the west side of the Great Kanawha River, at lock and dam numbered 2, in Marmet, West Virginia, and described as follows:

Tract numbered 1. Beginning at an iron pin in the eastern right-of-way line of the old county road at the southwest corner of the A. J. Baker land (now the property of the United States); thence, from said point of beginning, and running along and with said eastern right-of-way line, north twenty-six degrees fifty-seven minutes west one hundred and seventy-one feet to an iron pin in said line; thence, continuing along and with said eastern right-of-way line, north twenty-three degrees fifty-eight minutes west two hundred and eleven and five one-hundredths feet to an iron pin in said right-of-way line at the southerly corner of the lands of Mary B. Meyers and the northwest corner of the said A. J. Baker land; thence along and with the Meyers-Baker boundary line north sixty degrees thirty-two minutes east one hundred and twenty-one and eighteen one-hundredths feet to an iron pin in the intersection of the westerly right-of-way boundary line of the Charleston Interurban Railroad Company; thence and running with and along the said Charleston Interurban Railroad right-of-way line south twenty-four degrees thirty-two minutes east two hundred and sixteen and thirty one-hundredths feet to an iron pin in said right-of-way line; thence continuing with and along said right-of-way line south twenty-seven degrees east one hundred and sixty-six and fifty-two one-hundredths feet to the point of intersection with the boundary line between the said A. J. Baker land and the H. H. Smallridge and industrial center subdivision of the town of Marmet; thence with and along said Baker-industrial center boundary line south sixty-one degrees twenty-three minutes west one-hundred and twenty-three and eighteen one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, containing one and seven one-hundredths acres, more or less, and designated on United States Army Engineers' plat, "Kanawha River Locks and Dam numbered 2, real estate, United States Engineer Office, Huntington, West Virginia, March 1935 (file numbered 023-L2-11/1)", as "3-B."

Tract numbered 2. Beginning at the point of intersection of the eastern boundary right-of-way line of the Charleston Interurban Railroad Company and the northerly boundary line of the A. J. Baker land, and on the right-of-way line between said Charleston Interurban Railroad and the West Virginia State Highway Route Numbered 61; thence, from said point of beginning, and along and with said Baker line, north sixty degrees thirty-two minutes east four hundred and twenty and sixty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point in said Baker line; thence, south twenty-nine degrees twenty-eight minutes east three hundred and thirty-eight and ninety-one one-hundredths feet to the intersection of the north line of a fifty-foot street (now unnamed); thence, with the line of said street, south sixty-one degrees twenty-three minutes west three hundred and seventy-nine and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point in said street line; thence, north eighty-seven degrees thirteen minutes west seventy-four and eighty-eight one-hundredths feet, to a point in the right-of-way boundary line between the said Charleston Interurban Railroad Company and the West Virginia State Highway Route Numbered 61, said point being eighty-nine and seven one-hundredths feet distant, in a northwesterly direction, from the southerly boundary line of the A. J. Baker land; thence, running with and along said right-of-way boundary line, north twenty-seven degrees west seventy-seven and forty-five one-hundredths feet, to a point in said boundary line; thence, continuing with said right-of-way boundary line, north twenty-four degrees thirty-two minutes west two hundred and sixteen and seventy-five one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, containing three and three hundred seventeen one-thousandths acres, more or less, and being a part of the portion of the nine-acre Baker tract designated on said United States Army Engineers' plat as "3-A."

There is expressly excepted and reserved to the United States of America an easement of way for all right-of-way purposes whenever the same may be required, on, over, in, and across each of the two tracts hereinabove described, for the use and benefit of the United States of America, its assigns and permittees, and there is likewise hereby excepted and reserved to the United States of America the perpetual easement and right to flood such part or parts of each of the two tracts of land hereinabove described as may be necessary so to do from time to time in the interests of navigation and flood control.

(b) The two tracts of land described in subsection (a) of this section are parts, and come out of, that certain lot, piece, and parcel of land containing nine and fifty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, which was acquired by the United States through a condemnation proceeding had in the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, sitting in the city of Charleston, West Virginia, on November 9, 1933, and styled United States of America against A. J. Baker and others, a copy of the final decree in such proceeding being recorded on November 18, 1933, in the office of the clerk of the county court of Kanawha County, West Virginia, in deed book numbered 390, at page 527 thereof, to which reference is made for a more complete description.

SEC. 2. The consideration to be paid by such town of Marmet for the two tracts of

land, the conveyance of which is authorized by the first section of this act, shall be the sum of $3,300, being 50 per centum of the current appraised value thereof. Such two tracts of land shall be held and used by the grantee for the purposes of a public park and recreational site and for similar and related municipal purposes. The deed of conveyance of such tracts of land to be executed by the Secretary of War shall contain appropriate provisions to provide for a reversion of such tracts of land to the United States in the event the grantee shall fail to use or shall cease using them for such purposes or shall alienate or attempt to alienate any part of them.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PREVENTION OF PUBLICATION OF INVENTIONS

The bill (S. 2427) to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of Congress approved July 1, 1940 (Public, No. 700, 76th Cong., 3d sess., ch. 501), be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on approval and shall remain in force during the time when the United States is at war."

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DISBURSING OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 506) to require the issuance by the General Accounting Office of a quarterly certificate of settlement of money accounts to United States property and disbursing officers of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That hereafter the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government shall be settled by the General Accounting Office within a period of not to exceed 3 years from the date of expiration of the period covered by the account. A copy of the certificate of settlement in each case shall be sent to the disbursing officer involved and such settlement shall be final and conclusive after the expiration of 3 years from the end of the period covered thereby and no further charges or debts shall be raised in such accounts thereafter except as to moneys which have been or may be lost to the United States due to fraud or criminality on the part of said disbursing officers: *Provided*, That all unsettled, suspended, or disallowed items heretofore raised in the disbursing accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government at a date more than 3 years subsequent to the date of expiration of the period covered by the account to which they pertain shall be passed to credit by the General Accounting Office in the absence of any fraud or criminality on the part of the disbursing officer involved: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit recovery from any payee of public moneys illegally or erroneously paid to such payee or to preclude the recovery from the disbursing officer or his surety of any balances found due the Government under a settlement made within the period of 3 years as herein provided: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to deprive any disbursing officer of his right at any time to clear his accounts of questioned items in accordance with the provisions of existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes."

TITLES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND DEPARTMENTS OF INSTRUCTION AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The bill (S. 2422) to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain officers and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to prescribe from time to time the titles by which each of the several departments of instruction and offices of professor now or hereafter established at the United States Military Academy shall be known.

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the status, rank, precedence, pay, allowances, or eligibility for promotion or retirement, or otherwise to operate in any case or on any account to the prejudice of any of the professors at the United States Military Academy.

MEDICAL STATEMENTS

The bill (S. 2368) to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Any member of any reserve component of the land or naval forces who is on active duty or who may be assigned to active duty and who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes such active duty, and any person so ordered into the active military service of the United States who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes the period of service required under this joint resolution, shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such active duty or such period of service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. In addition, each such person who is assigned to such active duty or ordered into such active military service shall be given a physical examination at the beginning of such active duty or service; and upon the completion of the period of such active duty or service, each such person shall be given another physical examination."

SEC. 2. Section 8 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) Any person inducted into the land or naval forces under this act for training and service, who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes his period of training and service under section 3 (b) shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such period of training and service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. In addition, each such person who is inducted into the land or naval forces under this act for training and service shall be given a physical examination at the beginning of such training and service; and upon the completion of his period of training and service under section 3 (b), each such person shall be given another physical examination."

AMENDMENT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5143) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "Board", to insert "the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration,"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "land", to insert "now or hereafter owned by the Corporation and", and in the same line after the word "connection" to strike out "therewith" and to insert "with any such office building."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill provides for the exemption from taxation of buildings and land in the District of Columbia owned by the Home Owners' Land Corporation and certain named Allied governmental corporations. It also contains a provision for the exemption of land and buildings which are auxiliary to the main office building, and which are used in connection with the business in the main building. One amendment would add a new agency, namely, the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration recently created by Executive order. The other amendment proposed to the bill is merely a clarifying one. It makes clear and emphasizes the fact that these buildings and lands which are used as auxiliaries to the main properties must also be owned by the United States Government, otherwise the contention might be made that since such properties are used for an auxiliary purpose, even though they are owned privately, they would still be exempt from taxation. Of course, such a situation as that was never contemplated, and therefore this amendment emphasizes the fact that not only the main building but also any other buildings, lands, and appurtenances used in connection therewith are exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia, provided that in all cases such buildings and lands belong to the United States Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senate considering Calendar No. 1303 or Calendar No. 1304?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 1303.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought that bill had been passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BILBO subsequently said: Mr. President, after receiving further information from the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] I withdraw my objection to Calendar 1303, House bill 5143.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 1303, House bill 5143.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have heretofore been agreed to. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES AND MAKING OF CONTRACTS BY THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4579) to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "paragraphs", to strike out "2 and 3" and insert in lieu thereof "1 or 2."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

VERNON E. DEUS

The bill (S. 2292) for the relief of Vernon E. Deus was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,377 as hereinafter provided, in full satisfaction of a judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia on January 27, 1942, in civil action No. 7786 against Vernon E. Deus as a result of injuries sustained by Fred Walker, Jr., on June 24, 1940, while he was being detained at the guard room of the Senate Office Building: To Fred Walker, Sr., $80.50; to Fred Walker, Sr., as guardian for his minor son, Fred Walker, Jr., $1,250; and to the clerk of such court as costs in such civil action, $46.50: *Provided*, That such payments shall be made only upon the said Vernon E. Deus being relieved from all liability on such judgment: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such civil action, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriation for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the previous understanding, the bill will be passed over.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN DECORATIONS, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2404) to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 2. (1) That there is hereby created a decoration to be known as the Legion of Merit, which shall have suitable appurtenances and devices and not more than four degrees, and which the President, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, may award to (a) personnel of the armed forces of the United States and of the Government of the Philippines and (b) personnel of the armed forces of friendly foreign nations who, since the proclamation of an emergency by the President on September 8, 1939, shall have distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services.

(2) That there is hereby created a decoration to be known as the Medal for Merit, which shall have distinctive appurtenances and devices and only one degree, and which the President, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, may award to such civilians of the nations prosecuting the war under the joint declaration of the United Nations and of other friendly foreign nations as have, since the proclamation of an emergency by the President on September 8, 1939, distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States be, and they are hereby, authorized during the present war and for a year thereafter to accept from the governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics such decorations, orders, medals, and emblems, as may be tendered them, and which are conferred by such governments upon members of their own military forces, hereby expressly granting the consent of Congress required for this purpose by clause 8 of section 9, article I, of the Constitution: *Provided*, That any such officer or enlisted man is hereby authorized to accept and wear any decoration, order, medal, or emblem heretofore bestowed upon such person by the government of a cobelligerent nation or of an American republic.

SEC. 2. (1) That there is hereby created a decoration to be known as the Legion of Merit, which shall have suitable appurtenances and devices and not more than four degrees, and which the President, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, may award to (a) personnel of the armed forces of the United States and of the Government of the Philippines and (b) personnel of the armed forces of friendly foreign nations who, since the proclamation of an emergency by the President on September 8, 1939, shall have distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services.

(2) That there is hereby created a decoration to be known as the Medal for Merit, which shall have distinctive appurtenances and devices and only one degree, and which the President, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, may award to such civilians of the nations prosecuting the war under the joint declaration of the United Nations and of other friendly foreign nations as have, since the proclamation of an emergency by the President on September 8, 1939, distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the 'Legion of Merit,' and the 'Medal for Merit'."

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2414) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the figures "1942", to strike out ": *Provided*, That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than 6 lode mining claims held by the same person, nor to more than 12 lode-mining claims held by the same partnership, association, or corporation: *And provided further*, That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than 6 placer-mining claims not to exceed 120 acres (in all) held by the same person, nor to more than 12 placer-mining claims not to exceed 240 acres (in all) held by the same partnership, association, or corporation."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than $100 worth of labor to be performed or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby, suspended as to all mining claims in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, during the year beginning at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1941, and ending at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate bill 2414 was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 2414 was passed will be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask that House bill 6604 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, was read twice by its title.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the House bill which has just been laid before the Senate has some very distinct advantages over Senate bill 2414. It applies not only for this year, up until June, but takes in next year. It is a 2-year bill instead of a measure merely covering the year 1942 up to July 1. That is a very distinct advantage, and I think the Senate should pass the House bill rather than the Senate bill. I ask unanimous consent that House bill 6604 be substituted for Senate bill 2414 and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate 2414 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago we substituted House bill 6604 for Senate bill 2414 and passed it. The House bill came over just before we took action, and we did not have time to observe all the provisions in it. I now find that the House bill which the Senate passed contains a provision to which the Committee on Mines and Mining gave great consideration, and in the committee an amendment was offered to strike it out. I therefore ask unanimous consent to reconsider the votes by which House bill 6604 was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and the votes are reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now resume the consideration of House bill 6604.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like a minute in which to read the bill. We have a report on it from the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I may say that after conference in the cloakroom we have been able to remove the difficulty in connection with the House bill. On page 2, line 11, after the word "corporation", I move to strike out down to and including line 17.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly explain what the request would accomplish?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This has to do with a bill requiring assessment work on mining claims. Due to priorities, the miners cannot obtain the supplies and tools with which to do the assessment work and, furthermore, they have great difficulty in securing labor. The object of this bill is to relieve them from that burden until July 1, 1943.

The particular amendment which I have just offered was very thoroughly considered by the Committee on Mines and Mining. The committee agreed upon the amendment. We found in the House bill the provision which was eliminated from the Senate bill by the committee. If we eliminate the particular language I have moved to strike out, then the bill can go to conference between the House and the Senate, and the whole matter can be worked out, if there is any necessity for working it out, in conference.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand, from what the Senator says, that the purpose of the amendment is to accomplish economy of time and of service of men? Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is to save those who have mining claims from doing assessment work which they are unable to perform because of the labor situation and because of the priority situation.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is different. In other words, it voids forfeiture because of nonperformance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is there not also another point involved in the bill, which is that many of the men who have been inducted into service are owners of mining claims, and, of course, taken away from the sections of the country where their claims are located, they are absolutely unable, by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, to perform their assessment work?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true, and I thank the Senator for bringing out that point.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not also true that a similar bill was passed at the time of the last World War?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. Not only was such a bill passed at the time of the last World War but during the depression a similar bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 11, after "corporations", it is proposed to strike out the following: *"And provided further,* That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than six placer-mining claims not to exceed 120 acres (in all) held by the same person, nor to more than 12 placer-mining claims not to exceed 240 acres (in all) held by the same partnership, association, or corporation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ANTHONY W. LIVINGSTON

The bill (S. 2451) for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $164.23, to reimburse Anthony W. Livingston, first sergeant, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged by a storm on February 16, 1942, which flooded Government quarters occupied by him at the United States naval air station, Quonset Point, R. I.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

WILLIAM EDWARD FLEMING

The bill (S. 2469) for the relief of William Edward Fleming was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $138.45 to reimburse William Edward Fleming, pharmacist's mate, first class, United States Navy, for the value of personal property lost or damaged by a hurricane on January 15, 1931, which badly damaged Government quarters occupied by him at Ofu, Samoa: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwith-

standing. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

STUDY OF WAR AND POST-WAR PROBLEMS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was about to move to proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1134, Senate Joint Resolution 131. I should like to call it to the attention of the Senate. It is a joint resolution providing for the appointment of a joint committee of the Congress to make a study of war and post-war problems. It was favorably reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. It contemplates only that there shall be set up a joint committee of the two Houses, appointed by the respective Presiding Officers, which can work as a study group, along with the National Resources Planning Board and the representatives of such executive agencies as might be levoted to the same task, in accumulating data upon post-war conditions. The joint resolution has been on the calendar for a considerable time, and I had hoped that perhaps the leader might not object to the Senate considering disposing of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not press his motion at this time. In the first place, I think that in providing for the creation of a committee to look into post-war matters we must take into consideration the fact that in the executive departments there are already committees working on that problem. There is also the question whether it is wise to have a joint congressional committee, free from any outside membership, rather than a committee such as the O'Mahoney committee, which looked into matters in which both Houses and the executive departments participated.

A number of suggestions have been made by Members of the Senate looking toward the creation of some sort of post-war committee, but I doubt very much if the Senate is ready to act at this moment on a comprehensive proposal of that sort. Because of other matters, and because of the fact that we have been in a sort of recess, I have not had an opportunity to give the subject the attention it deserves in trying to work out a comprehensive solution.

In view of the fact that Senators generally have not given very careful study to the proposal, I do not think the Senate ought to take up at this hour, on this day, a measure providing for the appointment of a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress, especially in view of the fact that it might involve duplication of work already being done by other organizations in the executive departments. It might be possible to work out a plan by which all those efforts would be coordinated, so as to avoid duplication and having the same ground covered by half a dozen different committees.

I am informed that there are in existence in various branches of the Government, and in some voluntary outside organizations, a dozen or more committees of one kind or another looking into post-war problems. I should like to have the question investigated a little further, and not precipitate action here today looking to a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress.

To be perfectly frank, it has been my experience and observation that as a rule joint committees of the two Houses do not do the best work in a great many matters. We have tried that plan in connection with Government reorganization. We had one meeeting of the joint committee. It adjourned and each committee went its own way. We did the same thing with respect to policies. So I think it would be unwise today to precipitate this matter. I shall be glad to discuss it with the Senator and with other Senators and look into it to see if we cannot get the low-down on what is being done and what ought to be done in making some sort of investigation, collection of facts, and preparations for post-war legislation, which will have to come along later.

I hope the Senator will not press his motion.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I gladly accede to the wishes of the leader; but I wish to direct his attention to this statement:

In October 1941 I introduced a Senate resolution on this subject. It received the favorable report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. At that time I thought that the most effective way to approach the matter was by a Senate committee. However, I spoke to the leader about the matter, and he indicated that it might be desirable—or I understood him to indicate that it might be preferable—to have a joint committee. Consequently I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 131.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator understood me to favor a joint committee of the two Houses alone, he misunderstood me. I did not have that in mind.

Mr. PEPPER. What I wish to call the leader's attention to is the fact that I reintroduced the thought in the form of a provision for a joint committee of the two Houses. In fact, the measure on the calendar is a joint resolution on the subject. That, too, was favorably reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. It was then placed on the calendar. The subject is before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in the form of a Senate resolution, and it is on the calendar in the form of a joint resolution providing for a joint committee. The joint resolution contemplates that any committee set up shall work in conjunction with any other agency, legislative or administrative, which may be working on the same subject.

I should appreciate it if the leader would let some of us who are interested in the subject confer with him about it, in the hope that we may be able to get something going which has a legislative representation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that a joint resolution is on the calendar, making necessary the action of both Houses?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would not have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. No. I have introduced two measures. The first was a Senate resolution, which is now before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, after a favorable report from the Committee on Education and Labor. The second form is a joint resolution which is now on the calendar, also with a favorable report from the Committee on Education and Labor

Mr. BARKLEY. What I am anxious to avoid is duplication of work and diversity of report. We might find ourselves in the midst of confusion later when the war is over and we are undertaking to deal with post-war problems if we should have three or four committees at work and they should all make separate reports and recommendations. I think it would be infinitely better to have all the work done by the various committees coordinated, so that whenever a report was made it would be a single report, and would be authoritative.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I am striving to achieve. It is specifically provided in the joint resolution that it shall be the duty of the committee to work with other committees devoted to the same purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is one thing to work with other committees, and quite another thing to make a single report. The other committees might make their own reports, and this committee might make its report.

Mr. PEPPER. I am perfectly willing to give it an identity with those committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think there is no particular hurry. I think we can save time and accomplish more by trying to dovetail all the activities looking to post-war legislation, rather than provide a congressional investigation of the subject.

Mr. PEPPER The other committees are already in existence. My idea is that we are not doing anything on it now, and they are actually going ahead with their investigations. My idea was that we should begin to coalesce, and that there should be some legislative representation along with the others.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator that a year and a half ago other Senators, whose names I need not mention, contemplated the introduction of resolutions of one kind of another to work out some solution of post-war problems. Because of the international situation, and because of the urgency of other legislation, they were persuaded not to press this matter at that time. In view of the fact that they were interested and were on the verge of introducing measures on the subject, I think it might be well to confer with all those who are concerned and interested. It is a subject to which we must give attention.

I do not think we can afford to wait until the war is over before we undertake to do what we shall eventually have to do. At the same time, I think whatever we do should be comprehensive and authoritative.

Mr. PEPPER. That is my principal desire.

PARITY PRICES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in view of the recommendation contained in the President's message of today, that farm prices on which the ceilings are above parity be reconsidered by Congress with a view of reducing them to parity, and in view of the very general misunderstanding of the reasons and necessity for a ceiling somewhat in excess of parity in order to secure parity by farmers the prices of whose commodities are fixed upon the exchanges, I desire to submit a very brief statement on the subject. I have had very little time to prepare it, but I wish at least to make a preliminary statement at this time.

It is agreed that farmers are entitled to receive parity prices without legal interference through price-control devices, if under fair-trade conditions the market price goes that high. It is true, however, that if a price ceiling is fixed by law at the parity price, there would be no reasonable chance for farmers to sell their entire crops of cotton, wheat, corn, and other grains at the full parity price. They would, therefore, of necessity be forced to accept less than an average of parity. The reasons for the result stated are obvious and are well known in trade circles.

The market prices of cotton and a number of other agricultural commodities are ascertained by daily trading on the commodity exchanges. If there are more buyers than sellers, the price advances. If the sellers predominate, the price declines. When a cotton merchant or a cotton mill buys a quantity of cotton, prudent business management calls for hedging sales on the exchange to insure against loss as the result of declining prices. Investors and speculators who believe the price will advance, and thereby produce a profit, buy the hedges. If the annual crop is 12,000,000 bales and the annual consumption is 10,000,000 bales, who buys the entire crop of 12,000,000 bales during the 4 or 5 months of the marketing season? Consumers buy their current requirements, and traders who believe that a profit will accrue by holding the cotton buy the rest of it.

When the market price is at or near parity, who will buy the cotton or the hedges? If the mills cannot sell hedges, they can, with prudence, buy cotton only as needed for current use. Without buyers, every offered sale will drive down the price. Until the price goes low enough from the ceiling of parity price to attract buyers there can be no futures sales. Without that reduction in the price, and without a margin wide enough to encourage speculators and investors to buy, there would be no market for cotton except in quantities sufficient to supply the immediate needs of the mills; and the same rule, of course, would apply to wheat, corn, and all the other grains, and all agricultural commodities whose prices are fixed on the commodity exchange. Such a situation would produce unhappy results as follows:

First. The farmers would not get an average of parity prices.

Second. Farmers would be deprived of a market for a large part of their crop during the marketing season. They would be obliged to sell at reduced prices or to hold their cotton until the supply at reduced prices is exhausted.

Third. It would result in mortgage and other lien foreclosures, or cause long delays for creditors.

If an all-time market for cotton is maintained, there must be fluctuations in prices. If a price ceiling is fixed for cotton or these other commodities, the fluctuations will all be below that price. If parity is the ceiling point, practically all cotton will be sold below that point. A maximum price fixed by law at the parity level would mean either a price to the farmers lower than that price, or closing the markets for the sale of cotton except as needed for prompt use. Such a situation is unthinkable, and would torpedo the economy of the cotton belt.

If cotton, wheat, corn, and other grain producers are to be given a chance to get parity prices and parity income, there must be reasonable flexibility in price ranges above parity prices, as well as below those price levels. If inflexible ceiling prices are to be fixed by law, without having adequate floor prices, then a fair and reasonable margin must be provided between the parity price and the ceiling price. There is a difference of opinion among sincere farm leaders on what that margin should be. Congress decided that with a floor of 15 percent below parity provided by the Government loan plan, 10 percent above parity as a ceiling would permit the price to fluctuate between these two levels, and the price then would be governed by the trade law of supply and demand.

It is generally agreed that when a surplus of any commodity exists, there can be no inflationary price for that commodity. The object of the price-control act is to prevent inflationary prices. There exist in this country large surpluses of cotton, wheat, corn, and tobacco. There is no sound reason for including any commodity in a price-control law so long as there are large surpluses in the ever-normal granary.

Another important reason from the farmer's standpoint for objection to a price ceiling at the parity price is the fact that parity income is more important than parity unit prices. The mere fixation of a price per pound for cotton establishes only one of the income factors. The other is volume—price times volume. Last year, in the face of rapidly rising prices of everything the farmer buys, there was a reduction in production of cotton of about 20 percent from that of the year before. A price ceiling fixed at the parity price per unit would leave the producers 20 percent short in income. Parity income calls for parity price on the average quantity produced.

Dr. Stine, an outstanding economist in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, has furnished me with a definition of parity income, as distinguished from parity price. It is as follows:

> Parity income takes into account quantities and prices for all products of the farm. Costs are deducted, and the net income for farming is compared with the net income from other sources in terms of per person living on farms, and per person not on farms. Parity prices indicate the exchange relation in terms of prices per unit between the products of the farm and the items farmers buy for production and living. In this there is no allowance for changes in volume of production nor in volume of purchases of goods.

If an inflexible price is fixed at 18.35 cents, which is the present parity price, how would the cotton farmers' income compare with the income of industrial labor whose wage scale is positively fixed except as it increases from time to time by overtime pay and new raises in pay rates?

Present so-called parity prices for agricultural commodities do not truly represent parity between agriculture and industry. I expect later to have more to say on that subject. This country cannot have lasting prosperity until a real balance in earning power between these two groups is established. The debt paying and purchasing power of farmers should be readjusted upward. That can be done now only by increasing the daily, weekly, and annual earnings of the agricultural workers.

Farmers do not favor a runaway inflation. Neither do they favor drastic limitations on the prices of their products with no compensatory limitation on other factors which increase the prices of things they buy. They ask only for fair treatment after considering the prices of things they must buy.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 23d instant,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted on April 25, 1942:

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. CONNALLY), from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

> John Davies, Jr., of Ohio, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;
>
> Daniel Gaudin, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a sec-

retary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

J. Webb Benton, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general; and

John W. Dye, of Minnesota, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. VAN NUYS from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harry C. Blanton, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri;

Sterling Hutcheson, of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia;

Robert L. Ailworth of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia;

William Thomas Dowd, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina;

Ford S. Worthy, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina, and

John White Stuart of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Stephen W. Brennan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York, vice Frank Cooper, retired.

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

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Davies, Jr., of Ohio, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel Gaudin, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Webb Benton, of Pennsylvania, to be consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Dye, of Minnesota, to be consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert H. Ladner, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for appointment and promotion in the Army.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 28, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 27 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

William J. Korth, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Utah, in place of Ira N. Hinckley.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William H. Bartley, of Miles City, Mont., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont. Reappointment.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Cornelius Van H. Engert, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and consul general at Beirut, Lebanon, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

Maynard B. Barnes, of Iowa, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Laurence W. Taylor, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENT TO TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Robert L. Ghormley to be a vice admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 18th day of September 1941.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to be hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 24th day of April 1942:

Frank G. Johnson
William F. Malnate
Roger C. Rowse

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 27 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Davies, Jr., to be a consul of the United States of America.

Daniel Gaudin, Jr., to be a consul of the United States of America.

J. Webb Benton, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

John W. Dye to be a consul general of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Albert H. Ladner, Jr., to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from March 15, 1941.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Arthur H Allbright, Birmingham.

NEVADA

William Marl McGhie, Caliente.
Meryl J. Larson, Manhattan.
Edith Stone, McGill.
Julia E. Whipple, Montello.

OKLAHOMA

Woodrow R. Chambers, Cardin.
Vivian P. Waddill, Milburn.
Bessie F. Pryor, Olustee.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants

Robert Patrick Campbell
Paul Celestin Le Golvan
Walter Cecil Twineham
Herbert Edward Block
Frederick Whiting Timmerman
Abraham Chartock

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Maj. Lyman Lincoln Judge

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Robin Bruce Epler
Second Lt. Julius Porter Faris, Jr.
Second Lt. Donald Haynes Heaton
Second Lt. Albert Howell Snider
Second Lt. Jesse Duncan Thompson
Second Lt. Harry White Trimble
Second Lt. Wharton Clayton Cochran
Second Lt. John Frederick Harris
Second Lt. Harold Edward Nankivell
Second Lt. Harold Wesly Norton
Second Lt. Edgar Thornton Poole, Jr.
Second Lt. Clyde Arnold Thompson
Second Lt. George Henry Pittman, Jr.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels

Charles Nathaniel Sawyer, Signal Corps.
Gilbert Richard Cook, Infantry.
Max Weston Sullivan, Infantry.
Franklin Cummings Sibert, Infantry.
Archibald Vincent Arnold, Field Artillery.
Stephen J. Chamberlin, Infantry.
John Traylor McLane, Cavalry.
William Horace Hobson, Infantry.
Raymond Oscar Barton, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonels

Leo George Clarke, Adjutant General's Department.
Hugh Carlton Dorrien, Infantry.
Shirley Randolph Hurt, Field Artillery.
James Carl Horne, Infantry.
Werner Watson Moore, Quartermaster Corps.
Fremont Byron Hodson, Infantry.
Robert Theodore Zane, Air Corps.
Irving Compton, Infantry.
Rudolph William Broedlow, Infantry.
Albert Edmund Rothermich, Infantry.
Stowe Thompson Sutton, Infantry.
James Ainsworth Brown, Infantry.
Elliott Raymond Thorpe, Infantry.
Douglas Sugg, Infantry.
Milo Cooper Pratt, Quartermaster Corps.
LeRoy Allen Walthall, Air Corps.
Lucas Victor Beau, Jr., Air Corps.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Edward Allen Noyes
Charles Woodward Riley
Charles George Sinclair
Charles George Hutter
Frederick Henry Petters
Robert Parvin Williams
Edwin Brooks Maynard
Harvard Clayton Moore
Arden Freer
Paul Adolph Schule

To be majors

Roland Keith Charles, Jr.
Joseph Julius Hornisher

To be captains

Alonzo Allan Towner, Jr.
Wilbur Dwight Dice
Ralph Everett Reiner
Francis Patterson Wells
William Nelson Donovan
Norman Clemm Veale

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

Richard Jackmond Burch
James Perry Williams

CHAPLAIN

To be major, United States Army

Frederick Herbert Moehlmann

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Emil Fred Reinhardt
Ira Thomas Wyche
Gustav Henry Franke
Mark Wayne Clark
Lewis Blaine Hershey

To be brigadier generals

Ralph Corbett Smith
Geoffrey Prescott Baldwin
William Richard Schmidt
Jerome Jackson Waters, Jr.
Augustus Milton Gurney
Rex Webb Beasley
Charles Gardiner Helmick
Russell Gilbert Barkalow
William Glenn Livesay
William Archibald Campbell
William Carey Lee
Hume Peabody
Frank O'Driscoll Hunter
Harold Lee George
William Eugene Farthing
Shepler Ward FitzGerald
Walter Francis Kraus
Isaiah Davies
Philip Edward Brown
Donald Angus Davison
Harold Mark McClelland
John Ernest Dahlquist
Clayton Lawrence Bissell
Claire Lee Chennault
James Harold Doolittle

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Saviour of the world, in Thy name we come, believing that Thou wilt surely judge the wrong and establish the right. In a deep and all-inclusive faith we know that neither life, nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creation shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Heavenly Father, grant that this day, with fidelity and courage, we may overcome difficulties and bear valiantly our responsibilities; enable us to catch the strain of the Man of Galilee in disinterested and self-denying service. Teach us, O Lord, that he has not learned the vital lesson of life who fails to conquer fear. In our labors, in our devotion to duty, in the broad outlook upon the needs of our country, may we find the title of our place and honor. Grant that differences and discord may melt into patriotic cooperation and fuse into such purposes which shall give unity and inspire a full-toned citizenship. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 23, 1942, was read and approved.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

APRIL 23, 1942.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special authority agreed to today, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate the accompanying messages.

Respectfully yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, received by the Clerk of the House, under special authority granted April 23, 1942, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey; and

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) entitled "An act making appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6868) entitled "An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 21, 45, 74, and 79 to the foregoing bill; and that it recedes from its amendment numbered 68 to said bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had on April 24, 1942, examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted to him on April 23, 1942, he did on Friday, April 24, 1942, sign the following enrolled bills of the House:

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

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 of the House of the following titles:

On April 15, 1942:

H. R. 5686. An act for the relief of Lewis J. and Mary Black.

On April 20, 1942:

H. R. 6495. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River, at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.

On April 24, 1942:

H. R. 1541. An act for the relief of Jacques Hailpern, Max Hailpern, and Sally Hailpern Zaharia.

DISPLAY AND USE OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 303, to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this resolution? And what is the gentleman's request?

Mr. HOBBS. My request is that this resolution may be taken up for immediate consideration. I have conferred with the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], and with the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK]. There is no objection from either side.

The vote of the Committee on the Judiciary was unanimous.

This resolution is the codification recommended by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the National Flag Code Committee, and is in substance, one that has been promulgated for 20 years. The War and Navy Departments have been consulted. It simply codifies and emphasizes existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What does it do?

Mr. HOBBS. Nothing more than to establish for the use of civilians approved rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag, without penalty for violations. This does nothing except to promulgate for the information of the public the correct and proper uses of the flag.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is not new legislation, but simply a codification put out for the information of the general public.

Mr. HOBBS. This is new legislation, giving the official sanction of Congress to existing and widely approved rules for the respectful and patriotic use of the flag.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to my friend and colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HANCOCK. This bill reconciles certain small differences which exist between rules set up by various patriotic societies interested in the proper display of the flag and proper respect for it.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HANCOCK. It is simply declaratory and is designed to be a guide for the uniform and approved use of the American flag.

Mr. HOBBS. That is all.

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

Mr. HOBBS. Gladly.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there any provision in this resolution which attempts to take the flag off of art calendars, patriotic pictures, and the like?

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all.

Mr. JENSEN. Not at all?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. HANCOCK. It establishes standards for the use of the flag itself and not to representations thereof. These standards are recommended by numerous patriotic organizations. The committee which considered the bill is of the unanimous opinion that there should be an authoritative guide for the display of the American flag, which can best be accomplished by an act of Congress.

Mr. HOBBS. Thank you, sir.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following codification of existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, established for the use of such civilians or civilian groups or organizations as may not be required to conform with regulations promulgated by one or more executive departments of the Government of the United States.

(b) The flag should not be displayed on days when the weather is inclement.

(c) The flag should be displayed on all days when the weather permits, especially on New Year's Day, January 1; Inauguration Day, January 20; Lincoln's Birthday, February 12; Washington's Birthday, February 22; Army Day, April 6; Easter Sunday (variable); Mother's Day, second Sunday in May; Memorial Day (half staff until noon), May 30; Flag Day, June 14; Independence Day, July 4; Labor Day, first Monday in September; Constitution Day, September 17; Columbus Day, October 12; Navy Day, October 27; Armistice Day, November 11; Thanksgiving Day, last Thursday in November; Christmas Day, December 25; the birthdays of States (dates of admission); and on State holidays.

(d) The flag should be displayed daily, weather permitting, on or near the main administration building of every public institution.

(e) The flag should be displayed in or near every polling place on election days.

(f) The flag should be displayed during school days in or near every schoolhouse.

SEC. 3. That the flag, when carried in a procession with another flag or flags, should be either on the marching right; that is, the flag's own right, or, if there is a line of other flags, in front of the center of that line.

(a) The flag should not be displayed on a float in a parade except from a staff, or as provided in subsection (i).

(b) The flag should not be draped over the hood, top, sides, or back of a vehicle or of a railroad train or a boat. When the flag is displayed on a motorcar, the staff shall be fixed firmly to the chassis or clamped to the radiator cap.

(c) No other flag or pennant should be placed above or, if on the same level, to the right of the flag of the United States of America, except during church services conducted by naval chaplains at sea, when the church pennant may be flown above the flag during church services for the personnel of the Navy.

(d) The flag of the United States of America, when it is displayed with another flag against a wall from crossed staffs, should be on the right, the flag's own right, and its staff should be in front of the staff of the other flag.

(e) The flag of the United States of America should be at the center and at the highest point of the group when a number of flags of States or localities or pennants of societies are grouped and displayed from staffs.

(f) When flags of States, cities, or localities, or pennants of societies are flown on the same halyard with the flag of the United States, the latter should always be at the peak. When the flags are flown from adjacent staffs, the flag of the United States should be hoisted first and lowered last. No such flag or pennant may be placed above the flag of the United States or to the right of the flag of the United States.

(g) When flags of two or more nations are displayed, they are to be flown from separate staffs of the same height. The flags should be of approximately equal size. International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace.

(h) When the flag of the United States is displayed from a staff projecting horizontally or at an angle from the window sill, balcony, or front of a building, the union of the flag should be placed at the peak of the staff unless the flag is at half staff. When the flag is suspended over a sidewalk from a rope extending from a house to a pole at the edge of the sidewalk, the flag should be hoisted out, union first, from the building.

(i) When the flag is displayed otherwise than by being flown from a staff, it should be displayed flat, whether indoors or out. When displayed either horizontally or vertically against a wall, the union should be uppermost and to the flag's own right; that is, to the observer's left. When displayed in a window, the flag should be displayed in the same way; that is, with the union or blue field to the left of the observer in the street.

(j) When the flag is displayed over the middle of the street, it should be suspended vertically with the union to the north in an east and west street or to the east in a north and south street.

(k) When used on a speaker's platform, the flag, if displayed flat, should be displayed above and behind the speaker. When displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium, whether it is displayed in or outside the chancel of a church, or on or in front of a speaker's platform in a public auditorium, the flag should occupy the position of honor and be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's right as he faces the congregation or audience. Any other flag should be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's left as he faces the congregation or audience.

(l) The flag should form a distinctive feature of the ceremony of unveiling a statue or monument, but it should never be used as the covering for the statue or monument.

(m) The flag, when flown at half staff, should be first hoisted to the peak for an instant and then lowered to the half-staff position. The flag should be again raised to the peak before it is lowered for the day. By "half staff" is meant hauling the flag to one-half the distance between the top and bottom of the staff. Crepe streamers may be affixed to spear heads of flagstaffs in a parade only by order of the President of the United States.

(n) When the flag is used to cover a casket, it should be so placed that the union is at the head and over the left shoulder. The flag should not be lowered into the grave or allowed to touch the ground.

SEC. 4. That no disrespect should be shown to the flag of the United States of America, the flag should not be dipped to any person or thing. Regimental colors, State flags, and organization or institutional flags are to be dipped as a mark of honor.

(a) The flag should never be displayed with the union down save as a signal of dire distress.

(b) The flag should never touch anything beneath it, such as the ground, the floor, water, or merchandise.

(c) The flag should never be carried flat or horizontally, but always aloft and free.

(d) The flag should never be used as drapery of any sort whatsoever, never festooned, drawn back, nor up, in folds, but always allowed to fall free. Bunting of blue, white, and red, always arranged with the blue above, the white in the middle, and the red below, should be used for covering a speaker's desk, draping the front of a platform, and for decoration in general.

(e) The flag should never be fastened, displayed, used, or stored in such a manner as will permit it to be easily torn, soiled, or damaged in any way.

(f) The flag should never be used as a covering for a ceiling.

(g) The flag should never have placed upon it, nor on part of it, nor attached to it any mark, insignia, letter, word, figure, design, picture, or drawing of any nature.

(h) The flag should never be used as a receptacle for receiving, holding, carrying, or delivering anything.

(i) The flag should never be used for advertising purposes in any manner whatsoever. It should not be embroidered on such articles as cushions or handkerchiefs and the like, printed or otherwise impressed on paper napkins or boxes or anything that is designed for temporary use and discard; or used as any portion of a costume or athletic uniform. Advertising signs should not be fastened to a staff or halyard from which the flag is flown.

(j) The flag, when it is in such condition that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning.

SEC. 5. That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF REGISTRATION FACILITIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that registration in connection with the selective service is now taking place in the rotunda and will continue until 4:30 this afternoon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS OF THE WAR EFFORT (H DOC. NO. 716)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In certain ways the present world encircling war presents problems which were unimaginable during the first World War.

The theaters of combat today cover vastly greater areas. Many more millions of human beings are involved. The new factors of mechanical power, in the air and on the land and on the sea, have produced radical changes in basic strategy and tactics.

In this new war the nations resisting the Axis Powers face an even greater challenge to their very existence. They fight more powerful, more sinister foes; but their understanding of the magnitude of the task and the very firmness of their determination make victory certain in the long days to come.

In some other ways, however, the circumstances of today parallel those of 1917–18. Now, as in the last war, the common enemy has had all the advantage at the outset. Now, as then, bitter defeats and heavy losses must be endured by those who are defending civilization, before we will be able to establish the vital superiority in men and munitions which will turn the tide.

The United States was far better prepared for actual war on December 7, 1941, than it was on April 6, 1917. For over 2 years, by a succession of congressional acts, we had carried out or initiated safety measures for our own defense in growing volume and importance. There were the revisions of the neutrality laws, the adoption of the selective service law and the lend-lease law, and the great increases of our Army and Navy and the instruments of war which they needed.

After Pearl Harbor, the American people adopted a national program of war production which would have been called fantastic by most people 2 years before. It has required the shifting of the major part of American industry from the products of peace to the weapons of war.

Inevitably—but with the full approval of the Nation—this enormous program is dislocating industry, labor, agriculture, and finance. It is disrupting, and will continue to disrupt, the normal manner of life of every American and every American family. In this we repeat the pattern of the first World War, although on a vastly greater scale.

During the earlier war there were certain economic factors which produced unnecessary hardships; and these hardships continued long after the signing of the armistice. I use the word "unnecessary" because it is my belief that a very great deal of the suffering which was caused then can be avoided now.

These economic factors relate primarily to an easily understood phrase which affects the lives of all of us—the cost of living. Because rises in the cost of living which came with the last war were not checked in the beginning, people in this country paid more than twice as much for the same things in 1920 as they did in 1914.

The rise in the cost of living during this war has begun to parallel the last. The time has definitely come to stop the spiral. And we can face the fact that there must be a drastic reduction in our standard of living.

While the cost of living, based on the average prices of necessaries, has gone up about 15 percent so far since the autumn of 1939, we must now act to keep it from soaring another 80 or 90 percent during the next year or two—to hold it to somewhere near the present level.

There are obvious reasons for taking every step necessary to prevent this rise. I emphasize the words "every step" because no single step would be adequate by itself. Action in one direction alone would be offset by inaction in other directions. Only an all-embracing program will suffice.

When the cost of living spirals upward week after week and month after month, people as a whole are bound to become poorer, because the pay envelope will then lag behind rising retail prices. The price paid for carrying on the war by the Government and, therefore, by the people, will increase by many billions if prices go up. Furthermore, there is an old and true saying that that which goes up must always come down—and you and I know the hardships and heartaches we all went through in the bad years after the last war, when Americans were losing their homes and their farms and their savings and were looking in vain for jobs.

We do not intend after this war to present the same disastrous situation to those brave men who today are fighting our battles in all parts of the world. Safeguarding our economy at home is the very least that our soldiers, sailors, and marines have a right to expect of us civilians in Government, in industry, on the farm, and in all other walks of life.

We must therefore adopt as one of our principal domestic objectives the stabilization of the cost of living, for this is essential to the fortification of our whole economic structure.

Relying on past and present experience, and leaving out masses of details which relate more to questions of method than to the objective itself, I list for the Congress the following points, which, taken together, may well be called our present national economic policy:

1. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must tax heavily, and in that process keep personal and corporate profits at a reasonable rate, the word "reasonable" being defined at a low level.

2. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must fix ceilings on the prices which consumers, retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers pay for the things they buy; and ceilings on rents for dwellings in all areas affected by war industries.

3. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must stabilize the remuneration received by individuals for their work.

4. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must stabilize the prices received by growers for the products of their lands.

5. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must encourage all citizens to contribute to the cost of winning this war by purchasing War Bonds with their earnings instead of using those earnings to buy articles which are not essential.

6. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must ration all essential commodities of which there is a scarcity, so that they may be distributed fairly among consumers and not merely in accordance with financial ability to pay high prices for them.

7. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward, we must discourage credit and installment buying, and encourage the paying off of debts, mortgages, and other obligations; for this promotes savings, retards excessive buying and adds to the amount available to the creditors for the purchase of War Bonds.

I know that you will appreciate that these seven principal points, each and every one of them, will contribute in substantial fashion to the great objective of keeping the cost of living down.

It is my best judgment that only two of these points require legislation at the present time, for the very good reason that the Congress has already passed laws with respect to the others which seem adequate to meet the national policy enunciated.

I assure the Congress that if the required objectives are not attained, and if the cost of living should continue to rise substantially, I shall so advise the Congress, and shall ask for any additional legislation which may be necessary.

In the first item legislation is necessary, and the subject is now under consideration in the House of Representa-

tives. Its purpose is to keep excess profits down and at the same time raise further large sums for the financing of the war.

On this subject I believe that the objective can be attained through tax processes. We are now spending solely for war purposes the sum of about $100,000,000 every day of the week But before this year is over that rate of expenditure will be doubled. This means that a sum equal to more than half of the entire national income will be spent in the war effort. Almost the whole of these billions is being and will be spent within the United States itself.

Profits must be taxed to the utmost limit consistent with continued production. This means all business profits—not only in making munitions but in making or selling anything else. Under the proposed new tax law we seek to take by taxation all undue or excess profits. It is incumbent upon the Congress to define undue or excess profits, and anything in excess of that specific figure should go to the Government.

One of our difficulties is to write a law in which some clever people will not find loopholes, or in which some businesses will not be equitably included. I have suggested to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the House of Representatives that some blanket clause could well cover, by a special tax, all profits of any kind of business which exceed the expressed definition of the legal-profit figure.

At the same time, while the number of individual Americans affected is small, discrepancies between low personal incomes and very high personal incomes should be lessened; and I therefore believe that in time of this grave national danger, when all excess income should go to win the war, no American citizen ought to have a net income, after he has paid his taxes, of more than $25,000 a year. It is indefensible that those who enjoy large incomes from State and local securities should be immune from taxation while we are at war. Interest on such securities should be subject at least to surtaxes.

I earnestly hope that the Congress will pass a new tax bill at the earliest moment possible. Such action is imperative in the comprehensive all-out effort to keep the cost of living down—and time is of the essence.

The second item, relating to price control, is, with the exception of farm prices, adequately covered by existing law, and I have issued instructions to put this into effect immediately. It is our effort to be fair in all phases of price control; and if our future experience reveals inequality or unfairness, corrections will, of course, be made.

In respect to the third item, seeking to stabilize remuneration for work, legislation is not required under present circumstances. I believe that stabilizing the cost of living will mean that wages in general can and should be kept at existing scales.

Organized labor has voluntarily given up its right to strike during the war. Therefore, all stabilization or adjustment of wages will be settled by the War Labor Board machinery, which has been generally accepted by industry and labor for the settlement of all disputes.

All strikes are at a minimum. Existing contracts between employers and employees must, in all fairness, be carried out to the expiration date of those contracts. The existing machinery for labor disputes will, of course, continue to give due consideration to inequalities and the elimination of substandards of living. I repeat that all of these processes, now in existence, will work equitably for the overwhelming proportion of all our workers if we can keep the cost of living down and stabilize their remuneration.

Most workers in munition industries are working far more than 40 hours a week, and should continue to be paid at time and a half for overtime; otherwise their weekly pay envelopes would be reduced.

All these policies will guide all Government agencies.

In regard to item 4, prices of farm products: For nearly 9 years it has been the policy of the Government to seek an objective known as parity—or, in other words, farm prices that give the farmer an assurance of equality in individual purchasing power with his fellow Americans who work in industry. Some of the products of the farms have not yet reached the stage of parity; others have exceeded parity. Under existing legislation a ceiling cannot be placed on certain products until they reach a level somewhat above parity.

This calls for the second legislative action which I have mentioned. Under a complicated formula in the existing law prices for farm products—prices which housewives have to pay for many articles of food—may rise to 110 percent of parity, or even higher. It is the fault of the formula. In the case of many articles this can mean a dangerous increase in the cost of living for the average family over present prices.

In fairness to the American people as a whole, and adhering to the purpose of keeping the cost of living from going up, I ask that this formula be corrected, and that the original and excellent objective of obtaining parity for the farmers of the United States be restored.

It would be equally harmful to the process of keeping down the cost of living if any law were passed preventing the Government from selling any of its own surplus farm commodities at the market price. As a national policy, the ceiling on farm products—in other words, the maximum prices to be received by the producers of these products—should be set at parity.

With respect to item 5, the purchase of War Bonds, the American people know that if we would raise the billions which we now need to pay for the war and at the same time prevent a disastrous rise in the cost of living, we shall have to double and more than double the scale of our savings. Every dime and dollar not vitally needed for absolute necessities should go into War Bonds and stamps to add to the striking power of our armed forces.

If these purchases are to have a material effect in restraining price increases they must be made out of current income. In almost every individual case they should be big enough to mean rigid self-denial, a substantial reduction for most of us in the scale of expenditure that is comfortable and easy for us. We cannot fight this war, we cannot exert our maximum effort, on a spend-as-usual basis. We cannot have all we want, if our soldiers and sailors are to have all they need.

I have been urged by many persons and groups to recommend the adoption of a compulsory plan of savings by deducting a certain percentage of everyone's income. I prefer, however, to keep the voluntary plan in effect as long as possible, and I hope for a magnificent response.

With respect to item 6, rationing, it is obviously fair that where there is not enough of any essential commodity to meet all civilian demands, those who can afford to pay more for the commodity should not be privileged over others who cannot. I am confident that as to many basic necessities of life, rationing will not be necessary, because we shall strive to the utmost to have an adequate supply. But where any important article becomes scarce, rationing is the democratic, equitable solution.

Item 7, paying off debts and curtailing installment buying, should be made effective as soon as possible now that money is becoming more plentiful. Those who comply with it will be grateful that they have done so, when this war is over. Elimination of private debts and an accumulation of savings will provide a form of insurance against postwar depression. The Federal agency responsible for the control of credit for installment buying is taking appropriate action.

Indeed, as to all the items which do not require legislation, the executive departments and agencies whose functions and duties are involved are at work as expeditiously as possible in carrying out this whole broad policy.

The result will mean that each and every one of us will have to give up many things to which we are accustomed. We shall have to live our lives with less in the way of creature comforts than we have in time of peace. Our standard of living will have to come down.

Some have called this an "economy of sacrifice." Some interpret it in terms that are more accurate—the "equality of sacrifice." I have never been able to bring myself, however, to full acceptance of the word "sacrifice", because free men and women, bred in the concepts of democracy and wedded to the principles of democracy, deem it a privilege rather than a sacrifice to work and to fight for the perpetuation of the democratic ideal. It is, therefore, more true to call this total effort of the American people an "equality of privilege."

I firmly believe that Americans all will welcome this opportunity to share in the fight of civilized mankind to preserve decency and dignity in modern life. For this is fundamentally a people's war—

and it must be followed by a people's peace. The achievement of victory in war and security in peace requires the participation of all the people in the common effort for our common cause.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 27, 1942.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial from a Michigan paper.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include as part of my remarks some correspondence I have in my hand.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including with them excerpts from an article appearing in Look magazine of April 7, 1942, entitled "Wendell Willkie Answers Eighteen Blunt Questions."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Hon. Edward M. Curran, United States district attorney for the District of Columbia.

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

There was no objection.

LEON HENDERSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, at the outset may I say that I applaud the message of the President in the main. It does not, however, go far enough for me, particularly on the labor question. I still think legislation is necessary, and I believe the country feels this way about it.

This man Henderson, whom the President has chosen to administer price-fixing laws has been an interesting study to me.

In manner he is gruff, blustering, and domineering. In attack he is bold and ruthless. Under attack he is stubborn, defiant, and unbending.

He is a total stranger to the art of diplomacy, and yet he succeeds. He succeeds in the hard way. He starts out by making everybody mad with him, provoking a fight, and then wins out.

I saw him in his fight with the great Committee on Banking and Currency of this body and later with a committee in the Senate. In both instances he won. He won in his fight with the Congress and the country, and he won by the force of his informed intellect.

He believes in himself, in the accuracy of his information and the soundness of his judgment. He literally compelled the Congress and the country to accept him and his price-fixing scheme. My hat is off to this glutton for work and punishment. The devil fascinates me and I have no more brickbats to throw at him. His is a nasty job and he is quite the kind of a person that does best this kind of a thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 10 minutes after disposition of whatever is on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by the General Electric Co., of my home city.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a column by Mr. George D. Riley in the Times-Herald.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a private soldier in the United States Army to a friend which expresses in eloquent language the thought that his folks back home are well worth fighting for, and that every true soldier is glad to do his part in this great conflict.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell to the workers of the Otis Elevator Co. at Yonkers, N. Y., on April 16, 1942.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

The time has come, I believe, to face facts. There has been too much wishful talking, too much blinking away the truth. I could come here this afternoon and indulge in pleasant generalities, and pat you on the back and praise you for the job you are doing, and praise our soldiers on all fronts for the job they are doing, and we'd all leave here feeling not only happy but secure. I don't intend to do that. There is nothing for us to feel happy about at this stage of the war. There is very little security for freemen in the world today. If we are going to win this war, we must face the truth no matter how it hurts. I intend to give you the truth as I see it.

Our enemies have been preparing for 10 years, while we talked about preparedness. Their leaders have played a crafty game; they built great arsenals in secret while they assured us that they wished us no harm. They proclaimed their friendship for us while they planned our destruction. Their envious eyes sized up our wealth while they schemed to strip it from us.

While we followed the ways of peace, while we explored new frontiers of freedom, and while we walked careless and unheeding on new paths of democracy, they were preparing for war.

They prepared with the vigor and the singleness of purpose which we in America do not yet understand. In Germany and in Japan war preparation means the complete and utter domination of every hour of the time of every man, woman, and child by the state. It means self-sacrifice for everyone such as we in America have never known. It means the united effort on the part of industry, management, and the armed forces, such effort as we never have attained, but must attain if we are going to win.

We can't fight that sort of preparation with half measures or with half our hearts. I know that it is difficult for all Americans suddenly to change their ways of living and their ways of thinking to meet the situation that confronts us today. We have been a peaceful nation, living in the false security of our belief that we could get along without adequate protection in a greedy world. We placed our faith in the isolation of our geographical situation and in international good will—a myth. It was faith ill placed. Some of us believed that if we went on building a better life here for ourselves, jealous nations would let us alone in our prosperity. We all realize now how short-sighted we were. We are willing to admit that we were wrong. But are all of us yet willing to assume the sacrifices that will be necessary to achieve victory?

The sacrifices of our soldiers and sailors we take for granted. They are part of the tradition of our fighting men. But in this total war no line is drawn between the sacrifice of the soldier and the worker, the sailor and the farmer. Hitler blasted that line out of the London sky.

I'm not one of those people who say glibly that American inventiveness will win the war, or that American production will win the war, or that American labor will win the war. They all can help. And they all will have to help to the uttermost of their endurance—but it's the men in the front lines who will win this war.

But they can't win it without the complete, wholehearted, unselfish cooperation of every American back home. And those of us who are back home—secure because of those others fighting on the fronts—are going to have to give up many of the things that we now take for granted in order that the soldiers and the sailors will have enough with which to fight. The people at home will have to exhibit the same spirit that our flyers in China have made a symbol of valor in the whole East, the same loyalty that our sailors show carrying the arms and the ammunition to Europe and the eastern sea, the same skill, the same stout-hearted courage that have made Bataan a bright and stirring word on the pages of history.

I know some of your problems in the shops. I'm an engineer. I don't take lightly the job you've done, or the job you're doing or will do. I know that the quality of your workmanship has a definite bearing on the outcome of this mighty struggle.

But let us not delude ourselves. You and I, here at home, no matter how we strive, no matter how we sacrifice, no matter how we endure, are not doing and never can do the job that our soldiers are doing in the field. We owe it to them to redouble our efforts, to forget ourselves, to turn to and produce more every hour of every day than we ever believed it possible to produce.

We must convince ourselves that this job of turning out the arms and ammunition for our fighting forces is not just another job. Unless we do it supremely well, there aren't going to be any jobs at all, as we know jobs; there aren't going to be any closed shops and there aren't going to be any open shops. Hitler and the Japs aren't in the least interested in the 40-hour week or the 50-hour week or the 60-hour week. They're not interested in little business or big business.

They despise that bungling, debating institution we proudly call democracy. They despise freedom, human decency, the rights of the individual. They despise all the things for which we stand, all the splendid things on which we have built our Government, all liberty of action and of thought. They would kill all that we hold good; they would enslave us, every last one of us; they would black-out our freedom and institute the rule of the whiplash and the reason of the yoke.

Are we going to let them do that? We are not.

I'm not talking to labor only, this afternoon. I'm talking to labor and industry and management—and they all will sink or swim together. It is manifestly unfair for management to meet on the golf links this spring to discuss what it's going to do about labor. And it's unfair for labor to take advantage of these dire times to talk about what it's going to do about management.

And until we've won this war, we had all better forget there is a thing called golf, and stick right to the job. The 24-hour day applies to the front office as much as it does to the back shop.

I'm telling you, this war isn't anybody's "pink tea," and until all of us realize that, we're not going to win.

I could give you some encouraging statistics. But I'm not going to. Hitler's listening. But I can say that in our production of light tanks we're away ahead of schedule. Not only ahead of schedule but, ton for ton, we're building better tanks than anyone else in the world. That's no military secret. Hitler knows all about it. He got the news from his own General Rommel after our light tanks met his Nazi medium tanks in Libya and kicked the blitz out of them.

I can say, too, that in our production of certain types of planes we are ahead of schedule. But we're not turning them out fast enough, even now. Our production isn't synchronized. It does no good to turn out plane motors until we turn out a propeller to match each engine, a plane to match each propeller. And it does no good to make any of these things unless we have the ships to take them where they're needed. And we don't have the ships. We'll have to work a lot harder than we're working now before we get them.

It's going to take time to build ships. But we must be sure not to slow down other production; when the ships do start to slide off the ways they'll be ready to carry what you are making now.

One other matter occurs to me. I know that it seems manifestly unfair to ask you to speed up production today when you know that a material shortage may throw you into idleness the latter part of the week. In normal times it might be a smart idea to slow down.

But these aren't normal times. Whatever you make today, 1 hour from now, no matter how small a part of what implement of war, that job on which you work today may save some American's life. He's waiting for it, out there on one of our distant fronts. If you get it out this afternoon, that little piece, an hour ahead of schedule, may catch a ship that's loading now. And it may get into the hands of some young fellow you know who's off there in the war—some boy from your neighborhood—or from this shop, or your brother, or your son. It may reach him just in the nick of time to save his life and help him save his country.

Remember that, each hour of each day as you labor. Not a single minute dare we waste. I begrudge these minutes lost to production. Lives hang on these minutes, and lives of American soldiers are more important to every one of you than anything else.

As I said in the beginning, I could come in here and wave the flag and send you all home feeling fine. But you'd rather have me come here honestly and realistically, bringing you the plain truth. It doesn't pay to wait for miracles either in warfare or in industry. The only miracles we know today are made of brains and brawn, of sweat and blood.

Yes; you'll have to tighten your belts. Industry will have to tighten its belt. But that's all right. There are a lot of soldier belts tightened today on five continents. You're going to have to work harder; all of us are. You're going to have to forget ease and comfort and entertainment, for not one of these things ever won a war. It's not going to be a hardship to give them up, either. What do you and I know about hardships?

We may think we have long hours. We may think we have tough jobs. But we can wash our faces and go home at night, can't we? We don't have to lie in a stinking trench. And nobody's shooting at us while we work.

Every time you think that you're on a tough spot, remember the men of Bataan. They were too busy protecting this job of yours to think of profits or wages, overtime or investment or anything else. And all they asked in return was that you make the guns and the shells with which they could fight.

We all, every one of us, must pledge our hands and dedicate our lives to the task of making Bataan a symbol of pride and glory and victory as well as a symbol of sacrifice.

We can't turn back the pages of history. But we can write new pages. And I pledge for the Army that with your help, your all-out help, your sweat and your fatigue, and our blood, we will write that new page so that all Americans and all free men and women everywhere, in all time to come, will read with pride the heroic saga of the second battle of Bataan.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by President J. Rion McKissick, of the University of South Carolina, on the occasion of the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the Baptist Church of Swansea, S. C., of which Rev. Edgar W. Davis, is pastor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution by the city council of the city of Ottumwa, Iowa, on the subject of surcharges by the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a column of comment from the pen of Bob Davis of the New York Sun.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGEL. 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 Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter written me by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on April 23, I asked and received unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article entitled "The Mind of Japan," but I neglected to state the amount it would exceed the normal amount allowed to be printed in the RECORD. I have received an estimate from the Public Printer stating this will take three pages of the RECORD and cost $135. In view of the fact that I have been very sparing in the use of space in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert this article in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Boston Post.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects, in one to include a message from a group of English teachers to American teachers, and in another to include a letter from Mr. Donald Nelson, and in a third to include an address by myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on four subjects and to include in the first an editorial from the Washington Star; in the second, a telegram from Hon. E. O. Thompson, chairman of the Railroad Commission of Texas; in the third, a letter from Hon. Olin Culberson, member of the State Railroad Commission of Texas; and in the fourth, a letter from Mr. H. P. Nichols, an executive of the East Texas Oil Association.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a program sponsored by the Navy Department in honor of the Fulton-Sylphon Co., of Konxville, Tenn., and that in the event it exceeds the normal allotment it be printed notwithstanding.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article on patriotism from one of my constituents.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by William Allen White published in the Kansas City Star.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from Labor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of protecting the right of soldiers and sailors to vote, and to include therein an opinion by the Rhode Island Supreme Court.

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

There was no objection.

RAISING THE PAY OF OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the bill to raise the pay of our fighting forces has passed the Senate and it will soon be acted upon by the House. We, the Members of this House, know what sacrifices American men and women are making for America and all the ideals for which America stands. I know that we all share the feeling there is nothing too good for America's soldier heroes. The uniform and the service insignia are badges of honor which have earned the respect of friend and foe. The American soldier is no longer a trainee who will receive his schooling and then return to civilian life to await his Nation's call. His Nation's call has sounded. He is now a fighting man, learning to defend himself and to inflict disaster upon his enemy. He is working at war, on a 24-hour basis, 7 days a week.

We are spending, it is true, and our spending is rapidly reaching alarming figures. But we must not pinch pennies when our military guardians are concerned. The increase in pay which we will give them is certainly not an attempt to place a value on their service. We can never place a value on that service. The historians of another day and thankful posterity will evaluate the deeds and the service of these spirited fighting men. We can only, in our limited way, attempt to provide them some modicum of exchange with which to purchase certain necessities and items that will help them obtain some slight relaxation and some slight relief from nerve-wracking days and nights. This pay increase is but an evidence in concrete form of our respect for these men and their needs; an evidence that we wish their comforts and needs be met.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Santa Monica Outlook.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Richard L. Neuberger on the road to Alaska.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and to include certain excerpts in each one.

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

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say relative to the remarks just made by my colleague from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] that this matter was brought to my attention some days ago by a telegram from Hon. William A. Smith, a member of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County. I investigated the matter on that same day. A license was issued on that day to the county of Los Angeles to manufacture arm bands itself or by anyone it wanted to do it, provided that they were the authorized band. Furthermore, I was furnished with a list of four different manufacturers in Los Angeles County who were already licensed to manufacture arm bands at not exceeding 5 cents apiece. So, as a matter of fact, it is necessary to get all the facts on these matters, and I am certain from information that I have since received that the matter has been straightened out. It is obviously necessary that the thing be handled in such a manner as not to have charges like the gentleman has mentioned, but I am convinced that such charges will not be made, and, furthermore, that our county is in position to go ahead and make any arrangement it sees fit to make.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to 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.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

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

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow it may be in order to consider the bill H. R. 6995, known as the bill for the aid and relief of automobile dealers, that the debate be restricted to 1 hour, to be divided equally between the chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], and the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand that this is a unanimous report of the committee, and that both sides of the committee are anxious to have it disposed of as early as possible.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's information is correct. There is no opposition to the bill. This comes with a unanimous report, and the majority leader, as well as the minority leader, has been conferred with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr FISH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Mr. Speaker, I believe this to be sound and much needed legislation. Therefore it is not necessary to apply for a rule, which is the ordinary procedure. I hope that this may be taken up by unanimous consent.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the President of the American Bar Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FLOYD P. MORITZKY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4657) for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,000" and insert "$3,000."

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

CARROL D. WARD

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2192) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask certain consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6328) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the word "pay", insert ", out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Just what is this?

Mr. McGEHEE. The words "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" were left out by the House committee and were inserted by the Senate committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

HOWARD L. MILLER

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5887) for the relief of Howard L. Miller, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,360" and insert "$2,000."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. P. CORLEY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of E. P. Corley, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

AMENDING ACT MAKING APPROPRIATIONS TO PROVIDE FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6804) to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subparagraph (d) of paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"(d) Owners of passenger vehicles for hire, whether operated from a private establishment or from public space, other than those licensed under the two preceding subparagraphs and under subparagraph (i) of this paragraph, shall pay a license tax of $25 per annum for each such vehicle used in the conduct of their business."

SEC. 2. Paragraph 31 of section 7 of said act is further amended by adding the following two new paragraphs to be lettered (i) and (j), respectively, and to read as follows:

"(i) Owners of ambulances for hire and owners of passenger vehicles which, when used for hire, are used exclusively for funeral purposes shall pay a license tax of $25 per annum for each such vehicle used in the conduct of their business. Licenses used under this subparagraph shall date from July 1 in each year.

"(j) No person shall engage in driving or operating any vehicle licensed under the terms of subparagraph (i) without having procured from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent a license which shall only be issued upon evidence satisfactory to the Director of Motor Vehicles, under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, that the applicant is a person of good moral character and is qualified to operate such vehicle, and upon payment of an annual license fee of $5. Such license shall be carried upon the person of the licensee or in the vehicle while engaged in driving such vehicle when such vehicle is being used for hire. Application for such license shall be made in such form as shall be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent. Each annual license issued under the provisions of this subparagraph shall be numbered, and there shall be kept in the

Department of Vehicles and Traffic a record containing the name of each person so licensed, his annual license number and all matters affecting his qualifications to be licensed hereunder. No license issued under the provisions of this subparagraph shall be assigned or transferred."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to amend existing law of the District of Columbia so that ambulance and funeral cars may be placed in a different class from that in which they are at the present time. A person who seeks a license to operate an ambulance or a funeral car, under the provisions of this bill, merely has to show that he is of good moral character and qualified to operate said vehicle. At the present time the operators of ambulances and funeral cars are required to have the same rules applied to them as apply to the operators of taxicabs in the District of Columbia. They are required to be familiar with all points of interest in the District of Columbia and to wear certain badges of identification. We believe that those requirements are unnecessary and that the change presented in this bill is desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF CUSTODIAL EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6899) to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917," approved May 10, 1916 (39 Stat. 120), and acts amendatory thereto, shall not apply to the custodial employees who are in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia by reason of any provision, decision, or construction of said section, or acts amendatory thereto, when such employees are performing work required of them in school buildings during the time these buildings are used for nonrecreational official purposes by any Federal agency or department of the District of Columbia government other than the Board of Education, in accordance with the rules of the Board of Education governing the use of school buildings and grounds, including their use for day or evening schools and for nonrecreational purposes; and nothing therein contained shall be deemed to prevent any custodial employee from receiving in addition to his pay, salary, or compensation as an employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia any other pay, salary, or compensation for services which may have been rendered subsequent to May 31, 1941, or which may hereafter be rendered to any Federal agency or department of the District of Columbia government other than the Board of Education, during its use of school buildings under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to permit custodial employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to receive additional compensation when performing services for other District or Federal agencies.

Let us take, for example, the Civil Service Commission. That Commission has funds with which to pay the expenses for examinations held in the District of Columbia. As those examinations are held in the schools extra time is required on the part of the custodial force, but under existing law those custodians cannot accept any additional compensation. We believe that this measure is desirable. It has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6953) to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (b) of the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Tax on corporations: There is hereby levied for each taxable year upon the taxable income from District of Columbia sources of every corporation, whether domestic or foreign (except those organizations expressly exempt under paragraph (d) of this section), a tax at the rate of 5 percent thereof: *Provided, however*, That income derived from the procurement of orders for the sale of personal property by means of telephonic communication, written correspondence, or solicitation by salesmen in the District where such orders require acceptance without the District before becoming binding on the purchaser and seller and title to such property passes from the seller to the purchaser without the District is not from District of Columbia sources: *Provided further*, That income from the sale of personal property to the United States is not from District of Columbia sources unless the taxpayer is engaged in business in the District and such property is delivered for use within said District."

SEC. 2. Section 46 (g) of the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Any corporation receiving income from District sources or engaging in or carrying on any business in the District without first having obtained a license so to do, and any person engaging in or carrying on any business for or receiving income from District sources on behalf of a corporation not having a license so to do, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $300 for each and every failure, refusal, or violation, and each and every day that such failure, refusal, or violation continues shall constitute a separate and distinct offense. All prosecutions under this subsection shall be brought in the police court of the District on information by the corporation counsel or any of his assistants in the name of the District: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to mere collection by an agent of income of a corporation not having the license required hereby."

SEC. 3. Section 46 (h) of the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The term 'business' as used in this act shall include the carrying on or exercising for gain or economic benefit, either direct or indirect, any trade, business, or commercial activity in the District: *Provided, however*, That such term shall not include the procurement of orders for the sale of personal property by means of telephonic communication, written correspondence, or solicitation by salesmen in the District where such orders require acceptance without the District before becoming binding on the purchaser and seller and title to such property passes from the seller to the purchaser without the District; nor the mere submission of bids or the mere acceptance of contracts for the sale of personal property to the United States."

SEC. 4. (a) The amendment made by section 1 of this act shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

(b) The amendments made by sections 2 and 3 of this act shall be effective as of January 1, 1942.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the present District of Columbia income tax levies a tax upon incomes from District of Columbia sources of domestic and foreign corporations, and requires every corporation engaged in business or commercial activity in the District to obtain a license to do so. It is the purpose of this legislation to exempt from the tax income from the sale of personal property where orders therefor require acceptance without the District before becoming binding on the purchaser and seller and title to such property passes from the seller to the purchaser without the District, and to exempt from the licensing provisions of the act corporations which merely obtain orders for the sale of personal property by telephone, mail, or personal solicitation by salesmen in the District where such orders require acceptance without the District and title passes without the District. Many Members of Congress brought this matter to our attention and it was upon their request that the committee considered this legislation and proposed it.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. The amendment to the present bill, I understand, was brought about because the committee has been deluged with letters asking for the revision of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is true; many Members from at least eight or nine States have approached us and have said they believed that only corporations actually maintaining offices here and residing within the District should be taxed; that these others should not be taxed, for it was a barrier between the

States and the District of Columbia that was not wholesome.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in connection with this bill certain correspondence and telegrams relating to this subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, some time ago a bill was passed making it compulsory for both local and foreign corporations not only to take out an annual vendor's license, but also to pay a 5-percent corporate income tax on sources of revenue received from within the District of Columbia.

I think the present law is far-reaching and unfair and creates an undue tax hardship on foreign corporations, and sets up a trade barrier between the District of Columbia and the States.

Mr. Speaker, I received many letters from manufacturers in North Carolina, Tennessee, Arkansas, Georgia, and Maryland, protesting against this unjust and unfair tax. They feel that after paying the Federal, State, and county taxes, they are being penalized and asked that some action be taken. Therefore I introduced H. R. 6953 and ask the House for its immediate adoption.

This bill would tax merchandise where the title to the goods passes in the District. In other words, only those corporations will have to pay the tax who bring goods into the District in their own trucks, as the title would then be transferred in the District. Corporations who ship their goods via a common carrier transfer the title to the carrier when the merchandise is accepted by them. Only those corporations who pay the tax will have to pay the license fee.

Mr. Speaker, I include herein an interpretation of this bill which I received from the corporation counsel, Mr. Richmond B. Keech. I also insert two telegrams, one from Mr. W. G. Ewald, secretary of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, and one from Mr. J. Morton Lehman, representing the furniture manufacturers, in approval of this bill.

CORPORATION COUNSEL,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, April 21, 1942.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: Pursuant to your telephone request of this afternoon asking that I advise you as to the effect of the bill substituted for H. R. 6871, please be advised as follows:

This measure, to the best of my information, will result in a loss of revenue to the District of Columbia of approximately $185,000 per annum, plus an unknown additional figure.

Under the terms of the bill a foreign corporation which has a representative in the District of Columbia soliciting orders, the acceptance thereof being out of the District and title to such property passing from the purchaser to the seller without said District, would not be subject to the District of Columbia tax. Furthermore, the District would obtain no tax from the sale of personal property to the United States, unless the seller is engaged in business in the District of Columbia and the property sold to the United States is delivered for use in said District.

The practical effect, so far as sales to the United States Government are concerned, is that foreign corporations not engaged in business in the District of Columbia would pay no tax, and even those engaged in business in the District of Columbia would only pay a tax upon the income from sales of such property for use in the District.

Foreign corporations which merely obtain orders for the sale of personal property from persons in the District by telephone, mail, or personal solicitation (which orders are accepted without the District) would not be subject to the tax unless delivery is made into the District in some manner whereby title to the goods passes in the District. Generally, title would pass in the District in cases where delivery is made into the District in the delivery equipment of the seller, or c. o. d., or draft with bill of lading attached. In substantially all cases where sales are made by corporations not engaged in business in the District the parties can arrange for delivery in a manner whereby title will pass without the District, thus relieving the seller of the District income tax.

Very truly yours,
RICHMOND B. KEECH,
Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia.

BALTIMORE, MD., *April 23, 1942.*

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Baltimore Association of Commerce is of the opinion that pending bill H. R. 6953 would provide for a satisfactory amendment to the District of Columbia corporation income tax law and urge your favorable action for early passage of this measure.

W. G. EWALD, *Secretary,*
Baltimore Association of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 22, 1942.*

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
House Building, Washington, D. C.:

H. R. 6953 is satisfactory to the furniture interests which I represent. We feel that this bill cures all defects complained of in H. R. 5591, and we would appreciate your efforts for a speedy passage of the amended bill.

J. MORTON LEHMAN.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, after line 23, insert:

"SEC. 5. Article III of title V of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended by adding thereto the following new section:

"'SEC. 16. In all cases where the assessor claims that a decedent was domiciled in the District at the time of his death and the taxing authorities of a State or States make a similar claim with respect to their State or States, the assessor may, with the approval of the Commissioners, compromise and settle the taxes imposed by this title.'

"SEC. 6. The amendment made by section 5 of this act shall apply to estates of decedents dying before or after its enactment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this completes the legislative program of the District Committee today.

CONSIDERATION OF THE LAND-GRANT BILL

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time for the House to consider the bill (H. R. 6156) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, commonly known as the land-grant bill.

I may state in this connection that I have in mind if the request is granted, to notify the House a day in advance of the time it will be called up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman at this time also fix the time for general debate on the bill?

Mr. LEA. I would suggest that general debate be limited to an hour, to be divided equally between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman include that in his request?

Mr. LEA. I will. Mr. Speaker, I so modify my request.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand the gentleman is going to notify the House when the bill will be brought up, and that he will also notify the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. LEA. Yes, indeed.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when does the gentleman plan to call the bill up?

Mr. LEA. I intend to call it up at the convenience of the House; I thought possibly Wednesday; but I should want to consult with the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader before deciding that.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman now contemplates that it will be Wednesday.

Mr. LEA. I hope so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time for the House to consider the bill H. R. 6156, to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; and that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LET THE PEOPLE SPEAK

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively and respectfully to the message of the President of the United States. In my opinion, the note he strikes is pretty well justified by the situation which obtains.

However, in my judgment, the American people are entitled to know all the truth. Nothing else will save them or can make and keep them free. This is no time for half truths.

They are entitled to know that strikes in essential defense industries have directly and terribly impeded the production of necessary war matériel, and that an attitude of tremulous inactivity in expediting the positive ending of further delays from such sources has contributed and still contributes to the possibility of

our defeat and will continue under the set-up to which the President refers, for that is so.

They are entitled to know that a lot of blank-check appropriations made for national defense purposes have been sidetracked and used for purposes for which they were not intended by Congress, which situation now requires the lowering of the standard of living.

There is a multitude of other things they are entitled to be told. They should be shocked into a realization of what confronts them instead of being hypnotized by a lot of words or palliated by half truths.

If the big stick is ever to be used to advantage in this war, it must be swung effectively soon, or it will be too late.

There has been a lot of attempted coverage of shortcomings by efforts made to distract and to divert the attention of the people from the real issue. This should stop. It will have to be stopped, and there is no other answer to our internal economic situation. Our great enemy is found on the home front.

The New Deal program of the last 7 years is the big goat that has butted our defense efforts into insensibility. Make no mistake!

Do not be misled by false prophets or by the scribes and pharisees who now sit, for the time being, at the tables and desks in the inner sanctum of the temple of our Government. Now is the time for action. The people are fed up with all the conflicting orders and statements and promises emanating from high sources, inspired or not, corroborated or repudiated, as trial balloons to test popular sentiment, about which there never could, can, or should be any question.

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in disagreement with a lot of stuff and nonsense which paid propagandists, New Deal advocates, and misguided people generally, are putting in the papers these days.

Some very good people have swallowed the bait, hook, sinker, and line. Strange as it may seem, yet it is too true. Let's be realists for a few minutes. Why should we allow or permit our careless reading of headlines to convince us against a better judgment, based on careful consideration of the facts that have contributed to perpetuate our form of government, thus far.

This is a total war in which we are engaged, fighting to preserve our democratic, representative form of government, a war of survival, a war for our lives and liberty. So I ask you, in the words of St. Matthew, "What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his own soul?" That question should ring in the ears of every patriotic citizen, when confronted by the suggestion that his right to exercise his prerogative to vote, should be adjourned.

Any attempt to take advantage of the war to cover derelictions by proposing first, that all congressional elections be suspended; later by suggesting that there be no political campaigns for the duration—because they would destroy unity—is pure propaganda.

Let us be realistic. Of course we must win this war, but what are we fighting for if not to preserve and to conserve our form of government and to insure to posterity a continuance and perpetuation of the liberties we have enjoyed.

In order to do these things we must not tolerate a continuance of a program which puts saving social gains above saving the country. To stop such people, so-minded, from accomplishing such a purpose, we must be on the alert. The public must be advised and informed fully as to what is going on, and facts and figures must be factual. Responsibility for what has happened and is happening must be pinned on those individuals and groups who are and were responsible.

Tremendous expenditures are required to win the war. The great burden which the extravagance of the present administration has imposed upon the American people would be borne more cheerfully and bonds and stamps would be sold more successfully, and in far larger amounts and to greater extent if the people only knew their money would not be wasted. How can they?

Many, many millions, even billions, could be eliminated from Federal expenditures without affecting our war effort and without crippling the essential operation of the Federal Government, if the administration would give up its self-perpetuation policy.

In this emergency the pleas of special groups, fostered by the New Deal, for non-essential expenditures, which in the aggregate are staggering, must be and will have to be denied. The spending of lavish funds for such unnecessary purposes should be no longer judged on the basis of their merits as social experiments. It is time for us to know that we must take account of the serious predicament of this country. We are losing, not winning the war. We must cut every non-essential, non-defense expenditure, out, or to the bone.

Let me say the administration is not cooperating to that end, despite all its propaganda to that effect, for which we are paying. It is an incontrovertible fact that this administration is alone responsible for the fact that its fiscal policies have brought us to the present war with an almost incomprehensible, staggering public debt which even posterity may view with alarm, if it can ever be paid.

Read your history. Do you think for a minute that the American people will tolerate any such program as this which the wishful thinking of those most interested to keep themselves in power would like to put over? I do not. I know better.

So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to be chained, gagged, bound, restricted, or interfered with as to my right to make critical, constructive suggestions which I think may help to win this war, and put a stop to a program which this administration seems to persist in determining to continue, war or no war, in order to perpetuate itself in power at the expense of the people, piling bureaus on bureaus, like a second-hand furniture store, at a time when it should be concerned only with cleaning house in order to win the war.

I do not propose to let them get away with their camouflage, which does not hide from me the real intent and purpose they undertake artificially to conceal.

I will gladly, as in the past, support the Commander in Chief so long as he acts in that capacity, but if and whenever he tries to play party politics while, through Facts and Figures and other agencies, he sings another song, set to the key of not giving up a thing, refusing to acknowledge any mistakes, persisting in attempting to justify the New Deal philosophy, which delayed our preparedness and is responsible for much of our trouble—internal and economic—then I shall say what I think about it.

Every American is bound to discharge his duty as a citizen, and this is his and her country. It will belong to him and to her, and to the people, so long, and only so long, as they are not deprived of the opportunity—fully, freely, and without fear or favor—to express themselves at the polls. That is axiomatic.

Election at and during wartime? Of course, there should be and there will be one. Let the majority rule. Let the people speak. We are fighting primarily for that opportunity, or else what?

David Lawrence, Archibald MacLeish, or anybody else to the contrary, who undertakes to cooperate to favor the theory that the American people should be suppressed in or deprived of the exercise of their blood-bought prerogative to express themselves in peace or war, through the ballot, is off on the wrong foot, if Lincoln was right—and he was right—when he said:

> The people of these United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and the courts, not to overthrow the Constitution but to overthrow men who would pervert the Constitution.

So was Chief Justice Holmes, who said:

> We do not lose our right to condemn either measures or men because the country is at war.

President Wilson went even further. Said he:

> We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. Honesty and competence require no shield of secrecy.

The suggestion of Mr. MacLeish, of Facts and Figures, that "the free election of a free people could be used by enemies of the people's freedom" will not stand the gaff of cold-blooded analysis by anyone who relies on actual facts and figures. The statement is a figment of imagination, and, to be brutally frank, is nonsensical and dangerous. What do we care what anybody else thinks? It is our freedom we are trying to conserve and in our own way.

This is our war to win. It is time to fight an aggressive war—not to be waiting to find out what somebody may think concerning how we go about doing it. Our publicity should be pugnacious.

Now is the time for a tremendous political and propaganda offensive on our part, as Dorothy Thompson has said. It should be defiant and aggressive. Let the people speak at the polls. Then

Messrs. Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito will have no question as to what America is determined to do to them at whatever the cost and no matter how long it takes.

All question as to our lack of unity to win the war will vanish with the smoke of our internal exercise of our right here in America to say what we think. That right we propose to continue to enjoy and to exercise to the discomfiture of everybody who has been or still is in any way impeding our effort to win the war.

There will be no right of appeal from the verdict the people will render; nor will recommendations for mercy have any effect.

This is a fight to the finish.

As Mr. DITTER, of Pennsylvania, said, in substance, the other day, such a statement regarding adjournment of elections sounds like a command; as if, so to speak, somebody were trying to crack the whip; as though it were an unyielding order, uncompromising, "forbidding the people the right to express their will either by voice or vote."

This country was not framed on that theory and to knuckle to any such proposition is to sell our birthright for a mess of pottage. I am opposed to the proposition, lock, stock, and barrel, and for so many reasons I cannot take your time to enumerate them. They must occur to you.

It is obvious that if we cannot choose those who represent us; if we are to acquiesce in a program because to oppose it would be an expression of our dissatisfaction with it; if the people are not privileged to say what they think, then this is the beginning of the end of the America our forefathers fought to establish, and the dream of Milton, who said:

> Methinks I see in my mind a noble puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks. Methinks I see her as an eagle mewing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full midday beam; purging and unscaling her long-abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance; while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means.

is a nightmare, for the people will have been deprived of their essential, fundamental rights that make them great.

I will be no party to connive at dealing such a death-blow to democratic, representative government. If that be treason, make the most of it.

It has been said that politics is the science of government, and the people are the scientists. They are realists. This is true despite the hallucinations of a lot of people who think otherwise. This proposition to postpone proper criticism of what the elected officials of the people have perpetrated is going to be a dud and a boomerang. It is doomed when the people wake to realize what some are trying to do to them. The people pay the bills, fight the war, and will save the country. They have a right to demand an accounting of their servants, to know the reasons why—or why not.

I regret to reiterate that the rank and file of New Deal bureaucrats seemingly have but one purpose in mind, one motive which is compelling as against each and every situation which confronts them. That what I am to say may not be taken as a generalization; I will say there are some exceptions. That is not a partisan statement. I could call to substantiate my statement many Members of Congress across the aisle from me, who would say more than I shall.

Regrettable though it is, the fact is, the impelling motive which determines the decisions of a majority of New Deal bureaucrats is found in a solution of the preliminary question predicated on whether or not their decision in the premises will help the New Deal program, and also at the same time retain for them their jobs.

"Win or lose the war, I must not lose my job," is the thought too often uppermost in the minds of too many.

Any effort or suggestion to adjourn free elections or to prevent free expression by a free people of their informed and intelligent judgment on public questions is an attempt to intimidate, to suppress the people in the exercise of their right to protect and to save the very freedom such an order, if obeyed, would destroy.

No, gentlemen, the American people are too smart to be caught in that trap of pure political propaganda, so skillfully baited. The people still think for themselves, thank God, and they propose to win the war, and to make the war worth winning, by preserving their own freedom by ballots and bullets. They will stand for no suppression or denial of that right.

So let us have a going-over at election time. Let us put the blame and responsibility and give credit where it belongs.

Let us have an election by all means, and the campaign to precede it. Let us not try to win a war by depriving the people of an opportunity to speak their minds in Congress and elsewhere. It will not work.

History talks louder than most people think; it repeats itself. The inspiration for the proposition not to talk about the New Deal's mistakes, mismanagement, wasteful extravagance, and grave responsibility comes from high New Deal sources. So much the worse. So much the more reason for not being fooled into acquiescence to such a program.

Let the people speak and we will win the war. To bind, gag, and deprive them of their constitutional right will destroy rather than create unity, and lose the war. It is an attempt, unwarranted and inexcusable, to establish, under a camouflage, a dictatorship de luxe for the duration.

I will have none of it.

To suggest an adjournment of politics is to advocate an abrogation of our citizenship.

I shall fight such a program to the last ditch, and in so doing will have with me a preponderant majority of the American people in my attempt to save what little is left guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURDOCK). Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring before the House again a subject which has been uppermost in the minds of not only the Members of this body but of the American people generally, and in increasing measure in recent weeks.

All of us are uncomfortably aware of the Treasury's recent announcement that the sales of defense stamps and bonds are lagging. This despite the fact that the tempo of American production is sharply rising and the consequent fact that national income is also increasing at a marked rate. With the sharp increase in national income also we know that the total of available or purchasable consumer and durable goods is sharply dropping, as our war-production program bites more and more deeply into all types of production for civilian use. In other words, the inflation gap about which Leon Henderson and the economist advisers warn us is widening at an alarming rate. Billions of dollars of surplus purchasing power are stacking up. More will be stacking up every day. What, then, has happened to cause this sag in the purchase of stamps and bonds?

There is a glib explanation offered to the effect that the first wave of patriotic fervor following Pearl Harbor is ebbing. There is the other glib theory that Americans are discouraged under the successions of serious set-backs which we have suffered in the field. Neither explanation holds water. American patriotism and determination to win this war is not the "flash-in-the-pan" variety. Do not tell me that the average American wanted to win this war only for the first or second month after Pearl Harbor. Do not tell me, either, that there is a real American anywhere who is not more grimly determined today than ever, despite the reverses and disappointments suffered to date, that we can, we must, and we will win this war.

Stamp and bond sales have not bogged down because 130,000,000 Americans have lost interest in this war, or lost the will to win it. The sales curve is dipping solely and only because the American people are disheartened and disgusted with the way our domestic war effort is being mismanaged and misdirected. The American people are disappointed and angry, not because we have lost a few of the opening battles under the shock and surprise of aggression, but because national management refused to display the same spirit of grim determination and sacrifice that the people themselves feel. My mail, day after day, proves where the trouble lies. Time after time letters from my constituents say, "No more bonds so long as the Government dilly-dallies on this important question"; "Why should we buy bonds and make sacrifices if the Government refuses to stop boondoggling, political manipulation, social gains as usual?"; or, "Why should the people scrimp and save and sacrifice so long as the Government insists upon throwing money away faster than the people can possibly save it?"

There is not a Member among the 435 in this House who has not had the same complaints dropped on his desk

dozens of times during the past few weeks.

There is the answer to the Treasury's shameful story that the American people's enthusiasm for War Bonds and stamps is waning. There is the proof that the American people are protesting the lackadaisical attitude of Government in this emergency. There is the proof that it is not the people, but Government itself which is complacent in the face of the gravest peril which ever beset us as a Nation. And I warn you here, ladies and gentlemen, that no matter how brilliant may be our military strategy, no matter how effective our direction of foreign policy, we face the grave risk of losing this war right here at home, unless we wake up, clean house, and provide an effective, economical administration, stripped of every nonessential, and geared to fight this war to the quickest, safest, and most economical victory possible.

How have we been fighting this war to date? Why, with labor relations in the worst possible sort of fog because Congress has yielded time and again to pressure from the President, in his desire to keep labor securely in his own vest pocket. The result is continuing unrest and confusion which not only contributes to disunity, but which injures organized labor above every other group in America.

How else have we been fighting this war? Why, without a semblance of a national system of controls to prevent inflation. Just now, a year and a half after the first factors of inflation begin to drive us out of gear nationally, the President finally is about to approach the problem anew, after several months in which the administration generally has stubbornly refused to consider any overall, effective system of controls. As a part of this failure, for which this body must accept a major share of the blame, we are still bickering and stalling the dreaded job of writing an adequate war tax bill, which the people themselves have long since asked for, and which we know very well must be a part of any effective protection against inflation.

But even these things are probably not the most discouraging aspects of Government's failure in this emergency. Probably even worse has been Government's eternal and everlasting carelessness, extravagance, even possible outright corruption in the tremendous expenditures which are bleeding the country now and stacking up unthinkable burdens of debt for generations to come.

There is simply something about the attitude of bigger and better and faster expenditures with apparently no thought for values or consequences which must kill the soul and spirit of the average American who knows that he must carry the load.

Examples are legion. Any Member of the House could recite instances by the hour without ever repeating himself to show how Government is at work night and day deadening the American spirit. Specific examples have become so numerous, in fact, that single items standing by themselves simply lose all meaning. A couple of items, however, occur to me as worth mentioning here. These, of course, are no better or worse than a thousand others which could be used as illustrations.

Take the current rivers and harbors bill as a classic example of Federal pork-barrel extravagance at its very worst. The evils of the pork-barrel and log-rolling have been with us from the beginning of Federal Government, despite continuous criticism. Deplorable as these practices are in the very best of peacetime prosperity, when the Nation can best afford this type of wastefulness, they are simply indefensible and outrageously offensive in times of stress. Yet here, right in the midst of America's gravest crisis, we have actually reported to this body what is perhaps the most outrageous pork-barrel bill in all American history.

Key project in this omnibus measure is the St. Lawrence waterway, long favored by the administration, but frequently rejected by competent engineers, and long since turned down by the United States Senate when presented to that body as part of an international treaty. Those rejections, remember, were for sound, practical reasons back in peacetimes, when America could afford, if it saw fit, to boondoggle away its rich surplusses of money, materials, and energy. Now, with every last dollar of our wealth, and every last measure of our material resources and manpower desperately needed for the sole and immediate purpose of fighting this war, that project, together with some 235 other public-works items, has actually and seriously been reported to this House for consideration.

A project which never would win public approval on its merits in peacetime is now being offered in the name of national and international defense. And the purpose of loading this project into the omnibus rivers and harbors bill is purely and simply to win votes from reluctant Members who may be weak enough to vote for it on the pork-barrel principle of gaining approval for other items in the general bill in which they are directly interested. Thank goodness, the membership of this House and of the Senate will not prove as weak as the administration supporters of the bill have hoped.

This is no attempt to establish the case against the St. Lawrence waterway. That case has been established and strengthened again and again, despite the fact that the administration has devoted tremendous energy to the task of selling this project to the American people.

The case is so well known, in fact, that very few people, either in the United States or Canada, want to undertake the project, at least for the duration. But, granting that the proponents of the plan were right in their estimates of its value, the more nearly they were right, the more serious would be the damage to American railways and highway transportation systems, and consequently to the millions of men and women who earn their livelihood in the service of our existing transportation systems. The more nearly these proponents are right about the St. Lawrence power potential coming into use at an early date, the more certain would be the direct damage and loss to the American coal mining industry and the millions of coal miners who would be adversely affected.

As a matter of simple fact, the proponents are fantastically wrong about the St. Lawrence waterway and its potentialities. The money, the materials, and the manpower simply are not available to undertake the project now, unless we are to be foolish enough to sacrifice the constructive accomplishments we can immediately depend upon for the vague, footless, idealistic estimate of assets which might possibly accrue from the St. Lawrence some time between 1946 and 1950.

If a bird in hand is worth two in the bush; if a plane, a weapon, or a ship today may be worth a dozen next week or next month, then we will consider the St. Lawrence waterway and the odd assortment of projects represented in the Rivers and Harbors bill only when we find ourselves again with surpluses of wealth, materials, and manpower.

The point is, however, that we actually do have this Rivers and Harbors bill ahead of us on the calendar. The crying shame is also that there may be several separate items buried in that bill which, standing on their own feet, are justified as immediately essential to our war effort. Do you think for a minute that that thought has not occurred to your constituent, the average American? Do you think that your constituent is going to be particularly happy about the fact that you are whittling away to get a fancy dam across "Mud Creek" back home if he sees that you are figuring on getting that dam by deft log rolling which might seem amusing in normal times, but which shows up as a definite brake on the national effort in wartime?

This, therefore, is a definite appeal to the committee on Rivers and Harbors. For goodness sake, tear this current bill down. Get ruthlessly practical and strip out the deadwood and underbrush in this current measure. Then bring back the few projects which are honestly and immediately necessary to the war effort and let us authorize them promptly.

What I suggest here is not directed as a criticism of this particular committee. I mention the Rivers and Harbors bill only because it is a typical product of the complacency and irresponsibility which has frequently marked the action of this Congress, to the bitter disappointment of the American people.

How can this Congress honestly object to the criticism which is being heaped upon it when deference to the Executive in all things has become such an apparent habit that news stories commonly speak of delays on legislation as caused by this or that committee waiting upon instructions from the President? As an example, last Saturday's papers reported that the Appropriations Committee is holding up action on appropriations for the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, pending the President's decision with respect to these agencies.

Has Congress so completely abdicated its duties of policy making that it will not take the initiative in abolishing nondefense and nonessential agencies without

instructions from the President? If so, then the odius term "rubber stamp" is richly deserved by those in Congress who are responsible.

Never in a thousand years has the legislative function been so dangerously threatened.

Totalitarianism has destroyed it completely in country after country. Even in the few United Nations still clinging to the democratic principles legislative bodies are functioning only in a limited way. In the United States alone the legislative principle is free to operate. Will we further jeopardize it here, or will we protect and strengthen it by accepting our responsibilities fully as the Constitution directs and as the American people desire?

Remiss as we have been here, however, the more serious public complaints lie against the executive departments and agencies, where waste, extravagance, bungling, and glaring carelessness are costing the American people hundreds of millions, yes, even billions, of dollars.

So widespread and so tremendous are these utterly inexcusable losses that single examples, offered by themselves, cannot begin to tell the story. I would, however, like to show you just a few exhibits from the records of my committee's investigation now in progress at the Louisiana ordnance plant. I have just a handful of pictures here, which I hope all of you will examine carefully.

Here, for instance, are two taken of little sentry houses, just 10 feet 2 inches by 10 feet 7 inches, with an extended, or canopy type, roof over a small gateway. The first of these is costing $3,363; the second, $3,409. Note this picture of a little pumphouse. Note the size and the very simple type of construction. This is one of five such shanties estimated to cost $5,670 each.

Now look at this four-car garage building, just the simple sort of a frame building without interior finish that is typical of home garages. Estimated cost on this is $9,425. In line with this, notice this picture of a two-car grease rack. Here is an ordinary shed, just 31 by 40 feet, with wooden ramps, that cost $17,099. And so it goes on up the line, through this little office building at $21,793, this small laboratory at $36,128, this employment office at $64,403, and this police and fire station at $74,082.

The buildings pictured here, all of them, are the simplest sort of cheap frame construction with very ordinary inside finish, or even without any interior finish. This is the type of construction which you or I would expect to buy privately at certainly no more than one-third such costs, and probably as little as one-tenth in some cases. In fact, the Government and the contractors doing this type of work speak of it as 5-year construction.

Why in the world, then, is the contractor in this case permitted to install copper eave troughs and downspouts in such construction? Upon the records of an investigation which is still incomplete, 5,500 pounds of copper have thus been used—5,500 pounds of a metal that has practically become precious, so desperately is it needed in our war effort. The same reckless waste has been made of steel, the committee's investigators reporting times without number the lavish use of reinforcing steel in concrete construction where there is utterly no excuse or justification for it.

Even with all this reckless waste, however, the fantastic prices on this construction work simply stagger the imagination. Perhaps the best way to illustrate the extent of the extravagance is to quote directly from the comparison made by a committee witness. The following is taken directly from the record:

> To show you graphically what you can build for a high cubic-foot cost, this particular building which you have all looked at—employment building, exhibit 5—cost 87½ cents a cubic foot completed.
>
> Now, when the distributable items are added on to that, that cubic-foot cost will doubtless go up to nearly $1, because there are going to be many thousands of dollars added to it.
>
> Now, then, you are more familiar with the United States Supreme Court Building, which is a monumental affair, and is one of the most elaborate and well-built in the United States.
>
> It contains the finest of marble, and it contains a great amount of fine painting and sculpturing and friezes, and the cubic cost of that United States Supreme Court Building, after taking out the architectural and engineering service fees, was $1.10 per cubic foot, and that amount included a profit to the contractor. One dollar and ten cents per cubic foot to build the United States Supreme Court Building, when it costs nearly $1 a cubic foot to build a temporary wooden frame building.
>
> In addition to that comparison, we made one with the New House Office Building; and the New House Office Building cost, including air conditioning, 75 cents; without air conditioning, it was 73½ cents per cubic foot. As you can see, it is far less per cubic foot than that temporary building there.

Certainly, no further comment is necessary.

Even that is not all the story. Our investigation develops the fact that by the contractor's present system of audits, there are other funds allotted for construction which may even legitimately add another 46 percent to the cost of any or all of these buildings.

Enough for buildings. Now look at these exhibits of road construction. [Indicating.] Here is the road type known as 1-A. This type of roadway, of which this illustration is typical, is costing $98,170 per mile. The road is 30-foot paving, without proper grading and subgrading, and with what inspectors have termed a hopeless lack of drainage.

Here are two pictures of type 1-B roads. Look at the rutted muck and the standing water on this 44-foot-wide piece of roadway, which has cost $81,827 in its present state and which will cost $94,488 per mile when completed. Look at this close-up view of a 1-B roadway, 20 feet wide, which cost $42,949 per mile. Here again note the rutted muck, the standing water. The committee's investigator reports that he actually had to have high rubber boots to get around these roads, and said of this particular road:

> Entire road a positive quagmire.

You will be interested in these two pictures of the central pay office, a structure you would describe as a tar-paper shanty. This shanty, together with the so-called parking lot pictured, cost $14,683. Again note the mud and water. The building cost $2,235; the lot cost $12,448. In this connection, let me quote a witness appearing before the committee:

> And where the expenditure of $12,448 for that parking lot is, I am unable to answer.

Can such unthinkable expenditures result merely from gross carelessness or mismanagement, or is it impossible for even the most extravagant government to waste money at such a terrific rate unless there is also fraud and collusion involved? I am not ready to make such a charge in this case, but there are some very peculiar circumstances surrounding the construction of this Louisiana ordnance plant. As an example, since our committee's investigation started, there has been a hurried revision of auditing practices resulting in a reduction of some of the most outrageous charges.

Worse, three Government inspectors assigned to the job began to turn up some very embarrassing evidence about construction practices used there, particularly the construction of roadways. In fact, one of these Government-employed inspectors reported to the Army engineers in writing that officials of the contracting company were engaged in a conspiracy to keep pertinent information relating to the work from the Army engineers. After a period of a few weeks, and with their investigations and report far from complete, they were removed from the project. The pretext was that their removal resulted from an existing agreement between the contractor and responsible officials that former employees of the contractor would not serve as official inspectors or investigators on the project.

The investigation those men began, however, remains unfinished, and no move has been made to put new men on the job to see that the work they started is completed.

What has happened and is happening at the Louisiana ordnance project is probably no better or no worse than the conditions on many another fixed-fee contract would prove upon close scrutiny. We probably will not know the real story until the war is over, so tremendous is the program, and so inadequate is our administrative machinery and executive personnel for the job. It can certainly be said, however, that tremendous wastes have resulted, and are resulting, from fixed-fee contracts. The fixed fee is a little better, perhaps, than the cost plus fixed percentage of profit, under which the contractor is given an incentive to waste money; but the records will show that the lump-sum construction contract sharply cuts the costs to the taxpayers.

Certainly there are times when it is impracticable or impossible to follow the competitive-bid routine in this emergency. It is proper that the procurement services should have discretionary authority to negotiate contracts under such circumstances, but certainly the executive officers should feel bound to be doubly careful in protecting the taxpayers' interests in such contracts. Unfortunately, I am afraid, however, that

the contracting officials too frequently become careless and indifferent about their tremendous responsibilities.

Freedom with the taxpayers' money has always been more or less of a habit of Federal Government, but carelessness and extravagance have developed to shocking proportions in this administration. Under the pressure of emergency and the necessity of spending unimaginable sums for the war it is unfortunately true that carelessness and extravagance grow steadily worse.

Here are the main factors that are bogging down bond sales and burdening the American spirit and will to win. I repeat, that the American people have an unshakable determination to win this war, and that they are not only willing but anxious to go all out individually and collectively to win.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings on the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House during the past summer, several witnesses appeared in support of the St. Lawrence legislation and unhesitatingly assured the committee that the diversion of men and materials from our defense efforts to the construction of the project would have no appreciable effect on our preparations for the defense of the country.

These arguments, like so many others that were then advanced, from the peacetime perspective, even though then of doubtful validity, have been absolutely nullified by this country's direct participation in the World War. Notwithstanding that fact, occasionally Members of Congress insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from such testimony and from other studies based upon considerations of pure peacetime domestic economy, apparently on the theory that such statements tend to support the assertions of their sponsors that the project should be approved by Congress. Present conditions require the total elimination of such considerations and a reappraisal of the project from the sole point of view of its probable effect on our war efforts.

I want to call attention, particularly, to the labor phase of the situation in the light of a press release issued by Federal Security Administrator Paul V. McNutt under date of April 20. This statement calls attention to the fact that the War Manpower Commission has been created for making certain that the manpower we need for war production will be available when and where it is needed.

The press release pointed out that:

> The Commission has been charged by the President with the formulation of plans and programs and the establishment of basic national policies to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war, and the issuance of such policy and operating directives as may be necessary.

That the Congress is directly interested in this subject matter is indicated by the fact that among other functions it will be the duty of the Commission to formulate legislative programs designed to facilitate the most effective mobilization and utilization of the manpower of the country.

Mr. McNutt stated, among other things, that 18 industrial workers are required to equip a single fighting man; that we will need 13,000,000 additional war-production workers during the next year, 10,500,000 of whom must be skilled and semiskilled workers.

The statement reveals that there is already a serious deficiency in the number of skilled workers available for industry. These shortages are currently critical in many occupations. For example, the ratio of demand and supply for ship carpenters is 7 to 1; for aircraft riveters, 4 to 1; for marine machinists, 22 to 1. Plans of the War Manpower Commission call for the expansion of our industrial training as fully as possible.

Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, in charge of the survey and preparations for the building of the St. Lawrence project, in his testimony before the Rivers and Harbors Committee stated that an average of 10,000 men would be needed on the job. Of these, 8,000 were described as being skilled or semiskilled.

Insofar as any occupational detail was given to the committee, General Robins said, for example, approximately 700 carpenters would be needed, 300 concrete finishers, 130 electricians, 150 hoisting engineers, and 70 machinists. That men in appreciable numbers for many other highly skilled trades would be required to build the St. Lawrence project may be readily assumed from a review of the class of workers employed by the Tennessee Valley Authority, as shown by its annual report for 1941.

This report includes, among others, the following craftsmen employed in substantial numbers. Blacksmiths and helpers, bulldozer operators, crane and derrick operators, gas mechanics and helpers, power-shovel operators, sheet-metal workers and helpers, steamfitters and helpers, tractor operators, and many others of like character.

Can we afford to divert machinists to a project which by the reckoning of its most optimistic supporters could not contribute in the slightest respect to our war efforts before 1946 if it were commenced at once? What may be said with respect to carpenters and machinists may be said with equal force regarding many other classes of skilled workers which it would be necessary to divert from our most important war efforts to a project of questionable value from any and every point of view.

Nor is this the only phase of the labor question which challenges our attention. The farm-labor report issued by the Department of Agriculture under date of March 16 discloses a serious and rapidly increasing shortage of farm labor. One that threatens the food supply of our civilian population and the curtailment of our contribution to the needs of our Allies. This situation is being brought about not only by the induction of farm labor into our armed forces but by an abandonment of farm work by men who have been and are being attracted into the much more lucrative field of war production.

The latter condition is more acute in the highly industrialized Northeastern section of the United States. The farm labor supply of January 1, 1942, was for the greater part of the State of New York, 40 to 49 percent below normal and for certain parts of New York, 50 percent or more below normal.

From January 1, 1940, to January 1, 1942, the farm labor supply in substantially all of the State of New York declined from 40 to 49 percent.

The farm labor report stated, in part:

> Reductions in the labor supply available to farmers in 1942 will not be uniform in various sections of the country. The reductions will be greatest in the highly industrial sections, such as New England, Middle Atlantic States, and East North Central States where the reductions have been cumulative despite priorities unemployment. In other areas where new war industries have been or will be established, sharp reductions in the labor supply available for farm work may be expected to occur.

Administrator McNutt deprecates severely the practice of "pirating" of employees from one essential war industry to another to make up for individual existing shortages of skilled labor.

The proponents of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project would have us set up another enormous "pirate" to not only wean labor away from vital war-production plants, but inevitably to induce workers to leave their all-important agriculture and dairying pursuits now extensively carried on in northern New York and elsewhere in that region.

One must inevitably reach the conclusion that the great bulk of semiskilled and ordinary labors on the St. Lawrence project would be recruited from the already rapidly diminishing supply of farm labor.

In this connection, the fact should not be overlooked that for every worker on the St. Lawrence project, there would have to be an average of two and one-half to three workers in the plants and factories turning out the material that would be needed to build and equip the project.

There are many sound and persuasive reasons why the St. Lawrence project should not be instituted to compete with our war efforts. The present and alarmingly perspective shortage of labor is by no means the least important of the many facts demonstrating the absurdity of approving its construction.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. He has rendered a remarkable service, not only to the Members of the House, but

to the American people in giving us the data and the figures which he furnished in connection with expenditures in our war effort.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe that in the expenditure of the funds that we have turned over to the Army, the Navy, and the other branches of the Government that it is their responsibility now, since the Congress appropriated the money lavishly to them, to see that this money is spent wisely and judiciously?

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no doubt but what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct. The people will demand this.

Mr. Speaker, for several months I have been working diligently in an effort to get our Government and our larger distilleries to use more of the hundreds of millions of bushels of the surplus grains which we have in this country in the manufacture of industrial alcohol, rather than our sugar.

More than 2 months ago I talked to Leon Henderson, Price Administrator, and to my amazement I learned that less than 10 percent of our industrial alcohol, sorely needed in our national defense program, was being made from surplus grains. Sugar, of which there is now a claimed shortage, was being used to manufacture the rest, in spite of the fact that we are an importer of sugar and an exporter of grains, of which we have a surplus running into the hundreds of millions of bushels.

Accordingly, on February 9, 1942, I introduced in the House a resolution asking for a complete investigation and survey of the possibility of substituting surplus grains for sugar in making ethyl alcohol for industrial purposes and also to inquire into the status of sugar stocks. This resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and I regret to say that to date I have been unable to dynamite it out of this committee.

However, with the publicity this action received, I am happy to say that the powers that be in Washington woke up to the fact of the necessity of using some of these surplus grains for making alcohol. But while the use of grains for alcohol has increased somewhat in recent months, it is entirely insufficient, and every effort to divert our surpluses into this channel must be made immediately.

It has been estimated that total alcohol requirements for the year will reach 275,000,000 gallons. The use of 50,000,000 bushels of our surplus wheat for this amount of industrial alcohol would permit the release of about 300,000 tons of sugar for domestic consumption. About 2½ gallons of alcohol can be obtained from a bushel of wheat.

With 987,190,000 bushels of wheat on hand January 1, 1942, with this year's crop coming on, and with surpluses of corn and other grains correspondingly as large, think of the tremendous amount of alcohol vital to our defense program which could be manufactured.

Americans normally use about 6,600,000 tons of sugar a year, this amounting to about 103 pounds per person. These figures increased slightly in 1941, principally because of hoarding.

Last year American cane and beet growers produced 2,250,000 tons of sugar, and it is estimated production in 1942 will be 2,900,000 tons. Cuba will produce about 4,500,000 tons, of which nearly all will be purchased by the United States. Other sources, including Hawaii and Puerto Rico, will furnish about 1,350,000 tons.

That means that, roughly, 8,750,000 tons will be available, but there is the transportation factor to consider, among others.

But it all cannot be shipped; we must consider our Allies, and our domestic needs, even on a rationed basis, must be met.

Considering all these factors, it has been estimated that we must get along on about 4,000,000 tons, so it can be seen that the supply is under the normal demand unless some drastic steps are taken.

Therefore, it is absolutely essential that the use of these mammoth surpluses of grains for manufacturing industrial alcohol be stepped up immediately.

I want to point out that ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have been working for increased quotas for our domestic sugar-beet growers. I have consistently urged that the growers of beets in the United States be permitted to produce a larger proportion of the sugar consumed in this country. However, I was vetoed on every move, and the present so-called shortage is a direct result of this short-sighted policy.

Let me point this out: There is plenty of sugar available in the world today, it is admitted by the best of authority. The principal trouble is transportation. Cuba has thousands of tons of sugar cramming her warehouses to the very ceilings, according to sugar authorities, but ships cannot be secured to carry it to the United States.

It is simply a question of either devoting more ships to transporting sugar to this country or devoting those ships to the job of taking our troops and food and tanks and planes to the four corners of the world where we are fighting this war.

I am sure that every American citizen, if they never got another ounce of sugar, is more than willing to see our ships devoted to transporting our men and equipment to the fields of battle and not diverted to transporting sugar.

Therefore, in view of these facts and the short-sighted policy of limiting our own producers and favoring those of foreign nations and our off-shore possessions, our current supplies and our available supplies must be carefully preserved.

The use of the hundreds of millions of bushels of surplus grains in this country in the making of industrial alcohol for smokeless powder and for other vital defense purposes will take care of much of this so-called shortage.

If such an investigation as I have asked for were permitted, a lot of master minds in our Government might have some tall explaining to do. Over the protest of the domestic beet-sugar producers and Congressmen from the sugar-beet producing States, including myself, these Government officials and others forced a reduction of sugar-beet acreage of from 17 to 20 percent last year. Cane, which would have yielded 300,000 tons of sugar, was left to rot in Puerto Rican fields because processing was prohibited, according to the New York Sun of January 20, 1942. I, on the other hand, vigorously urged that American quotas be lifted to permit larger output. But we were opposed by Government leaders, who insisted that the United States had ample sugar supplies for all needs and who kept on insisting this right up until the time the plans to ration sugar were announced.

Mr. Speaker, I see in front of me one of the most distinguished Members of the House, and I cannot help but remark at this moment that this gentleman worked with this unofficial committee day after day to secure an increase of price and production of sugar beets in this country. I refer to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS. I may say that I am personally familiar with the excellent work of the gentleman from Montana who consistently urged, year after year, week after week, and day after day, the removal of any limitation upon the beet-sugar production of this country. I should add that last year and in several preceding years the entire Colorado delegation, composed of our four Congressmen and two Senators, conferred with the officials of the Department of Agriculture and with the sugar section thereof and earnestly entreated that this limitation be not imposed or that it be reduced. May I say further that we pointed out exactly what would occur in the way of shortages in sugar and rationing thereof as was manifest from the lessons of history. But we were assured we were mistaken. We suggested that there would be a shortage of ships to carry sugar from the Philippines and even from Cuba and other countries nearer the continental United States, but our predictions were not taken seriously. However, everything that we predicted and everything that the gentleman from Montana predicted has come true. I do not question the sincerity of the Government officials at all.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But the gentleman does question their judgment?

Mr. LEWIS. I do.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is right and I congratulate him.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We do not raise any sugar in Pennsylvania, but I do remember the time when the gentleman from Colorado and some of his colleagues were interested in trying to get the quota lifted in Colorado. This is also true of gentlemen from Michigan. I tried my best to get the Department of Agriculture to permit the American farmers and the American laborers to raise the sugar that we consumed in our own country, but we achieved no result. I think the gentleman from Montana is hitting the nail on the head when he says that we ought to use the surplus agricultural commodities that we have to manufacture the

alcohol that is necessary in our war effort rather than use the sugar that we have. I was under the impression that the bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee several weeks ago did that very thing. May I ask whether the gentleman has any information that would lead him to believe that we are getting more alcohol out of grain than we are out of sugar?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. I would like to have the gentleman from Montana answer that question if he can. Are they now using more grain for the manufacture of alcohol than they did 3 or 4 weeks ago?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I recall very distinctly the gentleman's able efforts in trying to accomplish the very thing that the gentleman from Colorado referred to and that which is the subject of my speech. We of the West have always felt that we have a good and sincere friend in the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I will now attempt to answer the gentleman's question. It is a difficult question to answer, but the best I can find out is that the use of grain for industrial alcohol is not being increased substantially.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the fine work he has done in regard to the sugar situation. I have attended a good many of those meetings myself. Of course, in my State we have a very large acreage of land suitable for growing sugar beets, and we are growing a large percentage of them. We have endeavored in the past to have the quota lifted so we could participate to a larger extent.

May I ask the gentleman this question. I had an inquiry today from a constituent asking why it is that we are paying some $47,000,000 to sugar producers not to raise additional sugar at this time, when we do not have enough sugar to go around. What is the gentleman's answer to that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will try and answer the gentleman's question. The $47,000,000 is provided for as a processing tax and is paid into the Treasury. Thereafter it is paid to the beet growers. This is a good feature of the Sugar Act. However, our restrictions of production of sugar beets does not make sense in view of the fact that we raise less than one-third of the amount of sugar consumed in this country. The Democratic platform and the Republican platform both promised the American people to give as much as possible of the American market to the American producer, but neither party has kept faith with the people.

I have, time after time, pointed out that our American sugar-beet growers were being discriminated against, in favor of growers in Cuba and in other countries. Ever since I came to Congress I have been on an unofficial committee composed of western Congressmen and Senators, including Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, Senator Wheeler, of Montana, Senator Schwartz, of Wyoming, Senator Adams, who is now deceased, Senator Johnson, of Colorado, Senator Clark of Idaho, and others, and our purpose has been to attempt to bring about an increased acreage for our beet growers. However, it took a world-wide war to get the quota restrictions lifted so that our American producers could grow all the beets they desire. And this still will not be sufficient to supply the American market.

Nearly 2 years ago, on June 20, 1940, I pointed out on the floor of the House that if we were to assume the position of the world's bread basket then we were just as likely to become the world's sugar bowl, as sugar is an essential food and may be stored indefinitely without loss.

Even now, with the lifting of all restrictions on sugar production this year, producers will be unable to increase their acreage substantially. There is a matter of refining facilities. Present sugar-beet factories can handle only so many tons of beets each season. Therefore, the producers are limited in their acreage to the amount of beets which can be handled by existing facilities. The sugar-beet growers and processors, before going ahead and planning huge increases in production, also look to the Government and ask for assurances that if this production is increased during this time of war, they be allowed to maintain these increases after peace is declared and they not be cut off at the pockets and be forced to let additional factories and newly developed land stand idle. To date these producers and refineries have not received these assurances.

And even if these factories were to be constructed, they could not be completed in time to handle this year's crop.

A more vigorous fight not only by the people themselves but in the House and in the Senate must be made for increased production of sugar beets, especially in the irrigated areas of the West. Sugar beets are our best cash crop in Montana. We have an abundance of rich, fertile soil on which to produce these beets. We have plentiful supplies of water for irrigation.

Our sugar-beet growers must be permitted to not only sustain their present production both during wartime and after but must be permitted to increase their production in the future so that the demands of the American market can be met by American farmers. If they are permitted to do this, you may rest assured that they will more than meet their share of our tremendous war-tax burden.

PREVENTION OF INFLATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I received a petition signed by several thousand residents of my district sent to me by the chairman of a Stop Inflation Committee.

The preamble to the petition urges four objectives, as follows:

1. An effective ceiling be fixed on all war profits.
2. An effective ceiling be fixed on prices of all agriculture commodities and manufactured products.
3. An effective ceiling be fixed on wages, with just regard to living costs.
4. An effective ceiling to be fixed on rents in all areas.

Coming as it does on the same day as the President's message to Congress on this subject in which he outlines problems that confront the Nation as well as suggestions as to their cure, this petition is of more than ordinary interest.

The President went into detail in reference to the rises in the cost of living which fall heavily upon the low-income group. He pointed out that the rise in the cost of living in this war has begun to parallel the cost of living in the last war, and says that the time has definitely come to stop the spiral. Further, he insisted that we must face the fact that there must be a drastic reduction in our standard of living. Although he holds the increase in cost of the necessities of life at 15 percent, since the autumn of 1939, he points out that if something is not done there will be a further increase of 80 or 90 percent during the next year or two, and then he says:

When the cost of living spirals upward week after week and month after month, people as a whole are bound to become poorer, because the pay envelope will then lag behind rising retail prices. The price paid for carrying on the war by the Government and, therefore, by the people, will increase by many billions if prices go up. Furthermore, there is an old and true saying that that which goes up must always come down, and you and I know the hardships and heartaches we all went through in the bad years after the last war, when Americans were losing their homes, and their farms, and their savings, and were looking in vain for jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the President did not only cover the four objectives as suggested in the petition that I received, but he added three additional ones. His list follows:

1. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must tax heavily, and in that process keep personal and corporate profits at a reasonable rate, the word "reasonable" being defined at a low level.
2. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must fix ceilings on the prices which consumers, retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers pay for the things they buy; and ceilings on rents for dwellings in all areas affected by war industries.

The President urges Congress pass a new tax bill as soon as possible. He then calls attention to the fact that legislation is not required under present circumstances to stabilize remuneration for work. He feels that stabilizing the general cost of living will mean that wages in general can and should be kept at existing scales. Then he says in his message:

3. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must stabilize the remuneration received by individuals for their work.

4. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must stabilize the prices received by growers for the products of their lands.

5. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must encourage all citizens to contribute to the cost of winning this war by purchasing War Bonds with their earnings instead of using those earnings to buy articles which are not essential.

6. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must ration all essential commodities of which there is a scarcity, so that they may be distributed fairly among consumers and not merely in accordance with financial ability to pay high prices for them.

7. To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must discourage credit and installment buying and encourage the paying off of debts, mortgages, and other obligations, for this promotes savings, retards excessive buying, and adds to the amount available to the creditors for the purchase of War Bonds.

The President points out that, insofar as the items he enumerates do not require legislation, he will see that the executive departments and agencies whose functions and duty are involved are to work as expeditiously as possible in carrying out his whole broad policy.

Then, speaking as to the result, the President said:

Organized labor has voluntarily given up its right to strike during the war. Therefore all stabilization or adjustment of wages will be settled by the War Labor Board machinery which has been generally accepted by industry and labor for the settlement of all disputes.

All strikes are at a minimum. Existing contracts between employers and employees must, in all fairness, be carried out to the expiration date of those contracts. The existing machinery for labor disputes will, of course, continue to give due consideration to inequalities and elimination of substandards of living. I repeat that all of these processes, now in existence, will work equitably for the overwhelming proportion of all our workers if we can keep the cost of living down and stabilize their remuneration.

Most workers in munition industries are working far more than 40 hours a week, and should continue to be paid at time and a half for overtime. Otherwise, their weekly pay envelopes would be reduced.

The result will mean that each and every one of us will have to give up many things to which we are accustomed. We shall have to live our lives with less in the way of creature comforts than we have in time of peace. Our standard of living will have to come down.

I firmly believe that Americans all will welcome this opportunity to share in the fight of civilized mankind to preserve decency and dignity in modern life. For this is fundamentally a people's war, and it must be followed by a people's peace. The achievement of victory in war and security in peace requires the participation of all the people in the common effort for our common cause.

Mr. Speaker, we find from what the President says that Congress must enact additional legislation. He assures us that the agencies under his control will perform their duty where no legislation is necessary. It is up to us to perform ours, and I express the hope that there will be no delay in the Congress considering the vital questions that the President advances at the earliest date possible.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. Certainly we must stabilize everything. Many of the suggestions that were made were very valuable, but you will now have to bring into the House legislation to cut down the prices that have been set on the farmers' commodities in order to carry out the President's request.

The memorial to which the gentleman referred as coming from 5,000 persons in his district stated that you should stabilize wages. Nothing was suggested in the President's address that would change any of the legislation we have on the books in that regard. Certainly the people of the country have been looking forward to the President's address hoping it would contain some statement of that kind.

Certainly, every strike in any industry, regardless of what it may be, which furnishes ammunition, ships, airplanes, or anything else that is needed by the boys who are sacrificing their lives at the front, must from now on be arbitrated.

We should not have a strike for even a moment and we should not have a slowdown. If labor is going to agree that we have no slow-downs and no strikes and will carry that program out, then there will be some truth in the statement that we do not need any legislation. If that is not the case then it is going to be just as essential that we have legislation to correct conditions of that kind as it is that we have legislation with respect to taxes or legislation for cutting down the prices of farm commodities.

If we are going to win this war, and we are going to win it, we have all got to put our shoulders to the wheel. We have all got to sacrifice and we are all going to do everything that is essential to the end of winning the war. This is the biggest question that faces the Nation today, and the man who is not going to do his duty or is not going to bend every effort to this end—it is just going to be too bad for him.

I hope they control prices and I hope we may have no fabulous incomes, because the situation now means a sacrifice for everybody and everybody has got to come right down to it. If we cut down these fabulous incomes that some people have that will hasten the day when we win this war because it will give more confidence to the fellows at the front, and we have got to back those fellows up and we have to give them all the confidence we possibly can.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I believe that the gentleman will agree that the law that Congress passed with reference to an attempt to control inflation has simply been impotent insofar as getting results are concerned. In other words, I do not know of a single thing that the American people have to use, such as food, clothing, drugs, rents, and all that sort of thing that has not been raised since we passed that act. Am I not right about that?

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman is; yes, but with respect to agricultural commodities which the Government owns, I do not believe the farmer or anybody else has the right to say they cannot be sold now. It is the President's duty to sell them or ask for such legislation, and I believe we have got to pass that kind of legislation. For instance, take the cotton farmer as an illustration. We have oodles of cotton and millions of bales of cotton, and now is the time to sell that cotton. We do not want to hold that cotton for a great, high price and then get the farmers to plant more cotton and after a while have all of it on our hands.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to make this suggestion to the gentleman. If the Government sells the cotton and sells the wheat and the corn on the open market, which the Government controls, for what they will bring, such action will destroy the entire economic structure of this country insofar as the farmer is concerned, and break him.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean now?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, if you put it all on the market.

Mr. RICH. Well, put it on the market judiciously and wisely. The cotton farmer has said that if they get 15 cents a pound for cotton they are satisfied, but none of them come here today and say that 15 cents is a good and fair price.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If you state that as a question, I would not agree with that statement. I do not know much about cotton, but I know selling wheat as suggested would demoralize the price of wheat.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the completion of the legislative program and following any previous special order, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I was rather interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. During the discussion of the agricultural appropriation bill the very suggestion that the gentleman made that we were to take the Government-owned commodities and place them on the market and the Agricultural Commodity Credit Corporation was to be allowed to operate for the purpose of practically controlling the market, that was voted down. That was the President's suggestion at that time and it was voted down. I am glad that the gentleman from Pennsylvania recognizes the foresight of the President at that time and

has at least recognized that this administration has at least advanced one idea that meets the approval of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I want to call attention also to the fact that at this time strikes are at a minimum In fact, there are no strikes, condoned by organized labor, at this time. Labor has voluntarily given up the right to strike since Pearl Harbor. Labor has cooperated in this program and I invite the gentleman's attention to the RECORD of Tuesday of last week. In the automotive industry we have idle machines and idle men and I pointed out the fact that the Chevrolet forging division of General Motors, taking the days of the 6th 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th of April, had 80 steam hammers available for operation and should have been working full time and full strength. During all that period according to a survey there were not over 40 of these steam hammers in operation. Not because of the lack of manpower or skilled labor but for some other reason not disclosed.

I pointed out the fact that there were idle machines, and that the automotive industry claimed they could not be converted to war-production program.

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

Mr. HOOK. Not at present, please; I have only a few minutes.

They are lying idle, with tarpaulins over them, while three great purchasing agencies of Russia, Great Britain, and China are crying for those machines. If they cannot put those machines in operation, if they cannot convert them, then give them to lend-lease and send them over there to those countries where they can be put in operation. If that was even proposed, those machines would go into operation. If you put the machines into operation the laboring men of this Nation will operate them for an all-out production. Labor has proven if you give them machines and give them the facilities, that they will produce. They are not only producing by machines, but they are giving their sons on the battlefields. Labor is patriotic and is doing a swell job of cooperation.

Of course, the Standard Oil Co. officials are busy having resolutions passed calling for the passage of the Smith-Vinson antilabor bill, accusing labor of holding up the war effort. In view of the recent revelations concerning the Standard Oil Co., I do not believe that we should take seriously any advice from a company whose actions were anything but cooperative. In fact, the records show that the Standard Oil Co.'s activities were proven to have been one of the major moves that slowed up our war efforts. Their actions bordered on treason.

Reports are to the effect that George Cleere, manager of the Standard Oil Co., held a mass meeting in Montgomery County, Ala., at which he introduced a resolution calling for support of the Vinson-Smith antilabor bill.

I think that it is not out of order to presume that the Standard Oil Co. representatives are still active in trying to slow down our war-production program, because I know of no weapon that would be more effective in slowing down and disrupting our war program than the passage of this Vinson-Smith antilabor bill. I trust that the membership of this House will take cognizance of the fact that it is those who themselves have been found wanting that are crying out against labor. I hope none of the membership will join up with an organization which has collaborated with the Nazis. The record speaks for itself. Labor has and is producing. The Standard Oil Co. has not. Take your choice. A vote for the Vinson-Smith antilabor bill will be following the advice of the Standard Oil Co. representatives, who have been anything but patriotic.

A vote against the Vinson-Smith antilabor bill will be a vote for patriotism as expounded by the American laboring man who has never been found wanting. The laboring men are producing on the home front and their sons are producing on the battle front. That is America at its best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PATENTS

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have only 2 minutes.

Mr. RICH. I will ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 2 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RICH. In view of what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] has said, I have here the following dispatch:

SOUTH PLAINFIELD, N. J., April 25.—A Government spokesman warned today that the Army may take over the Cornell-Dubilier Corporation plant here unless the 2,200 workers, on strike since Thursday, return to work today.

Alexander Smalley, of the War Production Board's Labor Division, who came here when Washington learned of the sudden walk-out, said "The War Production Board's objective in this matter is solely to get production moving once more. I have reason to believe that if production is not proceeding normally by Monday the Army will move in."

The plant manufactures vital communications equipment. The workers struck when negotiations for wage increases over the present minimum of 38½ cents an hour broke down.

So that apparently there are strikes going on today and you have them frequently.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 28 of this year the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] introduced a bill which would unquestionably and beyond the shadow of a doubt empower the Government during the period of this war to make as wide use as possible, or as needed, of any patented process which may be useful in war production. On that same day I made a 1-minute speech in which I urged that action be taken on that bill, and taken immediately, and I commended the gentleman from Tennessee on his action. I renew what I said then. It seems to me that if there is anything that is completely irrational it is for our war program to be held up in the slightest degree because of a patented process which somebody controls and prevents other manufacturers and other workers from producing as much of that particular thing as we need for the prosecution of the war, and if the Government does not have that power, or if there is any question whether it has or not, let us leave no doubt in anybody's mind, but have the House of Representatives act upon it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials on N. Y. A. and its activities in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter that I have written to a constituent of mine, a prominent lawyer in the State of Idaho.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KUNKEL for tomorrow, Tuesday, on account of death in family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 836. An act for the relief of John C. Crossman;

S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson;

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard;

S. 1424. An act for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree;

S. 1619. An act for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clyde Kingery;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of John Snure, Jr.;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes S. Hathaway;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson;

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey;

S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro;

S. 2017. An act to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes;

S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias;

S. 2175. An act for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer;

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Tom G. Irving, Thomas G. Irving, Sr., J. E. Irving, Mata D. Irving, L. T. Dale, and Amelia Dale;

S. 2202. An act to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of Regular Army;

S. 2212. An act to suspend during war or a national emergency declared by Congress or by the President the provisions of section 322

of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended, relating to certain leases;

S. 2399. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; and

S. 2406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Friday, April 24, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1541. An act for the relief of Jacques Hailpern, Max Hailpern, and Sally Hailpern Zaharia;

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 28, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m. April 28 and May 1, 1942, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 6840, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (railroad adjustments), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, April 29, room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 5 at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 130, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1597. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary Act of 1941 (Public Law No. 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law No. 166, 77th Cong., 1st sess.); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1598. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend title II of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 and the Fire and Casualty Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1599. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and the annual report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period; to the Committee on the Library.

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. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6484. A bill to suspend during the present war the running of statutes of limitations applicable to certain offenses; without amendment (Rept. No. 2051). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 6995. A bill for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6996. A bill to provide for the transfer to certain States of Farm Security Administration facilities and equipment which are used for the purpose of providing shelter, medical care, and sanitary facilities for migrant farm labor families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 6997. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain lands for addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 6998. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and maintenance of a building for, and for the operation of, the petroleum experiment station of the Bureau of Mines at Laramie, Wyo.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6999. A bill to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, the construction of an inland route from the western terminus of this channel to the present eastern terminus of the Intracoastal Waterway, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7000. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 7001. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to marketing quotas for peanuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 7002. A bill to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combatting malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 7003. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands for inclusion in grazing districts; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 7004. A bill to amend the act of March 7, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for continuing payment of pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the retired and Reserve components thereof; the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service, and civilian employees of the executive departments, independent establishments, and agencies, during periods of absence from post of duty, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. Res. 473. Resolution to investigate power-trust lobbying and other activities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. Res. 474. Resolution authorizing appointment of select committee to inquire into the proposed gasoline rationing in the country; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SCHUETZ introduced a bill (H. R. 7005) for the relief of Alex Krause, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2720. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of Martin Christen, secretary, International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers of America, requesting that the Beer Drivers' and Stablemen's Union No. 227 go on record to endorse House bill 6486; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2721. Also, petition of the division of forestry, Department of Natural Resources, Sacramento, Calif., requesting that the National Director of Selective Service, Hershey; the State director of California, Donovan; and the draft boards to grant deferment to the trained employees of the State division of forestry who are absolutely essential to the effective operations of the division of forestry in protecting the natural resources of

California until such time as they can be replaced; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2722. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Italian-American Labor Council of New York City, opposing the Smith bill, the Hobbs bill, and all other antilabor bills introduced in Congress; to the Committee on Labor.

2723. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Brotherhood of Teamsters and Auto Truck Drivers, Local No. 85, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, San Francisco, Calif., relative of House bill 6486, postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2724. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 20 members of the World Service Society of Westminster Presbyterian Church, Port Huron, Mich., urging that strikes and profiteering be outlawed during the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 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:

Almighty God and Heavenly Father, hope of every nation, whose infinite pity alone can soothe the tragic pathos of our world: Help us, Thy children, to rise above all fret and fear into the atmosphere of serenity and calm, as, casting all our care upon Thee, we feel the girding of Thine everlasting arms. Grant to us a clearer vision of the truth, a deeper sense of right, that will enable us, through Thine overwhelming power of goodness, to further the noblest interests of mankind.

Restore to every home in this beloved land the practice of parental tenderness, together with the spirit of filial devotion, that from the altars of life's highest, holiest relationships may rise a sacrificial flame of true devotion to the larger claims of service to our Nation. Help us, then, to face these days, just now so difficult and dark, with a courage born of perfect trust in Thee, with a faith made radiant with the hope of a world redeemed, in which men, as they journey on, shall take the hand of Him in whose companionship they find their full fruition, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 27, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of E. P. Corley; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky;

H. R. 5887. An act for the relief of Howard L. Miller; and

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6804. An act to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6899. An act to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916;

H. R. 6953. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 2320. An act to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5075. An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Brewster	Caraway
Andrews	Brooks	Chandler
Austin	Brown	Chavez
Bailey	Bulow	Clark, Idaho
Ball	Bunker	Clark, Mo.
Bankhead	Burton	Connally
Barkley	Butler	Danaher
Bilbo	Byrd	Davis
Bone	Capper	Downey
Doxey	McFarland	Shipstead
Ellender	McKellar	Smathers
George	McNary	Smith
Gerry	Maloney	Spencer
Gillette	Maybank	Stewart
Glass	Mead	Taft
Green	Millikin	Thomas, Idaho
Guffey	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Norris	Tobey
Herring	Nye	Tunnell
Hill	O'Daniel	Tydings
Holman	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Hughes	Overton	Van Nuys
Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	Wallgren
Kilgore	Reed	Walsh
La Follette	Reynolds	White
Lee	Rosier	Wiley
Lucas	Russell	Willis
McCarran	Schwartz	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of injury and illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

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

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Treasury (2), War, Justice, and Agriculture (7); and the Civil Service Commission, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of Negroes at Jackson, Miss., protesting against racial discrimination in employment in connection with war industries in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALSH:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for retention of the 40-hour workweek provision of law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for continuance of the National Youth Administration program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Leavenworth (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring suspension of the 40-hour workweek provision of law for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Education and Labor.