

while in June 1941, in peacetime, 1,599 producing wells were completed in the United States. Imagine, with this Nation fighting for its life, we produce only 5 percent of the number of wells completed in a similar time when we were at peace. As I said before, at that rate there will be an inexcusable shortage of petroleum, not just on the eastern seaboard but throughout the entire United States before another year has passed. More vital still is the fact that today the oil-producing fields of the rest of the world are either being captured or surrounded. The day is fast approaching when the United States must supply most of the needs of the United Nations. The excuse they give is lack of steel. I deny with all the vehemence at my command that if the scrap program is efficiently carried out that such would be the case; but even if I am wrong, let me say that all the wells needed in the United States can be drilled and equipped with less than 1 percent of the national annual output of steel. What profit will it be to save 100 percent of steel for other purposes, the use of which may be circumvented by the lack of oil, when only 1 percent of the Nation's steel would unquestionably, when fabricated into equipment, complete all oil wells which may be needed in any area?

I charged that sinister and powerful interests retained control of the entire petroleum field during peacetime on the basis of a so-called conservation program. I now charge the same influences are using the excuse of lack of steel for the same purpose in spite of the fact that our war effort needs every barrel of petroleum we can possibly produce.

I am eagerly awaiting the report of the Baruch committee on synthetic rubber. I am hopeful that the eminent gentlemen who comprise this committee will reveal the truth to the Nation. I say here this afternoon that if the synthetic rubber program is administered efficiently we can have all the synthetic rubber needed for our war effort and all essential civilian driving as well.

The Members of Congress have a responsibility to the Nation to get the facts, to punish the scoundrels within and without the Government who are impeding this vital part of our war effort, and to do this as quickly as possible. I have introduced a resolution to provide a committee with full authority to go into this matter, and I say that it should be done without further delay. Time is of the essence. If we do our part, it may prove the deciding factor in our winning the war.

We have delegated too much of our authority. It is in incompetent hands. It is under dastardly influence. It is our responsibility to clean up what I charge is a rotten mess.

Let us be more than a debating society. Let us act and act now to weed out maladministration, punish wrongdoing, and establish efficiency in this vital part of our war effort.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GREGORY (at the request of Mr. MAY), on account of official business.

To Mr. OLIVER (at the request of Mr. BLAND), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. BROWN of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), on account of illness.

To Mr. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. HANCOCK), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 10, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1887 A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$200,000, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 835); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1888 A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1839 A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report covering its operations for the period from February 2, 1932, to March 31, 1942, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 537. Resolution granting a gratuity to Barbara Louise McAndrews; without amendment (Rept. No. 2438). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXI, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7531. A bill to furnish Bibles to members of the armed forces of the United States upon request; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 7532. A bill to provide \$2,500 for the printing of reports of the survey, investigation, and plan for the utilization of the recreational resources of the Denison Dam and Reservoir project, Texas and Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 7533. A bill for the relief of owners of certain properties, mortgages, bonded obligations, and current obligations rendered inoperative by reason of restrictions arising from the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7534. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Social Security Act, to establish a Federal insurance system, to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance, to provide insurance benefits for workers permanently and totally disabled, to establish a Federal system of unemployment compensation and temporary

disability benefits, and a Federal system of employment offices, to establish a Federal system of hospitalization benefits, to amend the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PATTON:

H. R. 7535. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 7536. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAY:

H. R. 7537. A bill for the relief of Donna Pittel; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1942

Rev. S. Paul Schilling, Ph. D., pastor, Brookland Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

"O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Our shelter from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home."

it is to Thee that we turn in the present hour of our Nation's need. We praise Thee for Thy constancy and Thy changeless grace. We thank Thee that Thou art near not only when skies are sunny and days are peaceful, but also when rains descend and floods come and winds blow, beating upon the house of state. May our Nation be founded on the rock of that righteousness which alone exalteth a nation.

God of grace and God of glory, help us to discharge faithfully the sacred trust which Thy providence has committed to each of us. Grant that our attitudes and actions may be so guided by Thy Spirit that the vast sacrifices now being made by our people may serve the cause of true freedom in our own land and throughout the world. Conscious of our own inadequacy apart from Thee, we humbly ask for wisdom to discern Thy will and strength to perform it. Lead our people and all humanity, we beseech Thee, out of the storm and darkness of the night to the dawn of a new day of human brotherhood. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 7, 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had

agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 6682. An act to suspend in part the processing tax on coconut oil; and

H. R. 7145. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of the Interior to make exchanges with the Defense Homes Corporation of certain lands in northwest Washington, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7416) to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence and serving within the continental United States.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Finance of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 3,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session on the bill (H. R. 7378) entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 7416) to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from their place of residence and serving within the continental United States, is authorized and directed—

(1) In section 4 (a), to strike out "2" and insert in lieu thereof "3";

(2) In section 6 (b), to strike out "4" and insert in lieu thereof "5";

(3) In section 7, to strike out "2" and insert in lieu thereof "3";

(4) In the title, to strike out "and serving within the continental United States."

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 7145) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of the Interior to make exchanges with the Defense Homes Corporation of certain lands in northwest Washington, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LABOR DAY ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the President over the radio on last Monday night, following his message to the Senate, be printed as part of the RECORD.

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

I wish that all the American people could read all the citations for various medals

recommended for our soldiers, sailors, and marines. I am picking out one of these citations which tells of the accomplishments of Lt. John James Powers, United States Navy, during 3 days of the battles with Japanese forces in the Coral Sea.

During the first 2 days, Lieutenant Powers, flying a dive bomber in the face of blasting enemy antiaircraft fire, demolished one large enemy gunboat, put another gunboat out of commission, severely damaged an aircraft tender and a 20,000-ton transport, and scored a direct hit on an aircraft carrier, which burst into flames and sank soon after.

The official citation describes the morning of the third day of battle. As the pilots of his squadron left the ready room to man their planes, Lieutenant Powers said to them, "Remember, the folks back home are counting on us. I am going to get a hit if I have to lay it on their flight deck."

He led his section down to the target from an altitude of 18,000 feet, through a wall of bursting antiaircraft shells and swarms of enemy planes. He dived almost to the very deck of the enemy carrier, and did not release his bomb until he was sure of a direct hit. He was last seen attempting recovery from his dive at the extremely low altitude of 200 feet, amid a terrific barrage of shell and bomb fragments, smoke, flame, and debris from the stricken vessel. His own plane was destroyed by the explosion of his own bomb. But he had made good his promise to "lay it on the flight deck."

I have received a recommendation from the Secretary of the Navy that Lt. James Powers, of New York City, missing in action, be awarded the Medal of Honor. I hereby and now make this award.

You and I are "the folks back home" for whose protection Lieutenant Powers fought and repeatedly risked his life. He said that we counted on him and his men. We did not count in vain. But have not those men a right to be counting on us? How are we playing our part "back home" in winning this war?

The answer is that we are not doing enough.

Today I sent a message to the Congress, pointing out the overwhelming urgency of the serious domestic economic crisis with which we are threatened. Some call it inflation, which is a vague sort of term, and others call it a rise in the cost of living, which is much more easily understood by most families.

That phrase, "the cost of living," means essentially what a dollar can buy.

From January 1, 1941, to May of this year, the cost of living went up about 15 percent. At that point we undertook to freeze the cost of living. But we could not do a complete job of it, because the congressional authority at the time exempted a large part of farm products used for food and for making clothing, though several weeks before I had asked the Congress for legislation to stabilize all farm prices.

At that time I had told the Congress that there were seven elements in our national economy, all of which had to be controlled; and that if any one essential element remained exempt, the cost of living could not be held down.

On only two of these points—both of them vital, however—did I call for congressional action. These were: First, taxation, and, second, the stabilization of all farm prices at parity.

Parity is a standard for the maintenance of good farm prices. It was established as our national policy in 1933. It means that the farmer and the city worker are on the same relative ratio with each other in purchasing power as they were during a period some 30 years ago—at a time when the farmer had a satisfactory purchasing power. One hundred percent parity, therefore, has been

accepted by farmers as the fair standard for their prices.

Last January, however, the Congress passed a law forbidding ceilings on farm prices below 110 percent of parity on some commodities. On other commodities the ceiling was even higher, so that the average possible ceiling is now about 116 percent of parity for agricultural products as a whole.

This act of favoritism for one particular group in the community increased the cost of food to everybody—not only to the workers in the city or in the munitions plants and their families but also to the families of the farmers themselves.

Since last May ceilings have been set on nearly all commodities, rents, and services, except the exempted farm products. Installment buying has been effectively controlled.

Wages in certain key industries have been stabilized on the basis of the present cost of living.

It is obvious, however, that if the cost of food continues to go up, as it is doing at present, the wage earner, particularly in the lower brackets, will have a right to an increase in his wages. That would be essential justice and a practical necessity.

Our experience with the control of other prices during the past few months has brought out one important fact—the rising cost of living can be controlled, providing all elements making up the cost of living are controlled at the same time. We know that parity prices for farm products not now controlled will not put up the cost of living more than a very small amount; but that if we must go up to an average of 116 percent of parity for food and other farm products—which is necessary at present under the Emergency Price Control Act before we can control all farm prices—the cost of living will get well out of hand. We are face to face with this danger today. Let us meet it and remove it.

I realize that it may seem out of proportion to you to be worrying about these economic problems at a time like this when we are all deeply concerned about the news from far distant fields of battle. But I give you the solemn assurance that failure to solve this problem here at home—and to solve it now—will make more difficult the winning of this war.

If the vicious spiral of inflation ever gets under way, the whole economic system will stagger. Prices and wages will go up so rapidly that the entire production program will be endangered. The cost of the war, paid by taxpayers, will jump beyond all present calculations. It will mean an uncontrollable rise in prices and in wages which can result in raising the over-all cost of living as high as another 20 percent. That would mean that the purchasing power of every dollar you have in your pay envelope, or in the bank, or included in your insurance policy or your pension would be reduced to about 80 cents. I need not tell you that this would have a demoralizing effect on our people, soldiers and civilians alike.

Over-all stabilization of prices, salaries, wages, and profits is necessary to the continued increasing production of planes and tanks and ships and guns.

In my message today I have told the Congress that this must be done quickly. If we wait for 2 or 3 or 4 or 6 months it may well be too late.

I have told the Congress that the administration cannot hold the actual cost of food and clothing down to the present level beyond October 1.

Therefore, I have asked the Congress to pass legislation under which the President would be specifically authorized to stabilize the cost of living, including the price of all farm commodities. The purpose should be to hold farm prices at parity or at levels of a recent date, whichever is higher. The

purpose should also be to keep wages at a point stabilized with today's cost of living. Both must be regulated at the same time, and neither can or should be regulated without the other.

At the same time that farm prices are stabilized, I will stabilize wages.

This is plain justice—and plain common sense.

I have asked the Congress to take this action by the 1st of October. We must now act with the dispatch which the stern necessities of war require.

I have told the Congress that inaction on their part by that date will leave me with an inescapable responsibility to the people of this country to see to it that the war effort is no longer imperiled by the threat of economic chaos.

As I said in my message to the Congress:

"In the event that the Congress shall fail to act, and act adequately, I shall accept the responsibility, and I will act."

The President has the powers, under the Constitution and under congressional acts, to take measures necessary to avert a disaster which would interfere with the winning of the war.

I have given the most thoughtful consideration to meeting this issue without further reference to the Congress. I have determined, however, on this vital matter to consult with the Congress.

There may be those who will say that, if the situation is as grave as I have stated it to be, I should use my powers and act now. I can only say that I have approached this problem from every angle, and that I have decided that the course of conduct which I am following in this case is consistent with my sense of responsibility as President in time of war, and with my deep and unalterable devotion to the processes of democracy.

The responsibilities of the President in wartime to protect the Nation are very grave. This total war, with our fighting fronts all over the world, makes the use of executive power far more essential than in any previous war.

If we were invaded, the people of this country would expect the President to use any and all means to repel the invader.

The Revolution and the War between the States were fought on our own soil but today this war will be won or lost on other continents and remote seas. I cannot tell what powers may have to be exercised in order to win this war.

The American people can be sure that I will use my powers with a full sense of responsibility to the Constitution and to my country. The American people can also be sure that I shall not hesitate to use every power vested in me to accomplish the defeat of our enemies in any part of the world where our own safety demands such defeat.

When the war is won, the powers under which I act will automatically revert to the people—to whom they belong.

I think I know the American farmers. I know that they are as wholehearted in their patriotism as any other group. They have suffered from the constant fluctuations of farm prices—occasionally too high, more often too low. Nobody knows better than farmers the disastrous effects of wartime inflationary booms and post-war deflationary panics.

I have today suggested that the Congress make our agricultural economy more stable. I have recommended that in addition to putting ceilings on all farm products now, we also place a definite floor under those prices for a period beginning now, continuing through the war, and for as long as necessary after the war. In this way we will be able to avoid the collapse of farm prices which happened after the last war. The farmers must be assured of a fair minimum price during the readjustment period which will follow the excessive world food demands which now prevail.

We must have some floor under farm prices, as we have under wages, if we are to avoid the dangers of a post-war inflation on the one hand, or the catastrophe of a crash in farm prices and wages on the other.

Today I have also advised the Congress of the importance of speeding up the passage of the tax bill. The Federal Treasury is losing millions of dollars a day because the bill has not yet been passed. Taxation is the only practical way of preventing the incomes and profits of individuals and corporations from getting too high.

I have told the Congress once more that all net individual incomes, after payment of all taxes, should be limited effectively by further taxation to a maximum net income of \$25,000 a year. And it is equally important that corporate profits should not exceed a reasonable amount in any case.

The Nation must have more money to run the war. People must stop spending for luxuries. Our country needs a far greater share of our incomes.

For this is a global war and it will cost this Nation nearly \$100,000,000,000 in 1943.

In that global war there are now four main areas of combat; and I should like to speak briefly of them, not in the order of importance, for all of them are vital and all of them interrelated.

(1) The Russian front. Here the Germans are still unable to gain the smashing victory which, almost a year ago, Hitler announced he had already achieved. Germany has been able to capture important Russian territory. Nevertheless, Hitler has been unable to destroy a single Russian Army; and this, you may be sure, has been and still is his main objective. Millions of German troops seem doomed to spend another cruel and bitter winter on the Russian front. The Russians are killing more Nazis and destroying more airplanes and tanks than are being smashed on any other front. They are fighting not only bravely but brilliantly. In spite of any setbacks, Russia will hold out, and with the help of her Allies will ultimately drive every Nazi from her soil.

(2) The Pacific Ocean area. This area must be grouped together as a whole—every part of it, land and sea. We have stopped one major Japanese offensive; and have inflicted heavy losses on their fleet. But they still possess great strength; they seek to keep the initiative; and they will undoubtedly strike hard again. We must not overrate the importance of our successes in the Solomon Islands, though we may be proud of the skill with which these local operations were conducted. At the same time we need not underrate the significance of our victory at Midway. There we stopped the major Japanese offensive.

(3) In the Mediterranean and the Middle East area the British, together with the South Africans, Australians, New Zealanders, Indian troops and others of the United Nations, including ourselves, are fighting a desperate battle with the Germans and Italians. The Axis Powers are fighting to gain control of that area, dominate the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean, and gain contact with the Japanese Navy. The battle is now joined. We are well aware of our danger, but we are hopeful of the outcome.

(4) The European area. Here the aim is an offensive against Germany. There are at least a dozen different points at which attacks can be launched. You, of course, do not expect me to give details of future plans, but you can rest assured that preparations are being made here and in Britain toward this purpose. The power of Germany must be broken on the battlefields of Europe.

Various people urge that we concentrate our forces on one or another of these four areas, although no one suggests that any one of the four areas should be abandoned. Certainly it could not be seriously urged that we abandon aid to Russia, or surrender all of the

Pacific to Japan, or the Mediterranean and middle east to Germany, or give up an offensive against Germany. The American people may be sure that we shall neglect none of the four great theaters of war.

Certain vital military decisions have been made. In due time you will know what these decisions are—and so will our enemies. I can say now that all of these decisions are directed toward taking the offensive.

Today, exactly 9 months after Pearl Harbor, we have sent overseas three times more men than we transported to France in the first 9 months of the first World War. We have done this in spite of greater danger and fewer ships. And every week sees a gain in the actual number of American men and weapons in the fighting areas. These reinforcements in men and munitions will continue to go forward.

This war will finally be won by the coordination of all the armies, navies, and air forces of the United Nations operating in unison against our enemies.

This will require vast assemblies of weapons and men at all the vital points of attack. We and our allies have worked for years to achieve superiority in weapons. We have no doubts about the superiority of our men. We glory in the individual exploits of our soldiers, our sailors, our marines, our merchant seamen. Lt. John James Powers was one of these—and there are thousands of others in the forces of the United Nations.

Several thousand Americans have met death in battle. Other thousands will lose their lives. But many millions stand ready to step into their places—to engage in a struggle to the very death. For they know that the enemy is determined to destroy us, our homes, and our institutions—that in this war it is kill or be killed.

Battles are not won by soldiers or sailors who think first of their own personal safety. And wars are not won by people who are concerned primarily with their own comfort, their own convenience, their own pocket-books.

We Americans of today bear the gravest of responsibilities. All of the United Nations share them.

All of us here at home are being tested—for our fortitude, for our selfless devotion to our country and our cause.

This is the toughest war of all time.

We need not leave it to historians of the future to answer the question whether we are tough enough to meet this unprecedented challenge. We can give that answer now. The answer is "Yes."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROHIBITION OF THE PURCHASE AND SALE OF PUBLIC OFFICE

A letter from the Acting President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation designed to prohibit the purchase and sale of public office (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF DEFENSE WORKERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth quarterly report for the period beginning April 1, 1942, and ended June 30, 1942, of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, submitting,

pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the period from its organization on February 2, 1932, to March 31, 1942, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LAND ACQUISITIONS, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the National Park and Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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 State, Agriculture, and Commerce, the National Housing Agency, and Federal Security Agency (2), 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

Mr. TYDINGS presented petitions of the Women's Society of Christian Service of Friendship Church of the Peninsular Conference, of Cambridge, Md., and sundry citizens of the State of Maryland and Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference certain petitions praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, which have come to my office from the State of Washington and were executed by citizens and residents of Seattle, Wash. These petitions were sent to me by Mrs. Leta W. Kuster and Mrs. H. S. Baker, both of Seattle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from Washington will lie on the table.

Mr. BONE also presented a petition of members of the Skokomish Home Economic Club, of Union, Wash., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the people of the United States of America are being rationed on materials needed by the Government in order to conserve the sinews of war; and

Whereas the conservation of the manpower is also of prime importance to the successful prosecution of the defense of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Skokomish Home Economic Club, earnestly petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States that the manufacture, importation, and sale of alcoholic beverages in the United States of America, its territories, and possessions be immediately abolished and prohibited for the

duration of the war, for the purposes and reasons set forth herein:

1. To preserve the health, mental, and moral powers of the men now serving in the United States Army, Navy, and Air Corps, to the end that they may efficiently perform their duties.

2. That the manpower now being employed in carrying on the manufacture of and traffic in alcoholic beverages may be transferred to constructive industry and commerce or to defense activities.

3. To transfer the \$4,000,000,000 annually spent across the counter for liquor to legitimate trade, for the purpose of better sustaining the civilian health and reducing the relief burden of the Government.

4. To assist in the conservation of gasoline, rubber, and all materials used in the transportation of alcoholic beverages and supporting industries.

5. To conserve the use of alcohol for scientific purposes.

6. To conserve glass, cork, and all other materials used in the liquor industry and needed by the Government for defense industries. And whereas the May bill has already been made a law, we urge that it be enforced about our camps, in order that our boys may be given less chance of contracting venereal diseases, which is and will be a great hindrance to efficient work in the Army, Navy, or Air Corps.

MARY HUNTER,
President.
DOROTHY BELL,
Secretary.

Mr. McFARLAND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Douglas, Ariz., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached thereto, as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

Whereas in the War Act of 1917 the Congress of the United States included legislation forbidding the exploitation of the men in the Army and the Navy by liquor and commercialized vice, even though liquor was then forbidden in any military unit; and

Whereas in the Selective Service Act the Congress of 1940 called the young men of the present time to train for defense of our Nation if need be, and there now exists for these young defenders no defense from the activities of what Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, referred to as "a sordid business for the accumulation of money," namely, the traffic in alcoholic beverages, and since beer is now sold in the camps by Government authority, and since commercialized prostitution in camp areas threatens health, morals, and efficiency of service: Now, therefore,

We, the undersigned citizens of Douglas, Ariz., do respectfully petition you to vote for S. 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917.

BURLEY JONES.
ALICE B. NALLEY.
Mrs. NETTIE COLYER.

(And sundry other citizens of Douglas, Ariz.)

RESOLUTION OF THE MEDORA (N. DAK.) GRAZING ASSOCIATION—TITLE III OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

Mr. LANGER presented a resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Medora Grazing Association, held in Medora, N. Dak., on June 25, 1942, which was referred to the Committee on Agri-

culture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas there is in circulation in McKenzie, Slope, Billings, and Golden Valley Counties of North Dakota a petition addressed to the Congress of the United States requesting a repeal of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; and whereas this said petition alleges that the above designated act is being administered by political subordinates without responsibility to anyone and at great waste of public funds; and, further, that the area set apart and declared submarginal includes many good farms and that many have been induced to sell by promising rehabilitation elsewhere or relief jobs; and further, that these promises were not fulfilled and these people who have sold are now faced by eviction; and further, that those who have not sold are in a worse situation, being nearly or completely surrounded by Government holdings; and whereas lands acquired by the Government in the above designated counties, upward of a million acres have been taken from the tax lists for all time: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the members of the Medora Grazing Association in annual meeting assembled in Medora, N. Dak., this 25th day of June 1942, do hereby declare that to the best of our knowledge and belief many of these charges are untrue. In support of this contention we submit the following:

The act referred to above is being administered by civil-service employees of the United States and not by political appointees, the local administrators are responsible to their superiors at the regional office at Lincoln, Nebr., and they in turn to their superiors at Washington, D. C., all of whom are civil-service employees. To the best of our knowledge public funds are not being wasted as alleged in the petition. On the contrary, the grazing association members and temporary permittees paid into the Federal Treasury in excess of \$30,000 for grazing and other privileges on Government-owned land during 1941. This amount is considerably in excess of the amount of Federal funds expended in the area during this period except for land acquisition and Work Projects Administration funds. The amount which will be paid into the Federal Treasury in future years will progressively increase from year to year as livestock numbers are increased.

The petition further alleges that the area includes many good farms upon which our citizens formerly lived and made homes, and that many were induced to sell with promises of rehabilitation or promises of relief jobs. In this connection it should be stated that no one was induced to sell, participation in the program was entirely voluntary, only low-grade farms were purchased. The better farms and ranches are still in private ownership and are occupied by stockmen and farmer-stockmen who have grazing privileges on federally owned lands. The entire membership of the Medora Grazing Association of 140 members is composed of this type of operators; in addition to this approximately 40 operators have been granted temporary grazing privileges in this area.

Rehabilitation assistance has been supplied to a large number of families; a smaller number still occupy federally owned lands because of the scarcity of suitable relocation sites and curtailment of rehabilitation funds. A total of 3 families have been evicted and 10 additional families have been ordered to vacate Government premises by the United States district court for violation of the rules and regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture for the administration and protection of federally owned lands.

These regulations are designed to protect federally owned lands from trespass and to conserve the natural resources of the land and to convert them to their proper use.

The development phase of the program was financed by emergency-relief funds and all persons who so desired and could qualify were employed.

We as members of the Medora Grazing Association who are residing on privately controlled lands within or near the project boundaries and surrounded or nearly so by Federal lands are in as good or better condition than we were previous to the purchase program, through stabilization of our operations by means of long-time leases and controlled grazing.

It is true that the lands acquired by the Federal Government have been removed from the tax rolls; however, under the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act 25 percent of the revenue collected by the Federal Government reverts to the various counties in which the lands are located in lieu of taxes. In order to better maintain local government in future years, we respectfully request that this amount be increased to equal an amount that would normally be collected in taxes had the now federally owned lands remained in private ownership. We cannot speak for the other counties but in Billings County we know that no added tax burden has been placed upon the taxpayers of this county.

A large portion of these lands were non-resident owned and at best only annual leases could be secured previous to the Government purchase, resulting in insecurity of tenure as well as serious misuse of the lands.

The petition further alleges that lands acquired by the Federal Government have been taken out of production. It is true that a small portion of these lands were formerly devoted to the production of wheat, but because of their low productivity wheat production was never profitable except in the very best years. These lands have now in large part been reseeded to grass and are being utilized for grazing and hay production.

All the lands involved in the Federal purchase program were formerly in private ownership, but largely because of low productivity of the land and small uneconomical units these lands could not support the families dependent upon them for a living and pay costs for the maintenance of necessary local government and public institutions. This resulted in a high percentage of mortgage foreclosures, tax delinquency, and a heavy relief load among the residents of the area, and we respectfully submit that we do not wish to see a repetition of this situation. There were in operation in the school year 1934-35, 48 country schools in Billings County which were operated at a cost of approximately \$1,000 each; there were in operation during the past school term (1941-42) 23 schools at an approximate cost of \$1,000 each. By the elimination of some uneconomical units and by a readjustment of the school facilities according to the needs of the families remaining, 20 schools were discontinued, resulting in a saving to the school districts of approximately \$20,000.

We as members of the Medora Grazing Association welcome an investigation of the operation of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act in this area, as well as activities of the grazing association leasing said Federal lands. We are not in favor of returning these lands to private ownership for the reasons above stated.

In our opinion the petition referred to is a result of misunderstanding on the part of the petitioners of the real purpose and actual operations of title III of the Farm Tenant Act in this area, and instead of a repeal of the act we feel that this type of program has a definite place and merits continuation in areas having problems similar to those prevalent here prior to the initiation of the purchase program.

For further information pertaining to the situation prevailing in this area prior to the initiation of the Federal land-purchase pro-

gram, the present situation and the present operation of title III of the Farm Tenant Act and grazing association, we respectfully refer you to the office of the Soil Conservation Service in Washington, D. C.

OPERATION OF SELECTIVE-SERVICE REGULATIONS AS AFFECTING FARM LABOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference 2 identical telegrams, one signed by 46 farmers and stockmen of Finney County, Kans., and the other signed by 27 farmers of Scott County, Kans., expressing grave concern about the operation of the selective-service regulations as depleting the farmers of necessary labor. I request that one of the telegrams be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and the following telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

GARDEN CITY, KANS.,
September 8, 1942.

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned farmers and stockmen of Scott County, Kans., urge an amendment of the selective-service rules and regulations relative to farm labor. The situation is grave and all our farm labor is being taken from us by the draft; production is being drastically curtailed; and if present rule is maintained there will be no farm labor in another 6 months. We urge that you introduce or support a measure to exempt from service the necessary farm labor. This is very urgent, and something must be done at once or serious conditions and reduction in production will result.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS—RESOLUTION OF BENJAMIN A. FULLER POST, NO. 64, AMERICAN LEGION, PITTSBURG, KANS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution from Benjamin A. Fuller Post, No. 64, of the American Legion, at Pittsburg, Kans., in which they condemn the present practice of those in authority, for the duration of the present emergency, in permitting conscientious objectors to have furloughs.

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

Whereas it has been called to the attention of Benjamin A. Fuller Post, No. 64, of the American Legion, at Pittsburg, Kans., that under the rules now in force men of military age who are not willing to fight for our country and who are enrolled in conscientious-objector camps throughout the land are now receiving leaves, passes, and furloughs; and

Whereas patriotic citizens in the armed forces of the United States are undergoing intensive training in our mighty war effort to such a degree that to a great extent such passes, leaves, and furloughs are impossible in the armed forces; and

Whereas a large part of our armed forces are now stationed in combat areas actively engaged in the fight to preserve the American way of life; and

Whereas the intensive training and hard work in the training camps and on the battlefield have made furloughs and leaves impossible; and

Whereas a large number of these men have made the supreme sacrifice that democracy may live: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Benjamin A. Fuller Post, No. 64, of the American Legion, in regular meeting assembled hereby condemn the present practice of those in authority over the conscientious objectors and others who are unwilling to fight for this country and request that such unpatriotic citizens be interned in, confined, and restricted to camps provided for that purpose, and that they be not allowed leaves of absence of any character for the duration of the present emergency, and that they be not permitted at large in this country; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, Senator CLYDE M. REED, Congressman THOMAS D. WINTER, and the Kansas Department of the American Legion.

Dated at Pittsburg, Kans., this 31st day of August A. D. 1942.

B. VEICOGGIO,
Commander.
BEN W. WEIR,
Adjutant.

THE SHORTAGE OF FARM LABOR

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate the very serious situation which confronts American agriculture, and which also threatens the success of the war program. I refer to the growing shortage of farm labor.

Farmers this year have broken all production records in producing foodstuffs for our own and our allies' armed forces and civilian populations. But those acquainted with the situation are fearful that next year's production will be materially lessened. The draft boards and war-industry plants are drawing more and more young farmers and hired help from the farms. There also is a growing shortage of farm machinery.

The Kansas delegation in both Senate and House of Representatives laid this matter before Secretary of Agriculture Wickard this morning, and is also taking it up with General Hershey, Selective Service Director, and with Chairman McNutt, of the Manpower Commission. Something must be done to remedy this situation or the production program will fall down badly just when increased production is most needed.

In this connection I desire to read to the Senate a brief telegram received from 100 farmers of Finney and Scott Counties in western Kansas, as follows:

GARDEN CITY, KANS., September 9, 1942.
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building:

We, the undersigned, farmers and stockmen of Finney and Scott Counties, Kans., urge an amendment of the selective-service rules and regulations relative to farm labor. The situation is grave, and all our farm labor is being taken from us by the draft. Production is being drastically curtailed, and if present rule is maintained there will be no farm labor in another 6 months. We urge that you introduce or support a measure to exempt from service the necessary farm labor. This is very urgent, and something must be done at once or serious conditions and reduction in production will result.

Frank Roark, H. Young, M. Armantrout, F. Cook, C. Conine, W. Luke, A. Browning, Richard Holister, E. Wilkoff, J. Bryan, W. Melson, A. Chene, O. Bebermeyer, V. Watt, C. Durrant, W. Proudfoot, Bert Finkenhinder, Fred Starr, Fred Strickett, Bert Scott, O. Fleener, L. A. Garner, Frank Spangler, Mrs. Grace Graham, M. Robbins, Albert Petzelka, C. Dickhut, Al. B. Farls, F.

Brown, R. Christy, W. Robb, Edw. Rodenbuck, Roy Robb, K. Kirk, H. Kirk, G. Liggett, Archie Parkinson, G. Fouquet, Robert Gilbert, J. Scheideman, F. Mahler, G. Weishaar, Ronald Beach, R. Crist, H. Crist, Ralph Bezech, C. Olomon, R. Jones, O. Schoff, H. Hawk, E. Stone, Harry Brown, Chas. Newsom, A. Burkle, E. Wampler, C. Davis, Clay Weldon, Geo. Burg, T. Frisby, Cap Burtis, Frank Gobleman, Olney Newman, O. Reusser, Victor Hallich, Doc Jones, The Daily Telegram, by G. F. Reed, J. U. Crist, G. Armantrout, C. Danner, R. Werner, J. Ens, G. Moseley, R. Gasche.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 6921. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to authorize payments in cases where farmers' crops are acquired, prior to harvest, in connection with the acquisition of their farms for use in the national war effort, and to provide for the division of such payments; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1593).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2731. A bill to suspend until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the anti-trust laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 1592).

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

S. 2740. A bill to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1594).

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on September 8, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) transferring the management of the Senate restaurants to the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2757. A bill for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2758. A bill to authorize the President to issue certificates of appreciation and honorable discharge to civilian defense workers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 2759. A bill to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2760. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 2761. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 2762. A bill to except from the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes purchases or services rendered for the Department of Commerce where the amount involved does not exceed \$100; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 2763. A bill to prevent and punish the desecration, mutilation, or improper use of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2764. A bill to require reports with respect to the work of judges of the United States district courts; and

S. 2765. A bill to prohibit consent decrees in antitrust cases and to require the vigorous prosecution of such cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 2766. A bill for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. NORRIS introduced Senate bill 2767, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

LABOR DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator WAGNER in connection with the labor for victory program on September 5, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM LABOR DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a Labor Day address delivered by him in Milwaukee, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR NORRIS BY THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times entitled "The One Independent," paying tribute to Senator NORRIS, which appears in the Appendix.]

MORE GUNS AND LESS GRAVY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Need More Guns and Less Gravy," written by him and published in the Progressive of September 5, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MANAGEMENT OF THE WAR—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the management of the war, entitled "The Basic Trouble," by Frank R. Kent, published in the Baltimore Sun of September 4, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTERS FROM HOME FOR SOLDIERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Boston Post, entitled "Letter for a Soldier," which appears in the Appendix.]

REHABILITATION OF MEN REJECTED FOR DRAFT

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the rehabilitation of men rejected in the draft, published in the Newark (N. J.) News of August 25, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POSITION OF CONGRESS IN WARTIME—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHOENIX (ARIZ.) REPUBLIC

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Many Do Not Understand Position of Congress in Wartime," published in the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic of September 6, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

FRAUDULENT SEED AND FEED LOAN COLLECTIONS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Leader, of Bismarck, N. Dak., September 3, 1942, entitled "Seed and Feed Loan Collectors Are Busy," which appears in the Appendix.]

ABSENTEE VOTING BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the managers of the conference appointed on the part of the Senate to consider the amendments of the Senate to House bill 7416, which has just come over from the House of Representatives, I desire to report that the managers of the Senate and House met and that the House receded from its disagreement to all the amendments of the Senate, so that the conference report which I now present, and for which I ask consideration, adopts the bill as passed by the Senate with all amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7416) to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence and serving within the continental United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

LEO KOCIALKOWSKI,
JOHN C. BUTLER,
STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
JOHN F. HUNTER,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOSEPH E. TALBOT,

Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senate is going to take up the conference report, I think we should have a quorum present. 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	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Hayden	Rosier
Bridges	Herring	Shipstead
Brown	Hill	Smathers
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Langer	Tobey
Caraway	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	McNary	Van Nuys
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
George	Norris	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from

New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

My colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

RUBBER FOR MILITARY AND ESSENTIAL CIVILIAN REQUIREMENTS (H. DOC. NO. 836)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith send to you, for your information, the digest and report of the Special Inquiry Committee which I appointed on August 6 to study our rubber situation and to recommend action.

The committee consists of B. M. Baruch, chairman; Dr. J. B. Conant, president of Harvard University; Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and a staff of experts.

The introduction to the report tells the story in outline; the report proper gives the details in full.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The WHITE HOUSE, September 10, 1942.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be appropriately referred.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the report just referred to by the Vice President the report of the so-called rubber committee headed by Mr. Baruch?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. McNARY. The Vice President stated that the report would be appropriately referred. To what committee is it to be referred?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There has been some discussion, and the determination has not yet been made as to what may be the appropriate committee.

Mr. McNARY. If there is to be further discussion of the matter, I should like to call attention to the fact that the bill which resulted in the legislation under which the committee was appointed came from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which is studying the problem; and the report should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I cannot imagine what discussion would necessarily follow, if there be no issue as to the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection Mr. President, I do not care particularly to what committee the report may be referred, but what the Senator from Oregon has said might be said also of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which held hearings on the rubber situation, on a bill which was introduced for the committee. The committee took no action on the bill, but there were hearings on the subject lasting several days.

The Committee on Banking and Currency had jurisdiction because it brought in a measure dealing with the powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which had created, under authority of law, the Rubber Reserve Corporation as a subsidiary. So, there might be a legitimate claim that both committees might have jurisdiction. But I do not wish to get into any picayunish argument over the jurisdiction of committees.

Mr. McNARY. It is not "picayunish," by any means.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was not referring to the Senator's part as "picayunish." I was saying that I myself did not wish to get into any "picayunish" situation.

Mr. McNARY. That is somewhat different. The action upon the part of the Vice President is to refer a report which is a result of legislation reported by a subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The bill which resulted in the legislation was on the calendar, and passed the Senate and the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. And was vetoed by the President.

Mr. McNARY. The report now received is particularly in reference and in response to that legislation, and I think the report should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know what the report is or what it recommends, and I do not know what committee would have jurisdiction of a bill introduced in harmony with the recommendation and report of this committee. It might be well for the Presiding Officer to study the report and see what it recommends, in order to be able to say to what committee it should be referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has read the summary of the report, and is impressed that the report might perhaps go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me to be perfectly clear where the report should go. As the Senator from Oregon has said, it has come here in response to a measure originating in a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] was chairman. The subcommittee reported to the full committee, and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the bill to the Senate. It was passed by the Senate, it was passed by the House, and it was vetoed by the President. As I understand, the veto message has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Am I right in that, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. So far everything in relation to the matter has gone to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and under the general procedure of the Senate I cannot understand why this report, which has come as the result of that very measure, and with the veto message resting and waiting for this very report, should not go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, I move that the report be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the report and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Chair hears no objection, and the reference is made.

ABSENTEE VOTING BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] for the present consideration of the conference report on House bill 7416? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a very few minutes. I rise with no illusory hope that anything I shall say will change the attitude of the Senate, which was expressed some days ago on a yea-and-nay vote, but if any curious historian should ever mull over the records of the Senate in the years to come, I want him to find the Senator from Texas, humble though he may be, standing over the prostrate form of the Constitution with a sword broken in its defense still in his hand.

Mr. President, it is a favorite device of those who desire to perpetrate some radical innovation or violent change in the fundamentals to cloak their efforts all around with an attractive garment to make it look as if they were promoting the cause of virtue.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator's suggestion might apply to women, but not to us. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nebraska undertakes to differentiate between motives which he might entertain and those which our charming womanhood might entertain. I was generous enough to classify the Senator along with womanhood, because to women are always attributed qualities of benignity and virtue and charm, and I am surprised that the Senator from Nebraska should undertake to remove himself from that classification.

Mr. President, the bill cloaks itself beautifully under the headline of "Vote for soldiers." Of course, no one wants to deny a soldier the right to vote, if he has the right to vote. If in the commonwealth from which he comes he has the right to vote, the Federal Government, of course, should not prohibit that right, but, on the other hand, insofar as the Federal function of military control or naval control is concerned, provision ought to be made for him to exercise that right. But under the cloak of undertaking to do this lofty and noble thing, to permit soldiers to vote, I insist that the Constitution should not be ravished, and that our practices heretofore should not be altered.

Under the bill it is declared that those in the land and naval forces of the United States absent from their places of residence may vote, irrespective of any poll-tax requirement in the respective States.

Mr. President, I am not enamored of the poll tax. Personally, I should prefer

some system of registration, some other qualification for voting, based upon considerations other than the payment of a tax, but that does not change my insistence that under the Constitution and under every concept which we had of Government until this very moment, the States had the right to determine the qualifications of electors for Senators and Representatives. If that be not true, why did the makers of the Constitution write in the sand with weak and trembling fingers this provision?—

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people—

What people?

of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch—

Of what?

of the * * * legislature.

Of the Federal Legislature? No.

Of the State legislature.

Mr. President, have those words no vitality now? Are the respect and veneration for that provision extending over a century and a half now to be wiped out by the Senate of the United States because the sponsors of the measure cloak and mask and decorate their effort by an overweening desire that the soldiers shall vote? I am not against the soldiers voting if they have a right to vote.

The provision I have quoted as being a part of the Constitution of the United States has been reaffirmed in subsequent sections of the Constitution. As was suggested the other day by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART], why was it provided in the fourteenth amendment that if citizens of the United States were denied the right to vote in the several States the representation would be reduced? Was not that an admission that the right to vote for Representatives and Senators within a State was within the function of the State? It was an admission that the States might exercise that function. The Constitution undertook to penalize the States only if they exercised it in such a manner as to deny the right to vote on account of color or previous condition of servitude. Is not the very fact that a prohibition is made with respect to color and previous condition of servitude an admission that as to all other matters the State retains its full and complete power? The fourteenth amendment is the one penalizing the States if they exclude any citizens of the United States from voting.

The fifteenth amendment provides:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

That means by implication and by exclusion that, except for race, color, and previous condition of servitude, the States still have, as they had when the Constitution was drafted, the right to determine the qualifications of those who vote within the State for Representatives or for Senators.

Again, why did we adopt the nineteenth amendment, the woman-suffrage amendment? Why did we take that action by constitutional amendment? Why did we not pass a statute of the Congress saying that women would have the same right to vote as men? Because the Constitution, as then written, and now written, if not now so construed, provided that each State was to determine the qualifications, and the States, many of them, did deny to women the right to vote. Therefore we provided a prohibition, not an affirmative action on the part of the Federal Government, but in the nineteenth amendment we said:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

It was a prohibition, recognizing that the States did have the right up to that time to deny women the right to vote. The Federal Constitution simply made a prohibition with respect to it, and the adoption of that provision within very recent years is a reaffirmation of the ancient doctrine that each State has the right to prescribe the qualifications for voting.

Let us now look at the seventeenth amendment:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors—

Listen to this—

The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

How could language be plainer than that? How could the draftsmen provide anything that would penetrate the intellectual fog of any man any more clearly than that? How could the English language be employed to carry a more definite statement of the old law incorporated in the original Constitution? In the seventeenth amendment we say in substance that the old practice, the old constitutional provision, shall remain in effect; that when it comes to the election of Representatives and Senators every man must have the same requisite qualifications as an elector within the States for the most numerous branch of the legislature.

Mr. President, we did that within recent years. What is it proposed to do today? It is proposed to pass a little statute, something which was sprung on us here as an amendment. Very few of us had had time thoroughly to consider it. It is a little amendment saying, in effect, "Well, the State did have the right, but it no longer has the right, because we, the Congress of the United States, abrogate all State laws, abrogate all election laws." Some of the States have constitutional provisions which prohibit men in the armed services, if they are in the Regular Army, from voting at all. Now it is proposed to say, "Well, your constitution does not amount to anything. We will pass a little bill which overturns your constitution, and over-

turns the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. President, I realize that this is a futile contest. The Senate probably has already had its mind made up. The feast is spread before it; a little diet of what they think is a few votes somewhere; a little viand from which to gather and garner a few votes somewhere. That is going to make the Senate pass an act which is absolutely violative of the Constitution of the United States.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Texas makes, as, of course, he always does, a very pertinent comment on this question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the generous Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if the Senator makes any distinction in his observations of this matter between "qualifications" and "conditions"? Or how the Senator would define the word "qualifications" as it is written in the constitutional provision to which he has referred?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Florida for his suggestion; but, according to my view of this whole problem, there is nothing mentioned in the Constitution about conditions. But if there were, what difference would it make? We just wipe out the conditions. If the conditions do not suit us, we just enact a statute and wipe them out.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, would the Senator allow me to say that the reason I propounded the inquiry is that the Constitution does not allow the several States to impose any conditions they may see fit to impose. It only provides that the States may prescribe "qualifications" for certain electors.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If by hypothesis the States might impose conditions, they would not have the right, if they were not legitimate qualifications, to claim the benefit of the qualifications section of the Constitution, and vice versa.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator from Texas is too obtuse to differentiate between qualifications and conditions. Let us take the case of a voter who comes to the ballot box in my State, or in the State of Florida. I suppose there is a constitutional provision with respect to voting there. There is in my State. There are State laws in the various States specifying who can vote. The first question asked the voter is:

Mr. Smith, are you eligible? Have you the qualifications for voting for members of the legislature?

The applicant says:

Yes; I have.

Well, let us see. How old are you?

That is a condition. The applicant says:

I am 19 years old.

Well, you cannot vote. You cannot vote because in order to vote you must be 21 years old.

Is that a qualification or a condition? His condition is that he is only 19. The qualification is that he must be 21, and

so he cannot vote. Now, what is the difference between that and the question:

Have you paid your poll tax? The law requires that you pay a poll tax before you can vote.

No; I have not paid it.

That is a condition, if you want to call it a condition, or it is a qualification.

Since you do not possess that qualification, you cannot vote.

A woman comes to the polls and says:

I want to vote.

Very well. You are a woman. The nineteenth amendment says that the State shall not discriminate against you, but, being a woman, are you 21?

She may hesitate to say that she is 21. I do not know. But, anyway, that is just as much a condition as is the payment of the poll tax.

Suppose, on the other hand, an applicant comes to the polls and says:

I want to vote.

The election judge foolishly picks up the State constitution and the State laws instead of the statute of the Congress, and says:

Wait a minute. We have a registration law in this State. Are you registered? Have you your registration certificate?

The applicant fumbles around in three or four of his pockets, and looks in his hat band, and finds that he does not have a registration certificate. The election judge then says:

You cannot vote, because the law requires that before you can vote you must be registered.

If Congress can wipe out the poll tax it can wipe out provision for registration, it can wipe out the age requirement, it can wipe out the time requirement, it can wipe out everything, including the voter himself. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a further remark?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator, with his erudite mind, does not make any distinction between a person possessing certain maturity of body and mind which comes with adulthood and certain intelligence which comes with normality of intellect and being a citizen—things which are qualifications and performance of a condition. The Senator does not distinguish between the possession of those characteristics which go to the fitness of an elector and a case of an elector or a citizen who is not allowed to vote until he performs some act or satisfies some condition. It does not seem to me that it is monstrous to suggest that one of them falls in one category and can legitimately be called a qualification, and that the other is a condition precedent, and that a State may or may not have the right to impose conditions upon the exercise by a Federal citizen of the franchise with respect to candidates for a Federal office.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator; and I desire to be indulgent, so that if he desires to proceed further to illustrate his point relative to condition and qualification and the distinction between the two, I shall be glad to hear him.

However, granted everything that the Senator from Florida says, where is the forum which would determine whether the citizen is qualified to vote or whether he is not? Is that a Federal function? It never has been. The Senator from Florida, who has taken the oath to uphold the Constitution, should recall that we adopted the women's suffrage amendment which related merely to a prohibition. The amendment with respect to the election of Senators related to the old constitutional provision. There must be a forum to determine the matter. We cannot reach up like Herman, the magician, and pick it out of the air. We cannot reach under our senatorial desks and resurrect a statute. It must be based on the qualifications as well as the conditions. It may be called condition or it may be called qualification; but whichever it may be, it must be determined by a single authority. It is not possible to have the State determine qualifications and the Federal Government determine conditions. Otherwise, we would have the Senator from Florida trying to convince someone that this is not a qualification but is a condition, and he would resort to a Federal bureau; whereas another man would say, "This is not a condition, but is a qualification"; and he would resort to the State authority; and, of course, there would be confusion and uncertainty.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The inquiry propounded by the Senator is perfectly sound and reasonable. Let me with some pertinence say with respect to it that in the first place, after reading a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court—

Mr. CONNALLY. How recent?

Mr. PEPPER. In the year 1940; and, so far as I know, it is the latest decision by the Court on this subject.

I started to say that in a dual system of government, there is always a fine line of distinction between the beginning of Federal power and the beginning or the end of State power.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator a question; he has been asking me a number of questions.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator permit me to finish my observation?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; but I desire to ask him a question with respect to it.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is there a registration law in Florida?

Mr. PEPPER. There is.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator want to do away with it?

Mr. PEPPER. So far as I know—

Mr. CONNALLY. Congress could do away with it if it can do away with the poll tax.

Mr. PEPPER. Florida did do away with the poll tax.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about the Federal Government. If Congress can do away with the poll-tax requirement, it can do away with State registration, too, can it not? Would not that be a qualification?

Mr. PEPPER. It all depends upon the intent and effect of the State law. If

the effect of that law upon the exercise of the Federal franchise should be as iniquitous—

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment; let me ask what is the State franchise requirement. How old does a voter have to be?

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator to wait a moment, please. I say that if the effect of the State law upon the exercise of the Federal franchise should be as discriminatory and vicious as the poll tax is upon the exercise of the State franchise, the Congress would possess not only the power but the duty to delimit the States in the exercise of such a device.

Now I am glad to yield.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Are you sure, Mr. President? [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. If my interrogatories are not with the indulgence of the Senator from Texas, I shall desist.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not at all; I invited them.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is always a worthy foe and an honest one. So it is a privilege to have an opportunity to discuss these matters with him.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. I started to refer to the language of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *United States against Classic*. I think it is very pertinent language, and there is not much of it. It is found in *Three Hundred and Thirtieth United States*, on page 314:

We come, then, to the question whether that right—

That is, the right to vote for a Member of Congress—

is one secured by the Constitution—

Meaning the Federal Constitution.

Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes. The right of the people to choose, whatever its appropriate constitutional limitations, where in other respects it is defined, and the mode of its exercise is prescribed by State action in conformity to the Constitution, is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right. (*Ex parte Yarbrough*, 110 U. S. 651; *United States v. Mosley*, 238 U. S. 383. And see *Hague v. C. I. O.*, 307 U. S. 496, 508, 513, 526, 527, 529, giving the same interpretation to the like phrase "rights" "secured by the Constitution," appearing in sec. 1 of the Civil Rights Act of 1871 (17 Stat. 13).) While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (see *Minor v. Happersett*, 21 Wall 162, 170; *United States v. Reese*, 92 U. S. 214, 217-218; *McPherson v. Blacker*, 146 U. S. 1, 38-39; *Breedlove v. Suttles*, 302 U. S. 277, 283)—

In which the Supreme Court has stated that the right to vote was derived from the States, and therefore a poll tax was reasonable—

this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under

article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution, "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator lend to me the volume from which he has been reading?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

That decision, the Senator will observe, was written in 1940 by the then Associate Justice and now Chief Justice Stone, of the United States Supreme Court. The language to which reference has just been made was in refutation of what had been stated in *Breedlove* against *Suttles*, a case coming from Georgia, right on the point of the poll tax, in which case the court had said that the poll tax imposed by the State was legal, due to the fact that the right to vote, even for a Member of Congress, derive from the State authority; and, of course, if it derives from the State authority the States could condition it at their pleasure, capriciously if they would.

The whole fundamental principle, therefore, relative to the source of the right to vote for a Federal official is determined in this case, the *Classic* case, and the Court unequivocally says it derives from the Federal Constitution; and the State power to prescribe the qualifications and conditions for Federal citizens voting for Federal officials is to be understood as limited only by the superior power of the Congress to intervene and restrict that power, if, in the public interest, under its duty to protect the Federal citizen, it sees fit to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for lending me the volume from which he read and for his suggestion; but the Senator's speech is not in conformity with the decision. As I recall the decision—I have not read it lately—

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment. The case is one in which there was a criminal prosecution in Louisiana in connection with violation of the Federal criminal statutes by a man who voted in a primary election for a Representative in Congress; is not that true?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. In that case the opinion does not lay down any such doctrine at all as that contended for by the Senator from Florida. The court merely held that since the primary was an essential process through which the candidate had to go in order to be eligible to run for election in the fall, in the general election, a fraudulent act in connection with the primary was a fraudulent act in connection with the election. That is all the Supreme Court held in that case. It did not go down into the "innards" of this case; it did not eviscerate the Constitution or perform a surgical operation upon it. It quotes section 2 of article I.

I yield now to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to make exactly the same point as that which the Senator from Texas has made.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very much pleased that the Senator desires to do so.

Mr. HILL. The case referred to does not involve the question involved in the bill, the question of the poll tax. On the contrary, in the *Pirtle* case, as the Senator knows, the Supreme Court denied a writ of certiorari when the question related to the imposition of a poll tax as a qualification for voting.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield; but I desire to conclude as soon as possible; my ammunition is running low, and I wish to finish.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well; I shall gladly desist in just a moment.

In the *Pirtle* case to which the Senator from Alabama has referred there was involved only State action, and no action by the Congress. The decision cannot be decisive on the point in question, because the principle in the *Pirtle* case was different from that in the *Classic* case. In the *Classic* case the Court held that the right to vote is derived from the Federal Constitution. Up to that time, in the *Breedlove* case, coming from Georgia in 1937, with respect to the poll tax, the Court had said that the right to vote for a Member of Congress is derived from the State. Therefore, of course, the States could condition it. However, when the principle is admitted that it is derived from the Federal power, the State cannot burden the exercise of the Federal power. Therefore, the case is different from the *Pirtle* case to which my distinguished friend from Alabama referred, because in that case there was only a State statute, and a State constitutional provision with no intervening restrictive action by the Federal Congress.

I should like to know if there is any decision directly or indirectly by the United States Supreme Court based on the action of the State attempting to invade this field after the Congress has stepped in and delimited the burdening of the Federal franchise against aggressive and restrictive State action.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator did not answer me as to whether he thinks Congress should abolish the State registration law in Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thought I made a fair answer. I say that if the facts should show—

Mr. CONNALLY. I am asking the Senator if he thinks the Congress has the power to abolish the State registration law of Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Texas wishes to put it on the question of naked power; yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. "Naked" is the correct word to use. There is nothing on it but skin and bones. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does not the *Classic* case refer to the exercise of the Federal power, which has long been exercised, as to the qualifications and conditions, and the sanctity of the ballot?

Mr. CONNALLY. The question in the *Classic* case was not as to the maintenance of a man's right to vote except, as

an incident to a criminal prosecution for fraud in violation of the Corrupt Practices Act.

Senators have heard the oration of the Senator from Florida. Listen to what the Court said. This is from the opinion of the Court in the *Classic* case:

Interference with the right to vote in the congressional primary in the Second Congressional District for the choice of a Democratic candidate for Congress, is thus, as a matter of law and in fact, an interference with the effective choice of the voters at the only stage of the election procedure when their choice is of significance, since it is at the only stage when such interference could have any practical effect on the ultimate result, the choice of the Congressman to represent the district.

The effect, as I said a while ago, was that since the primary is an essential step, fraud practiced in the primary is the same as fraud practiced in the election. That is all the *Classic* case holds.

Concerning the right to vote, the Court said:

The right of qualified voters to vote at the congressional primary in Louisiana and to have their ballots counted is thus the right to participate in that choice.

That is a beautiful generality, which no one would question.

We come then to the question whether that right is one secured by the Constitution. Section 2 of article I—

That is the section which I read. Why does the Supreme Court refer to section 2 of article I if it does not mean anything? Why does the Supreme Court dignify it by notice if section 2 of article I does not mean what it purports to mean?

We come then to the question whether that right is one secured by the Constitution. Section 2 of article I commands—

It does not beg. It does not intercede. It does not implore. It does not whine and ask. It—

commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes.

The Federal Constitution, by section 2, article I, thereof, prescribes the qualifications for Members of Congress, and those qualifications must be the same as those which the State prescribes for electors for the most numerous branch of the legislature.

The Senator from Florida has invoked an authority which says that the Federal Constitution in article I, section 2, fixes the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress and that those qualifications must be the identical ones prescribed by the State for the most numerous branch of the legislature.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. No other interpretation could be given to the language set forth in section 2 of article I. It does not say that the qualifications shall be those set by the State for the electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature, or as may be prescribed by Congress, or as fixed by the Federal Government.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; of course not.

Mr. HILL. The language as to qualifications appears at the end of that section.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Alabama is quite correct.

This is the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Classic case, which has been invoked by the Senator from Florida:

The right of the people to choose, whatever its appropriate constitutional limitations, where in other respects it is defined, and the mode of its exercise is prescribed by State action in conformity to the Constitution, is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution, and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right.

The Supreme Court says that since section 2 of article I of the Federal Constitution has defined the qualifications for electors, that becomes the Federal law, of course. It becomes a Federal right. No State may provide as a qualification for the election of Members of Congress some other qualification than those defined for the most numerous branch of the legislature. If it should attempt to do so, it would be violating the Federal Constitution.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the Senator say that the States may impose upon their citizens who desire to vote in Federal elections for Federal officials the same conditions they may impose upon their citizens who are attempting to vote in State elections for State officials?

Mr. CONNALLY. If I correctly understand the Senator, I do not see any reason why they could not do so. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida another question. Does he believe that the Federal Government could prescribe that any soldier 18 years of age or older may vote?

Mr. PEPPER. That is a closer case.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not talking about a close case. I want to know if the Federal Government could do that.

Mr. PEPPER. I know that the Senator from Texas does not want to ask a facetious question.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I want to ask the question which I have asked. I want to know if the Federal Government could so prescribe.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to answer the question. That is a close case, because age has a fair relationship to qualification to vote, whereas the payment of a sum of money has no possible relationship.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let us assume that it is a close question. What agency, administrative board, or bureau is to decide it? If the Senator says that the Federal Government will decide it, then he admits that the Federal Government may provide that men above 18 years of age may vote.

Mr. PEPPER. The Federal judicial power would have to be the arbiter on the question, because the instrument under interpretation would be the Federal Constitution or Federal statute. The Federal Congress can go far enough to protect the integrity of the Federal franchise. The Congress has the right to throw off or hold back whatever might

impinge upon or diminish that franchise; and the Federal judiciary will protect it in doing so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. The Senator has not yet defined the Federal franchise. I have read the Constitution several times and find no reference to it.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator give me an opportunity to attempt to give a definition of the Federal franchise? I believe the Senator has commented on the fact that I have never given a definition of it.

Without being technical, the Federal franchise is the privilege to vote for Federal officials, conferred upon Federal citizens by the Federal Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. According to that definition, a voter might be 10 years of age. I do not believe there is anything in the Constitution about the Federal franchise, except in article I, section 2. The only Federal franchise is that the Constitution, in section 2 of article I, adopted for its own purposes the franchise of the several States.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] remarks, sotto voce, that I have previously made the same speech. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have made the same speech.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I was speaking with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Barkley]. The Senator from Texas overheard me. I have no objection to the Senator from Texas talking as long as he desires to talk.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. However, it is a fact that the Senator made the same speech when this subject matter was before the Senate for debate on a prior occasion.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is very true. It is very much the same speech. That is why the Senator from Nebraska does not want to hear it again. He heard the speech when it was made the first time and he does not want to hear any more of it. It is the same question and of course pretty much the same speech. The Senator from Nebraska has said that he was speaking with the Senator from Kentucky. However, the condition of the atmosphere and of the auditory nerves of the Senator from Texas are such that he can still hear, irrespective of the quiet, gentlemanly tone of the conversation. I do not object to that. I assure the Senator from Nebraska that I am about to conclude, and that he does not need to read the Record on this subject. If it is distasteful to him I apologize, because I very much dislike to do anything which is distasteful to the Senator from Nebraska, but, as the Senator realizes, I have been prodded and goaded by the Senator from Florida and I must proceed.

While, in a loose sense—

Evidently the court was thinking about this bill—

While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (see *Minor v. Happersett*, 21 Wall. 162, 170; *United States v. Reese*, 92 U. S., 214,

217-218; *McPherson v. Blacker*, 146 U. S. 1, 38-39; *Breedlove v. Suttles*, 302 U. S. 277, 283), this statement is true only in the sense—

Now listen—

that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I—

The court goes right back to it every time. The court knows the Constitution, if some courts do not always observe it, this court knows what the Constitution is—

to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its power to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution, "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

Mr. President, I realize I am engaged in a useless and futile task. The Senator from Nebraska has expressed the attitude of those who are going to vote contrarywise. They have already heard what is now being said, and do not want to hear any more.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, while I know he does not desire to take further time, let me ask why in the world did the makers of the Constitution put section 2 in the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution? Was it not because they recognized that the State had the right to do what? To abridge the suffrage, to fix the qualifications or conditions, if the Senator prefers that word, and even went so far in admitting that right as to provide a penalty if the right were exercised under certain conditions. Is not that true?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. I thank the Senator. The fourteenth amendment was, of course, basically intended to do that very thing, and in that particular provision it did accomplish that result.

Mr. President, the Senate, of course, is going to adopt the conference report. We had a roll call on the questions involved some days ago, but a number of Senators are now present who were not here at that time. I do not want to detain the Senate. I grieve, for I regard this bill as a very serious and very violent rupture of our constitutional processes which have been generally accepted and which no one has ever questioned for 150 years.

Now we are going to take this action under the cloak of doing something for the soldiers. When a person wants to accomplish some supposed reform such as this, as I observed awhile ago, he cloaks it all over and ornaments it and sprinkles it with perfume to make it pleasing to the nostrils, and he usually picks out some odious thing, something that essentially someone does not like at all, such as the poll-tax requirement, we will say, rather than requirements for direct registration and educational qualifications, or some other kind of requirement. So, to meet the odious thing which it is desired to destroy, the proposal is perfumed and scented and decorated and embellished and appears under the guise of helping the soldiers, most of whom will never vote, of course, anyway, because they are in distant lands and cannot vote,

and do not want to vote, and are not worried about voting.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further in that connection, since the bill passed the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Secretary of War has addressed a communication to the Senate and to the House in which he practically states that, so far as the men outside the United States are concerned, it is going to be impossible for them to exercise the right to vote proposed to be granted by this bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. President, when the Constitution was adopted many States had requirements for the exercise of the right of suffrage, including property qualifications, and all that sort of thing. That was in the minds of the makers. They recognized that situation. I do not favor that sort of thing. Massachusetts, I understand, had such a requirement up to within a few years ago. If I am in error in that statement, I hope some Harvard graduate will rise and correct me. Massachusetts had certain such requirements up to within the recent past, if not the present.

The Senator from Illinois is not now present. If he were, I should like to ask him a question. There is no poll tax required in Illinois. That is the right of the people of Illinois; if they do not desire a poll tax, the people of Illinois have a right to say so. A few other States have a poll tax, but it is not the function of Illinois to tell such other States that because Illinois does not have a poll tax the other States shall not have one, any more than it would be the right of the States that do have the poll tax to say to Illinois, "Now, Illinois, you must establish a poll tax; you have got to have a poll tax just as we have." Is it not just as logical, is it not just as reasonable for the other States to demand that Illinois and Florida adopt a poll tax as it is that Florida and Illinois, neither one of which has the poll tax, shall say to the other States, "We have not any poll tax; it does not bother us; we can run for office and all that, but we are just burning up to engage in a noble crusade and we are going to say to you benighted, benumbed, and bedraggled States to do as we have done; we want you to have the same laws as we have."

As I said the other day, the Governor of the State of Florida came before the Finance Committee and said:

For God's sake, do not tax the race horses any more; in Florida we rely on them for revenue; we get 14 percent of our State revenue from race dogs and race horses. If you impose a Federal tax on them so that they will be put out of business and will not pay the State tax we will have to refinance our whole State economy.

That is all right. If Florida wants race horses that is her business. Florida has many other attractions, and why should she not have race horses? [Laughter.]

I was in Illinois recently. They have many laws there. They also have race horses, and they get money out of horse racing. We are not trying to prevent them having race horses. They have

traffic laws. I do not like them as well as I like the traffic laws in Texas, but that is no reason why I should say to Illinois, "I do not like your traffic laws and we are going to pass a law in Congress making you have traffic laws such as are in force in Oklahoma." No one would stand for that.

Mr. President, I am astounded, I am shocked that the Senate of the United States should consider taking this action as I contemplate the wreckage and ruin of the Constitution of the United States with the Senator from Illinois on the one hand and the Senator from Florida on the other bitterly disputing as to which one should hold the dagger of Brutus that did the dirty deed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, during the progress of the pending legislation I submitted a number of proposals to the conferees and to the chairman of the committee, and I should like now to ask the chairman of the committee if the position set forth in a letter from the New York State War Ballot Commission is correct or if they have perhaps failed to interpret the bill as it is interpreted in the minds of the members of the committee in charge of the legislation. In New York a State law accords the privilege of voting to men in the armed service no matter where they may be located. The privilege is extended to them to vote for town, village, county, city, State, and Federal officers, and there is no imposition of a poll tax or any other requirement of that particular character. We feel that we have a model law which has been in operation now for several months. Ballots have been printed, the registration forms have been mailed, and there is a feeling that the pending legislation will interfere with the progress and application of the legislation which has been enacted by the State of New York.

One of the questions asked of me in a recent communication from the chairman of the commission, to which I invite the attention of the chairman of the committee in charge of the pending legislation, is as follows:

Under this Ramsay bill many thousands of New York soldiers who are now in Pine Camp, Fort Niagara, Madison Barracks, and many flying fields would be disenfranchised for the reason that the Ramsay bill provides that only soldiers who are not within the State of New York, or their respective residences, could avail themselves of the provisions of the Federal law.

These men are in the armed services, they are removed from their home districts, but they are still within the State. It is the contention of the New York State Ballot Commission that the proposed law might disfranchise these men, and I should like to direct that question to the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, if I am not mistaken, the distinguished Senator from New York read from the same document to which he is now referring, or from a similar one, and asked the same

questions, while we were debating the proposed legislation on the floor of the Senate. I remember this particular question because I replied that the statement as to the provisions of the proposed law was not correct. The law will apply to anyone absent, not from the State, but from his place of residence.

Mr. MEAD. I thank the able Senator for his reply. I wanted to be sure that it was contained in the record of the debates on the pending legislation.

Another question has been asked, which I may also have raised on a previous occasion. Under the proposed law the service man applies for the right to vote by filling out a postal card. Under the New York State law he applies for the right to vote by filling out a rather comprehensive questionnaire. As between filling out the postal card and the questionnaire, the average individual might follow the line of least resistance and apply by merely signing his name to a postal card. That is not in conformity with our State election law and with our registration law, and it might result in a denial to a resident of the State of the right to vote for local officers. It might prevent him from voting for State, county, village, or city officers, and permit him to vote only for Federal officers.

I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island tell me whether or not, if applying for a ballot by filling out a postal card gives a man a right to vote for Federal officers, would it be necessary for him, in order to be entitled to vote for local and State officers, to fill out a separate application coming from the State authority?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, Congress obviously has authority only to provide regulations for the election of Federal officials. Therefore it has nothing to do with the election of State officials. There is no prohibition, however, against additional opportunities being given by a State for voting for the election of State officials in connection with the provisions for the election of Federal officials. In fact, it is specifically stated in the proposed law itself that that very thing may be done. Furthermore, there is provision whereby the secretary of state, when sending out the ballots, may include with the ballot both the State ballot, as the State law makes it possible, and a booklet explaining the provisions of the law. So I think any enlisted man would be able to understand his rights. He has the choice of voting under one ballot or the other, as he sees fit. Both ballots cannot be counted, of course, when it comes to the counting of the votes in the election.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it occurs to me that there will be some confusion, because in a number of States which have already enacted laws of this character forms have been prepared, and the forms which have been prepared conform with the election and registration requirements within the State. The forms filled out and properly certified to will bring to the service man the ballot which the citizen in the community will

receive on election day when he goes to vote. That ballot will contain a complete list of officials to be voted for at the election.

The postal card, however, as suggested in the pending bill, will, when filled out, merely permit the serviceman to vote for Federal officials, who will be in some instances Members of Congress only. Unless some arrangements are made whereby the secretary of state shall be able to furnish the servicemen with the State application, plus the postal card, plus a booklet of instructions, I am afraid that a great many votes will fail to be properly recorded.

It occurs to me that the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], or the amendment which I offered to the conferees, which would eliminate such States as have already enacted adequate legislation granting the right to vote to the servicemen, should be contained in the proposed law. In view of the fact that the parliamentary situation will not allow them to be considered at this time, in view of the fact that the proposed legislation contains a great many helpful privileges, in view of the fact that it is too late to consider amendments of any kind, I hope that the authorities will get together, in order that confusion will be reduced to a minimum, and that the men of the armed forces, no matter where they may be, will be allowed to vote for all the officers for whom they would be allowed to vote if they were home in their own voting precincts.

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

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am, of course, in complete agreement with the Senator regarding his feeling that this new system may invite serious confusion. I discussed that matter at considerable length during the debate. I sought to clarify the situation, but there seemed to be no successful formula. It appears to me, I will say to the Senator from New York—and I think the Senator from Rhode Island will agree to the statement—that it finally comes down to this: If the secretaries of state in the various States will fully exercise the option which is given them under the proposed law, they can make sure that the ballot which the soldier receives, no matter what application he files, is a total ballot, covering everything. I think the situation in the final analysis is up to the secretary of state in the respective States. The law gives him the option, it is up to him, and, as explained to me by the able Senator from Rhode Island during the debate, the only reason why that could not be made a mandate of the pending statute is that the Congress cannot take constitutional jurisdiction over State offices, and could not order the secretaries of state to do this complete job.

The statute will permit the secretaries of state to amplify the ballot so that it will include not only the Federal officers, but all the State officers. It is up to the secretaries of state. I wish to add, however, that I am still afraid that the soldier in the field will find a substantial confusion in this dual invitation which

he receives to cast his ballot, and if there is any possible way to make it emphatically plain to him that he can use but one of the methods, and why he should use one or the other, I agree with the able Senator from New York that every possible effort to that end should be made, because I think that otherwise, in States such as New York and Michigan, which have adequate absentee voters' laws, the privilege proposed will not be an asset but a liability.

Mr. MEAD. I am obliged to the able Senator from Michigan for his noteworthy contribution, and I was attempting to say a moment ago that if the secretaries of state and the War Ballot Commission will get together in States where State laws covering this question are already enacted, and if they will simplify the procedure insofar as they are able to do so, the maximum number of votes will be cast.

I wish to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I know that he considered our requests, and that he discussed the matter in the conference. I realize the obstacles in his pathway, like the interference of the Federal authority with the proper authority of the State. We have no other course than to accept the proposed legislation as it is before us. Amendments are out of order. It is a worthy objective. We will make the best of it. I hope that the secretaries of state and the War Ballot Commission will heed the good advice given to them by the able Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], if he will permit me to do so. The description of those who are the beneficiaries under the poll-tax amendment is a little different in language from that in some other sections of the bill, in that in the poll-tax amendment the auxiliary services are not specifically mentioned, as they are in the other provisions of the bill. I am sure it was the intention of the committee and of the chairman that the beneficial provisions of the poll-tax section should be alike available to the members of the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the Women's Navy Reserve, and the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, although they are not specifically mentioned in the poll-tax provision.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, to answer the question I will say that of course I do not know what was the intention of the Senator who submitted the amendment; but it seems to me that the intention of the Senate in adopting the amendment, and the phraseology of the two clauses would lead one to the conclusion that the term "military service" in the amendment included all the different services enumerated in the first clause, for the reason that in the first clause it is provided:

In time of war, notwithstanding any provision of State law relating to the registration of qualified voters, every individual absent

from the place of his residence and serving in the land or naval forces of the United States—

Then it goes on—

including the members of the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the Women's Navy Reserve, and the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps—

And so forth. That shows that the principal phrase was "serving in the land or naval forces of the United States," and the other language simply in amplification to show what was meant by that phrase. So when the next section refers to persons in the military service, I think it must mean persons serving in the land or naval forces of the United States, and the conclusion would be that all those forces enumerated would be included in the phrase "in military service."

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long. I realize that extended debate on the bill would be of no avail. I appreciate the fact that under all the circumstances there could not, as a practical matter, be very extended debate on the bill. The Senate shortly will have to consider legislation dealing with the matter of inflation and the dangers it presents at this hour. It is necessary that the Senate very shortly consider the long overdue tax bill. Only this morning the Senate Committee on Military Affairs considered an important piece of legislation affecting our Army and our war effort. It will very quickly have to be considered by the Senate. In fact there could be no time at this critical period for extended debate or discussion of the bill now before us.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has made a very able speech against the bill in which he presented the constitutional argument against the bill. I do not wish to reiterate what the Senator from Texas has said. I do wish to join with and associate myself with him in the argument he has made.

The Senator from Texas stood squarely on section 2 of article I of the Constitution. I see no way to escape from that section. I see no way to find any other ground on which to stand. The language of that section is clear. It is definite. It is unequivocal. It provides that—

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

There is no equivocation about that language. There are no "buts" or "ifs" to that language. There are no conditions precedent or conditions subsequent in that language. It is so clear that any 10-year old child reading it can know and would know exactly what its meaning is. There is nothing in the language that in any way says that the qualifications shall be those requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature unless the Congress shall prescribe otherwise or unless someone else shall make some other prescription as to the qualifications. The language is clear; the language is specific.

It has been in the Constitution from the very beginning. It cannot be changed, Mr. President, by an act of Congress.

Mr. President, the representatives of the people who wrote the Constitution, wrote that language into the Constitution. They failed to delegate any power to the Federal Government, or to the Congress as a branch of the Federal Government, in any way to prescribe or modify or fix the qualifications. They left it to the States to fix the qualifications for the electors both voting for Federal officials and State officials.

Mr. President, the only way that that provision of the Constitution could be changed would be for a constitutional amendment to be adopted; for the people who have the power, and who did not see fit to delegate the power to the Congress or to the Federal Government, to come along and through an amendment to the Constitution change this section, and delegate such power to the Congress or to the Federal Government. But until there is an amendment to the Constitution, no power rests in the Congress or in any other branch of the Federal Government to prescribe the qualifications for electors.

This fact was clearly and specifically recognized when the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted; because in section 2 of that amendment there is a provision recognizing that the States may deny the right to vote to certain of its citizens, and providing a penalty on the State or States if such right should be denied. If the Congress has the power to fix the qualifications and to prescribe them, why was it provided in section 2 of the fourteenth amendment that if a State denied or abridged the right to vote, a penalty should be imposed upon it?

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator is a trifle inaccurate, I believe, in that the section to which he refers does not penalize for any abridgement, but for abridgement except for certain excepted provisions.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct as to that.

Mr. GILLETTE. I did not want the statement of the Senator to be left in the RECORD without that correction.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that. The Senator is absolutely correct. Of course, the penalty is provided as the Senator has stated.

Mr. GILLETTE. Exactly.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Texas called attention to the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution, the women's suffrage amendment. If the Congress could have fixed the qualifications, certainly so far as the election of Federal officials was concerned there was no need for the amendment. All Congress had to do was to pass a law which would provide that no person should be denied the right to vote on account of sex. It would not have been necessary to have had the nineteenth amendment.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does not the very fact that the Federal Government says that no person shall be denied the right to vote on account of sex imply that the right to vote can be denied on some other ground?

Mr. HILL. Of course; as the Senator has said, the very fact that the Constitution says that a person cannot be denied the right to vote on account of sex, shows the full power to be in the hands of the several States except as expressly limited by the Constitution. In 1913, when the seventeenth amendment, providing for the direct election of Senators, was adopted, the people—because the people write the Constitution; it is their Constitution—realizing that for 125 years our system of government had worked well with the power to prescribe the qualifications resting in the States, reaffirmed that power and specifically provided that the qualifications of electors in electing United States Senators should be just what the qualifications of electors had been for the past 125 years, to wit, the qualifications laid down by the States themselves.

Mr. President, the views which the Senator from Texas has expressed, views in which I concur and which I have sought briefly to state, were well stated by the Supreme Court in the Breedlove case in 1937. Language could not be clearer or more definite than this—I quote from the Supreme Court:

The privilege of voting is not derived from the United States but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth amendment (right to vote regardless of race, color, or previous servitude) or the nineteenth amendment (woman's suffrage) and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems proper.

Let me repeat the last words:

May condition suffrage.

Let me call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the use of the word "condition" by the Supreme Court. The Senator from Texas will recall that our able colleague the Senator from Florida sought to make a fine distinction between "qualification" and "condition." Here we find the Supreme Court of the United States using the very word "condition," showing that the Court makes no distinction between what the Senator from Florida sought to call a condition precedent and a qualification.

The decision of the Court in the Breedlove case, in 1937, found confirmation when the Supreme Court, in 1941, about a year ago, sustained that decision by denying a writ of certiorari in the Pirtle case.

Mr. President, under the clear language of the Constitution and under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, I cannot escape by any processes of the imagination the very fixed conclusion that the bill is unconstitutional. It is clearly unconstitutional, Congress having no power whatever to legislate and prescribe the qualifications or the condition, to use the words of the Supreme Court, for the electors.

The bill would take from the various States of the Union a right which those States have exercised for 150 years—the

right to prescribe the qualifications for electors. It is a clear and specific invasion of that right, an abridgment of that right of the States, and an abridgment for which there is no constitutional authority.

Mr. President, to show how dangerous is this proposed legislation we need only to look at the history of the legislation itself. When the bill was first introduced and when it first passed the House of Representatives, it was a bill merely to set up machinery to provide that soldiers who met the qualifications of their respective States might vote. That was all the bill did. But it opened the door. It opened the door for having Congress go into the matter of prescribing the qualifications of electors. The bill was not permitted to remain in the form in which it passed the House of Representatives. The Senate went further; it went into the question of prescribing qualifications when it adopted the amendment to strike down the poll-tax requirement as a qualification. It went further by putting in a provision making the bill apply to primaries as well as to elections. As it passed the House of Representatives, the bill contained no reference at all to primaries. The Senate went further by making the bill apply to all soldiers, wherever they might be, although the War Department says that such a thing is impractical, that it is not possible under existing conditions to provide for soldiers to vote who are scattered to the four ends of the earth, and that to enact this provision into law may seriously impair or impede our war effort, and may endanger the very lives of the soldiers whom the bill is supposed to benefit.

Mr. President, on August 29 the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, wrote a letter to the Senate and the House of Representatives in opposition to the bill. He began his letter by saying:

I am compelled respectfully to direct the attention of Congress . . . to grave questions.

Grave questions! Would it be possible to use a more challenging word, one which carries more import, or one more calculated to arrest attention and to prevent action, than the word "grave"?

I am compelled respectfully to direct the attention of the Congress . . . to grave questions involving the matter of pending legislation to provide absentee voting by members of the armed forces of the United States serving outside the continental limits. I have particular reference to H. R. 7416, "a bill to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence and serving within the continental United States," now pending in the House of Representatives. This bill was passed by the House of Representatives on July 23, 1942, and by the Senate, with amendments, on August 25, 1942.

At the outset and with a view to making sure that the War Department's general position on this question be not misunderstood, I desire to reiterate that which has been stated in reports to committee of the Congress on such legislative proposals, viz: "The War Department desires that it be clearly understood that it offers no objection to the principle of men in the armed forces voting in any election in which they are eligible to vote. The Department desires, insofar as it is possible, to give such assistance and en-

couragement as it can to the exercise of voting rights to men in the Army, but such assistance and encouragement should not be permitted to impede military functions in any way or to result in divulging secret information."

It is the considered opinion of the War Department that H. R. 7416, as passed by the Senate and as previously passed by the House of Representatives, would impede military functions and might result in divulging secret information.

The War Department is opposed to the authorization of voting by members of the armed forces serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska. It is a matter of public information that we do not have available at this time sufficient transportation facilities to carry our forces, weapons, munitions, foods, medicines, and other essential supplies overseas. Continuous intensive study is being given to this problem, and as one result there was inaugurated some time ago a new postal facility known as V-mail service. On June 15, 1942, microfilming of V-mail was initiated for a limited number of destinations and gradual extensions will be made as additional facilities become available. The bulk and weight of microfilmed mail is only about 2 percent that of ordinary mail. This is cited to show what far-reaching steps are being taken to reduce overseas shipments.

Mr. President, the Secretary of War shows how critical is the situation with respect to transportation, how strained we are, how limited we are in our facilities, and what a tremendous burden will be placed upon those facilities by the bill now under discussion. Are we to believe that the men at Bataan were more interested in receiving ballots than they were in receiving guns, munitions, food, medicine, and supplies which they did not have, and the lack of which led to their defeat?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have been following the Senator's discussion with a great deal of interest. Is the Senator opposed to giving soldiers the right to vote?

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that 44 out of 48 States have made provision for their soldiers to vote. My State of Alabama has made the provision for her soldiers to vote. I favor giving the right to vote to every soldier who is qualified in the State of which he is a resident. However, I shall not make a gesture with respect to giving soldiers the right to vote when to do so would involve doing something which would be unconstitutional as well as a violation of the rights of my State and of every other State. The Secretary of War states that passage of the bill in its amended form may well impede our war effort, divulge important military information, and even endanger the lives of men whom the bill under consideration would affect.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator agree with the Secretary of War in the statement which he has made?

Mr. HILL. I have no disposition not to be absolutely candid with the Senator from New Hampshire, but I have had no such opportunity to study the situation as I am sure the Secretary of War has had. The Secretary of War has in-

formation which I do not have, and which I do not think any Senator has or can have, because it is secret and confidential information, concerning existing transportation facilities. The Secretary has information with respect to the burden now placed upon those facilities, and the necessity of the War Department resorting to the so-called V-mail, or the microfilm procedure which has reduced the bulk and weight of the mail 98 percent. He knows just what the need is, and he does not hesitate to state that he believes that the bill would place a tremendous burden on the transportation facilities.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from New Hampshire spoke with respect to giving to the soldiers the right to vote, and suggested that it should be granted to all of them. Does not the bill now under discussion in effect discriminate against the ones in distant lands? They will not have the privilege of voting.

Mr. HILL. That is practically what the Secretary of War says.

Mr. CONNALLY. The soldier who is stationed in this country will have an opportunity to vote and the one who is in a distant land will not have the opportunity.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from New Hampshire asked the Senator from Alabama if he was not in favor of giving the soldiers the right to vote. It is impossible to give something which one does not have. If a panhandler on the street asks me for a quarter and I feel in my pocket and ascertain that I do not have a quarter, I cannot give it to him. We have not the power to give every soldier the right to vote.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Texas is absolutely correct. In his statement he puts his hand on the heart of the whole situation. The Congress has only that power which has been delegated to it under the Constitution. Congress cannot give something which it does not have.

Mr. BRIDGES. The argument which the Senator was using concerning the burden placed upon our transportation facilities would not apply in the present case, would it? I understood the Senator to quote from the letter of the Secretary of War, who stated that the bill would put a great burden on the transportation facilities of the country in carrying mail to and from soldiers. If the bill were limited to soldiers and sailors within the continental United States there would not be any great burden placed upon our shipping system, would there?

Mr. HILL. If the operation of the bill were limited to the United States I think the objection of the Secretary of War based on transportation facilities would be met. Unquestionably there would be no such burden if the bill were limited to the continental United States, as it was when it passed the House.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. Let me read one short paragraph from the letter of the Secretary of War because it bears on the question raised by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The shipment of the supplies of applications for ballots (postal cards), the return to the various secretaries of states of the executed applications, thence the carrying of the blank ballots and instructions to the voters, and the return of the executed ballots from the several theaters of operations overseas, would present a tremendous problem. This is particularly true of this year's fall elections because of the short time now remaining.

I call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the following language because it clearly indicates what the Senator has said will come to pass. The man overseas will not have an opportunity to vote.

The Secretary continues as follows:

Indeed, the time is now so short that there is a grave question that the various operations essential to carrying out the provisions of the bill could be completed so that the executed ballots would be in the hands of election officials of the various districts or precincts or counties of the voters' residences by the time the polls are closed.

A further, but less tangible, objection involves that of national security. Rigid censorship is imposed upon mail coming from our overseas forces. The War Department would not feel justified in waiving such restrictions in the interest of the secret ballot, nor would it recommend to the Congress that such waiver be directed by statute. Further, there would be the possibility of secret information being disclosed to the enemy as to the location and strength of our forces.

The question of providing a means for members of the military forces to vote in time of war is an old one. Under date of April 17, 1918, the then Acting Secretary of War, Hon. Benedict Crowell, wrote the Secretary of the Navy as follows:

"After a most careful consideration of this entire matter, the War Department is of the opinion that it is neither advisable nor desirable to allow soldiers in the theater of war to vote. Their votes cannot be taken without seriously interfering with the military efficiency of our fighting forces."

Do we wish seriously to interfere with the military efficiency of our fighting forces?

An effort was made to permit some of the men in France to vote in the fall of 1917 and it was then and there proven, at least to the satisfaction of the military authorities, that such an effort seriously interfered with military efficiency. The job at this time even if time permitted, with our forces being so widespread, literally to the four corners of the earth, would be impossible to perform without jeopardizing military operations.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if he believes that it would seriously interfere with the morale and efficiency of our fighting men to give them the right to vote?

Mr. HILL. The War Department does not speak of morale but it strongly feels that to carry out the provisions of the bill with all the necessary machinery for same would seriously interfere with military efficiency and military operations.

I believe the War Department has a better insight and a better picture of the situation than has any other agency or individual. The Senator from New Hampshire is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, and he well knows that the War Department is in possession of the best information with respect to the situation. Neither I nor any other Member of Congress has such facts, because they involve confidential, secret military information.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator's statement is merely an assumption, because the Department has never put such procedure into practice. It is based on what the Secretary has said.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; it is not. I invite the Senator's attention to these words:

An effort was made to permit some of the men in France to vote in the fall of 1917, and it was then and there proven, at least to the satisfaction of the military authorities, that such an effort seriously interfered with military efficiency.

That is a proved case. It is not speculation. It is not hypothesis. It is an example. In a test case some of the men were permitted to vote, and the conclusion was reached, as the Secretary of War has said, that it proved to be a serious interference with military efficiency.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator probably cannot answer, but I should like to have an answer to the question, How can giving a man the right to vote interfere with his efficiency as a fighting man?

Mr. HILL. These men are scattered in fox holes in the far ends of the earth, and the situation surrounding them and the conditions to be overcome are such as to involve interference with military efficiency. It is not a question of merely giving the right to vote, even if the Congress had power to give the right to vote.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator does not object to giving the men in this country the right to vote, but just those who are outside the United States. Is that his view?

Mr. HILL. As a Member of the Senate, I cannot give anybody the right to vote, because I do not think the Senate and the other House of Congress have any power to give anybody the right to vote. I favor letting all men vote who in their respective States are qualified to vote; I favor, as I have said, giving all soldiers the right to vote who in their respective States are qualified to vote. As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, 44 out of the 48 States have made provision enabling men who are qualified in those States to vote.

Mr. BRIDGES. All the arguments that we have been discussing here for the past few minutes, which the Senator has brought up and which he has obtained from the Secretary of War, according to his latest statement, are wholly beside the point.

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. BRIDGES. No matter what the situation may be, he does not believe that Congress has the power to give these men the right to vote.

Mr. HILL. I think there are two propositions involved. In the first place, under the Constitution, the Congress has no

power to give these men the right to vote. Then, we also are confronted with the practical proposition, raised by the letter of the Secretary of War, that, in the opinion of the War Department, as illustrated in 1917, to try to set up and operate the machinery necessary to enable the men overseas to vote, would seriously affect military efficiency.

Mr. BRIDGES. That must have been in some isolated case of a single State or a few States, and not under a Federal statute.

Mr. HILL. So far as interference with military efficiency is concerned, it would not make any difference whether the privilege was exercised under the machinery of a State statute or of an attempted Federal statute.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. I merely wanted to ask the Senator two questions. Does the Senator know of any time in the history of the United States when the Congress has attempted by congressional enactment to withdraw the authority conferred on the States by section 2 of article I?

Mr. HILL. I certainly do not, but, on the contrary, wherever Congress has submitted an amendment to the Constitution that in any way affected section 2 of the Congress, in the very act of submitting the constitutional amendment, has confirmed and reaffirmed section 2 of article I of the Constitution.

Mr. GILLETTE. That answers the second query I intended to propound. On three occasions when the Nation has attempted to restrict that authority of the States which was conferred by the Constitution, to wit, in the fourteenth, and the fifteenth, and the nineteenth amendments, Congress has in every case done so by proposing an amendment to the Constitution, as amendments are provided for by that document.

Mr. HILL. Exactly; and if they had thought that Congress had the power to fix the qualifications it would not have been necessary for the Congress to submit the amendments; it would not have been necessary to have gone through the long and somewhat tortuous and certainly slow process of amending the Constitution.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Texas has said, of course, anyone could make an appealing speech about letting the soldiers vote. As I have said, in 44 of the 48 States the machinery is already set up and provided, and is in existence today to enable soldiers to vote.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HERRING. Does the Senator know that in many of the States, under the provisions of the State law, ballots cannot be distributed until the 1st of October and, in some cases, until the 10th of October, so that there would be little chance to get the ballots to soldiers who are absent?

Mr. HILL. I should say that there will be just about as much time to get the ballots under the State laws as un-

der the pending bill. All the different steps which would have to be taken under the bill would require time, so that there certainly would be no saving of time as compared to State action.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HERRING. Under this bill a card would have to be mailed to a soldier; his return card would be sent to the secretary of state, and back would go his ballot.

Mr. HILL. Exactly.

Mr. HERRING. And under the State law he must write the secretary of state and get an application for an absentee-voter ballot. Communications would have to go back and forth three or four times, and that would consume time.

Mr. HILL. Under this bill there has got to be sent to the soldier a postal card. If he is in Australia or in the Solomon Islands it would be necessary to send the post card all the way to Australia or the Solomon Islands; the soldier would have to fill out the postal card and send it all the way back to the secretary of state of his State; then the secretary of state would have to send to the soldier, all the way back to the Solomon Islands or Australia, a ballot, and that ballot would have to be returned to the election officials. Let me say to the Senator that, according to my information, the average oceangoing vessel can make only two or three round trips to Australia in a whole year's time.

Mr. HERRING. Perhaps the Senator has no relative across the water, as some of the others of us have, and I will say to him that I hear from my boy every 7 days.

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to hear the Senator say so. Of course, whether any of us have any relatives or have not any relatives across the seas is not germane to the question involved; but I can say that I have some relatives who are serving outside the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I realize that there is much truth in what the Senator from Alabama says as to the impossibility of carrying out the provisions of this proposed law if we pass it today, and it is a sad commentary, it seems to me, if it is true. I should like to ask him if he thinks it comes with good grace for those who are opposed to this legislation and who have delayed it for weeks and are now further delaying it at the very end of the legislative process to complain that if we pass the bill it will be too late and will not do any good?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that I am not conscious of the fact that there has been any undue delay about the pending legislation.

Mr. NORRIS. The delay, as I understand, has come about because of those who are opposed to the legislation.

Mr. HILL. So far as today is concerned, we have been discussing the conference report for hardly 2 hours, and I can assure the Senator, if he is growing

weary and restless, that I shall shortly conclude.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want the Senator to get that idea.

Mr. HILL. As I recall, the Senator showed some—what shall I say?—ennui when the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was delivering his address.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not mean that anything I said should be so construed, and I had no such idea.

Mr. HILL. I know the Senator from Texas and I are the only two Senators on our side who will have anything to say on the pending question, and the fact is that if the Senator from Nebraska had not interrupted me I would be in my seat now, because I was at the very close of what I intended to say.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, perhaps, I am to blame for some of the delay so far as this discussion is concerned.

Mr. HILL. Since the Senator raised the question of delay, I am afraid that he has contributed to it, because I had only about one or two more sentences to utter, and then I was going to take my seat.

Mr. NORRIS. I had not supposed that I would be charged with delaying the measure. I can say that, in my opinion, if it were not for the peculiar parliamentary situation we would not have this question before us. The Senate adopted amendments to the bill passed by the House. The House could have agreed to the amendments adopted by the Senate, but the House did not do that, as I understand, because those who were opposed to the proposed legislation prevented that course being followed. If it had been followed, we would not be debating the question now. I am not complaining; I know Members of the House had a right to proceed as they did. I am not finding fault with them that the bill was sent to conference. Now the House conferees have agreed to all the Senate amendments. So the effect will be when we shall have adopted the conference report just the same as though the House had originally agreed to the Senate amendments.

Mr. HILL. Of course the Senator realizes that he and I are not responsible for the action of the House of Representatives, but the Senator knows—for he had a distinguished career in the House, and I had the honor of serving there—that if there is any body in the world a majority of which can work its will at all times without delay it is the House of Representatives.

Mr. NORRIS. I suppose that is true. That is true in the Senate, in a general way—

Mr. HILL. No, I would not say that is true in the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. But it takes a long time to do it. It took a long time in the House to pass on this matter.

Mr. HILL. I would not say that is true in the Senate. The Senator knows that with our unlimited debate, with no previous question, or anything of that kind, matters can be delayed in the Senate. So far as the House is concerned, as the Senator well knows, under the rules of the House of Representa-

tives the majority can at all times work its will without delay.

Mr. NORRIS. In the House and in the Senate also there must be a quorum. As I understand, when this bill went back to the House, advantage was taken of the technicality that there was not a quorum in the city, and it was delayed for quite a long time.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator should say they took the technical position that a quorum was not present. The vote in the House yesterday showed that more than a quorum voted for the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. But it took some time to get it, and that time would not have been consumed, and it was not taken, by the friends of the proposed legislation. It was taken by those who were opposed to it. So, if the bill is being passed too late, so that it will be impossible of enforcement by the Secretary of War and other officials, practically all the delay, and the impossibility of enforcing the law, will have come about by the action of those opposed to the legislation.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator recognizes that those who oppose the proposal, although he may not agree with them, feel that there is a very fundamental question involved in this proposed legislation.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not complaining about that.

Mr. HILL. A very great constitutional question is involved in the proposal. I think those who feel that a great constitutional question is involved, that a fundamental proposition is involved, one opening a door which, if carried through to its logical conclusion, might even end in the dissolution of our dual system, and the obliteration of State sovereignty could not be criticized because they demanded that a quorum be present to vote on a bill of this supreme and far-reaching importance.

In conclusion, I desire to protest as vigorously as I can against the enactment of this bill. I think it is most unfortunate that a measure with such an unconstitutional provision, with its invasion of the rights of the States, should be brought in at this time. The enactment of the bill will, in my opinion, be resented by many loyal, devoted, patriotic citizens. At this grave hour in the history of our country the compulsion of the hour dictates that we do all those things which will make for unity and a united effort on the part of our people, and that we do nothing at all which will cause people to resent action on the part of the Federal Government, to resent what they feel to be a violation of the Constitution, and an intrusion on the rights of the States, and an intrusion on their own rights. To invite resentment is to invite division among our people and to undermine our war effort.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, Senators have stated that they were anxious to bring up other matters, and I have urged them to desist for a short time in order that we may proceed to vote on the question now before the Senate. After all, the only question before the Senate is whether it will adopt the conference report, which the House has already

agreed to. The conferees on the part of the Senate were successful in obeying their instructions—namely, that they insist on the Senate amendments. The House agreed to all the Senate amendments, so that all the questions which have been discussed here today are beside the point. The only point before the Senate is whether it will agree to accept the conference report, and I trust we may have a vote on it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Hayden	Rosier
Bridges	Herring	Shipstead
Brown	Hill	Smathers
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Langer	Tobey
Caraway	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	McNary	Van Nuys
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
George	Norris	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Sixty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

PRICE CONTROL AND INFLATION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, it will be necessary for me to go to the Finance Committee in a few minutes. I desire to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and I may introduce a bill on the subject of price control and inflation during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand the able Senator from Michigan to say that he desires unanimous consent jointly with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] to introduce a bill during the adjournment of the Senate?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; that is my request.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask the Senator on what day he thinks the bill will be ready for introduction?

Mr. BROWN. I think we can have it ready by Saturday. I will say that any Senator who wants a copy of it—and several have spoken to me about it—will receive one as soon as it is introduced.

Mr. McNARY. Will it be printed by Monday next?

Mr. BROWN. I think it can be; yes.

Mr. McNARY. Is it the desire and intention of the Senator from Michigan that the bill shall be referred?

Mr. BROWN. I shall ask its reference to the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. McNARY. At the time the bill is introduced?

Mr. BROWN. We had hoped—and I may say to the Senator from Oregon that we have already made tentative arrangements to that effect—to hear representatives of the administration on Monday, and farm representatives on Tuesday. I have already talked with Mr. O'Neal and other representatives of farm groups who want to be heard, and that date is satisfactory to them. Then I thought we would perhaps hear from other interested parties on Wednesday, and we hope to have the bill reported some time late next week. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I make this request because I realize if the bill is to be acted on at an early date, that it is necessary to have it considered before the tax bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I grant that, and I think the request is a reasonable one. However, I stated a few days ago that I should want to consider the purposes of the bill before I would consent to it being referred to any particular committee. I may ask the Senator from Michigan who probably will be in charge of the bill, if it will refer generally to price controls affecting raw materials produced on the farm and wage controls?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. So far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, that is his thought on the subject.

Mr. McNARY. So that it will embrace all the factors involved in the cost of production and the cost of living?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, under that statement, and in view of the experience which the able Senator from Michigan has had in handling so ably the previous price-control bill, I have no objection to the Senator's request. In fact, I think the bill ought to go to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is a rather unusual procedure to ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, but, if it is permissible under the rule, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan then expand his request to include waiver of the first and second reading of the bill and its reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. BROWN. I do, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF HOUSE BILL 7416—ABSENTEE VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 83, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 7416) to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from their place of residence and serving within

the continental United States, is authorized and directed—

(1) In section 4 (a), to strike out "2" and insert in lieu thereof "3";

(2) In section 6 (b), to strike out "4" and insert in lieu thereof "5";

(3) In section 7, to strike out "2" and insert in lieu thereof "3";

(4) In the title, to strike out "and serving within the continental United States".

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I simply wish to explain that one of the amendments made the change in numbers necessary in some of the sections. The change in the title was made necessary by the adoption of the amendment because it struck out references to the continental United States. The changes contained in the concurrent resolution are purely formal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign House bill 7416 during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMARKS AGAINST CRITICISM OF SENATOR GREEN AND REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY IN THE PROVIDENCE (R. I.) JOURNAL

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, a few days ago I came across an editorial in the Providence (R. I.) Journal. My interest in this editorial was aroused by its caustic comments on the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and Mr. JOHN E. FOGARTY, a House Member from that State. Both of these Members of Congress were the subject of vigorous criticism.

The editor laid down the dictum that "criticism is the essence of our freedoms," and then proceeded to apply this theory by criticizing the Senator from Rhode Island for being a strong pro-administration man, and Representative FOGARTY for a somewhat opposite viewpoint. The Senator from Rhode Island is denounced for being a "yes man," and Representative FOGARTY for being a "no man."

The Providence Journal is apparently strongly Republican, and such an editorial makes plain why its editor finds justification for this peculiar form of criticism. Being any kind of a Democrat deeply offends him. Many newspapers have lost their ability to mold public opinion by such a bitterly partisan attitude which finds nothing commendable in the viewpoints of men in the opposite party.

The editor very logically suggests that the people will want to know to what end criticism is being directed and what point of view motivates it. His editorial on the Senator from Rhode Island and Representative FOGARTY provides a complete answer. I imagine that the people of Rhode Island will have little trouble discerning exactly what "point of view" motivates this biting editorial observation of the Journal.

When an editor asks the voters to defeat a public servant because of his defense of certain views which the editor regards as bad and then calls upon the same voters to defeat another man for holding a contrary view, he thereby demonstrates why the public frequently ignores editorial advice.

The voters have learned to look behind the spirit of partisan rancor which creeps into so many editorial observations. They have come to know what motivates the editorial "point of view" of many newspapers.

JAPANESE ON THE PACIFIC COAST

Mr. President, there is one other matter to which I should like to refer, which may be a matter of more immediate concern to the people of the Pacific coast than to people of the east coast. It has to do with the viewpoint of a well-known citizen of my State and of the Pacific coast. His name is Miller Freeman. At one time Mr. Freeman was the Republican national committeeman from my State. He publishes seven journals devoted to business life on the coast. The Miller Freeman publications are as follows:

Pacific Fisherman, founded 1903: Devoted to the commercial fisheries of the Pacific. Leading fisheries journal of the world, and a recognized authority.

Pacific Motor Boat, founded 1908: Devoted to motor boat activities of the Pacific coast.

West Coast Lumberman, founded 1900: Devoted to the timber industries of the West. Largest and most successful journal of its kind in the world.

Pacific Pulp and Paper Industry: Devoted to the important pulp and paper activities of the Pacific slope, including Western Canada.

The Log: Devoted to the maritime interests of the Pacific. Founded 1920, catering particularly to the personnel, including masters, mates, pilots, and engineers. Largest circulation of any marine journal published in the Pacific area, with world-wide distribution.

Mining World: Champion of the mining and metallurgical industries of the West.

Western Canner and Packer, founded 1908: Devoted to the food processing and packing industries of the West.

Mr. President, this will give some idea of Mr. Freeman's interest, which is purely at present, and has been for many years past, in the business world. Mr. Freeman has for many years interested himself in the Japanese question. As far back as 34 years ago he was publicizing the Japanese question and writing editorials on the subject, and I should like to quote two or three paragraphs from an editorial he wrote back in 1908:

It is high time that the people of the Pacific coast cease their futile pursuit of that will-o'-the-wisp, the Japanese trade, which selfish interests have held dangling before their eyes, and realize to what goal this blind commercialism is leading them. It is time they began to appreciate that, even were the dream of a big Japanese commerce to come true, some other things are just as much worth while.

It would be a low order of patriotism indeed that seeks for a hollow trade supremacy at the cost of social welfare, perhaps at the cost of ultimate strife, and of all the basic principles which are the foundation of American home supremacy, of domestic integrity, and of national pride. And it is an even lower order of patriotism that will inflict

these dangers and this deception upon an altogether too unconscious people, merely for the gratification of personal and corporate ambitions.

He winds up the editorial with this paragraph:

If we follow the false doctrines preached by pro-Japanese press, we will soon be making Japan a present of the Pacific coast in order to preserve our friendly relations and build up a large American-Japanese commerce for Nippon steamships to handle.

That expression of 34 years ago is typical of the viewpoint of Miller Freeman. Whether one agree with his economic or political views, or any other views he may cherish, one can only be constrained to regard him a prophet. He was pointing out those many years ago that we might pay a tragic price for our commercial relations with Japan.

Mr. President, those of us who have lived among the Japanese know that they are a very cold and hard and purposeful people. They do not deceive anyone who is realistic in his contemplation of the problem presented by this whole business of Japanese trade.

We know now to our sorrow what it meant to arm Japan by sending to her millions of tons of scrap iron and munitions of war at a time when we were professing friendship for poor China.

We are also learning, Mr. President, I may say parenthetically, that our altogether pleasant pre-war relations with Germany, represented by recently uncovered connections of big American business organizations, have come back to us, and will come back to us, in the form of blood and tears and ashes in our mouths, although some publications in this country are stoutly defending these business relations with the Hitler machine and the cartel crowd as though they were utterly sacrosanct. They say, on the one hand, that we cannot do business with Hitler, and in the next breath decry the fact that some of us are trying to show up these business relations which have been carried on, relations which, as I view them, have been distinctly to our national disadvantage, since they meant a close relationship that vitally affected our military preparations.

Without attempting to evaluate Mr. Freeman's views, because they speak for themselves, it may be said, whether one agrees with his party philosophy or not, that he is a very able and patriotic man. He has written an editorial which will appear or already has appeared in his Pacific coast publications. It deals with the Japanese question. Because it is an interesting and forceful editorial, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I am sure that all those who are vitally interested in the Japanese question will find it to their advantage to read it.

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

The problem arising from the presence in the Western United States of some 300,000 persons of Japanese ancestry has been temporarily controlled, but it has not been solved.

This population is, and will continue to be, a growing, threatening, incubus upon the

United States—unless the riddle which arises from it is accorded energetic and courageous attention.

The writer for many years challenged Japanese immigration and infiltration into the United States as jeopardizing the safety of this country. For this he has been pilloried by some, scoffed at by others—until Pearl Harbor silenced such critics in shame.

Before the Tolan Congressional Committee Investigating National Defense Migration the writer on March 2, 1942, uttered a statement which sought to enunciate certain considered principles touching the Japanese population, its position in this country, and America's attitude toward its people of Japanese ancestry.

The Tolan committee statement has been accorded no small measure of attention. Perhaps significantly, its opening sentence squares precisely with the control currently being exercised over Japanese in Pacific coastal areas. The sentence was: "It is my recommendation that all Japanese, both alien and American-born, be evacuated from the Pacific Coast States, and other defense areas, and kept in the interior under strict control for the duration of the war."

This present writing seeks to extend the statement made before the Tolan committee.

It enunciates a doctrine which the Miller Freeman Publications will espouse and support. It raises a standard to which we invite adherence in patriotism and tolerance.

By our blindness in the past we have brought upon ourselves and future generations the problem of the presence in this country of a prolific, insoluble Oriental race, already numbering some 300,000 persons.

For the safety of these people, and ourselves as well, we must recognize this problem, and seek its solution. We have currently controlled it; but the future will bring it back again, intensified by the bitter memories of war and perfidy.

Let no one cry "persecution." There is no taint of persecution in our doctrine. Rather it is conceived in tolerance, but in realistic recognition of the dangers and brutality of racial hatreds, and of the perils inherent in a national ambition which litters its history with the tattered shreds of its honor and its most solemn obligations.

We are not here considering our future relations with Japan and its people. Japan has taken the sword, and Japan must perish by the sword. To that end America fights in unity and with inflexible purpose.

We are concerned here with America's problem of the Japanese within her gates—most of them, by our own will, American citizens.

As a result of the strange vagaries of American law, the Japanese who are American citizens enjoy that status merely by the accident of birth.

They were born American citizens because they were born here. We have given them full rights with any American, and have exacted no obligation of them.

They did not ask to be Americans. They took no obligation to be Americans. They have not even fore sworn the dual citizenship which Japan maintains for them.

Some American-born Japanese are loyal to America, but among their ranks are many who are not. Unfortunately, the loyal share the onus which treason and espionage and treachery have brought to all of them.

When the war is won, must the Japanese come back from the inland areas to bitterness, suspicion, and hatred won for them by traitorous elements among them and the failure of the loyal to prove their loyalty?

Solution must be found for this problem—and it should be sought most assiduously by those Japanese who are loyal Americans, aided by all who tolerantly and intelligently seek the welfare of the United States and future peace on and along the Pacific.

It is not enough for Japanese-Americans to buy bonds and prate of loyalty. Words spoken and oaths sworn by Japanese tongues will bear little weight with the American people so long as Pearl Harbor reverberates in American memories.

The stain must be wiped out by actions.

Let Japanese who would enjoy American citizenship denounce the Japanese program for the enslavement of east Asia.

Let there be an end to Japanese-language schools dedicated to the training of American citizens in allegiance to Japan.

Let the loyal drive out those who bring shame upon them by traitorous activities.

Let every Japanese repudiate the doctrine of the divinity of the Emperor of Japan and denounce him as the dishonored foe of civilized mankind.

Let us on our part seek the means by which to prevent persons of alien heart from winning American citizenship based on birth alone and without assumption of those duties and obligations which that citizenship imposes.

This is not persecution—for persecution offers no solution to the problem.

Neither is the cry "persecution" an answer to the call to thoughtful, tolerant recognition and consideration of the problem.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Lindley R. Durkee, of Washington, to be Work Projects administrator for Washington, effective as of September 1, 1942, vice George R. Stuntz.

From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Charles H. March, of Minnesota, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1942 (reappointment).

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

Sundry officers for appointment and promotion in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Interstate Commerce the nomination of Charles H. March, of Minnesota, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1942. This is a reappointment. I ask that the nomination be placed on the calendar.

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

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

COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc, with the exception of the nomination of Fred J. Blumer, to be postmaster at Monroe, Wis. The Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE and Mr. WILEY] have requested that that nomination go over until Monday. At their request, I ask that the nomination go over.

Mr. McNARY. I was going to make the same request, Mr. President. Both Senators from Wisconsin have asked that the nomination go over until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc, with the exception of the nomination of Fred J. Blumer, to be postmaster at Monroe, Wis., which will go over until Monday.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Inasmuch as the nomination of Charles H. March, of Minnesota, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner is a reappointment, I ask that that nomination also be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles H. March, of Minnesota, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

CONTROL OF UTILITY RATES AND COMMODITY PRICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is worth our while to call

the attention of the country and of the Senate to what I believe to be an important and material necessity in connection with the control-of-prices program upon which the Government has engaged. We passed the price-control bill and set up a Price Administrator and gave him certain powers. In my humble opinion, he cannot successfully cope with the thousands of dilemmas and predicaments which present themselves to him, and he cannot have any effect upon the control of prices unless he is given control of all prices, including all that affect our cost of living.

In the act creating the Office of Price Administrator we specifically excluded from his control all regulation of public-utility rates, such as telephone, gas, water, and electric rates, streetcar fares, and so forth. It was natural that such an exclusion should be made because the regulation of all such rates is provided for and controlled by various boards and commissions. Yet I fear that the handicap which that exclusion has placed upon the Price Administrator may have a disastrous effect upon his attempt to prevent runaway prices and a consequent increase in the cost of living, with resultant inflation, which all of us want to prevent.

I had a short correspondence with the Price Administrator; and I think I can best illustrate it by reading my letter to him and his reply.

On August 11 I wrote the Price Administrator as follows:

MY DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I have given some study to the various attempts of the utility companies—gas, telephone, and electric—to increase rates and to make application in the various States to the proper commissions for such increases.

These attempts have increased recently, and I understand several States in the Middle West have allowed these increases. In other States applications have been made and are now pending. My recollection is that you participated in some of the hearings on such a petition, and late in June a release was given by your office in which the public was informed that you had asked to intervene where an application for an increase of electric rates was pending before the Maine Public Utilities Commission at Bangor.

I am of the opinion that these attempts to increase rates have been influenced to some extent at least by the general belief that the pending bill in Congress would increase the taxes on these utility companies. In the Maine case your petition of intervention alleged that if these rates were increased over the country indiscriminately the result would be that your work in stabilizing prices would be greatly interfered with, and that the result would be the "hoarding, manipulation, speculation, and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions and scarcities caused by or contributing to the national emergency."

You alleged that such increases made because of the increased Federal taxes "would be contrary to the intention of the Congress, inflationary in character, and adversely affect the program and policies of the Office of Price Administration to stabilize prices."

I am interested in this subject because I believe that a general increase in utility rates, where it is not clearly shown that such an increase is necessary in the public interest, would not only be inflationary but would affect the program and policies of your organization and would make it practically impossible for you to stabilize prices.

The purpose of this letter is to ascertain, if possible, to what extent applications for such increases are coming in from over the country generally, and, if they are coming in, what you are doing about the matter, and what you are able to do to prevent such increases.

It seems to me this subject is very important at this time because of the pending tax bill before the Finance Committee of the Senate. It is very possible that some legislation on this subject should be included in this proposal before it is enacted into law.

Your early reply will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

G. W. NORRIS.

On August 19 Mr. Henderson answered that letter as follows, his letter being directed to me:

I was greatly interested in your letter of August 11 on the problem of utility rates and the program of this office and the National Government to stabilize commodity prices and the cost of living. The problem has been given special attention by this Office in recent weeks and I shall be happy to supply you with information about our activities in that field and "to aid you in ascertaining to what extent applications for such increase are coming in from over the country generally and, if they are coming in, what we are doing about the matter, and what we are able to do to prevent such increases."

As you know, the Emergency Price Control Act exempts utilities and common-carrier rates and we are without power to fix such rates and charges. Nevertheless, we have deemed it necessary to participate in rate-regulatory proceedings in our effort, not altogether unsuccessful thus far, to prevent increases in conflict with our basic program.

Let me refer briefly to some of the specific cases and problems we have recently encountered in this field. In April our attention was called to the 15-percent increase in telephone rates made by the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. in the State of Iowa. This increase, termed a surcharge by the company, was imposed on nearly all exchange and intra-State toll service. No regulatory agency whose permission must be first obtained for such rate increase in Iowa is provided for by the laws of that State. After obtaining the technical assistance of the Federal Communications Commission, we called the company in conference and requested it to withdraw this increase as it appeared that the higher rates were imposed in large part to effect estimated higher Federal income taxes. The company agreed to this request and subsequently withdrew a request for a rate increase of about the same character pending before the North Dakota commission, although it had earlier obtained the approval of the South Dakota commission for a similar increase in rates.

We are attempting to keep a close watch over other telephone rate increase applications in various parts of the country. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has furnished us with a list of all such applications which have been made by its associated companies. I am glad to say that there are now relatively few such applications pending.

A somewhat more difficult problem with respect to telephone rates is presented in connection with the rates charged by the independent telephone companies because of their large number. We recently met with the executive committee of the United States Independent Telephone Association and explained our program to them. To the extent of our ability, we propose to scrutinize their requests for increases and participate in as many cases as possible.

Because of your lifelong effort to protect the public in their relations with the electric light and power industry, you may be es-

pecially interested in our work in the electric rate field. It is true, as you suggest, we filed a petition for intervention in the Bangor Hydro-Electric rate case before the Maine Public Utility Commission. There, too, it appeared that the increase requested was because of projected higher Federal income taxes. Moreover, we were advised by certain paper companies, customers of the electric company, that if the power rate increase was approved, they would seek to have our maximum prices on paper and pulp increased. While conferences were pending with respect to the date of hearing, the company withdrew its application for an increase.

Mr. President, that illustrates how the control of public utility rates has a direct bearing on the cost of living and, therefore, on the question of inflation.

The rates we pay for water, gas, telephone, and for electric light and power are all directly and properly chargeable to the cost of living. They relate to the necessities of life. In the aggregate, spread over the country, they amount to many hundreds of millions of dollars. Yet, Mr. Henderson has no power to fix such rates. I am not complaining that he does not have the power. Later I shall ask permission to introduce a bill which I believe will cover the situation. All public-utility rates are regulated by commissions somewhere, either State or National. The Maine case illustrates how Mr. Henderson, while he had no right to reject the application made by the utility for a higher rate, did want to appear and show the Commission that if it allowed the increase requested the prices he had fixed in Maine would all be knocked into a cocked hat. While he could not fix a rate for electricity, if the Commission, which had the power to do so, should increase the rate it would put out of joint every ceiling he had made for commodities in Maine. He was informed, as he states in his letter, that the pulp company bought a great deal of electricity, and that if the rates which it had to pay for electricity in the manufacture of wood pulp for newspapers should be increased, it would have to charge more for its product, which would start an endless chain and result in inflation and ruin.

I continue with the letter:

At the request of the Rural Electrification Administration, we participated in conferences with respect to a proposed increase in rates for electric energy sold by an electric company to a rural cooperative. Subsequently the company withdrew its request for higher rates.

In this instance a rural electric cooperative, supplying its customers with electricity, bought its current at wholesale from a private company. The private company notified the cooperative that it would have to increase the rates. If that were done, it would probably follow that an increase of rates would take place among all the members of the cooperative organization. Hence the cost of living would climb and the danger of inflation would stare us in the face.

Mr. Henderson continues:

Among other power rate cases now receiving our attention is the Niagara Falls Power Co. case before the New York Public Service

Commission. In another, the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. is seeking increases before the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission applicable to its commercial and industrial customers. We will probably seek to intervene in this case also.

At first blush one might think that Mr. Henderson should keep out, because the statute creating his office specifically states that he shall not have the power to fix utility rates. Yet he has proceeded on the theory that, even though he lacks the power, it is his duty, as he wishes to prevent inflation and to preserve the cost of living at a reasonable rate, to appear before various commissions and protest against increases in rates, because such increases would put out of joint every price which he has fixed.

Mr. Henderson says further:

Our survey of pending electric rate cases does not now indicate a large number of applications for rate increases. However, there is now an upward trend in the number of requests for rate increases before the State commissions which seems to be due primarily to efforts to shift war taxes upon the utilities to their consumers.

The gas-rate problem appears to be more troublesome at this time. Among the cities where increases have recently been made or now pending are Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Minneapolis, and Washington, D. C.

I call attention to Washington because I understand that yesterday certain action was taken, to which I shall refer when I finish reading this letter, and that the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia will meet tomorrow to give further consideration to the subject.

I continue with the reading of the letter:

We are now or will oppose most of these increases, particularly because they adversely affect the cost of living of practically the entire population of those cities.

The relationship of taxes to utility rates is extremely important in devising and administering a proper program to control prices and the cost of living. In peacetime the principle that a utility is entitled to a fair return after allowance of all Federal income tax has been generally accepted. As an essential war measure, however, we propose to oppose the application of this principle to any request which would contemplate an increase in rates predicated upon the allowance of anything over and above the normal Federal income tax. Higher rates predicated upon increased Federal taxes would obviously be contrary to the intention of Congress, be inflationary in character, and adversely affect our program to prevent further increases in the cost of living.

In our work in this field we have sought to cooperate with the existing regulatory agencies. Both the Federal Power and the Communications Commissions have gladly made available the advice and help of their technical experts.

I am glad to state that our right to intervene and participate seems to be readily conceded in these cases before the Federal and State utility commissions. However, one commission, that in the State of Illinois, has not yet acted upon our request for intervention. This is a proceeding involving street-car fares in the city of Chicago. Of course we have no desire to interfere with the efforts of the State or Federal commissions under their respective statutes to reduce rates whenever found necessary.

In seeking to cooperate with the existing regulatory agencies in the utility and railroad rate fields, we are proceeding in the belief that when Congress exempted these rates from our jurisdiction, it was implied that these Commissions would recognize that the dominant principle governing the fixing of all prices in wartime would be the Government's program to stabilize commodity prices and the cost of living and that the utility and railroad rate principles must be reexamined in the light of the Government's economic program, upon the success of which depends both the winning of the war and the peace. Their recognition of this obligation will be an important step in the success of the Government's program to prevent further increases in the cost of living.

Therefore, while I hope there will be no need for additional legislation in this field, serious consideration must be given to the practice in Canada where the consent of the price board, which administers an over-all program, as well as that of the existing regulatory authorities, is a prerequisite to utility rate increases. Certainly it should be understood without additional legislation that Federal income taxes shall be borne by those upon whom such taxes should be levied. A different policy would seriously impair, if not destroy, the basic efforts of the Government to stop inflation.

We appreciate very much your interest in this phase of our work. If we can furnish you with any additional data or information on it, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely,

LEON HENDERSON,
Administrator.

Mr. President, Mr. Henderson mentions one place where he made an effort to prevent increasing gas rates, namely, in the city of Washington. I think it would not be unfair to say that, figuratively speaking, when Mr. Henderson's representatives appeared before the Utilities Commission here they were politely shown the door. It is true Mr. Henderson has no authority to fix gas rates in the city of Washington, but, as I have said, his representatives were there for the purpose of trying to convince the Commission that an increase in gas rates in the city of Washington meant that all the prices which he had fixed, after investigation, expense, and time, would all be knocked into a cocked hat. As I read the reports in the newspapers, I do not think that the representatives of the Price Administrator were treated with very great respect.

Mr. President, Mr. Henderson stated in his letter that he did not think that additional legislation was necessary. If he encounters cases of the kind I have mentioned, however, as he is likely to do in many places, the law will have to be changed, it seems to me, because if we are going to control the cost of living, if we are going to prevent inflation—and I believe Congress is practically unanimous in the desire to prevent it—the Price Administrator must have jurisdiction over everything that goes into the cost of living. If he does not have such jurisdiction, no matter how earnest and honest or efficiently he may try to perform the duties of his office, he will meet with failure. I think what is going on right now in this city is an illustration. I do not think he ought to have authority or jurisdiction to control gas rates

specifically; but, at least, we ought to go as far as Canada has gone.

I have talked with several representative Canadians, and I understand from them that the Canadian law is working well. They said they did not see how conditions in Canada in this respect could be improved. In that country one commission has over-all jurisdiction and is given the right to say that no other commission anywhere in the Government shall increase commodity rates without its consent.

Mr. President, I have prepared a bill which I think will accomplish that result. It provides that no utility rate shall be raised without the consent of the Price Administrator. Such a provision seems to me to be essential. If we are going to prevent inflation by the control of prices—and no one questions that that is what we are trying to do—then the man or the commission that controls prices must have jurisdiction over every price that goes into the cost of living.

Everyone knows that what the ordinary householder pays for gas or electric lights or for water goes directly into the cost of living. It cannot go anywhere else; it must go and does go there. If such rates are increased, the cost of living goes up; and if the householder is a wage earner, he has a right to say, "My cost of living has gone up; the utility companies have increased the price of gas, of water, of electric light, of street-car fare, and I cannot live on my wages, which have been fixed." I think wages must be fixed before we can be successful in our attempt to prevent inflation; but in order that utility rates all over the country may not be increased, unless there can be a showing of absolute necessity made, somebody ought to have the right to prevent such increases, and I do not know who could better do that than the Price Administrator.

Mr. President, I have referred to the Utilities Commission in Washington, which tomorrow is going to take up the question whether or not they shall allow the gas company to increase the price of gas to practically every household in the great city of Washington. That action was not taken by unanimous vote of the Commission. The Commission consists of three men, and there was one member who through it all stood out against any such proceeding. Regardless, however, of motives—and it may be that they are moved by motives that are perfectly honorable and honest—everybody in the great struggle in which we are now engaged must sacrifice something; the poor and the rich, the millionaire and the pauper must all sacrifice in accordance with their ability to sacrifice, and it would, it seems to me, be inviting failure in our effort to prevent inflation if the Price Administrator had no power whatever over public-utility rates, which, as everyone knows, go into the cost of living.

It will be hard, perhaps, in a great many cases, although I think in some it will be easy, for public utilities to pay increased taxes, but they must take the money out of their stockholders' profits and not out of the consumer. I think a great many of them are so patriotic that they do not want to stand in the way

of preventing inflation, which Mr. Henderson is seeking to do. I believe that many of the applications for increased rates were withdrawn, as Mr. Henderson's letter indicates, because of the patriotism of the men and the corporations that had made the applications. The commissions before whom they have appeared have almost universally said, "While we can say that he does not have jurisdiction in this matter, yet our action has definite application to the question of inflation and has definite application to the prices which Mr. Henderson must fix, and the ceilings he must erect, if he is going to prevent inflation."

Therefore, it seems to me, that there ought to be a law which would give him that further jurisdiction, as a matter of prevention, and to guard against action by some utility commission that may not be imbued by the proper spirit or may be moved to allow increases in public utility rates; which, in the most part, have been made, I think beyond question, with the idea that Congress was about to pass a tax law which would increase the taxes on everybody, and the utilities were getting ready to pass the tax on to their consumers and thus have a direct effect upon the work of the Price Administrator and often bring it to naught.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to introduce the bill which I have mentioned which provides—

That rates charged by any common carrier or other public utility shall not be increased without the consent of the Price Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received. The Chair inquires to what committee the Senator desires the bill referred?

Mr. NORRIS. I think it should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The bill (S. 2767) to amend subsection (c) of section 302 of Public Law 421, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 26, second session, entitled "An act to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes," approved January 30, 1942, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, September 14, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 10, 1942:

SECRETARY OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Ernest K. Kai, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Charles M. Hite, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Charles Carlton, Infantry, with rank from April 19, 1942.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Second Lt. Myron Richard Bittikofer, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM SEPTEMBER 1, 1942

Lt. Col. Thomas Henry Rees, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Floyd Randall Waltz, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Henry Woodberry, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Harold Francis Loomis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Leland Harold Stanford, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named majors (temporary) to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

William A. Willis

Harold W. Bauer

The following-named majors (temporary) to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1942:

Charles H. Hayes

Richard C. Mangrum

The following-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 13th day of June 1942:

Sgt. George M. Warnke

Platoon Sgt. Ralph H. Guppy, Jr.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 13th day of June 1942:

Wesley R. Christie, a citizen of Georgia.

Richard H. Vestal, a citizen of Texas.

Robert H. Hammond, a citizen of California.

Paul H. Millichap, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of August 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 10, 1942:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Charles H. March to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1942.

COAST GUARD

PROMOTIONS

To be lieutenants, to rank from May 25, 1942

Harold L. Durgin Ronald M. Freeman

Joseph R. Davis Joseph A. Ciccolella

Thomas B. McKinstry Ralph S. Feola

Ellis S. Gordon Howard W. Schleiter

Myron W. Caskey Richard H. Fairman

Forrest A. Tinsler Clarence N. Daniel

Julian S. Loewus Harold D. Seilstad

Wayne L. Goff

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

To be hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant commanders

William M. Gibson

Ralph Leslie Pfau

To be hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant

William N. Martin

Harold J. Seaborg

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

George K. Brenner, Madison.

KENTUCKY

George W. Tye, Barbourville.

Susan R. Hill, Carrollton.

Herman A. House, London.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Gracious Lord, who art our life and salvation, give us grateful hearts that we may praise Thee for the glory and bounty of this world; for the seasons with their seedtime and harvest, for all the blessings and gladness of life, and for good will toward all men. We pray especially for all Thy children, for the destitute and homeless, and for those who bear burdens not their own; save them from the anguish of despair that they may not be broken down by doubt.

Heavenly Father, Thou has promised comfort, peace, and rest to those who believe in Thee; Thou hast said that the world is Thine and that the kingdoms of this world shall become Thy footstool; O God, forgive if we pray amiss. We look upon the valley, the mountain, and horizon and we see but the wandering star, and we pause; it tells us not of the morning. O sun of righteousness, come forth from thy hiding place that we may behold the new heaven and the new earth in which dwelleth the parliament of man.

This is my Father's world,
And to my listening ear,
All nature sings and around me rings
The music of the spheres;

This is my Father's world,
Why should my heart be sad?
The Lord is King; let the heavens ring;
God reigns, let the earth be glad.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the completion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a short editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address delivered by me in New York.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the New York Post of September 9.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address entitled "Food for Freedom," by Douglas H. Oswald, of Marianna, Fla., winner in the State and Southeastern F. F. A. public-speaking contest.

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

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have something new to bring to the attention of the House today; that is the Treasury statement of September 4 showing at what speed we are running into the red, going in debt at the greatest speed this Nation has ever known in that respect. I have called this matter to the attention of the House time after time after time and asked the question, "Where are you going to get the money?"

On September 4 the amount we have gone into the red since July 1 has been \$9,777,000,000. This is at the rate of over \$150,000,000 a day or over \$100,000 a minute. It is with such speed we are going in the red that ought to make the minds and hearts and thoughts of every Member of Congress whirl. It should

make you dizzy to think about it. I will tell you how to stop it in a measure.

Now we are trying to sell bonds to the people. They will have to buy these bonds if we are to survive. But I say to the Congress here and now that we have a lot of things in the Government that we ought to do away with. We ought to stop extravagances, plug up the holes of waste, and cut out a lot of unnecessary spending that is now going on. That is the point I want to make: Stop this unnecessary spending. Stop a lot of New Deal agencies; close them up, and do it at once. I could name a dozen that ought to be put out of business, closed up, and the employees put at other jobs—jobs that will take that many people off of the pay roll of Uncle Sam and place them on the pay roll of industry and farms.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein two short newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 months, since Congress passed the Servicemen's Dependents Act and adopted amendments to the Selective Service Act, some commendable progress has been made toward eliminating injustices in the draft system.

There still are some inequities and considerable confusion which should receive immediate attention if our whole war effort is to proceed most effectively and discrimination is to be eliminated.

I pointed out to this House more than 8 weeks ago that there was a serious lack of uniformity in the administration of the Selective Service Act. Since that time numerous Members have received complaints, and there has been widespread criticism that policies followed by State directors and local boards were contradictory and inconsistent. National headquarters has not seen fit to correct this situation, although Brigadier General Hershey has attempted to focus attention on the new classifications set up by Congress in the recent amendments to the draft law.

At the present time, despite the instructions which General Hershey issued last week, married men in some areas still are being called for induction, while large numbers of single men in other areas have not been summoned. Indeed, as General Hershey's own press release suggests, some boards have not found out yet how many single men they have in their lists.

There is serious confusion concerning the deferment of men in essential industries, with the result that neither employers nor employees can tell how long such men will be allowed to remain at their jobs. We are clamoring for increased production of all sorts of war supplies, yet the shipyards and aircraft plants and other factories turning out these vital items are losing trained workers rapidly.

Failure of the War Manpower Commission and selective-service headquarters to lay down some clear-cut regulations which all local boards would be required to observe has had the effect of causing many essential men to enlist or seek commissions because they believed they soon would be reclassified into I-A and called for induction.

A fundamental weakness in the whole draft system is the failure of Federal authorities to distribute quotas on a national basis.

I am advised that quotas are allocated to the individual States in accordance with the ratio between the national registration and the total State registration. There was no attempt to assign the largest quotas to the States with the largest number of single men. No consideration seems to have been given the fact that some States like California have a large number of war industries whose workers are essential to the war effort and should be placed in class II.

In the States the same procedure has been followed in most instances, although I understand that in recent weeks efforts have been made to pool the I-A men. General Hershey's memorandum last week, calling on all State directors to pool the I-A men, admits that the new instructions will not be completely effective for another 60 days because calls for inductees are sent out that far in advance.

The result is that boards with large numbers of married men and men who are essential to industry still are being required to furnish more inductees than they should. War industries are being handicapped and families still are being broken up, while in some sections there are substantial numbers of eligible single men still available.

In this connection the latest issue of the United States News points out that the decentralization of the selective-service machine results in "a highly uneven working of the draft system that Congress may want to correct by a change in the law." This magazine, which has followed developments in the draft very closely, also states that "General Hershey prefers not to exercise the degree of control that he could exercise."

The time has come for Congress to act. We should act promptly and positively. A draft system which was designed for peacetime—when we thought that men were to be called into service only for 1 year's training—is not the best way to obtain men for warfare. We cannot continue to disrupt our industries and undermine internal morale by tolerating such a system. The immediate need is for uniform policies, regulations, and interpretations. We should end discrimination and confusion by setting up a na-

tional draft system. I trust the Military Affairs Committee will lose no more time in looking into these phases of the problem and that in the meantime the Federal authorities responsible for mobilizing our manpower for both industrial and military purposes will take further steps to correct the inequities and reduce the confusion.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GRANT of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PRICE CONTROL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, in response to the President's demand on this Congress for immediate action to forestall further inflationary trends, I have introduced a bill which unquestionably will achieve that purpose.

The necessity for legislation of this kind is no surprise to me. The President's demand for legislation is likewise no surprise to me. The surprising thing is that so much time has been lost, time which well might have been used advantageously to curb the inflationary movements already advanced to a dangerous point.

More than a year ago, when Price Administrator Henderson appeared before the Appropriations Committee, I asked him point blank whether an effective price-control program could be put into operation without controlling all factors entering into prices. His answer left no room for doubt, when he replied that a rigid price control was impossible without complete control of all the elements of cost. And yet, despite this unequivocal statement, nothing effective has been done with one factor, nor is there a certainty at this time when it will be done.

Congress should act on both fronts simultaneously. Why should we surrender on the one line and make an aggressive attack on the other? Farm prices and wage rates are tied together. Both of them are factors which, if uncontrolled, will be instrumental in blowing up the inflationary balloon. If we are to do a successful job in dealing with inflation, it cannot be a piecemeal, tinkering effort. The President has set a dead line for action on one front, but as to the other continued uncertainty prevails.

The President would permit the Congress to provide a solution for the one problem but holds to himself the right to settle the other. Is this suggestion compatible with our understanding of democratic processes?

I believe it is high time that political values of all and every kind be dispensed with, and that our national need and our national peril be the sole motivating factors. The American people are demanding action on both fronts at one and the same time, and that time is now.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to read the following telegram from Dr. J. B. Price, of Monticello, Ark., on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], who is absent on account of illness:

MONTICELLO, ARK., September 7, 1942.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, United States House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.:

This will advise that Congressman W. F. NORRELL is now sick and has been for the past 2 weeks. I am his attending physician and certify that he will not be able to return to the Capitol before about the 1st of October 1942.

J. B. PRICE, M. D.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—OUR RUBBER SITUATION (H. DOC. NO. 836)

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 Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith send to you, for your information, the digest and report of the Special Inquiry Committee which I appointed on August 6 to study our rubber situation and to recommend action.

The committee consists of B. M. Baruch, chairman; Dr. J. B. Conant, president of Harvard University; Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and a staff of experts.

The introduction to the report tells the story in outline; the report proper gives the details in full.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 10, 1942.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the record should disclose some testimony in connection with the message of the President to the Congress and the country which will throw light on the action taken by Congress in dealing with the control of prices and other factors in the realm of inflation.

One has a right to presume that when a Cabinet member and an important Administrator in the executive branch

testifies before a committee of Congress in connection with pending legislation, that they speak for the administration and represent the views of the President.

If this is a correct assumption, then let me direct your attention to the testimony taken when the price control bill was pending before the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

On page 2072 of the printed hearings you will find this testimony from the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, which was presented to the committee on Tuesday, October 21, 1941:

Farmers have been accused of greediness, of not being content with parity. Let me say here and now that accusations of that sort are in my opinion unjustified and unfair. The farm price ceiling provision of this bill is certainly no basis for that conclusion. There is a perfectly practical and obvious reason for stipulating that no ceiling should be imposed on farm products at less than 110 percent of parity rather than exactly at parity. * * * The real purpose of restricting ceilings to a point somewhat above parity is to make it reasonably sure that all farmers will have an opportunity to get parity. After all it happens to be the expressed policy of Congress and the administration to achieve and maintain farm prices at parity.

There you have an expression of the administration viewpoint as presented by a member of the Cabinet on October 21, which is about 11 months ago.

Consider now the testimony of Mr. Leon Henderson, Price Administrator, which appeared on page 649 of the printed hearings on the price control bill and which was presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency on Friday, August 15, 1941. Mr. KEAN, of New Jersey, asked this question:

Mr. Henderson, do you favor the 110 percent parity provision provided for in this bill?

To this inquiry Mr. Henderson replied as follows:

There is a standard needed in any determination of price fixing where Congress already has established a standard. And if I interpret that provision correctly, the 110 percent is a workable standard for price administration * * * and the 10 percent above parity is a good working standard. For that reason I am in favor of it.

Here then is the testimony of two key-men in the administration with reference to the control of price on agricultural commodities and it is to be presumed that they were expressing the administration viewpoint only 11 months ago.

I am for any proposal that is fair and I adduce this testimony to show that the Congress is not at fault in providing legislation to deal with this problem.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, recently my friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] delivered a speech in the House, under special order, in regard to the rubber situation. In that speech he was extremely critical of

the able and efficient and distinguished Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones. If one should read that speech which was made last week, he would have the impression that Mr. Jones premeditatedly and deliberately refused to give information to a committee of the House of Representatives. This is not the case, and for the information of the gentleman from New Jersey, I will state to him why Mr. Jones declined.

As the gentleman knows, a group of Representatives from certain of the Northeastern States formed themselves into an unofficial committee to investigate the gasoline and oil situation. Apparently, not having enough to keep them busy on gasoline and oil, they took on the rubber situation too and formed a so-called subcommittee from the so-called committee of the House of Representatives to go into the rubber question. Everyone should know that neither the so-called committee nor the so-called subcommittee was a committee of the House of Representatives, and was nothing more or less than what might be called a rump committee.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARTLEY. I want to say to my distinguished friend, for whom I have a very high regard, that the committee of which I am a member and to which the gentleman is now alluding, was appointed, unofficially, it is true, by the majority and minority leaders of the House. We asked to be appointed not alone to go into the question of gas and oil but synthetic rubber as well, and it was the full committee and not a subcommittee that requested Mr. Jones and Mr. Crossland to appear. I would like furthermore to call to the gentleman's attention the fact that previously Mr. Crossland did recognize us and did appear. I may state further—

Mr. BULWINKLE. Just wait a minute. If the gentleman wants to make a speech he should make it in his own time and the gentleman should let me answer one thing at a time. The gentleman says it is an unofficial committee. The gentleman is correct in that statement and that is not denied. Now, what else? Because, forsooth, the majority leader and the minority leader, as well as members of the delegation from the northeastern States joined with you, that does not make it an official committee of the House of Representatives.

Some days ago the Secretary of Commerce telephoned me and asked about a committee of the House of Representatives that had written to Mr. Crossland, Vice President of the Rubber Reserve Company, requesting him to appear before the committee at such time as he might deem best, naming 3 days of the following week, and sent him a list of questions for Mr. Crossland or someone else to answer. Mr. Jones said this was called to his attention and that this was the reason he spoke to me over the telephone asking me if it was necessary. I said, "What committee are you talking about?" He said, "Why, I have a letter

here from the special committee of the House to investigate the fuel oil, gasoline, and rubber situation."

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes; I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think that in view of the muddled condition of gasoline rationing and rubber rationing, we ought to have had a committee of the House a long time ago appointed with authority so that the men referred to here could come before them and clear up the terrible situation in which we find ourselves?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Ask me a question and do not make a speech. I will answer the gentlemen. If the gentleman had been as good a Member of the Congress as he thinks he is he would have read some of these hearings and would have seen how many times these gentlemen had appeared before House committees.

Mr. RICH. That does not answer the question. The question is this. Does not the gentleman think that with the muddled condition of the rubber and gasoline interests we ought to have a committee of the House?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does the gentleman know that the Baruch committee was in action?

Mr. RICH. You know what the Baruch report is and we will know what is in it tomorrow and not before then.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the gentleman is a member of the rump committee I can understand full well why he is getting so agitated.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. In just a minute. Let me finish this statement first.

I said, "There is no such committee of the House." I further stated that I understood that the various delegations from certain States in the Northeast have formed themselves into a strictly unofficial committee to investigate the gasoline and rubber situation but that it was not necessary for Mr. Crossland or anyone else to appear unless they wanted to. I said, "Do you want to appear?" He said, "I do not for three reasons. The first is that the answers to some of the questions would be against the military policy of the United States Government at the present time. In the second place, the President of the United States has appointed a committee known as the Baruch committee to investigate the rubber situation and to make a report, and it would be far better if the Rubber Reserve Company, or any other agency of the Government, did not undertake to give out information until this Baruch committee had reported on it." Then, in the third place, the questions were of such a nature that it would require quite a number of men working on the answers to them, but that the first two objectives largely controlled his desire not to appear. I said, "You do not have to—it is up to you. If you want to appear at any time before any of these groups calling themselves a committee, you can do it, but that rests with you." He stated that he had made it a rule to appear as

much as possible whenever requested by the committees of the House and Senate on any matter on which they sought information.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am including in this speech the letter from this so-called subcommittee to Mr. Crossland, giving all the questions asked by the so-called committee. These questions speak for themselves. I could take them up one by one, and I believe that every fair-minded man in the House would agree that the Secretary of Commerce was right in not answering them.

There are four pages of questions. I do not have time to read them, but I want every Member of the House to read them in tomorrow's RECORD.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I have hastily examined the committee report by Mr. Baruch. It is a very full and comprehensive report. I believe it will cover all the information that is desired by these questions asked by this committee.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I doubt that.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes; gladly.

Mr. HARTLEY. I want to call the gentleman's attention and the attention of the House to the fact that in contrast with the attitude assumed by Secretary Jones, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, appeared before our committee this morning and complimented us on our work and said he found that the hearings were most enlightening and helpful to him.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I would tell the gentleman that if the Secretary of the Interior had called on me and asked me, I would have told him that he did not have to appear unless he wanted to, because this practice of constantly taking men from their work, taking them here regardless of the time they have for anything else, by an unofficial committee of the House of Representatives, and then coming in here with the view of having that made into a public document, is not according to correct parliamentary procedure.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. In just a minute. I will give you plenty of time when I get through.

Mr. RICH. I would like to ask a question right here.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I said I declined to yield at the present time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 21, 1942.

Mr. STANLEY T. CROSSLAND,
Vice President, Rubber Reserve
Company, 811 Vermont Avenue,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CROSSLAND: The Special House Committee to Investigate the Fuel Oil, Gasoline, and Rubber Situation, of which I have the honor of being chairman, will resume hearings on Wednesday of next week, and I am requesting your appearance before said committee on Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday of next week. Will you kindly let me know as soon as possible which of these 3

days will be most convenient for you to appear?

I also request that you prepare in advance and have with you for the information of the committee the following data:

1. A statement, in tabular form, showing:

(a) The names of all companies with which Rubber Reserve Company has made contracts for the production of butadiene, styrene, polymerization plants, butyl, and/or other methods for producing ingredients for and/or synthetic rubber.

(b) Date of such contracts.

(c) The capacity, in short tons, of the specified product for each company's plant.

(e) The amount of steel plate, other steel, copper, bronze, and brass, and compressor capacity in horsepower, required for the construction of such plant. These figures should be upon a comparable basis and should cover the entire plant, including auxiliaries and utilities as well as battery limits.

(f) The state of construction progress as of August 20, 1942 (i. e., whether the plants are still on the drawing board, whether the ground has been broken, or whether construction has actually been started, and if so, has progressed to what percentage of completion).

(g) The anticipated completion date for such plants.

Where Rubber Reserve Company has made a contract with a company for the production of butadiene, using a petroleum product as a feed stock, or base, and where such company is not a petroleum company, then this information should be supplemented by giving the names of all petroleum companies having any interest in such Government contracts, showing the extent of the interest of each.

I would like to have copies of this tabulation not later than Tuesday, August 25, for the committee members to study.

2. A sample copy of the contracts made by Rubber Reserve with companies designated in the above tabulation. If the contracts made with these companies are not uniform, then a sample copy of the contract made with a majority of these companies should be presented and should be accompanied by a statement noting the details in which other contracts that have been made differ from it.

3. A sample copy of the contracts made by Rubber Reserve Company for the purchase and/or sale of butadiene, styrene, synthetic rubber, or other product produced in the plants enumerated in the tabulation requested in No. 1 above. If these contracts are not uniform, then a sample of the contract made with a majority of the sellers, purchasers of the products of these plants, to be accompanied by a statement showing how other contracts that have been made differ from the sample.

4. A tabulation of prices which Rubber Reserve Company has agreed to pay producers for butadiene, styrene, butyl, or other product for which it has made contracts to purchase in connection with the synthetic-rubber program. If these price figures vary, then the statement should contain a brief explanation covering the variations.

5. A copy of any contracts negotiated by Rubber Reserve Company requiring the pooling of patents, the fixing of patent royalties, and providing for exchange of technical or patent information.

6. A statement, in comparative tabular form, showing the total amount of critical material per ton of butadiene in each of the plants that Rubber Reserve Company has contracted for that will produce butadiene from petroleum products or alcohol. This figure should be all-inclusive, covering the entire plant, including auxiliaries and utilities as well as battery limits.

7. A statement listing all persons employed by or loaned to Rubber Reserve Company with a technical background in petroleum, alcohol, or rubber industries, and/or all per-

sons who are chemists or engineers by profession employed or loaned to Rubber Reserve Company who have worked upon any phase of the current synthetic-rubber program, including those who have advised with or given recommendations to Rubber Reserve Company in relation thereto. This statement should show the date on which such person's association with Rubber Reserve Company commenced and date on which such association was terminated, if it has been terminated.

8. A list of all persons serving on petroleum industry technical committee or committees who have advised or consulted with Rubber Reserve officials in regard to the current synthetic-rubber program from its inception to the present. This statement should indicate the companies which primarily employ such persons.

9. A statement, in tabular form, showing the contemplated production of synthetic rubber by any of the processes or methods for which Rubber Reserve Company has made contracts, broken down into 6-month periods, starting with July 1, 1942, and continuing to July 1, 1945, inclusive.

10. A copy of Memorandum of Meetings Held by Netches Butane Products Co., with particular reference to the meeting of June 23, 1942, with Mr. Madigan, and also a copy of Mr. Henderson's letter of June 29, 1942, accompanying this memorandum, referred to in the letter of E. J. Henry, of Atlantic Refining Co., to Netches Butane Products Co., under date of July 6, 1942.

11. A copy of any reply made by Netches Butane Products Co. to E. J. Henry, of Atlantic Refining Co., to his letter of July 6, 1942, which appears at pages 924-925 of the printed hearings of the Gillette committee.

12. Copy of any reply to the letter of J. A. Brown, of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., under date of June 25, 1942, addressed to the Honorable Jesse Jones and Mr. H. J. Klossner, President, Rubber Reserve Company, and all subsequent correspondence between Mr. Jones and/or Mr. Klossner and Mr. J. A. Brown growing out of this letter of June 25, 1942.

13. Copy of the letter of Netches Butane Products Co. to Rubber Reserve Company under date of June 18, 1942, and reply to that letter, and any subsequent correspondence growing out of that letter.

14. A statement and/or data showing the extent of the investigation made by Rubber Reserve Company into the 45,000 ton butadiene plant of Phillips Petroleum Co. on which was based the decision to stop construction of this plant; also the extent of the investigation made on which the Rubber Reserve Company's decision was based to permit Phillips subsequently to proceed with the construction of this plant. This data should show any changes in prices, design, or critical material requirements, if any, made by Phillips to satisfy Rubber Reserve Company's requirements before the decision was made to permit resumption of construction.

15. A statement showing the original, and any subsequent modifications of the original estimates of cost and critical materials for the 100,000-ton butadiene plant of Rubber Synthetics, Inc.

16. A statement showing the extent of the investigation proceedings and the reasons for the decision to defer construction of the 100,000-ton butadiene plant of Rubber Synthetics, Inc.; also, the amount of money expended on this project up to the time of its deferment, showing what proportion, if any, can be recovered by the Government; also a statement showing the extent of liquidating damages, if any, for which the Government is liable as a result of the suspension of the construction of this plant; also any other commitments or obligations, if any, confronting the Government in connection with this project.

17. A statement showing the extent of the investigation made in respect of the ade-

quacy of raw materials for the production of butyl in connection with the contracts awarded for butyl or flexon by Rubber Reserve Company. Statement should show the investigations made prior to the awarding of contracts for the first 60,000 tons annual capacity of butyl, and also the investigation made preceding the decision to expand this program to 132,000 tons capacity annually, and should also show the reasons which actuated Rubber Reserve Company in expanding this program.

18. A copy of any other letters from Netches Butane Products Co., or from any of the five petroleum companies participating in the Netches Butane Products Co., to Rubber Reserve Company, discussing the availability of feed stocks for the Netches plant, and any replies or subsequent correspondence in relation thereto.

19. Copy of the telegram of June 26, 1942, to M. J. Madigan, from Arthur E. Pew, Jr., relative to an order forbidding the Netches Technical Committee to complete the investigation of the Houdry process, and any reply or correspondence subsequent thereto.

20. A statement, in tabular form, showing quantities of butylene required annually, commencing August 1, 1943, as feed stock for the proposed Netches Butane Products Co. 100,000-ton butadiene plant; Sinclair Rubber, Inc., 50,000-ton plant; Cities Service Refining Co., 50,000-ton plant; Rubber Synthetics, Inc., 100,000-ton plant; Shell Chemical Co., 30,000-ton plant; Humble Oil & Refining Co., 30,000-ton plant; Standard Oil Co. of Louisiana, 6,200-ton plant; also showing the available supply of butylene on an annual basis, commencing August 1, 1943, in the approximate neighborhood of these plants.

21. A statement, in tabular form, showing contemplated production capacity in short tons, per year, from plants in rubber reserve program of:

(a) butadiene, including both those plants using alcohol and petroleum products as feed stock;

(b) styrene; and

(c) copolymer synthetic rubber plants, as of October 1, 1942, December 1, 1942, and on the first day of each month during the year 1943.

22. The names of the technical advisers of Rubber Reserve Company who gave the opinion to H. J. Klossner, President of Rubber Reserve Company, that they did not feel justified in adopting the Houdry process around July 3, 1942, including copies of any written statements or opinions by these technical advisers to that effect.

23. A copy of the report made by Phillips Petroleum Co. to Rubber Reserve Company, giving the results of its investigation into the Houdry process, and all correspondence, if any, pertaining thereto.

24. A statement setting forth the investigation made by Rubber Reserve Company into the possibilities of alcohol as a feed stock for the production of butadiene, names of technicians making such investigation, and copies of any written opinions or recommendations made by them.

Sincerely yours,

WM. J. FITZGERALD,
Member of Congress.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I want to endorse what the gentleman from North Carolina has said with reference to the self-appointed, self-constituted committees that go out and make investigations under the guise of being official committees of the House. I think it is bad practice, and I think it has resulted in a great deal of confusion, not only with

reference to rubber but some other matters. Recently a constituent sent me an interview by some man who claimed to be the attorney for some committee investigating tin scrap or rubber or something. I found out that this man was simply a junk dealer who knew nothing about what he was talking about. I think the practice should be condemned.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. In just a minute. Let me proceed.

Thinking about this matter after the gentleman from New Jersey had spoken, I asked the Secretary of Commerce to give me the number of times that he or others in his Department or in the agencies of which he was chairman or director had appeared before committees in the Congress on the rubber situation. Imagine my surprise to find that already the so-called alleged special committee of the House had had three members of the Rubber Reserve Company to appear before them. Without going into details, I shall, Mr. Speaker, include in this speech the letter from the Secretary of Commerce to me, and there it will be brought to the attention of the House that Mr. Jones has appeared 18 times before the committees of the House on the rubber question. Others of his associates have also appeared, and I call to the attention of the House that the Secretary of Commerce emphatically states:

In addition, I wrote letters to each Member of Congress describing in detail participation by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation agencies in the war effort, including a full description of activities in connection with the procurement of rubber, on January 16, May 7, and September 15, 1941, and on March 21, 1942, copies of which are attached. My conception of the responsibility of an administrator of a Government agency includes the obligation to keep Congress fully advised as to all activities under his charge. I have followed this policy consistently.

These are the reports which I hold up here, but which I do not make a part of this speech, which every Member of Congress has had and which came to his office. I wish to call to the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey a paragraph in the letter from the Secretary to me which he might keep in mind:

Ever since the early part of 1933, when I became Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, I have reported to Congress, through the Banking and Currency Committees, both in the House and the Senate, every transaction that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made, and have discussed in detail the many phases of the work of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its various affiliated agencies. We are required by law to make periodic reports, but I have gone much further than the law requires in order that Congress might be kept fully posted as to everything that is being done by the agencies under my supervision. That policy has been continued to this day, and will be continued.

The entire letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, September 8, 1942.

Replying to your inquiry as to the number of times either I or members of our organization have appeared before congressional committees in connection with the rubber

situation, I wish to advise that I appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate on May 8, 1941, in connection with the proposed synthetic rubber program, and thereafter before that committee on January 27, 1942, May 8, 1942, and July 14 and July 15, 1942, to discuss the rubber situation in connection with various legislative proposals. I appeared in connection with rubber before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House on May 7, 1941, September 16, 1941, and on February 2 and February 5, 1942; before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate on December 10, 1941; before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House on January 7, 1942; before the Military Affairs Committee of the House on January 15, 1942; before a special committee of the House of which Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN was chairman on January 20, 1942; before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Use of Farm Products on May 21, 1942; before a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House on February 25, 1942, and May 27, 1942; before a subcommittee of the Special Committee of the Senate Investigating the National Defense Program on February 19, 1942, and before the committee itself on April 7, 1942. In all, 18 times.

Mr. Howard J. Klossner, President of the Rubber Reserve Company, appeared before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Use of Farm Products on April 28 and April 29, 1942.

Mr. Stanley T. Crossland, Vice President of Rubber Reserve Company, appeared before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Use of Farm Products on April 28 and April 29, 1942, May 21, 1942, July 14, July 15, and July 17, 1942, and before the special committee of the House of which Hon. WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD is chairman on July 29, 1942.

Mr. M. J. Madigan, Assistant to the President of Rubber Reserve Company, appeared before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Use of Farm Products on July 14 and July 15, 1942, and before the special committee of the House of which Hon. WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD is chairman on July 29, 1942.

Dr. E. R. Weidlein, technical consultant of Rubber Reserve Company, appeared before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Use of Farm Products on April 28 and April 29, 1942.

Mr. R. J. Dearborn, technical consultant of Rubber Reserve Company, appeared before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Use of Farm Products on July 15 and July 17, 1942; before the special committee of the House of which Hon. WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD is chairman on July 29, 1942; and before the Committee on Patents of the Senate on August 12, 1942.

In addition to the witnesses appearing at all of these hearings the time of a great many officials, lawyers, technicians, and other personnel was given to attendance at the hearings and in preparation of the data presented.

In addition I wrote letters to each Member of Congress describing in detail participation by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation agencies in the war effort, including a full description of activities in connection with the procurement of rubber, on January 16, May 7, and September 15, 1941, and on March 21, 1942, copies of which are attached.

My conception of the responsibility of an administrator of a Government agency includes the obligation to keep Congress fully advised as to all activities under his charge. I have followed this policy consistently.

A few days ago Mr. Crossland was asked to appear again before the informal committee of which Mr. FITZGERALD is chairman. I telephoned Chairman FITZGERALD and asked if Mr. Crossland's appearance could be deferred a few days, to which Mr. FITZGERALD very kindly agreed. Mr. Crossland was either out of the city at the time or was then

preparing to leave for the Gulf coast in connection with the synthetic-rubber program. He had already appeared before this committee on July 29, as I have mentioned.

A week ago Sunday I saw for the first time Chairman FITZGERALD's letter to Mr. Crossland of August 21, a photostatic copy of which I enclose. It will be noted that this letter in 24 questions asks for a great deal of specific information. Normally all of this information would be readily furnished, but, since we entered the war, publication of information that might be of value to the enemy has been restricted. Furthermore, it would require quite some time to accumulate the material necessary to answer the 24 questions and to sort out any part of it which might be of value to the enemy and which, according to Office of War Information should not be made public.

The statement of Mr. HARTLEY, a member of Mr. FITZGERALD's committee, that the officials in charge of the rubber program, from myself down, had determined to give Congress the "brush-off" is not true.

Some of the testimony referred to above was given in executive session and no record was made. However, nearly all of the testimony that has been given to the committees regarding rubber by Chairman Donald Nelson and other executives of the War Production Board, by myself and members of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Rubber Reserve Company is available in congressional committee records. Certainly every imaginable question about the synthetic rubber program has been asked by members of the various committees, and answered to the best ability of the witness.

Ever since the early part of 1933, when I became Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, I have reported to Congress, through the Banking and Currency Committees, both in the House and the Senate, every transaction that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made, and have discussed in detail the many phases of the work of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its various affiliated agencies. We are required by law to make periodic reports, but I have gone much further than the law requires in order that Congress might be kept fully posted as to everything that is being done by the agencies under my supervision. That policy has been continued to this day, and will be continued.

Very sincerely yours,

Secretary of Commerce.

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

Mr. Speaker, this is the situation that has developed. I believe in official committees of the House of Representatives investigating, if need be, any department or agency of the Government, but I do not concede that it is the duty of any Cabinet officer, administrator, or director of any agency to be constantly at the beck and call of any rump committee when they might want him to appear.

As far as I know, there is not a single person in authority in the administration who would refuse to give any information regarding their work or the departments unless it might at the present time interfere with the war effort or give aid and comfort to the enemy.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I wish to ask the gentleman from North Carolina this question: This morning we were called to the caucus room of the Old House Office Building by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] to discuss the question of

gasoline rationing. We were informed that there were three or four committees that had met for the purpose of discussing gasoline rationing and tire rationing. It was suggested that a committee be appointed this morning of nine Members, who were appointed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], to get in touch with the other members of the other committees that were appointed for the same purpose. Is it your contention that Members of the House should not call together other Members of Congress for the purpose of discussing these questions?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I say to the gentleman that we are in a war—a war of the worst kind. And I do not think any unofficial group of Members should attempt to assume the duties of a committee.

Mr. RICH. How did we get into that war?

Mr. BULWINKLE. How does the gentleman think? The gentleman from Pennsylvania on the floor here one day accused the administration for the attack on Pearl Harbor. Do you remember it?

Mr. RICH. And I do not apologize for it even now.

Mr. BULWINKLE. You do not apologize for it even now?

Mr. RICH. No.

Mr. BULWINKLE. You still say that the administration was the cause of the Pearl Harbor attack?

Mr. RICH. You are trying to defend the administration, and you are having a hard time. That is what you are doing down in the Well now, and you cannot do it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. You are still saying as a Member of Congress, on your own responsibility, that this administration was responsible for the attack by the Japanese upon the United States; are you?

Mr. RICH. I made that statement, and I do not apologize for it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is all I want to know.

Mr. RICH. Certainly.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is all I want to know.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. I was present with the group this morning, called by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. There was no intimation of the formation of a committee to conduct hearings at which Members or witnesses would be called, but it was a committee, as I understood it, to consider the problem and to approach the proper agencies of government to secure relief without any call for hearings.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is what I understood.

I believe that it is the duty of every Member of Congress to support the Government in the war effort and not to attempt to breed disunity between the people by unjust and unwarranted criticism. Some of the criticism that I have heard this summer, Mr. Speaker, of the Government, appears to me to be tinged with a political flavor. Too much of it, in fact. While I do not attribute these

motives to the gentleman from New Jersey, I would rather and do say that in excessive zeal he has made criticisms which are unjust and unwarranted of a great administrator of a department.

In conclusion, may I not say to you that I would have each and everyone forget politics, forget any bitterness that he might feel against someone in authority, and to remember that in waging this total war in which we are now engaged that it will take the united efforts of all in authority and the united efforts of all our people. There will be plenty of time in the future, after we have won this war, to engage in politics, make criticism, and investigations, but for the present it is our duty to help to cement this Nation so that the Axis Powers will know that they are fighting an aroused and united Nation.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield for the purpose of a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I ask if copies of the Baruch report are available? If not, I ask unanimous consent that the report be read. We on the east coast are from minute to minute awaiting information and awaiting the shipment of oil and gasoline to our area. On Monday of this week we had to have fires in our furnaces and boilers. It was cold in New England.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it impractical at this time to read that long report. It has already been given to the press and will appear in the papers this afternoon. In all probability printed copies of the report will be available tomorrow morning. The Chair has referred the report to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered it printed. The Chair thinks it would be a bad precedent to establish at this time to have such a long report read.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Many Members have asked, Mr. Speaker, to have the report read. Would it take very long?

The SPEAKER. It would probably take most of the afternoon. The Chair thinks it will be in print almost by the time it could be read.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In view of what the Speaker has stated I withdraw my request; but I must say that we are most earnestly waiting to hear something definite.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Would it be in order to ask to have the report printed in the Record?

The SPEAKER. The report is being printed as a public document. It would make a rather long Record.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I do not know the length of the report.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a very valuable report. Many people do not know how to get material from the document room. It would be a good thing to have it printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not at this time like to recognize a Member to submit a request to have printed in the RECORD a long document such as this report; the Chair would not like to set a precedent of this sort under which all these matters could be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would make a document that would be both cumbersome and costly. The Chair takes this position especially in view of the fact that the report will be promptly printed as a public document.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then I ask that a short résumé of the report be made and placed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. If somebody has made such a résumé, but the Chair does not know that anybody has.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Could that be done?

The SPEAKER. Yes; if it is short enough. The Chair doubts if the gentleman from Massachusetts is submitting a parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey has asked me if he might address the House for 5 minutes before I use my time. It is agreeable to me.

The SPEAKER. If it is agreeable to the gentleman from Illinois and to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has 15 minutes following the gentleman from Illinois, it may be done.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] may address the House for 5 minutes at this time?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and insert therein a copy of a letter addressed to a member of the New York Cotton Futures Exchange.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF THE RUBBER AND GASOLINE SITUATION

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that any Member of this House, with all due respect to my distinguished friend who just preceded me, that anyone should find fault with a committee that has spent the last 8 weeks here in Washington holding hearings almost daily in an effort to seek a solution to the gasoline and fuel-oil shortage on the eastern seaboard and the badly bungled synthetic-rubber program.

Our committee is not playing politics, and I should say that any Member who would attempt to play politics with any of

these subjects has no place here in the House. We are a nonpartisan committee, consisting of five Democrats and five Republicans; and let me add that we are unanimous, we are united, in the opinions I have expressed both on rubber and on the gasoline and fuel-oil shortage. I will tell you why Mr. Jones did not want Mr. Crossland to appear. Mr. Crossland is a young man 35 years of age, with 2 years of high school and 5 years' employment on the Chicago Stock Exchange. Then he got a job as a clerk in the R. F. C., was transferred to Washington in 1940, became assistant to the President of the Rubber Reserve Company, and later blossomed out as its vice president in charge of oil contracts, the fixing of fees, commissions, and everything else in connection with the synthetic-rubber program, a program involving \$650,000,000 of American money.

We are trying to help bring about efficiency in this war effort, and we are in no way attempting to impede or conflict with the Baruch committee. I want to tell the House here today that I went on the air in a Nation-wide broadcast 3 days prior to the President's appointment of the Baruch committee and urged that such a committee be appointed, because, may I say again, the synthetic program under the administration of the Rubber Reserve Company is a mess. It is a national scandal that certainly ought to be exposed, whether it is by an unofficial or official committee of the House. The reason we did not appeal to the House for official standing was because we felt the delay would only further permit a muddle to go on.

Our committee, I believe, has done a good job. We have made recommendations and other Cabinet officers, and others in charge of this program, have seen fit to concur in our recommendations. As I mentioned a moment ago, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, with his entire staff, came before our committee this morning in a 2-hour hearing. They gave us much valuable information and also complimented the committee on the work it is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this House for 14 years. I have lived through the New Deal. There have not been many things in which I agree with Mr. Ickes, but I tell you here and now that I believe we would have a much more adequate, a much more efficient solution of our gasoline and fuel-oil problem if it were put under one head and given to Mr. Ickes to handle. I say that because there has been a terrific conflict between Mr. Henderson, Mr. Ickes, and various agencies charged with the responsibility in this regard. Let me say further that if we have cold homes in the East and if our war workers have not gas and rubber with which to drive to work, you can lay it to the maladministration of these problems here in Washington. Any committee, official or unofficial, that attempts to solve the situation is not entitled to condemnation but to commendation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in

the RECORD and to include therein an address by Dr. Aurelio F. Concheso, Ambassador of Cuba, on behalf of the United Nations of the Western Hemisphere, at the closing session of the International Student Assembly, city of Washington, Saturday, September 5, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], under special order of the House, is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days the matter of price control will again be before this House. I believe the President has shown great wisdom to ask the Congress to reconsider this matter which is of such far-reaching importance to all of the American people. Economics today are so complex and one item impinges so upon another that the whole subject must be given most careful consideration. We are the elected Representatives of the people. We have a duty to those people back home who sent us here to take care of their various requirements.

It was not long ago that we enacted the Second War Powers Act. One item of that act pertained to the coinage of the 5-cent piece. One would hardly consider the 5-cent piece as being an item of great economic importance. However, the law as written permitted the Treasury to coin new 5-cent pieces out of 50-percent copper and 50-percent silver. When I saw that provision in the War Powers Act I became a little suspicious of that 50-percent silver. With silver at 72 cents an ounce I did not know what would be the value of the silver in the 5-cent piece, whether it would be worth more than 5 cents or not. It was later on proven that it came very near to that point. In any event, I took up the subject with one of the Members of the body at the other end of the Capitol and the item, section 1201, was changed to provide that—

The Director of the Mint with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the War Production Board is authorized to vary the proportion of silver and copper and to add other metals if such action would be in the public interest.

About the 1st of June the mint started to strike 5-cent pieces out of 50-percent silver and 50-percent copper. This action was brought to my attention by the president of one of the vending machine companies. I knew nothing about the mechanism of a vending machine, but it seems it is operated by magnetic control. Neither copper nor silver has magnetic qualities and practically all of the vending machines would be out of operation as a result of this new type of coin. I called this fact to the attention of the mint and the order was revoked.

Let us see what would have happened had they coined these 5-cent pieces, which is the ordinary man's dollar and the most useful coin in our whole coinage system. What would have happened?

There are hundreds of thousands of these vending machines in existence in the factories throughout the country and a great proportion—a very significant proportion—of our peanut crop, our sugar, our fruit juices, and other agricultural products, including tobacco, is sold and distributed through these "silent salesmen." Had we thoughtlessly introduced into our monetary system a coin that would not have worked in vending machines, it might have had a serious effect on the distribution of many agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker, I only bring this matter up to show that we must approach a highly technical, a highly economic subject, such as price control, with the greatest of care. We cannot leave out of our consideration even such a humble coin as the 5-cent piece. We do not know where the effect of its change might have reached, just as we do not know onto what dangerous ground an unstabilized price structure may lead us. There is one thing we do know—we must strive to keep an equal balance between all phases of our economic life.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I am most interested in the gentleman's observations, particularly the pointed way in which he brings up the importance of careful handling of the technical aspect of price control.

The majority floor leader said yesterday that he hoped there would be no hearings on the new price-control bill. We all have a great regard for the committee of which the gentleman is a distinguished member. I wonder whether the plans of the committee are merely to create such an authorization without hearings or to have hearings to review, we hope speedily, the present economic situation and the way the price and wage control would affect it.

Mr. DEWEY. I have not been advised as to the wishes of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which I understand the legislation will be or has been referred.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I feel that Congress ought to settle the matter of price and wage controls. As the gentleman stated at the outset, it is our job. I want us to do it speedily, but I hope that Congress will investigate the matter and go into it through the means of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

May I say in closing that I am happy to advise the growers of peanuts, the sugar growers, the fruit growers, and others that the Treasury will put out a 5-cent piece that will work in vending machines, the "silent salesmen" that distribute their products.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short letter addressed to Mrs. Nellie T. Ross, Director of the Mint, on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.
The letter referred to follows:

AUGUST 20, 1942.

Mrs. NELLIE T. ROSS,
Director, Bureau of the Mint, the Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DIRECTOR: I wish to thank you for your telephone call of yesterday to apprise me that your Department would not be able to consider any materials for the minting of a 5-cent piece that did not contain silver, and hence any cooperation on the part of the Rustless Iron and Steel Co. of Baltimore in finding suitable metal would not be needed.

As I stated to you over the telephone, my interpretation of title 12, section 1201, Public Law 507 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, is that this law authorizes a 5-cent piece made up of any metallic content, even if the silver and copper were present in infinitesimal quantities, particularly as section 1201 states that "such 5-cent pieces shall be deemed to be minor coins or coinage and not silver coins, subsidiary silver coins, silver coinage within the meaning of the monetary laws of the United States."

My interest in this whole subject is economic and social rather than monetary. Several weeks ago I was informed that the mint was about to place an order for the striking of 5-cent pieces of 50-percent silver and 50-percent copper. Advised of this intention, a number of vending-machine companies offered protest for the reason that their machines would not operate unless the 5-cent piece had some magnetic qualities not possessed by silver and copper. Your Department courteously postponed giving the order above mentioned for further consideration of the metallic content, but it has since been discovered that almost all of the metals, such as electrolytic nickel, electrolytic manganese, copper, and silver have been placed on the critical-materials list and cannot be supplied for coinage purposes.

In the meantime, an actual shortage of 5-cent pieces is developing and the Treasury Department is under great expense for the shipment of these heavy coins from one section of the country to the other to meet requirements. Hoping to be of assistance to the Treasury Department, I requested Mr. C. E. Tuttle of the Rustless Iron & Steel Co. of Baltimore, Md., to call upon the mint yesterday. This company, I believe, has developed various noncorroding and ductile metals obtained from domestic sources of which there is sufficient supply for them not to be placed on the critical-materials list. My thought was that some new metal might be obtained out of which a satisfactory 5-cent piece could be struck without further delay, thus causing a saving to the taxpayer in shipment cost of the insufficient supply of existing nickels, and furthermore a saving in the cost of the metallic content of the 5-cent piece itself.

With silver selling at over 71 cents an ounce, it would seem an extravagance to place much of it in a subsidiary coin.

I do not believe it is realized how much agriculture would be affected by the intrusion of a 5-cent piece in our monetary system that could not work in vending machines. These "silent salesmen" have been installed in nearly every manufacturing plant throughout the country and are an easy means of distributing peanuts, candies containing sugar, dairy products in the form of chocolate and milk, fruit juices, tobacco in the form of cigarettes, and other commodities. Further, they are used in lock boxes in railroad stations and musical instruments.

In fact, the 5-cent piece is the ordinary citizen's dollar and probably is the most useful and the most used coin that we have, and any shortage of it must cause a great public inconvenience.

To sum up, no 5-cent piece should be struck with a metallic content that will not operate

in vending machines and hence cause a great inconvenience to the defense workers in factories or cause a loss of outlet of agricultural products now reaching the public through the means of vending machines.

Fearing that in these days of great pressure on all departments of the Government only the monetary significance of the change in the nickel will be considered and social and economic factors overlooked, I have become the self-appointed champion of the humble nickel in order that it may continue to serve in the fullest manner the requirements of our citizens to whom it has meant the source of food, drink, amusement, and transportation.

With all best wishes, I am,

Very cordially yours.

PRICE CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Price Control Committee, which will be called upon to act very shortly, I am wondering whether we shall have hearings on the request for legislation that has been made. We do not yet know the form of legislation to be presented. But the dramatics of it all. Putting the legislative body on the spot. Yet the Executive has been dilatory, more so than the Congress. Yet the people are to blame us, to our great misfortune and to their own misfortune, because of the light we have been placed in by the Executive.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. After all, is not this a case where the legislative branch ought to be on the spot? Is it not true that this is our responsibility?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, yes; but it is proclaimed that we have not been on the job; that we have avoided the issue.

The President stated that he has carried out five of his seven points of April 27; that the Congress has failed in the other two. He proclaims to the people that on taxation matters we are dilatory. His own Treasury is dilatory. The fanciful proposals that have been suggested by his administration have made it impossible to get anywhere because of the time necessary to dispose of them. Because of the delay we lose millions a day; that is true. However, he can borrow money now probably more easily than he can borrow it later on, and the tax bill will be continued in operation. Both these methods have to be employed, but the tax bill must be rather permanent legislation. We are losing for the moment what must be made up later. The taxation committees do not deserve the criticism hurled at them by the President. Taxation is a very severe burden upon our citizens, and there has been no more dilatory action on the part of the taxation committees than is to be expected under a democratic form of government.

The second point is that we have failed to stabilize food prices. I will take a little of the blame or credit, being on the price-control committee. I heretofore voted against the 110 percent of parity. However, that was in the original bill pre-

sented to us by the administration and what they said they were satisfied with. Now the President wishes to stabilize at 100. If they cannot stabilize at 110, how are they going to stabilize at 100? If we have no hearings, we will get no information as to how this can or will be done. If beef cattle products are going up to 137 and 110 is now the limit, how will 100 percent help the matter? That is a question the farmers may well ask.

He says, "As soon as I get this legislation, I promise you that I will stabilize wages." I said only yesterday, in view of past performances we would like to know something more definite as to the method he expects to adopt.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does not the gentleman feel that that is a rather silly way for a legislative body to operate, based on the promises of some other branch of the Government? If there is something that is required to be a law, let the legislative body enact it and not rely on promises, however vague or however explicit. Is not that the way for us to legislate?

Mr. GIFFORD. It is. I do not want to be placed in a position here of embarrassing the President of the United States. I have supported him in his war measures. I have been no isolationist. I have voted for all the money requested and for the war powers he has deemed necessary. Although I voted against the 110 percent of parity, I voted for the bill in its final enactment. I am not now attempting to embarrass him, but I do object to his telling people that the Congress has been wholly to blame, and lead them to forget the failure of his own agents, after getting the law they held to be satisfactory. I am tired of this Executive build-up at our expense.

I do not blame the farmers for asking more definite assurances after reading the A. F. of L. paper that came out this morning stating that the President is in close contact with Mr. Murray and with Mr. Green and that they have arrived at a plan or conclusion already, and that Congress should not mess in it.

I will say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] that if these three men have already prepared a plan I feel like insisting they tell us what the plan is. Are we to be told only after he gets the farmers to be willing to remove section 3 from the price-control bill? Why can we not be told now? Must we guess? Well, I can hazard a guess. He talks about a possible 15-percent rise in food in his recent message.

We may suppose that he will stabilize wages at 15 percent more than exist at the present moment. We might suggest that 20 percent may be contemplated. And at any time Mr. Green and Mr. Murray are dissatisfied he will stabilize again.

I realize that war is a dictator and I know that our legislative powers must be curtailed, and I have voted, and so have you, all the money and powers he has asked for. We are ready to follow

through. However, we, as Members of Congress, are now suffering intensely on all fronts because of the ineptitude of those whom he has appointed. We knew we would suffer and that we would be the ones to be blamed. We are the go-between for the people, even between the Army and the Navy. We are elected, not as lawmakers any more, but as interventionists, almost entirely, with these bureaus which we set up and manned by appointees over whom we have no authority.

For months we considered the price-control bill. We knew that Mr. Henderson would administer it. He was before us many days and we questioned him closely as to how he would proceed. He and all other administration supporters declared they did not want any labor legislation in that bill. They were willing to stand for 110 percent of parity. Read the hearings. And now we are told by the President that Congress has not given him what he wanted. We urged upon him what he now finds to be necessary. However, we heard from him last April, but his message at that time was very indefinite. I have it here.

He wanted haste in the tax bill. He is largely to blame for its delay. The other request was a new price-control bill affecting the farmer but sufficient reasons were not advanced to convince the farm bloc of its necessity. You read in the newspapers in December last the statement that if trouble followed on farm prices between Wickard and Henderson, those memorable words, "I can fire one of them." He seemed to think he had power enough at the time. Consider what Mr. Henderson's bureau has blamed the Congress for recently. When he originally came before the Appropriations Committee he wanted funds for only a skeleton organization. He declared that the people would see that the law was administered through their complaints and in the usual manner of court procedure. When he came before the committee last December he wanted some 1,700 people to distribute in handling separate commodities. That appeared fairly reasonable. Later he came forward and wanted some 90,000 employees, largely as clerks for the rationing boards over the country. It appeared that he would like to employ snoopers. He made a speech a day or two ago. Did you read it? I have it here. It is a very interesting speech. He says he is going to carry out this price-control law "to the very hilt." Mark the word "hilt." At another place he says, "But I want no snoopers." But he seems to have them. I seem to have real proof of it. Attempts to trap people is proven and highly resented.

How often I have said that every one of these organizations wants a huge police force to try to find a lawbreaker. Let us consider what they have done to us on fuel oil. Tankers are reported to come into certain places and are unable to unload the fuel oil. Our people are not allowed to have it delivered to their own tanks because we are all considered to be crooks until proven otherwise. They will not pour oil into your tank be-

cause they do not trust you to use it according to regulations. I resent being treated in that manner. Our people should be considered as honest, and the crooks punished when proven guilty. I do not subscribe to the doctrine that all should be deprived because of a few lawbreakers. But that is the way these bureaucrats seem to wish to function. That is the way Mr. Henderson in his speech night before last appears to feel. Oh, I have expected that he would be fly-bitten, but that he would try to endure it.

The tramp lay beside the road, sweating and dirty, flies all over him; but one horsefly bit him harder than the others. Then he said, "Just for that, all of you get off."

That is the temper they get in. Because they are bitten once in a while and they find some crooks, then the edict, "None of you can have it." That method of procedure, I insist, is wrong. Again, I am willing to vote for this bill without hearings. We have already had voluminous testimony. Most of us desired to grant this power in the first instance. When the bill was being considered a nod from our President would have been all that was needed.

There was a very close vote in the conference about the 110-percent parity. One word from the President and it would have been defeated.

Constitutional? "If you do not act by October 1, I will." The people of this Nation heard that. They admired his courage. The courage comes mighty late. But I admire courage, even if dilatory. I am very glad that he is willing now to stabilize food prices and wages. But if he would set aside that law, he could set aside any law under the dictatorship powers we have given him. We may well pause and consider the grave danger to our democracy.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Under your interpretation of the President's statement, what would he do if Congress would refuse to do anything? What would he do?

Mr. GIFFORD. That is the question. That is very much the question. He said, "I will act." He will act how? When? How often? Is that a fair question I am asking of him? He paints the Congress as a failure in order to build up executive support of the people.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. What does he mean by saying he will stabilize wages? He is going to fix the price of farm products, but is he going to fix the price of wages when he says, "I will stabilize wages"?

Mr. GIFFORD. That is what we want him to explain more fully.

If he will come out with a statement and say, "We intend to stabilize wages at 15 percent above the present standard," then we would know what he is doing. After the farmers have submitted, he could stabilize wages at a point highly pleasing to Mr. Green and Mr. Murray, and what could we do about it?

However, we read in the morning paper that Murray and Green seem to say, "We

have settled it already; you Congressmen must not mess in." We must also consider that he wants to stabilize farm prices at parity by taking into account the benefit checks that are paid. I support him in that, but many who represent the farmers so humbly may well consider this phase. The members on the minority side of our Committee on Banking and Currency will probably be as anxious to support the President as those on the side of the majority.

Perhaps the microphone has already lulled the farmers' fears in these matters, and their faithful representatives should no longer hesitate to follow their President with full confidence that he will look after their welfare as he has heretofore done in good measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. I will not ask for further time. The subject is intensely interesting at this particular moment.

RENTALS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a form of inflation has broken out in the District of Columbia which, unless it is effectively handled, may soon get out of bounds. Complaints are being made that mercenary owners of business properties in the District of Columbia are taking advantage of the war emergency to increase the rents of their properties to an inordinate extent, in some instances as much as 100 percent. In some instances the Government of the United States is being made the victim of this rent squeeze. Unfortunately the Rent Control Act of the District of Columbia gives no authority to Rent Administrator Robert Cogswell to control this situation. Under the law he can deal only with residential properties. Startling evidence on this subject was placed today before our colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, the able chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. Mr. Cogswell has received a mass of complaints from victims of the squeeze—shopkeepers, lawyers, doctors, and others—and it is not going too far, I think, to state that mandatory legislation may be proposed to give the District Rent Control Administrator authority to cope with this ominous situation.

It is important that this matter shall receive adequate attention before it gets out of hand. Washington, the Capital City, is the object lesson and pace setter for the entire country. If rent piracy in respect to business properties becomes the established practice here, it may not be long until the custom will spread and every city in the country will feel the blighting effects of this inflation trend. The smaller business concerns of the country are having a desperate struggle for existence at best. Many of them, on account of inability to get priorities and other restrictions, are hanging on the ragged edge of insolvency. If they sud-

denly find themselves faced with outrageous rent increases, they will be pushed to the wall, and nothing can save them. The Federal Price Administration Act, like the District of Columbia Rent Control Act, is defective in that it gives no authority whatever to hold rents of business properties to a reasonable maximum.

[Here the gavel fell.]

STATEMENTS MADE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon on the floor of this House a very astounding and shocking statement was made by a Member of Congress. If the same statement had been made outside of the Halls of the House, on a street corner, or in any other public place, I believe that very likely the gentleman making the statement would have immediately found himself in the hands of authorities and probably in jail.

The statement was made on the floor of the House however, and because it was made on the floor of the House it will do incalculably more harm than if it had been made on a street corner. Within a very short time that statement will be broadcast over every radio station in Japan and over every radio station in Berlin. More than that, it will be broadcast and published from every radio station and in every newspaper in the very important and powerful nations of the world which are yet in a neutral position. The statement will bring aid and comfort to the enemy and will cause some doubt perhaps in the minds of powerful neutrals whom we should like to have on our side. It will tend to create disunity among some foolish people in this country and tend to make for a less intensive war effort on the part of some others.

To make such a statement on the floor of the House, in my opinion, renders a Member of Congress absolutely useless insofar as any work he can do here while this war is in progress. I think there is not a single Member of the House who concurs in the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]; in fact, I am positive not a single Member of the House agrees with him. The reiteration of the statement and the added affirmation that he would not apologize for it or had no apology to make, to my mind places the gentleman in a position of absolute uselessness. For this reason if he still thinks and feels that way he should at once resign as a Member of Congress.

GEORGE E. DEATHERAGE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, George E. Deatherage was fired by the Navy from

a job he held under that Department at Norfolk, Va., because it was determined by investigations conducted by myself and by the Dies committee that Deatherage was not in sympathy with the country's program, but was a proclaimed Fascist and not a fit person to be associated in any way with the armed forces of the United States. If you recall, Deatherage was one of the leaders of the White Camellias who were advocating fascism in this country. There are many more Deatherages in the service of the country who have no place there; there are many other Fascists in this country, American Fascists, holding key positions in the defense program while law-abiding, honest-to-goodness Americans capable of performing those duties have a difficult time to get in under the present set-up.

Deatherage was discharged from his job with the Navy after an investigation was conducted by Secretary Knox. When he was dismissed the Secretary described him as an undesirable person. He had been employed at the Norfolk Navy Yard as an engineer. He was discharged after a careful study of his past record. The country hoped and trusted that that would be the last we heard of Deatherage, but we find now that this same gentleman, Mr. Deatherage, is employed by the Army Engineer Corps and is holding a responsible position—the very man who advocates fascism, the very man who openly advocated a Fascist dictatorship for our country.

The Army Engineer Corps, I am reliably informed, hired Deatherage without having asked the F. B. I. to investigate him. We have been assured time and again that the Civil Service Commission or the F. B. I. is asked to check on all people connected with the defense program. There is supposed to be an investigation in every individual case to determine whether a man's ability and background are such as to justify his being placed in a responsible position. I am informed that Deatherage was never investigated by the F. B. I. with respect to his second job. What the country is entitled to know is how he secured his present position without being investigated and who is protecting him in the Army. It seems to me we are pursuing the wrong policy when a man with a record such as Deatherage has can be placed in a responsible job while young men and women before they can be employed in even a minor capacity have to be investigated by the F. B. I. It is an outrage to see a man who has been investigated and condemned by the Dies committee, by the McCormack committee, and by the F. B. I., who has been accused of being a Fascist by Members of Congress, who has been investigated by Secretary Knox and found to be unfit—to see such a man being able to secure a position with the Army of the United States. I call the attention of the House to this fact and make the statement that there must be some steps taken to remedy such conditions if we want unity and strength to fight our enemies from within and from without. If we expect to win this war and this peace we cannot afford to play ball with men like Deatherage who advocate the very principles of fascism and nazi-ism against which we are fighting

today. Deatherage and his friends have as much sympathy for democracy as I have for Hitlerism. We owe it to our boys in the trenches to protect the home front for them and to do that we have to protect our institutions against men like Deatherage. We shall never win this war with Deatherage and the likes of him holding responsible jobs with the Army, Navy, or the Intelligence Services. It is about time that we wake up and face the issue of native fascism which is just as dangerous to the safety of our country as is the fascism we are fighting abroad.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry that it was not possible to secure printing of the so-called Baruch report and recommendations regarding rubber, oil, and gasoline, because there is nothing of more vital importance to the Nation today than fuel for the conduct of the war, for the carrying on of our industries, and for the health of the Nation.

Secretary Ickes and Mr. Eastman, head of the war transportation, have done something, but not enough. They have done a good deal, considering their hands have been tied. And we must have action at once. Promises do not fill empty tanks. I am still asking that an agency under a single head be given full authority to act.

May I ask the assistance of the Members—and I know many of them agree with me—in seeing that the Government converts to coal wherever possible instead of using oil. We on the eastern seaboard are told to convert oil burners to coal in order to save oil. I am reliably informed that today new Government buildings are having oil burners put in instead of using coal. A great saving can be effected in that way, and certainly this should be done. The administration should practice what it preaches.

I also ask the Members from the States that have plenty of gas and oil if they will not join with us from the eastern seaboard in seeing that we get our adequate share. I would like to remind every one of the people living in those States when they are taking three, four, five, or six hundred mile automobile trips for pleasure, of our gasoline shortage and ask if they will not stop and help us to secure the necessary amount in order to carry on our commercial business on the eastern seaboard.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if the report was not referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered printed?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; of course, that is true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many people do not understand that they can get these reports from the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BLAND. Would it not be in order then to appear before the Committee on Printing and ascertain the proper number of reports that should be circulated?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is a very valuable, constructive suggestion. I think we should notify people that they can secure those reports. There is no problem in New England that is occupying the minds of the people more than that of keeping warm this winter, running their industries, which include the war industries, and for the commercial people to have enough gasoline to carry on their commerce. Thousands of dollars are being lost because they cannot get gasoline for commercial purposes. It is not complaining when I repeat again that no section of any country, with the possible exception of Russia, and that is so big it is difficult to treat it all the same, there is no other country of the so-called Allies that is discriminating against one section of the country. New England has always been so loyal to the United States it cannot understand the unjust treatment. It may not be, and I am sure it is not, intentional discrimination, but the result is a very pronounced discrimination against the eastern seaboard. I know my colleagues who have done so much to help other nations will do everything in their power to help New England and the eastern seaboard.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a great deal about parity and about price fixing of farm products at 110 percent of parity. The bill that was passed by Congress did not fix the ceiling on farm prices at 110 percent of parity at all. It simply said that prices should not be forcibly fixed at less than that. It fixed a price-fixing ceiling. It did not fix a floor. Prices were allowed to go wherever they might go, but the ceiling could be fixed at 110 percent of parity.

There were many, many reasons why it was necessary at that time to safeguard farm products by seeing that they should not be fixed forcibly by the Price Administrator at less than that amount. I am greatly interested in farm products. I suppose I represent in this Congress a district that produces more corn than any other district in the United States—I am quite sure of that—and more than any other like area in the world. Corn sells today in my district for along about 70 cents per bushel. Parity is 92 cents or 93 cents a bushel. Whoever says that we have been asking that prices be fixed at 110 percent of parity is woefully mistaken or misin-

formed. Moreover, grain prices have never gone up even to parity; and 110 percent of parity for grain is a myth.

The prices that the farmer gets for farm products have little to do with the prices that the housewives pay for food in the grocery stores. The farmer gets an average of only about 45 percent of the prices at which his products sell in the retail markets.

While at home recently, I went into the grocery store to buy some Wheaties. I had heard so much about Wheaties. You know all the athletes eat Wheaties. If you happen to be down a little bit, or if you have an ache or a pain in your sawdust or in your vertebrae, then you should take some Wheaties. "Eat Wheaties—Eat Wheaties," is a standard joke out in my country. Well, I bought a package of Wheaties and I paid almost \$12 per bushel for my wheat, whereas wheat is selling for only about \$1 a bushel out on the farms. I have often pointed out that many of our people who talk about the price of farm products do not know what they are talking about. They are really talking about the things that are made or manufactured from agricultural products, and not about the price of farm products themselves. Farm products and farm prices have not caused any great increase in food prices. I refer to the prices that the farmer gets. What the farmer gets is no criterion of what you pay at the grocery store. As I have said many times, it is the spread between the farm and the dinner table that you ought to talk about. The advance in the cost of living is not caused by the \$1 per bushel for wheat that the farmer gets. It is caused by the \$12 per bushel that is charged by the processor when you buy for your dinner table. The same things are true of almost everything else that you buy for your dinner table. The farmer is not at fault. He does not get even as much as parity. The trouble lies somewhere else than with the farmer; the high increase is caused by something besides the farmer. What is it?

Mr. Speaker, I want wages to be fixed at a high level. I have always voted for labor. I believe in paying workingmen a liberal wage. Their wages should be high enough to enable them and their wives and children to live in comfort and happiness. At the time of the passage of the price-fixing bill it was necessary to safeguard the farmer so long as other staples were not being fixed. It was necessary to assure that prices would not be fixed on the things that he raises out on the farm at less than 110 percent because prices on other things were not fixed at all. The farmer is willing to take 100 percent of parity if the things that he buys are on a like level. I would be mighty glad to take 100 percent of parity for farm products because I could then go home and sell my corn for 92 cents or 93 cents a bushel instead of taking 70 cents a bushel for it.

But it is oftentimes argued that the farmer gets this difference between the 70 cents and the 93 cents, because he is paid a bonus or a benefit known as the parity payment. But this is not true. There are just as many corn farmers who never get this parity payment as there

are who do get it. There are as many acres producing corn outside of the corn-marketing area as there are inside of it. These people get no parity payments at all, or else, in some instances, they get but a small percentage of it.

Furthermore, all farmers who do get parity payments are required to pay or to give a consideration for these payments. They are required to give a quid pro quo for them. They are compelled to forego the right to raise and plant corn on a very large acreage of their own farms. They must give up the right to produce on their own farms. Taxes against their farms, including the acreage that is not under production, go on and on forever, just as Tennyson's proverbial brook flows on and on forever. Any farmer who takes these benefits must lose the productiveness in a high percentage of his own soil. The sun comes up each year above the Equator and fructifies the fields and God's wondrous bounty gives the farmer his increase and his returns. But any farmer who takes these benefits must give up much of his productive capacity and the productive capacity of his acres and of his farm. He resigns a considerable share of the sunlight and the bounteous gifts of nature because he is not allowed to produce to the full capacity of his farm. Such a corn farmer, even though he gets the full parity payment, nevertheless gives a consideration for such payment, even if he is within the commercial area. The difference between the 70 cents and the 93 cents is not in any wise or manner compensated by any subsidy or benefit that he may get from the Government. It still remains true that he never gets as much as parity for the corn that he produces; and it still remains true that the price of farm products has not caused any increase in living expenses. But this increase is plainly attributable to other influences and other causes. The danger of inflation is not caused by farmers and by prices out on the farm. This danger is to be found somewhere between the farm and the dinner table.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILL

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Clerk shall be authorized to receive a message from the Senate on the soldiers' vote bill, H. R. 7416, and that the Speaker may be authorized to sign the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 14, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1890. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1891. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certified copies of the five acts passed at the second special session of the Fifteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, June 15-16, 1942; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

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. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2686. An act amending law detailing military personnel to South American countries; without amendment (Rept. No. 2439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DITIER:

H. R. 7538. A bill to achieve the objectives outlined by the President in his message to Congress dated September 7, 1942; to stabilize the cost of labor, prices of agricultural commodities, and the cost of living; to protect the principle and practice of collective bargaining for labor; to preserve the principle of parity for farmers; and to promote the national unity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7539. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States," approved May 14, 1942, to create the grade of field director in such corps comparable to the enlisted grades in the Regular Army, to provide pay and allowances for all members of such corps at the same rates as those payable to members of the Regular Army in corresponding grades, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. R. 7543. A bill to make it the duty of the Director of the Census to collect libelous statements relating to certain officers or any body or group thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Census.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 7540. A bill for the relief of Robert Griffin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 7541. A bill for the relief of Peter J. Petersen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 7542. A bill for the relief of John V. Saul; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3314. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the board of directors of the California Fig In-

stitute, opposing and protesting against any reduction in the import tariff rate on almonds and dates; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3315. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of the Church of the Brethren, Blair County, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3316. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Young Democrats of California, protesting against the dismissal of Robert Burns and the appointment of Wilford Frischknecht, of Utah, as California State administrator and regional director of an area in which over 80 percent of the National Youth Administration work is concentrated in California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3317. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, adopted August 17, 1942, relative to proposed taxation by the Federal Government of municipal bond obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1942

The Reverend H. W. Burgan, D. D., pastor, Hamline Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thou God of nations, in these tragic times may we stand fast in the faith wherein Thou hast made us free. May we give testimony to the belief that Thou art our refuge and strength, an ever-present help in time of trouble.

Save our Nation, O Lord, from the foes that press upon us from without. Give strength and wisdom to our President, guide our Congress, be with our armed forces, bless the homes that have given of their sons and daughters. Save us from selfishness that may keep us from making necessary sacrifices. Give courage, we pray, O Thou gracious God, to all our people, and judgment to our leaders, that we may be led in the way of that wisdom which cometh from on high.

Save us, O Lord, from the anxiety and fear that destroy men's minds as well as their bodies. Help us to be so morally undergirded that we may be strong to struggle for the freedom given to us through the sacrifices of our founding fathers.

Teach us Thy way, the high way of righteousness, and help us to walk therein humbly and prayerfully, knowing that Thou art our salvation.

Answer our prayers, O Thou eternal God, God of nations. Bless America. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Chief Clerk (John C. Crockett) read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., September 14, 1942.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.