transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in military service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 2, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will hold hearings beginning Tuesday, October 13, 1942, at 10 a. m., in the Committee Room, 1015 House Office Building, on H. R. 7620, a bill to provide for adjusting royalties for the use of inventions for the benefit of the United States, and for other purposes.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1945. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1946. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Office for Emergency Management, Office of War Information, in the sum of $26,990,000, for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 862); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1947. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Office for Emergency Management, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, in the sum of $5,500,000, for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 863); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1948. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the emergency fund for the President, amounting to $25,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 864); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1949. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $34,920 (H. Doc. No. 865); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1950. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Office of Civilian Defense, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $1,042,000 (H. Doc. No. 866); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1951. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the War Manpower Commission for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $17,166,000 (H. Doc. No. 867); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1952. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to aid in the conservation of rubber by the prohibition of speeding; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 7629. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to expedite the war effort by providing for releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 7630. A bill to provide additional personnel for civilian defense activities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 7631. A bill to provide for protection by war damage insurance of leasehold interests in property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 7632. A bill to provide that during the present war payments with respect to any crop of sugar beets or sugarcane shall not be subject to deductions on account of the employment of children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 7633. A bill to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Planning and Reconstruction, a Congressional Planning and Reconstruction Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PACE:

H. Res. 547. Resolution authorizing an investigation of commodity prices; to the Committee on Rules.

---

# SENATE

## FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1942

Rev. Richard M. Mussen, pastor, Sherwood Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, in these days of struggle and strife, when we share the destinies of freemen everywhere, be with our Nation and lead her in the way of liberty and truth.

Bless richly the President of these United States and all those who share with him the burdens and privileges of government.

Guide the President of the Senate and each Member of it, as they face together the difficult tasks, the heavy responsibilities, and the momentous decisions of their high office.

Be with the men of our armed forces, who by their courage, their loyalty, and their lives protect us on the land, in the air, and on the sea. Make us worthy, O God, of their sacrifice.

Hasten the day when oppression and tyranny shall be no more, when peace shall come and the cause of righteousness for which we stand shall be victorious. For we ask it in the spirit of the Christ who came to set men free. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 1, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE POLL TAX—TELEGRAM FROM GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, in order that my colleagues, and the country as well, may know the attitude of the people of Mississippi in regard to certain proposed legislation, I wish to read into the RECORD and have appropriately referred a telegram from the Governor of Mississippi. It is as follows:

JACKSON, MISS., *October 1, 1942.*

Senator THEODORE G. BILBO,
*Washington, D. C.:*

As Governor of Mississippi and knowing that I speak the sentiment of the people of Mississippi on this subject, I urgently appeal to you to oppose the present attempt to do away with our poll tax requirement by congressional action. Congress has no constitutional authority to pass such an act. It appears that certain would-be reformers are taking advantage of the war conditions to put over their so-called reforms. This is a time for unity of our people. It is no time for measures which seek to divide us. We should all stand together. Measures like this and some others that are in the making by leaders who have themselves been misled tend to divide our country.

PAUL B. JOHNSON,
*Governor of Mississippi.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram presented by the Senator from Mississippi will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENT IN NATURE OF A PETITION FROM GEARY COUNTY, KANS., ON THE SCARCITY OF FARM LABOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a statement in the nature of a petition signed by representatives of the Geary County Farm Bureau Board, U. S. D. A., A. A. A. county committee, and representatives of the Geary County Bankers Association, regarding the scarcity of farm labor.

There being no objection, the statement in the nature of a petition was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNCTION CITY, KANS.,
*September 22, 1942.*

We, the undersigned of the Geary County Farm Bureau Board, Agricultural War Board, County Agricultural Adjustment Agency Committee, and representatives of the County Bankers Asosciation, because of the serious need of farm products for food and for necessities of war, and the extreme

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

scarcity of farm help, offer the following recommendations for your consideration:

That agriculture be supplied with enough help to keep our farm factory producing at a maximum capacity, and that this help include enough trained and experienced men to supervise and direct the work.

That trained farm help not be allowed to go into industrial defense work solely because of higher wages. Farmers cannot be expected to compete with wages of other industries. Trained and experienced men in various farm production activities should be kept at their job either through a subsidy of the Government or by freezing them on the job.

That so far as possible an able-bodied man be left on each farm that is producing the real necessities of war in large enough quantities to require 100 percent of this able-bodied man's time.

That Geary County be considered a preferred area because of its proximity to the Fort Riley Military Reservation.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS—PETITION AND MEMORIAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the right of petition is one of the great constitutional rights. I have in my hand, and present, a petition of citizens of Arpin, Wis., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor, and so forth, in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, and I also present a memorial of sundry citizens of Eau Claire, Wis., remonstrating against the enactment of that bill. I ask that the petition and memorial be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition and memorial presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. Res. 297. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the policy of certain governmental agencies in requisitioning railroad property submitted on the 1st instant by Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. HATCH); without amendment (Rept. No. 1629).

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

S. 2795. A bill to amend the act approved July 24, 1941 (34 U. S. C., Supp. I, 350f), so as to adjust the pay status of enlisted personnel appointed to commissioned rank for temporary service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1630).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 7378. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1631).

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORTED PRINT OF THE REVENUE BILL AND SENATE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing I report an original Senate concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The resolution provides for the printing of additional copies of the revenue bill and the Senate report thereon.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the revenue bill is ready.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is contemplated that the bill will be reported today.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator have any information as to when the bill will be taken up by the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. My information is that it will be taken up in the Senate on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; on Monday.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I thank the Senator.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there shall be printed 8,500 additional copies of the Senate reported print of the bill (H. R. 7378) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, together with the accompanying report thereon, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room, 5,000 copies for the use of the House document room, 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2818. A bill to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments; to the Committee on Military Affairs

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2819. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the suppression of prostitution in the District of Columbia," approved August 15, 1935; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado introduced Senate bill 2820, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 2821. A bill to restore Capt. Lara P. Good, retired, to the active list of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2822. A bill for the relief of William Kovatis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 2823. A bill for the relief of the victims of the Minnesota cyclone of September 11, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

BILL TO INCREASE PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF ARMY NURSE CORPS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask for its appropriate reference.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps. In the pay readjustment measure which was recently enacted, we did adjust the pay of the Army nurses, but since that time two new organizations connected with the military operations of this country have come into being, the so-called Waacs and the so-called Waves. Because of the pay allowances given to these two new military branches it is necessary at this time to readjust the pay of a branch of the service which has been notoriously underpaid for many years, a branch of the service which is indispensable to the operations of our military effort, the Army Nurse Corps.

In connection with my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter written to me by Francis M. Sullivan, acting director, national legislative committee, the American Legion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill of the Senator from Colorado will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The letter is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
*Washington, D. C., October 2, 1942.*

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: This is with further reference to your telephone conversation with Ted Ray yesterday afternoon concerning a bill to increase the pay of members of the Army Nurse Corps.

The American Legion at its national convention in Kansas City, Mo., September 19–21, 1942, unanimously adopted a resolution asking the Congress to enact legislation which would place Army nurses on a comparable basis with other Army personnel as to pay, allowances, and other benefits. I am enclosing a draft of a bill which I believe will serve as a basis for legislation to give the Army nurses the same pay and allowances as officers of the Army with the same grade and length of service. An identical bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman ANDREW EDMISTON, of West Virginia, which is H. R. 7633.

We are delighted that you will handle this bill in the Senate and I am sure it will receive early consideration under your expert guidance. I wish to assure you the American Legion will cooperate with you in every way possible.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
*Acting Director,*
*National Legislative Committee.*

The bill (S. 2820) to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REFERENCE OF SENATE TRADE-MARK BILL AND HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, in September of last year the Senate passed Senate bill 895, relating to the registration of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and so forth. In fact, the bill was a codification of trade-mark legislation. The bill was passed after hearings before the Senate Committee on Patents. It was referred to the House Committee on Patents, and on September 24, 1942, more than a year later, the House amended the Senate bill by agreeing to some 421 amendments to the bill. The bill itself had only about 40 pages. The amendments are of such a character as virtually to rewrite the bill. Therefore I ask that the bill and the House amendments be referred to the Senate Committee on Patents.

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

A SECOND FRONT

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have received an interesting letter from a soldier boy who comes from my State. He is now in the Army. He writes:

DEAR SENATOR: With our friend Willkie on the front page yelling for a second front, and numerous others, including the Communists, joining the chorus, I have a thought that might be of interest to you.

As a soldier, I am very much interested in this second front, for my neck is involved one way or another. And as a soldier, I have faith in our Army General Staff, and we soldiers do not believe it is time yet to open up such an attack. We soldiers do not want such an attack made before we are ready.

Now history is repeating itself. Lincoln allowed the editorial writers, politicians, etc., to force him into ordering the advance at Bull Run before we were ready. As a result, the North suffered a very severe defeat, and a war that might have been ended by one good, big victory of the North lasted 4 long years. We do not want another Bull Run.

We soldiers do not think our generals want to open a front this year, because we have neither the men nor materials to see it through.

If you check the Lincoln-Bull Run episode, you will be amazed to see how it parallels today's situation.

The soldiers' spirit is good, but they do not want to go off half-cocked on this very bloody proposition.

Yours,

——— ———.

In line with what is set forth in the letter I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "The Political Second Front," published in the New York Times of September 26, 1942.

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

[From the New York Times of September 26, 1942]

THE POLITICAL SECOND FRONT

The silliest spectacle we have seen in a long time is that of American Communists who until June 22 of last year were doing all they could to injure this country's defenses and stab Britain in the back holding a mass meeting in Union Square to demand that the military strategy of the United Nations be changed to suit the party line. Nobody listens to them. Nobody trusts them. On the basis of their record they would hurt their own cause, even if it were a good cause. A group at the other end of the political spectrum who would oppose a second front to suit another party line would be just as silly and more dangerous. We do not believe that there are in this country, outside of jail and not on the run from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, enough members of such a group to hold a mass meeeting in a telephone booth.

More serious is the frank insistence now being made in Moscow that a second front be opened at whatever cost. The Russian demands call for plain speaking. We are not in this war to save Russia. Russia is not in this war to save us. She did not try to save Norway, Denmark, Belgium, the Netherlands, or France in 1940. She did not lift a finger when the invasion of Britain seemed imminent. Let it be admitted that she was no more selfish then than Britain and France were when they abandoned Czechoslovakia to the wolves, or than we were when, still clinging to an obsolete isolationism, we connived in that betrayal.

Now let us consider our actual relationship to Russia and her actual relationship to us. Self-preservation is her first law, and it is also ours. Self-preservation dictates to her that she shall not risk losing more than she gains by permitting us to use her Siberian bases against Japan, though by doing so we might save many thousands of American lives and many billions of American dollars. Self-preservation dictates to us and to Britain that we shall not vainly sacrifice half a million men just because we admire profoundly the gallant defenders of Stalingrad.

We have no choice but to leave to the specialists in such matters the decision as to when we shall strike on the European Continent. It may be that a blow struck this fall, at great risk and with great losses, will contribute more to final victory than a heavier blow struck next spring. It may be that we have more chance for success if we wait. But this is not a question to be settled by acclamation in Union Square, or in the pages of newspapers and magazines, or on the floors of Congress. It is folly to attempt to settle it in that way.

We turn our eyes on Russia, across thousands of miles of sea and land. Shall we leave our differences with her, to be aggravated by venomous whispers, while the well-meaning friends of a common cause cry hush to any candid discussion? There is no basis for future harmony in such a course. Let us say openly that we will not harry our President and his advisers into any adventure they are convinced, on evidence which cannot be made public, is unwise. Let us confess that we believe just as firmly in the American system as Stalin does in the Russian system, and let us face the fact that the two systems are not alike. Let us then make every honest effort we can to establish a foundation on which they can exist peaceably and amicably in the same world. On this understanding we can build. We cannot build on hush-hush and hypocrisy.

These, as they seem to us, are plain truths. They do not diminish in the least our profound admiration for the Russian people, for their commanders and for their soldiers. We cannot and shall not forget Stalingrad when we unleash war on the Continent, nor when peace is made.

Mr. WHEELER. So far as my own feeling in the matter is concerned, Mr. President, while I think that everyone would like to see a second front opened, I believe, as the boy in the Army who wrote the letter believes, and, as he says, other soldiers believe, that confidence should be reposed in the General Staff, and the whole matter should be left up to the General Staff, rather than to Mr. Willkie or columnists or other persons who are trying to tell the Army General Staff how to carry on the war. If the people of the United States would let the Army General Staff conduct the war without trying to bring pressure on them from the outside, as Mr. Willkie has suggested be done, I think we would be far better off.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEN OF THE MERCHANT MARINE—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gold Star Heroes of the War at Sea," published in the Philadelphia Record of September 30, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7565) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. GIFFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION—PETITION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I present and ask to have appropriately referred a petition signed by the leading officers and educational authorities of 42 of the 48 States. Because of the Nation-wide source of this petition, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read the petition and that I may have the privilege of commenting briefly upon it after it shall have been read.

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

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

A PETITION IN BEHALF OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE UNITED STATES

*To the President and Congress of the United States of America:*

The public-school systems of the United States are essential to the winning of the war and the winning of the peace to follow.

Manpower trained and equipped to produce and to use the modern instruments of war and to carry on essential civilian activities is necessary to winning the war. The schools not only give much of the direct training needed in the armed forces and in industrial production, but what is immediately important, and in the long run may be more important, they give the primary and foundational knowledge, skills, and attitudes basic to men and women who are to receive the more immediate and specific training for war activities. Neglect the elementary- and high-school training of boys and girls today and the manpower required by modern war will not be available tomorrow.

The duties of citizens in time of the peace to follow the present war will be no less complex and arduous than now. The effectiveness with which our citizens meet the problems of the future depends in a large measure upon whether we keep the schools open and available to the children and youth of today.

Educational opportunities from the standpoint of the Nation are not now equitably distributed, and to that extent are undemocratic. The rural children, the children of minority groups, and the children everywhere in the areas of low economic resources in our Nation do not now receive and have not received at any time in the past the amount and quality of education commensurate with the needs or the ideals of our democratic Nation. Democracy cannot be made effective throughout the Nation until the National Government provides for a fair standard of educational opportunity for all the children of all the people.

The effect of inadequate educational opportunity is well reflected in the fact that nearly 200,000 men otherwise qualified for the armed service have been found unfit because of illiteracy or near illiteracy. While it is true that steps should be taken to give these men the training they should have received in childhood, it remains a fact that these educational deficiencies must be prevented at source in the thousands of communities throughout the Nation. Federal aid for education is necessary for attaining that objective.

Educational opportunities cannot be made adequate for all the children and in every community and State under any system of State and local taxation. The evidence is irrefutable and inescapable that unless the Federal Government grants financial aid to the States in support of public schools, several million American children will continue to be denied the standard of education that ought to be considered their birthright.

At the very time the Nation needs the most from the schools, the schools are being stripped of their teachers largely because the funds are not available, and will not be available under existing State and local support, to pay the salaries necessary to enable teachers to remain in the teaching profession.

In view of these facts and conditions we, the undersigned chief State school officers and the executive secretaries of State education associations, respectfully petition you to enact into law immediately the bill, S. 1313, now pending on the Senate calendar, to provide funds to the States for lessening the inequalities of educational opportunities within and among the States, and to make possible the most valuable contribution of the schools to the winning of the war.

Respectfully submitted.

Alabama: E. B. Norton, State superintendent-elect; Frank L. Grove, executive secretary; Arizona: E. D. Ring, State superintendent; Walter Maxwell, executive secretary; Arkansas: Ralph B. Jones, State superintendent; Miss Willie A. Lawson, executive secretary; California: Roy W. Cloud, executive secretary; Arthur F. Corey, executive secretary, southern section, California Teachers Association; Colorado: Mrs. Inez Johnson Lewis, State superintendent; W. B. Mooney, executive secretary; Connecticut: Alonzo G. Grace, Commissioner of Education; Lyndon U. Pratt, executive secretary; Delaware: H. V. Holloway, State superintendent; Gwendolyn A. Marshall, executive secretary; Florida: Colin English, State superintendent; James S. Rickards, executive secretary; Georgia: M. D. Collins, State superintendent; Ralph L. Ramsey, executive secretary; Idaho: C. E. Roberts, State superintendent; John I. Hillman, executive secretary; Illinois: Irving F. Pearson, executive secretary; Indiana: Robert H. Wyatt, executive secretary; Iowa: Agnes Samuelson, executive secretary; Kansas: George L. McClenny, State superintendent; C. O. Wright, executive secretary; Kentucky: John W. Brooker, State superintendent; W. P. King, executive secretary; Louisiana: R. R. Ewertz, director, Division of Instruction and Supervision; H. W. Wright, executive secretary; Maine: Richard B. Kennan, executive secretary; Michigan: Eugene B. Elliott, State superintendent; A. J. Phillips, executive secretary; Minnesota: H. E. Flynn, Commissioner of Education; Walter E. Englund executive secretary; Mississippi: J. S. Vandiver, State superintendent; Walter N. Taylor, executive secretary; Missouri: Lloyd W. King, State superintendent; Everett Keith, executive secretary; Montana: Elizabeth Ireland, State superintendent; Martin P. Moe, executive secretary; Nebraska: Archer L. Burnham, executive secretary; Nevada: Dwight F. Dilts, executive secretary; New Hampshire: James N. Pringle, Commissioner of Education; New Mexico: Mrs. Grace J. Corrigan, State superintendent; R. J. Mullins, executive secretary; North Carolina: Clyde A. Erwin, State superintendent; Fred W. Greene, executive secretary; Jule B. Warren, editor North Carolina Education; North Dakota: A. E. Thompson, State superintendent; M. E. McCurdy, executive secretary; Oklahoma: James M. Staten, executive secretary, State Board of Education; C. M. Howell, executive secretary; Oregon: Rex Putnam, State superintendent; Frank Parr, executive secretary; Pennsylvania: Francis B. Haas, State superintendent; H. E. Gayman, executive secretary; South Carolina: James H. Hope, State superintendent; J. P. Coates, executive secretary; South Dakota: J. F. Hines, State superintendent; S. B. Nissen, executive secretary; Tennessee: A. D. Holt, executive secretary; Texas: L. A. Woods, State superintendent; B. B. Cobb, executive secretary; Utah: Charles H. Skidmore, State superintendent; Milton B. Taylor, executive secretary; Vermont: E. W. Davis, State Director Educational Research and Guidance; Virginia: Dabney S. Lancaster, State superintendent; Francis Chase, executive secretary; Washington: Pearl A. Wannamaker, State superintendent; Joe A. Chandler, executive secretary; West Virginia: W. W. Trent, State superintendent; R. B. Marston, executive secretary; Wyoming: Ester L. Anderson, State superintendent; O. C. Kerney, executive secretary; District of Columbia: E. J. Braun, Senior Specialist, School Facilities, U. S. Office of Education; Wisconsin: John Callahan, State superintendent; O. H. Plenzke, executive secretary.

## SENATE BILL 1313 AND THE NATION'S WAR EFFORT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the petition which I am presenting is signed either by the chief State school officers or the executive secretaries of the State education associations, or both, in 42 of the 48 States. It asks that Senate bill 1313 be made a law at the earliest date possible.

Senate bill 1313 is now a war measure—one of the most important which has been presented to the Senate. It is important because it will enable the schools throughout the country to make themselves fully available in the education of those persons who are to win the war.

When the war began we were already under way in our program of producing guns, tanks, planes, ships, and other materials of war. We had started our assembly lines and we have now increased our capacity to turn out materials of war. When we needed men trained for production of materials we trained them. We have bought supplies, tooled our factories, erected new plants, and have trained riveters, welders, and others for production. To produce has been our goal so far.

But we have reached the time when we must have men to fly the planes, man the guns, steer the ships. We have produced and are producing men who can take these machines into battle and bring them back. When we planned a 10,000,000-man Army and began to induct young men we found that when we had reached 40 percent of our 10,000,000 goal we had rejected 200,000 men—15 divisions—who were educationally unable to fight the kind of war we have to fight. They were physically fit but they did not know enough.

Mr. President I have said previously on the floor of the Senate that I know of no battle in the whole range of history since men started to fight with armies the result of which could not have been changed by 15 divisions of fresh, well-trained troops. I not only realize what we are losing as the result of this widespread illiteracy throughout our land, but what our country is losing by wasting the time of some of its best officers in attempting to teach the one-tenth of the illiterates who have been accepted into the Army how to read and write sufficiently well to prepare them to understand and execute commands.

Mr. President, the educational needs of the Army were brought out during the Institute on Education and the War, called by the Commissioner of Education in Washington during the last 4 days in August. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, commanding general, Services of Supply, told us in no uncertain terms what part the schools must play in the war. He said:

> The job of the armed forces is to win the total war on the battle front. * * * The job of the schools in this total war is to educate the Nation's manpower for war and the peace that follows. * * * This is an army of specialists. Out of every hundred men inducted into the service, 63 are assigned to duties requiring specialized training. Our job (in the Army) is to teach men to fight. We cannot long continue to take the time and facilities needed for this job and use them on a job which could have been done before the induction of men into the Army. * * * The schools must provide an education—basic reading, writing, and arithmetic—for those 200,000 men who because of illiteracy are unable to take up arms for their country.

Here is a call from a man who knows the needs. Out of an army of 10,000,000 men there are 6,300,000, according to General Somervell's figure, who must perform work which requires technical preparation. His request calls for two things: We must stop sending boys into manhood as illiterates, thus keeping them from serving their country, and we must provide training for additional millions of men for the armed service and civilian services essential to the war.

Illiteracy, wherever we find it, dulls our war effort. It is not possible to take an illiterate man into a factory and make a producer of him. The personnel staffs of our factories, our arsenals, and all the various industrial activities which are using their energies at the present time to make victory sure are calling for an overcoming of the illiteracy which exists.

Just as industry keeps the materials of war coming in ever-increasing amounts from the assembly lines, so must we keep the young people who come out of our schools trained so they will be available for the services demanded of them.

The schools in most of the States cannot be fully effective in contributing to the war effort because they do not have sufficient financial resources. There are 28 States which cannot pay their teaching staffs an average of $25 a week; 19

States cannot pay their staffs an average of $20 a week; 6 States cannot pay their teaching staffs an average of $15 a week; and 2 States cannot pay their teaching staffs an average of $12 a week. None of these States can compete with the wages paid in industry. These figures tell us why, in some of the States, there is a high percentage of illiteracy, why there is low school attendance, and why education for the war effort is menaced. They show us why the passage of Senate bill 1313 will contribute materially to winning the war.

Mr. President, I have prepared a list of the 28 States in which extremely low salaries are paid, and I ask that the list be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

SUPPORTING DATA

*Average weekly salaries of teachers for 1939–40, in States*

(Based on figures of United States Office of Education for 1939–40)

| | *1939–40 weekly* |
|---|---|
| LESS THAN $12 | |
| Mississippi | $10.75 |
| Arkansas | 11.63 |
| LESS THAN $15 | |
| South Carolina | 14.29 |
| Alabama | 14.31 |
| North Dakota | 14.33 |
| Georgia | 14.81 |
| LESS THAN $20 | |
| South Dakota | 15.52 |
| Kentuck | 15.88 |
| Nebraska | 15.94 |
| Tennessee | 16.58 |
| Maine | 17.19 |
| Virginia | 17.29 |
| North Carolina | 18.19 |
| Vermont | 18.87 |
| Louisiana | 19.35 |
| Florida | 19.46 |
| Kansas | 19.50 |
| Oklahoma | 19.50 |
| Iowa | 19.56 |
| LESS THAN $25 | |
| Idaho | 20.33 |
| Texas | 20.75 |
| New Mexico | 22.00 |
| Missouri | 22.29 |
| Wyoming | 22.48 |
| West Virginia | 22.50 |
| Montana | 22.77 |
| New Hampshire | 24.19 |
| Minnesota | 24.54 |

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the children of this country deserve the freedoms we are fighting to give to the children of other nations. We can afford it. We make our children pay for the war when we neglect them during war. President Roosevelt, commenting on this point, said:

> Teachers as a group are performing a great service. Children must not be allowed to pay the cost of this war in neglect or serious loss of educational opportunity.

A great industrialist said recently:

> If we can afford war, we can also afford education. * * * If we can spend billions for war, we can afford to spend millions that will give American children their birthright—health and education. * * * Whatever else we do, let's not stint our children.

Senate bill 1313 will enable each State to do its share in the service of the Nation in this war, and will enable each to strengthen the foundations of an enduring peace. This petition represents the voice of 30,000,000 school children under the direction of a million teachers. These voices should be heard.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have asked unanimous consent that I might make this brief statement, and I think I had better conclude it. Then I shall be glad to yield.

When I came on the floor of the Senate this morning I noticed one of the page boys reading a very fine book, a book entitled "Quo Vadis." If I remember my Latin, I believe the translation of that is "Whither goest thou?"

I am wondering whither we are going—where we are heading. I am almost ashamed of myself, Mr. President, to stand on the floor of the United States Senate and make a plea for equal education for the youth of our land on the basis of the war effort. If I know anything about the fundamental theories of the American Government, and the aspirations of the fathers who brought this Government into existence, I know that the very basis of our Government depends upon a universally trained citizenry. I know, too, from the studies which the Committee on Education and Labor has made and other studies dealing with migratory labor, with strategic materials, and with the various types of war activities, manpower, selective service, and all kindred matters, about the economic problems with which we are faced, and problems which may affect the entire citizenry of our country, I know of no problem which cuts so deeply into the basic fundamentals of what we call Americanism than does the neglect of our schools and the neglect of the school children.

Mr. President, day before yesterday Hitler made a speech, and, commenting upon America, making fun of our President, making fun of our people, making fun of our war effort, he called attention to the fact that the problem of unemployment was too big for America; that we could not solve it, although we had no problem comparable to that which other countries had, because, he told us, we had a great land, with mighty resources, with only a few people to the square mile.

Mr. President, this is wartime. The greatest advance which was ever made during the entire history of our educational program came during a prior war. It came when Lincoln saw the necessity of equal opportunities in education for the people throughout the whole of our land. When he did what his predecessor, Buchanan, by vetoing what became the great land-grant college bill, had failed to accomplish, Lincoln instituted in time of war the greatest educational experiment the country or the world has ever known. He brought to the world, as a result of the establishment of the great land-grant institutions, the greatest single blessing ever given to the people of the world by a single act of any government. It was a war measure then. Aid to education is a war measure now.

I repeat, Mr. President, I regret to have to admit that we must bring this matter forward at this time as a war measure; that the war requires that we act when we should have acted without the pressure of war.

Mr. President, I hope and trust that our leader will afford an opportunity for consideration of the bill by this body in order that it may soon become the law of the land. It has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Education and Labor and is on the calendar.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I merely wish to ask one or two questions. The Senator has already made an explanation to some extent. I had intended to inquire about the status of the bill. I understand it is on the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The bill has been reported and is on the calendar.

Mr. STEWART. It has been favorably reported by the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes, I made a mistake when I said it had been reported unanimously. It was not unanimously reported. The last time it was reported a minority report was filed.

Mr. STEWART. The bill provides for a fund, as I recall, of $300,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes, the bill calls for an authorization of $300,000,000.

Mr. STEWART. How is that amount broken down and divided among the States, on what basis? Is it based on the last census? Is it on the basis of population alone?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; the bill provides that the money shall be distributed on the basis of State need to produce equality of educational opportunity for all boys and girls in the primary and secondary grades of the schools.

Mr. STEWART. A moment ago the Senator placed in the RECORD a list of all the States of the Union showing comparative salaries paid to school teachers. Can the list be used as a criterion of what the Senator has stated; that is, that the States having the lowest-paid school teachers are those having the greatest need for additional funds?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. There are three or four factors which have been used in ascertaining the need. First of all, is the ability of the State to discover the need. That is, under the theory of the bill the Federal Government would not willingly go into a State if the State had not done its duty, but would ascertain from the income taxes of the State whether the State had done its full part with regard to providing education for its boys and girls.

The next criterion is the universality of the educational opportunity on a proper basis. Next is the actual need in order to give the opportunity of education to all the boys and girls of the State.

Mr. STEWART. For what other scholastic purpose would this fund be used except the payment of the salaries of school teachers?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Within certain bounds it could be used as the States direct. It could not be used for anything outside the educational effort. But some

States are backward in the State-wide organization of their school system, and some of the money could be used for adult education, and some could be used for kindergarten instruction, if it is within the State program. The Federal Government would not dictate with regard to the choice.

Mr. STEWART. Would the control be entirely within the State authority?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It would be.

Mr. STEWART. The State educational authorities?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Within the bounds of the law, it would be.

Mr. STEWART. Is it contemplated that any of this money might be used, for instance, for purposes of erecting school buildings?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In general the building fund is a separate matter. It was a separate matter in the original bill, and I think it remains a separate matter in the present bill, because the building question is entirely different from that of giving equal educational opportunities to students. Of course, buildings are necessary.

Mr. STEWART. I am sympathetic toward the bill, I will say to the Senator from Utah. I desired to ask a few inquiries with respect to it so I might be able to answer questions which have come to me recently in letters from my State. I have read the bill and the committee report on the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When we discuss the bill I shall be ready to answer questions which may be asked concerning it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] will lie on the table.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a few minutes in discussing the petition concerning which the Senator from Utah has just spoken.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah has presented a petition in behalf of the public schools of the United States, addressed to the President and Congress of the United States, asking for and urging action on Senate bill 1313 at the earliest possible date. I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Utah and to join with him in his eloquent and timely remarks. I wish to join with him, and with those who have signed the petition, in asking for and urging the earliest possible action on Senate bill 1313.

The Senator from Utah emphasized the bill as a war measure. Mr. President, it is a most important, a most urgent war measure. As the Senator from Utah has well said, in the days before the war it had been a peace measure. The Senate Committee on Education and Labor has three times reported the bill favorably to the Senate. In 1937, the bill was reported unanimously by the committee. Subsequent thereto, in 1939, the bill was favorably reported to the Senate; and now it comes to the Senate with almost a unanimous report in favor of its passage.

Those who have studied the educational system of our country and the question of educational opportunities know the gross inequalities which exist as between educational opportunities in the various States of the Union. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a new and, to me, a startling inequality in the matter of educational opportunity. As we know, the Federal Government has established Japanese colonies in the State of Arkansas. The Federal Government is providing schools in those colonies for the education of the Japanese children in the colonies. A survey of the salaries paid to teachers in those schools for Japanese children shows that the minimum weekly salary of the lowest-grade elementary school teacher is $24.23. The minimum weekly salary of the upper-grade elementary school teacher is $31.15. The minimum weekly salary of the high school teacher is $30.46—$24.23 for the lowest-grade elementary school teacher, $31.15 for the upper-grade elementary school teacher, and $30.46 for the high school teacher, in the Federal schools for Japanese children.

In contrast with the salaries paid by the Federal Government for the education of Japanese children, we find that the average weekly salary of teachers, principals, and supervisors—not the lowest grade teachers, but principals and supervisors—in Arkansas public schools, elementary schools, and high schools, is $11.23.

Mr. President, when we see the Federal Government expending two or three times as much to provide educational opportunities for Japanese children as is being expended to provide educational opportunities for our own children in these United States of America, how can we as Members of this body remain silent, how can we fail to act on behalf of children who are citizens of our own country, whose fathers today are being called into service to go out and to fight and to suffer and to die in order to protect this country from the onslaughts and the attacks of the Japanese? Let us remember that under the law, American children when they become 20 years of age—perhaps even when they become 18 or 19 years of age—will be subject to being called into the service of our country in its armed forces, having rifles put in their hands, and being sent forth to suffer, to struggle, and, if need be, to die for their country. Yet our country is spending from two to three times as much money on the education of the children of our enemies, those who would destroy our country, and our freedom, and who would enslave us, as is being expended on the education of its own citizens.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I concur wholeheartedly in the statement just made by the junior Senator from Alabama. I am ashamed to say that in my own State because of a lack of funds nine schools in one county have not been opened this year. Yet at the same time there is in my State a Japanese colony where the teachers are receiving more pay than the pay received by those teaching our own children, and where the Japanese children are receiving educational advantages far beyond those received by our citizens.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the chart showing the figures relative to this matter proves that the Senator from Colorado is absolutely correct.

What shall I say? Certainly it is a little humiliating to have to admit that in the State of Colorado the average salary paid to the teachers, principals, and supervisors in elementary and high schools is lower than the salary which the Federal Government is paying to the lowest-grade elementary-school teacher in one of the Japanese colonies in the State of Colorado.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I concur fully in what the distinguished Senators from Utah and Alabama have said relative to the matter. I find that in South Carolina the average salary paid to teachers in 1939 and 1940, according to the figures submitted by the distinguished Senator from Utah, was only $14.29, and that the average salary paid to teachers in Alabama was $14.31. Let me say that since that time it has been possible to increase the teachers' pay; but I hope that the present condition will be remedied.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say relative to what the Senator from South Carolina has said that 27 States—practically two-thirds of the States in the Union—are today furnishing men to fight, and, if need be, to die for this country; and yet in those 27 States the average salary paid to teachers, principals, and supervisors in all public schools from the high schools to the lowest-grade elementary school is less than the minimum salary paid to the lowest-salaried elementary-school teachers in the Japanese colonies in Arkansas.

Mr. ROSIER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROSIER. Mr. President, I desire to comment on certain phases of the bill providing Federal aid to education.

For 25 or 30 years those who have been particularly interested in education in this country have been pressing the Congress of the United States to make some provision for Federal aid to education. That effort is based upon the idea that general education is very vital to the preservation of our institutions. The difference of opinion has been turned on the question, Who shall bear the expense for the support of education?

Back in the early days education was supposed to be the private business of each individual family. The families who had the wealth to educate their own children provided them with the best educational opportunities, while the children of the poor were afforded no education or were given what was called poverty education. A little more than a hundred years ago, Horace Mann, of Massachusetts, started a movement in this country that established State public education. That fight has been continuing for a hundred years.

Boiled down to its lowest terms, the issue is, Shall the few who have the

wealth be taxed to provide support for schools for the education of the children of families who do not have the wealth?

In that question is involved the problem of equality of educational opportunity.

In my State of West Virginia in the last 10 years we have gone through a fight in the matter of establishing equality of educational opportunity.

I may say that down to this very minute a great many people hold that education is a local matter, that the children of a certain district or locality shall have such schools as they are able to provide. That means that districts, counties, and States with a low property valuation can tax themselves locally to the limit and still be unable to provide educational opportunities which can be provided at a low rate of taxation by wealthy communities. In my State there were counties which had $10,000 of property assessment behind each pupil who enrolled or registered in the county. There were other counties which had only about $700 of assessed value back of each pupil enrolled. So for all these years we carried on the fight to establish greater educational privileges for the children in the less-favored communities so far as wealth is concerned. It has come about in the last 6 or 8 years that we have transferred the support of our schools from the county and district to the State, so that today, Mr. President, the State of West Virginia provides 55 percent of the support of the public schools of the State. There is one county in the State of West Virginia which receives 90 percent of the support for its public schools from State funds.

Mr. President, I hold that education is vital to the preservation of this country. If we have any distinctive American way of life, it is our system of education, and I think in 150 years we have demonstrated that our success among the nations of the earth has been based very largely upon our system of education, the kind of education which Washington advocated in his Farewell Address, which Thomas Jefferson first outlined for us, and which Horace Mann, through years of struggle, established in the States of this Union.

I should like to say a word about the equalizing of educational opportunities. I suppose that there is no subject on which political orators and orators of all types have expanded themselves more than on their support of public education in this country. It is a good deal like our professions of Christianity; we profess very loudly, but we do not practice. I say we have come to a time in this country when the States as related to local communities and the Nation as related to the States must assume responsibility for the educational problem.

The bill in question is really a war measure; it is a measure for the preservation of our Nation, Mr. President, because we are not only called upon to furnish the intellectual and spiritual leadership in this war but we are called upon to provide the training and education which will provide the bulwark of our protection after the war.



Let me say that, following this war, 1 year after this war, we will be confronted with more "isms" than were ever before dreamed of; everyone will be affected, and the only way that we can stand up against the wave of isms and all sorts of ideologies which will assault us after this war is over, will be by having a majority of our people intelligent and educated, for we all know that an ignorant mass of people are subject to be the prey of the demagogue and those who would advocate all sorts of isms.

So, Mr. President, I gladly lend my support to this measure, and I join with all those who are supporting it not only as a war measure—and it certainly can be justified in every respect on that basis—but more especially as a measure to preserve our institutions after this war shall have ended.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for the contribution he has made. He is one of the leading educators of this country; his is one of the real authoritative voices in America on the subject of education. He has said much that I thought, perhaps I might say, but he has said it better, and, I am sure, in a more compelling way than I could have said it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I was somewhat surprised a moment ago at a statement made by the Senator from Alabama with respect to the payment of teachers who are conducting schools for the Japanese, who are being held as unwilling guests of the Government, or perhaps unwilling guests, but who, nevertheless, have been segregated to themselves. Can the Senator inform me by what authority the schools in which Japanese enemies are being educated are maintained? I do not recall that Congress has given any authority to maintain schools to educate our enemies.

Mr. HILL. I should think that under general legislation which Congress has passed to provide for the bringing together of the Japanese in certain areas in colonies.

Mr. STEWART. In concentration camps.

Mr. HILL. I should not call them concentration camps, for the colonies such as we operate are entirely different from what we think of as concentration camps which the Germans operate.

Mr. STEWART. So far as I am concerned, they could be worse than that with respect to the Japanese. However, if I may interrogate the Senator further, may I ask him if he knows whether the Japanese Government extends a similar courtesy to such Americans as are being held prisoners in Japan?

Mr. HILL. I cannot tell the Senator; I do not know. I do know that in the Senator's State the average salary of teachers, principals, and supervisors in all public schools, that is, from the lowest elementary schools through the high schools, is $14.56.

Mr. STEWART. That has been slightly increased, if I may interrupt the Senator; it is $16.58 a week.

Mr. HILL. I am glad it has been raised; but even with the $16.58 figure, it is still far under the salaries which are being paid by the Federal Government for the education of the children in the Japanese colonies. The lowest elementary salary in these Japanese colonies, as I have stated, is $24.23.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator for answering the questions I have asked, and I wish to say to those who have already spoken on this matter that I am in hearty accord with those who favor the passage of the bill referred to, or one of similar character, because I feel that school teachers are greatly underpaid, and that most of the States are not making the fullest effort to pay them proper salaries.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct about teachers being underpaid in many of the States. As to the effort that is being made, I wish to emphasize that the States in which there is the largest number of children, States which are the poorest in the economic ability, poorest from the standpoint of the wealth with which to provide education, are the ones which are making the greatest effort to educate their children. They are the ones which are levying the heaviest taxes upon themselves. They are the ones carrying the heaviest burden in an effort to give their children the best possible educational opportunities.

There is only one way in which we can equalize educational oportunities in this country, and that is by the passage of a bill such as Senate bill 1313, under which the Federal Government would raise the standards of education in the poorer States, with their greater number of children, States which are taxing themselves to the limit, and which are making the greatest effort today to educate their own children.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I am aware that Senate bill 1313 is not before the Senate for action at this time, but I have been greatly interested in the remarks which have been made in support of the bill. Perhaps I myself can agree with most of the statements which have been made, but I think we should keep the RECORD a little bit straighter than it is up to the moment with reference to the report of the committee being unanimous in support of the bill. Two speakers have made the statement, I believe, that the report was practically unanimous. That is hardly correct, because I believe a minority report was filed.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. I have been greatly interested in the figures he gives us with reference to the expense of operating the schools for the Japanese evacuees in Arkansas as compared with the expense of operating local schools in Arkansas. That implies that we must raise the expense of operating our domestic economy in all lines to match the expenditures which are being made in connection with

our war program, and I think that would be a very false premise to assume.

Mr. HILL. I do not agree with the Senator at all. The education of children, the preparation of children for citizenship, cannot be put into any general category with all other economic or social problems that may be involved in our domestic economy.

Mr. BUTLER. I am of the opinion that it is not possible to measure the value of education to an individual by the amount of money spent on it.

Mr. HILL. It is not possible to measure the benefit of an education by the money spent on it, but we certainly can measure the educational opportunity we give an individual by the amount of money expended, and that is what the plea is for. The plea is to give decent educational opportunities to all the children of this country, whether they reside in Nebraska, North Dakota, or any other State of the Union. We certainly can measure the educational opportunity by the money.

Mr. BUTLER. If we wished to measure it by the amount of money being spent, or if the amount of money were a controlling factor, we would cease to draw from the log cabins of Kentucky men such as Lincoln, or others of the leading men and women of the Nation, who have come from perhaps the sod schoolhouses on the prairie. We would look to New York and other centers where the receipts from tax money are great. I do not care to extend the comparison any further for the moment, but I should like to give an illustration, if the Senator will permit.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has mentioned Abraham Lincoln. If he is to follow the logic of the theory he suggests, then he perhaps would abolish all schools in the country. I do not think the Senator has arrived at that point. Every once in a while we find a rare genius such as Abraham Lincoln who perhaps comes once in many generations, who can and does overcome the handicaps and the obstacles and the barriers presented by his not having had educational opportunity, but he is the exception rather than the rule.

Mr. BUTLER. I am of the opinion we are not going to benefit our educational situation by attempting to make it entirely the responsibility of the Nation. I would apply the same logic to the operation of State institutions that I would apply to individuals. We make advancement by helping ourselves and not looking too much to someone else to give us something as individuals, and the same observation will apply to the States. If the States will collect their taxes promptly, based on proper rates of taxation, I think that most of them will be in position to give necessary educational opportunity to their students.

Again referring to the matter of bringing school expenditures up to the level of our war program, I have a letter from a man in Louisiana, for instance, who visited a place where there is being spent $3,400 on the construction of guardhouses which will accommodate two guards. It would be possible to construct buildings which would take care of two guards for a very small fraction of $3,400, and I am fearful that if we should attempt to put our school and other domestic expenses upon a level with our war expenditures, it would be a little too much of a burden even for the United States Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Alabama yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have before me a table indicating that the average weekly salary of teachers, supervisors, and principals in the State of Nebraska amounts to $15.94 per week. Does the Senator feel that to be an adequate salary for the teachers in his State, and if not, why does not his State raise more money in order to increase the salaries of its teachers?

Mr. BUTLER. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that the salaries of teachers in Nebraska are disgracefully low, but I am of the opinion that the people of Nebraska are well able to pay decent salaries. They may not be in position to match the salaries being paid to war workers, but they can pay better salaries than they are now paying, and ultimately they will do so, and, I hope, without assistance from the United States Treasury. The moment the United States intervenes to help us with our educational system, I fear it will attempt to direct the kind of education we are to receive, and that is something for which we are not ready.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama made a very significant statement a few moments ago when he said that the States of the South are doing all they can in order to assist in the education of the children of the South.

Off and on for the past 5 or 6 years the Committee on Education and Labor has been holding hearings on bills authorizing Federal aid for education. Facts were presented to the committee showing that the State of Mississippi—in fact, many other States of our Union—could spend for educational purposes every dollar of tax money they collect each year for all purposes and yet they would not spend as much money per pupil as does the State of New York. That seems incredible and yet it is true.

Mr. HILL. In other words, if the State of Mississippi spent for education alone every dollar that today is being spent not only for educational purposes, but for all other governmental purposes, it still could not provide for its children the educational opportunities which are being provided by other States.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct; that is the point I was seeking to emphasize. If the Senator will permit me to be more specific: In 1933–34 Mississippi spent, per pupil enrolled, $18.93, and New York spent $124.32. Arkansas spent only $19.86 per pupil. Why, the average expenditure per pupil enrolled for the period indicated in continental United States was $64.76. Thus it can be seen at a glance that something must and should be done at once in order to give near equal educational advantages to all residents of our Nation, no matter where they live.

Another significant sequence to the lack of funds is found by noting that in the States of the South that are not able to or do not spend the amount of money which should be spent on education, the percentage of pupils in the high schools of these States is much less than in those States that are better able to carry the burden.

For instance, in the State of Mississippi, where only $10.75, as an average, is paid weekly to the teachers, supervisors, and principals in the schools of the State, only 39.5 percent of the pupils in the State of high-school age are in high school. In the State of New York, where an average of $50.07 per week is paid to teachers, supervisors, and principals, the percentage of pupils of high-school age in high school is 82.7.

Mr. President, I do not desire to infringe upon the time of the Senator from Alabama, but with his consent I should like to place in the RECORD at this point a table showing the percentage of pupils of high-school age enrolled in the high schools of each State, and also a table showing the weekly salary of teachers, supervisors, and principals of each State. I am sure he will not object.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table presented by the Senator from Louisiana will be printed in the RECORD.

The table is as follows:

| State | Average weekly salary of teachers, supervisors, and principals (1939–40) | Percentage of pupils of high-school age enrolled in high school (1940) |
|---|---|---|
| Alabama | $14.31 | 40.7 |
| Arizona | 29.65 | 58.0 |
| Arkansas | 11.23 | 43.7 |
| California | 42.33 | 82.4 |
| Colorado | 26.78 | 71.2 |
| Connecticut | 35.80 | 70.6 |
| Delaware | 32.17 | 65.4 |
| Florida | 19.46 | 57.1 |
| Georgia | 14.81 | 49.2 |
| Idaho | 20.33 | 78.6 |
| Illinois | 30.92 | 67.0 |
| Indiana | 27.54 | 80.4 |
| Iowa | 19.56 | 78.8 |
| Kansas | 18.50 | 82.0 |
| Kentucky | 15.88 | 40.6 |
| Louisiana | 19.25 | 50.5 |
| Maine | 17.19 | 61.6 |
| Maryland | 30.07 | 47.0 |
| Massachusetts | 38.63 | 76.8 |
| Michigan | 30.30 | 75.2 |
| Minnesota | 24.51 | 71.4 |
| Mississippi | 10.75 | 39.5 |
| Missouri | 22.29 | 65.8 |
| Montana | 22.77 | 76.7 |
| Nebraska | 15.94 | 82.0 |
| Nevada | 29.95 | 86.1 |
| New Hampshire | 23.71 | 62.5 |
| New Jersey | 40.25 | 73.6 |
| New Mexico | 22.00 | 51.9 |
| New York | 50.07 | 82.7 |
| North Carolina | 18.19 | 62.5 |
| North Dakota | 14.33 | 65.8 |
| Ohio | 30.51 | 75.9 |
| Oklahoma | 17.50 | 69.3 |
| Oregon | 25.63 | 85.3 |
| Pennsylvania | 31.53 | 71.5 |
| Rhode Island | 33.77 | 53.4 |
| South Carolina | 14.29 | 49.1 |
| South Dakota | 15.52 | 75.0 |
| Tennessee | 14.56 | 46.1 |
| Texas | 20.75 | 67.5 |
| Utah | 26.80 | 93.3 |
| Vermont | 18.87 | 55.6 |
| Virginia | 17.29 | 51.6 |
| Washington | 32.81 | 92.5 |
| West Virginia | 22.50 | 55.3 |
| Wisconsin | 26.51 | 70.6 |
| Wyoming | 22.48 | 94.2 |

Mr. ELLENDER. I should also like to place in the RECORD at this point a table

showing the percentage of persons of 25 years of age or over, who have completed 4 years of education or less. The percentages will be somewhat reflected in proportion to the amount of money which is spent in the various States, especially in the South. The table will show that the percentages are much less, of course, in the States where more money is expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table presented by the Senator from Louisiana will be printed in the RECORD.

The table is as follows:

*Percentage of persons 25 years of age or older who had completed 4 years of education or less*

| | |
|---|---|
| Alabama | 28.9 |
| Arizona | 19.4 |
| Arkansas | 23.1 |
| California | 8.1 |
| Colorado | 9.0 |
| Connecticut | 11.2 |
| Delaware | 12.9 |
| Florida | 18.5 |
| Georgia | 30.1 |
| Idaho | 5.2 |
| Illinois | 9.6 |
| Indiana | 7.7 |
| Iowa | 4.1 |
| Kansas | 6.1 |
| Kentucky | 20.2 |
| Louisiana | 35.7 |
| Maine | 7.4 |
| Maryland | 15.3 |
| Massachusetts | 10.1 |
| Michigan | 10.2 |
| Minnesota | 7.5 |
| Mississippi | 30.2 |
| Missouri | 10.3 |
| Montana | 7.4 |
| Nebraska | 6.0 |
| Nevada | 8.8 |
| New Hampshire | 8.1 |
| New Jersey | 12.0 |
| New Mexico | 27.3 |
| New York | 12.1 |
| North Carolina | 26.2 |
| North Dakota | 10.8 |
| Ohio | 8.4 |
| Oklahoma | 13.5 |
| Oregon | 5.2 |
| Pennsylvania | 12.3 |
| Rhode Island | 13.7 |
| South Carolina | 34.7 |
| South Dakota | 7.2 |
| Tennessee | 21.7 |
| Texas | 18.8 |
| Utah | 5.5 |
| Vermont | 6.1 |
| Virginia | 23.2 |
| Washington | 5.9 |
| West Virginia | 16.5 |
| Wisconsin | 9.4 |
| Wyoming | 7.1 |

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to emphasize the fact which has been stated by the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator has properly and well spoken of the conditions in the South, but the lack of opportunity is not at all confined to the South. Many States in other sections of the country, particularly in the West, offer fewer educational opportunities than are offered in the South. The situation in those States may be a little less aggravated than in some places in the South, but there is still a sharp and pronounced lack of educational opportunity in many of the States outside of the South.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about it. For many years the Senate has had under consideration numerous bills for Federal aid and little but committee action has taken place.

It is my contention that all States will benefit if we should make possible equal educational advantages for all children no matter where they live. We have a mobile population. In many States over 50 percent of their population is not native-born. People move in from other States to become permanently located. Would it not be better to have well-educated people to move in than to have fourth graders move in?

Mr. President, this problem is now beyond the talking stage. We need action and the quicker we act the better off we shall be. We should enact Senate bill 1313 without delay, and I suggest to our distinguished majority leader that the bill be called from the calendar at the first opportunity.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I apologize to the Senator for interrupting him, but I am one of the conferees on the price-control and anti-inflation bill, and I was about to ask that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Alabama the Senate stand in recess until 3 o'clock. The conferees are very nearly together on their report. The report must be acted upon first in the House. We hope to have it ready for consideration by the Senate at 3 o'clock.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is there any reasonable probability that a record vote will be necessary on the conference report?

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt it, unless such a vote is demanded. I see no reason why there should be a record vote, but we can never tell about it. If some Senator demands it, and a sufficient number second the demand, we will have a record vote. But I think the prospects are fair that there will not be such a demand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the addresses which are to be made upon the subject of Senate bill 1313, or any other subject, the Senate stand in recess to 3 o'clock p. m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I am intensely interested in what may be the outcome of the consideration involving Senate bill 1313, and I should like to offer my thanks and appreciation to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for the splendid way in which they have today expounded the need and the occasion for the proposed legisation. May I ask the Senator from Utah whether there is companion legislation pending in the House of Representatives at this time?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No bill similar to Senate bill 1313 has been introduced in the House up to this time.

Mr. NYE. Then it is all the more important, it seems to me, that before long the Senate accomplish the passage of the bill to the end that there may be opportunity for the House to act before the end of the present session. Does the Senator have in prospect any time when we might take up the bill in the Senate?

Mr. HILL. I know of no definite date, but I certainly hope and strongly urge that the bill may be considered at the earliest possible date.

Mr. NYE. I shall want to join the Senator in any undertaking that is his to hurry such action.

Mr. HILL. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from North Dakota.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROSIER. I wish to make one other remark about the subject of education in a democracy. Education in countries dominated by aristocracy is confined to the privileged few. It is our theory that in a democracy the children across the track should have the same opportunity for development and growth as the children up the avenues. We have had difficulty carrying out our ideas of equality in a democracy, but in a democracy education should be universal, and out of universal education we are going to get our leadership in the future.

I may say that in a democracy leadership is just as apt to come out of a mountain cabin or a home in a tenement as it is to come out of the homes of the well-to-do and the rich. Sometimes we like to think it is more apt to come from the homes of the poor. But in this modern age we cannot depend on the Abraham Lincoln type of development. For a great many years I have heard that example held up in regard to education. No one can have an admiration surpassing mine for Abraham Lincoln and all his accomplishments, but there are many Abraham Lincolns scattered all through the poor homes, farm homes, and homes of laboring people of this country, who, if they had the opportunity, could become of tremendous value to their country.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that in a democracy we have to think in terms of the average man and make our comparisons in that way?

Mr. ROSIER. Yes. We educators do not profess that we can make great intellectual leaders out of all people. Such an idea would be preposterous. It is said that the great problem in education is to discover talent and ability and to develop it, and who knows where we can find it in this country? I think it was Thomas Carlyle who once made this significant remark:

> The greatest human tragedy is this, that a person who is capable of learning should die in ignorance.

The objective of education in a democracy is to see to it that no boy and no girl, whatever may be his or her material

circumstances, shall be robbed of the opportunity to learn and to develop the talents with which they have been endowed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I agree with all that the Senator from West Virginia has said. I could proceed further at this time and give to the Senate many figures and, I hope, many persuasive arguments in behalf of the bill. It seems evident, from the debate which has taken place in the Senate today, in which numerous Senators have voiced their views and expressed their support of the bill, that many of the Members of this body are anxious to have it considered at the earliest possible time. I hope we may have that much-desired consummation—early consideration and early action on the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize what the Senator from West Virginia has said. The failure of the Congress to pass this bill would be a denial of democracy itself. We are today engaged in a great war to preserve our democracy from attack and from destruction by forces from without. If we should fail to pass this bill we would fail to give proper, adequate, and much-needed protection to our democracy against forces from within. Long ago Macaulay declared that America need have no fear of the enemy from without; that it was the vandal within who would bring about her destruction. There perhaps is no greater seedbed of vandalism than ignorance. A democracy must live and survive through the character, independence, and enlightenment of its people, and if we fail to give to the children of our country, its future citizens, the opportunity to build and develop character and intelligence, the opportunity to receive enlightenment, then we deny democracy itself, we shut off the springs from which democracy receives its life-giving waters. If we shut off those springs the inevitable end must be the death of democracy.

Mr. President, with the single exception of winning the war, of putting forth the efforts needed to win the war, there is nothing more important, nothing more compelling to be done at this hour, than the passage of Senate bill 1313. We should pass it, as the Senator from Utah has said, as an urgent war measure. We should pass it as an urgent measure to make proper provision for the peace, with all its many problems, which is to come after the war. We should pass it so as to protect and preserve our democracy from within, even as we struggle and fight today to protect and preserve our democracy against the forces from without.

### INVESTIGATION OF REQUISITIONING OF RAILROAD PROPERTY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 297, submitted by me (for myself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. HATCH) on October 1, and reported favorably today by the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 297) authorizing an investigation of the policy of certain governmental agencies in requisitioning railroad property.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the resolution, which, as I understand, was reported today from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, provides—

> That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full investigation of the practices and policies followed by the War Production Board, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, directly or through subsidiary agencies, with respect to the requisitioning or other acquisition of railroad property. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

Under the law the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized to decide whether existing tracks or short lines or feeder lines or other lines of railroad may be abandoned, and since the passage of the Transportation Act of 1920, in which that authority was first included, I think it has been exercised on numerous occasions. Of course, in a case in which the Commission authorizes the abandonment of a railroad track or any part of a railroad system the property still belongs to the railroad company to be disposed of as it may see fit. Undoubtedly the situation grows out of the scarcity of steel and probably other critical materials involved in abandoned railroad trackage, and whatever the War Production Board has done or is doing is based upon that need.

I have had my attention called to the fact that in a number of cities all over the country—Birmingham and in other cities—the War Production Board has ordered the taking up of streetcar tracks which have been abandoned by the utilities—busses and other forms of transportation having been provided instead of streetcars. I would not want to justify the adoption of such a resolution as this on the basis of any isolated case in which the War Production Board or any other agency for war purposes is proceeding to acquire railroad tracks, whose abandonment has been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, or whose abandonment has not been approved, simply to look into one isolated case of that kind.

I wish to inquire of the Senator from Kansas to what extent this practice, or whatever it may be called, is general? How many such cases are there? Is it one isolated case, or what is the situation with respect to the problem which makes it necessary to investigate the practices of the War Production Board? I base that question upon this fact: It is easy here to adopt a resolution to investigate somebody. We have investigating committees here and there, and we are investigating everybody who has anything to do with the conduct of the war, and we give out reports and blasts and comments after we have made an investigation. I want to know whether the difficulty which the Senator from Kansas has in mind, and which the committee must have had in mind in reporting the resolution, is sufficiently general, or are the cases sufficiently numerous to justify a general investigation? The resolution would indicate that a condition has been found which makes it necessary for us to investigate the War Production Board, the Office of Defense Transportation, which is the Interstate Commerce Commission, or the Chairman of that Commission, or at least the head of it, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and all that. I should like to know what the basis of it is.

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

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to bear witness to the conditions in Oregon. I have not had anything to do with the preparation or the proposal of this resolution; indeed, I have not asked for such information in many, many years; but in this instance I rather favor a proposal such as the able Senator from Kansas has suggested.

In my own State there are two illustrations of what I think should be considered. From the Columbia River, on the main line of the Union Pacific, to Shaniko, a distance of 75 miles through a wheat-producing section, the rails are being removed. There are deep canyons on either side of the railroad track. With a shortage of tires, it would seem impossible to move the wheat and the cattle and sheep from that section next year. I think those responsible are taking into consideration the immediate need for rails without considering the future. It seems to me that such action amounts almost to confiscation of farm properties.

I have gone into the matter and find a want of coordination between the War Production Board, the Metals Reserve Company, Mr. Eastman's organization, and the Interstate Commerce Commission. In one instance the Interstate Commerce Commission held a hearing on the 8th of September. Before it could submit a report the Metals Reserve Company went into action on the advice of the War Production Board, which says that it has been authorized by the War Department to do this particular job.

I believe that the whole situation could be saved if the various agencies could reason together and determine the economic situation which confronts the farmers. No one wants to deny the Government or the War Department the use of needed rails; but they could probably be obtained elsewhere, rather than by taking from a farming community rails which are needed to meet the needs of commerce for next year. I appear as a voluntary witness only because of the challenge——

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not a challenge. I am seeking information.

Mr. McNARY. There are two instances in my State. One involves the line from Brogan to another place in Oregon. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] told me about an instance in his State.

I rather favor the proposed investigation, because I know it would be fair. It would be calculated to develop the sub-

ject, and not to expose or attack anyone. During all my service in the Senate I have never been charged with attacking anyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. My inquiry was based upon my desire to obtain information. I do not wish to participate in the adoption of a resolution to investigate the War Production Board or any other agency on the basis of an isolated case in which someone does not want rails taken up.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me state for the information of the Senator from Kentucky that within the past 60 days we have had three such instances in New Mexico, one of which involved some locomotives which were needed elsewhere.

The thing about which farmers are complaining is that a railroad may make an application to the Interstate Commerce Commission to abandon a certain railroad line because there is no necessity for it; and before the Interstate Commerce Commission can act, the War Production Board will order the rails taken up. On the 2d of September the Interstate Commerce Commission held a hearing in the little city of Clayton, N. Mex. An investigator was sent there. At the same time, and before the Interstate Commerce Commission had made a decision as to the necessity for abandoning the line, the War Production Board, under its authority, ordered the rails taken up.

It happened at a bad time of the year. As the Senator from Kentucky knows, New Mexico is a stock-raising and farming State. The farmers of New Mexico send their cattle and sheep to market about the first of October. Contracts are made for delivery on that date. Without considering the needs of the people at that particular time, and before the Interstate Commerce Commission had arrived at a decision, the War Production Board ordered the rails taken up.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. For the further information of the distinguished majority leader, let me state that recently a tentative effort, at least, was made to requisition a whole railroad system in Colorado. That particular system is the backbone of transportation for about 75,000 people, and the only comprehensive transportation system they have.

In fairness to the War Production Board and to the Office of Defense Transportation, upon my protest they agreed that there would be no haste about the matter and that all interested parties would be afforded the opportunity for a full hearing. When agencies of the Government reach out and affect railroads which are in use, I believe there is legitimate reason for looking into the question and determining the war needs as against the needs of the general community. Many such railroad lines are vital to the production of a number of mines which are engaged in mining strategic minerals.

I wish very heartily to endorse the resolution. I do not believe that any harm could come from the investigation if it were pursued in a fair spirit. I believe that it would be very helpful, because the communities which are threatened in that way should know where they stand and how they are going to live, from a transportation standpoint.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, of course, the committee could have looked into this subject without a resolution. It has the right to call witnesses before it and find out what is being done. It may be a little more impressive to have the Senate adopt a resolution authorizing such an investigation. The proposed investigation involves no expense, and I shall not object to the present consideration of the resolution; but I hope that the investigation called for will not result in throwing out a dragnet to try to find something which has been done by the War Production Board, the Office of Defense Transportation, or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of which Senators do not approve. If anything needs correction, it seems to me that through a conference among the various agencies a modus operandi might be worked out so that it would not be necessary to enact any legislation on the subject. I do not object to the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me make a very brief statement. This situation is widespread. It extends clear across the country, from one ocean to the other, and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico.

The immediate and urgent interest arises from the fact that last June I had a conference with the president of the Santa Fe Railroad, the largest railroad in Kansas, and one of the great systems of the country, in which he told me that the Santa Fe Railroad was about to file applications for the abandonment of about 185 miles of branch lines in Kansas. I urged him to delay the presentation of such an application until the rubber situation and the truck situation had become more nearly normal. He declined to do so.

The railroad pressed its application, and the Interstate Commerce Commission set hearings. A record has been made; and yet in the interim the War Production Board, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and a Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiary, the Metals Reserve Company, has begun a requisitioning process, without giving anyone an opportunity to be heard and before the Interstate Commerce Commission had made any finding on the record already made.

The situation is widespread. I talked with Mr. Eastman about this subject night before last. Mr. Eastman believes that the War Production Board ought to defer action in this instance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I believe that the Senator's information as to the agency which makes the requisition is not quite correct. I think the Senator will find that that agency is the Section of Inventory and Requisition. That is the section through which the order comes. That section is where the Senator should begin his investigation.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that I have conferred with the division to which he refers. The actual requisitioning is done by the Metals Reserve Company. Possession of the property is taken by the Metals Reserve Company, which is a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

As I have stated, I had a talk with Mr. Eastman night before last. I had had an understanding with him that no action would be taken in these cases until there had been a careful investigation from all sources. I was told that the War Production Board is about to violate that understanding. Since I have been in the Chamber I have been called to the telephone by one of Mr. Eastman's associates, who told me that the Office of Defense Transportation was having difficulty in getting the War Production Board to defer action until all sides of the question can be presented.

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I have spent about a week trying to find out from the War Production Board how much steel rail it needs. The purpose of the requisition is to obtain steel rail. I am unable to ascertain. I have been trying to find out how much steel rail is available from other sources besides branch-line railroads. I have been unable to ascertain. Also, I have tried to find out from Mr. Eastman. He does not know, and he says that he cannot find out. I think it is about time for somebody to find out.

There is no question that under normal circumstances many branch lines would be abandoned. However, in this period of uncertainty as to rubber tires and trucks, when such branch lines are abandoned and their rails taken up, communities are deprived of transportation and there is brought about irreparable damage, which should not be caused, at least until the communities interested have had an opportunity to be heard. The Interstate Commerce Commission affords such opportunities for hearings. The War Production Board does not.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to endorse and supplement what my colleague [Mr. McNARY] said about the branch line from the Columbia River into the Shaniko and central Oregon area. So exercised and concerned are the people of that great producing area as to what is about to happen to the railroad which serves that community that a delegation has come all the way across the continent to ask that we do what we can to protect the interests of the people of that community.

I am very much in favor of the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think I have said enough. The situation is urgent. That is the only reason for my

bringing up the resolution out of order and asking unanimous consent for its consideration, in order that an investigation may be made. I believe that the Committee on Interstate Commerce is familiar with such things, and is the proper agency to make the investigation. Someone somewhere should do something about it. All we propose to do is to find out what the policy is, who declares it, and what the basis is, and to protect, so far as we can, the interests of the communities that will be affected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I was very happy to join with the junior Senator from Kansas in the introduction of the resolution. One reason which impelled me to endorse the resolution was a statement made to me by Mr. Julius Luhrsen, who is secretary for the railway brotherhoods. Mr. Luhrsen made the statement that he had made a survey of idle rails and that he discovered there were 3,000 miles of idle rails in this country not serving under any certificate of convenience and necessity. If that be the fact, such idle rails should be utilized before utilities which are serving public welfare are torn up. The only way I know of to establish the facts is by means of a hearing to ascertain the true situation. That is the only way to establish it; and that is one of the impelling reasons which caused me to join with the Senator from Kansas in presenting the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 297) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full investigation of the practices and policies followed by the War Production Board, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, directly or through subsidiary agencies, with respect to the requisitioning or other acquisition of railroad property. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER 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 NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there are only a few nominations on the Executive Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cleora Hila Creed to be postmaster at Turon, Kans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotions and appointments in the Marine Corps.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the routine nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

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

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

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

That completes the Executive Calendar.

PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES—CONDUCT OF THE WAR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of pleasure and edification to the discussion today on the subject of education. When the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER] spoke I was reminded of an incident which occurred in the life of Göethe, the great German poet and philosopher. It is said that when he came to die those gathered around his bedside heard him say "More light! More light!" Some thought he meant more candlelight; but there was one there who was a twin soul with Göethe, who comprehended that what he meant was that the world needed more light.

The word "education" comes from the Latin "educare," to lead out from darkness into light. In this country we have seen an overemphasis on great buildings, as though that meant education. I am reminded of the philosopher who spoke of a great educator sitting on one end of a log and a student on the other as composing the greatest university. We need facilities which will give opportunities to boys and girls to have a break. Above that, we need educational leaders, men and women who think straight, in terms of democracy, in terms of moral values, in terms of those things which make for manhood and strength.

We need a reeducation in relation to Government itself, to eliminate the chiseler, the grafter, and the leaner. We need education in terms of individual honesty. We need to learn, not "What can I get?" but "What can I give?"

As a boy in high school I was privileged to learn from a great teacher, a woman who thought that education consisted in bringing right ideas to her pupils. Of her, after she had passed on, it was my privilege to say:

MY TEACHER

She was no purveyor of mere facts.
With her, grades were not the thing.
She had enthusiasm—the Greeks' "fire of the soul."
And she gave of it, and giving,
Her student caught the flame.
Building men was her task.
She told us "to dream dreams,
Build ourselves a great plan of life
Full of joy and vision."

With her nothing was dull and monotonous.
Every bit of learning was a step to nobler truth.
Life was a mysterious adventure.
We were growing units of a perfect entity.
We were singers of a great symphony.
We were seekers for more light.

Glad and joyous was she,
And she taught us to be likewise.
No task was drudgery, but an opportunity for growth.
In helping others, we helped ourselves.
We were, like Millet,
Painting pictures for eternity.
We were called to do great things.

She fed us self-reliance and the dignity of life;
She taught us to think, to breathe, to feel;
To get rid of fear and ignorance,
And dare to go out and do.

Radiant was this woman.
Like sunshine was her presence,
And her influence was like the dawn.
You speak of "money and things"
You who find life but a grabbing process.
Learn of her as I have learned,
And you will find a new meaning
To this link in the chain we call "life."

—*Alex. Wiley.*

Mr. President, I did not intend to speak on the subject of education, but to me it is vital. In the last analysis, it depends upon the quality of the teacher. I heard the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER] speak about the era to come after this war, when we shall face "isms" and false doctrines. Yes; but we must be frank. Some of our so-called great educators in this country have espoused many of the false "isms" and have become the disciples—and, what is more, the disseminators—of such false "isms." They did much to undermine the very fundamentals of our country which made America great, namely, industry, thrift, and courage. It took a war to bring us back to our senses. As I say, I did not rise to speak today on that subject.

CONDUCT OF THE WAR AND THE HOME FRONT

Mr. President, next Monday this body will consider the largest tax bill in the history of this Nation.

That tax bill imposes a tremendous financial obligation on the American people. It also imposes a grave obligation on the Congress of the United States.

It perhaps serves a constructive purpose for us to review that obligation in the comparative calm before next week's financial dive bombing takes place.

We know that America's destiny on the battle front is in the hands of the Commander in Chief and our fighting forces and their leaders. America's destiny on the home front is in our hands. The conduct of the war rightly belongs with the experts, as was said here today; and it is important that the American people recognize this fact.

How will we at home manage the home front? Congress cannot and must not "pass the buck" to the President to look after the economy of the Nation. That is our job. The people are very seriously concerned about the way money is being spent in this battle for existence. Loose spending does not make for morale building on the home front.

Right now little businessmen—tens of thousands of them—are going through their Gethsemane. Millions of our people are dependent upon little business. Our way of life is dependent upon little businessmen and the farmers. Many thousands of them are being put out of business and production.

The condition of the farmer and the little businessman, the rationing of fuel, tires, and food, enormous unnecessary expenditures, the employment of 2,300,000 civilians in government, and strikes have caused Senators to express grave fears about the future.

I am not fearful of the future, Mr. President, provided government will do what it should do without hesitation. Action—courageous action—is required, especially on the home front; and one of the essential things that must be done is immediately to get rid of a large number of civilian employees of government, reducing the personnel of bureaus and departments to the bone. This would make for understanding on the home front. Had I the time I should amplify that thought. Our trains, which the President wants for the war effort, are filled with civilian employees of the Government—2,300,000 of them. Travel on trains to the West and see who travels de luxe. Your money and mine is paying that bill. The money of the taxpayers is paying the bill; and we do not seem to be concerned about it.

Probably no Senator has received any substantial amount of mail relating to the conduct of the war itself. On the other hand, every Senator has received countless letters criticizing the conduct of domestic affairs during the war.

That is extremely significant. It is important because every taxpayer has a right to expect an enlightened, efficient, and realistic conduct of domestic affairs. When we are unable to achieve a desired objective on the battle front, it is not because our forces lack courage; but when we fail to achieve our domestic objectives, it is frequently because we in the Senate lack courage.

Right now people all over America are confused by chaotic bungling, mismanagement, and contradictory statements emanating from Washington. As an explanation of why there is so much confusion I recommend a recent newspaper article entitled, "Urges a Coordinator of Public Addresses" by Henry McLemore, which appeared in the Washington Star of September 30. I ask that this column be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we ask our men to lay down their lives if necessary. We ask our citizens on the home front to make sacrifices; and we are preparing to ask them to pay the freight for the highest tax bill in the history of the United States. Is it, then, too much to ask Government to give leadership and to sacrifice?

The great labor unions of the land have banned strikes for the duration of the war; but wildcat, unauthorized strikes, persist. Is it too much to ask that the Government, which drafts men, shall be courageous enough to ban all strikes for the duration of the war?

At a time when farm auctions in my State and elsewhere are the highest in a generation is it too much to ask of Government that it shall adopt manpower policies which will insure that sufficient labor is allocated to the farms—the food-producing plants of the country.

At a time when we fight to keep the so-called American system alive, is it too much to ask that Government shall keep small industries alive, rather than place its reliance chiefly on large industrial plants? There have been several abortive attempts to solve this problem, and they have admittedly failed. The best example of utilizing small plants has been found in Britain; and the British have set a pattern which we might well follow. The other evening it was my privilege to listen to Mr. Holland, whom I consider a great American. He has been called into the picture by Mr. Nelson. He told us that in Great Britain the small plants are doing the job more efficiently and at less cost than are the large plants. In the Senate we sit listening to problems in which the hinterland is interested. At a time when the war demands the dedication of every working hour of every American, either on the battle front or on the home front, is it too much to ask that Government consider as a war measure the 48-hour week instead of the 40-hour week—not as a permanent invasion of labor's rights but as a temporary measure necessary for survival?

Mr. President, in one respect, at least, the recent price-control debate had a healthy effect. It demonstrated that there is still a spirit of independence in the United States Senate. It demonstrated that the Congress of the United States is not like Hitler's Reichstag—simply a group of "yes" men. It demonstrated that the Congress of the United States is composed of men who exercise their own judgment as legislators and statesmen in spite of the whipped-up fury which comes from misrepresentation.

With the Senate and the House in the final stages of enactment of the anti-inflation measure, following the conference which is now in session, we find the President returning from a trip throughout the country, with headlines announcing, "President Attacks Congress."

I am not one of those who are particularly fearful about such scrapping. I think it is a healthy sign. I think it is a good sign that neither the President nor the Congress will kowtow to each other. We are here to do a job; and if we do not agree, we have a right to disagree. So I am not particularly concerned about criticism. As I say, it is a healthy sign. What I am concerned about is that we do not obtain results in relation to the conditions about which I have spoken. When I say "we" I mean we on the home front.

Next Monday, as I have said, this body will begin its discussion of the new revenue bill. The Chief Executive has already charged Congress with delay in enacting revenue legislation, but no one has stated what is the actual fact—that the initial delay in formulating such legislation came from the failure of the Treasury, as a branch of the executive arm, to make early recommendations to the House Ways and Means Committee. Although, according to its public announcements, the Ways and Means Committee was ready last January to begin its consideration of the tax measure, no recommendations were forthcoming from the Treasury until March, and those recommendations were subsequently replaced with other recommendations.

Let us now, however, pass a genuinely realistic tax bill which in large measure will absorb the tremendous amount of excess earnings in the hands of all Americans. The occupants of the galleries particularly are interested in that particular cause of inflation. What do we mean by excess earnings? The answer is obvious to every Senator. We have stepped up our national income from seventy billion to an estimated $115,000,000,000. At the same time our supplies of goods for consumers have dwindled. Today between twenty and thirty billion dollars are in the hands of people who did not have such amounts of money before; and there is no place for the money to go except into a competitive market for consumer goods. That situation is the obvious menace of inflation. If we were at peace, we could step up our production of consumer goods to meet the extra purchasing power of the people. Nevertheless, to a large degree that is impossible, because it is obvious that most of our effort must be directed into war channels.

It should be possible, however, for us to adopt a more constructive and a more inclusive program relating to consumer goods for civilian needs—not merely with the idea of safeguarding civilian enterprise—the little businessmen—but with the broader objective of providing another check against inflation and another bulwark for the maintenance of civilian morale.

Mr. President, we do not know how much manpower will be available for the production of civilian goods, and what is infinitely more disastrous, neither apparently does the Government know. Conflicting statements about manpower have been emanating from a number of responsible Government leaders. They have fallen down on the job. We know that in many instances the Governmental manpower requirements for Government ordnance plants have been much smaller than the original estimates, and we know also that no one has accurately estimated the number of men who will be released from the vast construction industry as private construction dwindles to a minimum and as Government construction reaches the completion point. Probably millions of men now working on construction jobs for the Government will soon be out of employment because the construction work will be completed. In the

over-all planning of the war effort it is imperative that we determine now the extent of this source of manpower and how it may best be integrated into the war effort.

Napoleon said that God was on the side of the big battalions. We disagree with that proud boast. We believe that God is on the side of those who walk in His ways and do justice to their fellowmen.

Because of our inadequate preparation in the pre-war days, and because of our inefficient efforts since Pearl Harbor, due to the fact that there was a lack of perspective or a lack of comprehension of the tremendous effort needed, we find ourselves in the situation which confronts us today. It is up to us now to demonstrate that we are adequate to meet the situation, to meet any emergency. We are freemen; and, now possessing freedom and democracy it is up to us to carry through with appropriate understanding, and to solve our many problems. We have full reliance on the justice of our cause, and we believe that the forces of evil will not prevail. We have faith that this war is a war of liberation, not only for America, but for all peoples who are equal to the task of ruling themselves.

Perhaps this is to be an age of democratic imperialism—an age in which people will have learned the value of self-discipline, and also will have learned that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

We now know that in this great war effort 131,000,000 people have to enter upon a great cooperative way of thinking, living, and working together; but the people have their servants, and those servants are the Executive and the Congress of the United States.

It is for us to give direction and guidance in this great hour. America went through a period when the South was arrayed against the North, and before that it went through a period when the South and the West were arrayed against the East.

But now we are one people. We have seen what happened under Hitler, when class was arrayed against class. That must not happen here. We stem from many bloodstreams, but we are one people. Here neither race nor creed nor any other thing should separate us from the obligation that each of us owes to this beloved country of ours. We have come upon hard times, and they require that we meet them realistically. In order to do so we shall have to make tremendous sacrifices.

The recent Baruch report in reality had a much wider application than the specific plan for the conservation of rubber. While it was generally overlooked in the press, the fact is that the committee expressed grave concern over the administrative chaos in Washington. It is infinitely important that such chaos be eliminated. Referring again to the President's remarks about chaos in Washington, let me say that I think he could very nicely decide that it is not in Congress but in the vast bureaucracy which he has created in Washington that the conditions about which he spoke may be found.

The Baruch report pointed out, that our people face sacrifices "because of mistakes that have been made, and for which the people are not to blame." Nevertheless, this is no time for domestic wrangling; and that was the reason for the recommendations for a new administration setup for the rubber program. That was the reason why it was necessary to create a single administrator under the W. P. B. to take over responsibility which had previously been shared by a number of Government agencies with overlapping and confusing authority.

Such centralization of authority was badly needed. It should not have been necessary, 9 months after Pearl Harbor, to call for such a centralization of authority and to point out the delays occasioned by a conflict between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Rubber Reserve Company and the Office of Petroleum Coordinator. That delay was not the mistake of Congress.

The point I desire to make in this connection is that the shortcomings are not confined to the rubber agencies. Today they spread over a wider range of governmental agencies—that portion of the Government which the President controls. The new centralization of authority for the rubber program is only a beginning. Today we need an over-all plan instead of a system of monopolistic controls. We need very badly a centralized economic high command embracing many more fields than the rubber administration. I repeat, Mr. President, that we need a centralized economic high command.

We know that today our purchasing regulations still delay procurement and production. We know that today we are still adding unnecessarily to the high cost of winning the war. We know that today we are still multiplying administrative burdens, and we know that today we are still placing grave, unnecessary business risks on suppliers. We know that today we are still enmeshed in a labyrinth of red-tape methods of securing vital war supplies and equipment.

I repeat what I said in the beginning: That under the present administration 2,300,000 civilian employees are in the Government service at a time when conditions require the calling of more men into the Army, the Navy, and the air services. Despite that need today, 2,300,000 civilian employees are crowding the trains and are cluttering up the streets of Washington.

So I say to the Members of Congress that it is our business to step into the picture and to refuse to appropriate money to sustain branches of government which are unnecessary to the winning of the war. We talk about spending $75,000,000,000 in the 12-month period starting last July and ending in the coming July, and we have heard talk of adding $100,000,000,000 on top of that in the ensuing 12 months. We who control the purse strings listen to departmental heads and clerks, and let them set up their economic picture of their requirements, when we, recognizing that our very existence is at stake, should take hold of the situation, cut appropriations to the bone, and eliminate all unnecessary expenses.

I say again that we know we are enmeshed in a labyrinth of red-tape methods. We need less regulation of procedural details and more contracts written on the basis of results which must be accomplished. We need a uniform procedure of auditing and authorization. Above all we need to eliminate the curse of governmental delegation of responsibility without authority.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Star of September 30, 1942]

M'LEMORE URGES A COORDINATOR OF PUBLIC ADDRESSES

(By Henry McLemore)

Freedom of speech and freedom of speeches are two different things.

For the former we would all gladly die, but for the latter—well, the sooner we do something about it the better off this country is going to be.

Freedom of speeches is a menace, a genuine one. What Washington needs, and right away, is a coordinator of speeches. By a coordinator of speeches we mean a wise, understanding gentleman who will take all the speeches of Government representatives before they are delivered and see to it that they agree. This is especially needed on speeches pertaining to the war. There must be 9,804 different schools of thought on this subject in Washington, and unfortunately each follower of each school is equipped with a sound set of vocal organs and a burning desire to exercise same at any and all times.

They'll speak anywhere. Let one of them get an invitation to address the midyear graduating class of a cello and trap-drum school, and he's off on the next train. Let the manufacturers of miners' lamps ask one of them to address their annual convention, and neither rain nor hail nor storm nor darkness will stop them from being on the platform at the appointed time.

And they never agree. This was brought home to us by a reading of the newspapers the other day. In one column, in type as black as a chimney sweep's waistcoat, was a speech by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard.

"We are damn well losing this war, and no 'buts,'" he said. "We are still losing this war. It will take all we've got to win—what are you going to do about it?"

In another column, in type as black as a witch's robe, was a speech by Vice President WALLACE. Now, what do you think he said to the gathering of notables who sat on a wooded knoll on the estate of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Davies? Did he agree with Mr. Bard? Did he pound the ears of the notables with dire warnings? No, sir. Not at all. We quote from Mr. WALLACE's speech:

"We are over the hump, although the tangible evidence may not be evident for some time yet."

Who is right and who is wrong? Mr. Bard or Mr. WALLACE?

That poses a pretty question for the average American citizen, doesn't it? How is he to know, in his home in the Carolinas, the Dakotas, the Virginias which one of these important men has the low-down?

It's bound to make the citizen's mind spin, fill him with doubt. He knows that Mr. Bard, as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, is closer to the inside information than a hen to an egg. At the same time he knows Mr WALLACE, as Vice President, is no stranger to what is going on, being a man who has a key to the White House.

This sort of thing goes on all the time. Mr. A says the Germans are cracking and revolution is just around the corner. Mr. B says

the Nazis are strong as ever and are perfectly able to take another 3 or 4 years of war.

That's where the coordinator of speeches would come in. He would know what speeches were going to be made, and when. All speechmakers would have to submit their orations to him.

After reading them he would say something like this: "Gentlemen, somebody is wrong. Mr. Jones, you are telling the chicken fanciers of Dubuque that we are winning the war. Mr. Edwards, you are telling the Spanish moss collectors of Jacksonville that the United Nations now hold the upper hand. You, Mr. Photts, are leaving for Los Angeles to tell your hearers that Japan has shot its bolt and is as good as done for. While you, Mr. Snopes, are off for Atlanta to tell the sons of the boll weevil that the Japanese are in control of the Pacific and that Oregon is in danger of being captured.

Now, let's take all of your speeches and boil them down into something that resembles an agreement. Otherwise, no one in this country will know what to believe, and that does not aid in unity.

Let's either be winning this war or losing it. If we are winning it, let's relax a bit. If we're losing it, let's get mean and tough and rough and lay aside all excuses and start throwing our Sunday punches.

Speaking of Sunday punch, can you imagine what will happen when this country really gets to the point where it has to let one loose. It'll be the most devastating punch ever tossed.

Now, in our speech before the graduating class of dogs for defense, we are going to say—

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. The able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is absent. He made reference to a recess and a later session at 3 o'clock this afternoon. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], with whom I have conferred, said he thought that the conference report would not be here until 4 o'clock, and it has been suggested that a recess be taken until that time. I move that the Senate take a recess until 4 o'clock today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 4 o'clock p. m.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the conferees have agreed on the conference report on the supplemental price-control bill. The House must act on the report first, and, under the rules of the House, there may be 1 hour of debate on a conference report. The House may be considering the report now, but, obviously, the Senate will have to recess again until the House acts. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. It will probably be at least an hour before we can get the report, and, in all probability, when the report is brought in, a quorum call will be had so that Senators may be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m., when called to order by the Vice President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2584) to permit appointment of White House police, in accordance with the civil-service laws, from sources outside the Metropolitan and United States Park Police forces.

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. 7565) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to Senate concurrent Resolution 32, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there shall be printed 8,500 additional copies of the Senate reported print of the bill (H. R. 7378) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, together with the accompanying report thereon, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room, 5,000 copies for the use of the House document room, 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

STABILIZATION OF THE COST OF LIVING—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROWN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7565) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, the President is authorized and directed, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living; and, except as otherwise provided in this Act, such stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. The President may, except as otherwise provided in this Act, thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities: *Provided*, That no common carrier or other public utility shall make any general increase in its rates or charges which were in effect on September 15, 1942, unless it first gives thirty days notice to the President, or such agency as he may designate, and consents to the timely intervention by such agency before the Federal, State, or municipal authority having jurisdiction to consider such increase.

"SEC. 2. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this Act; and may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by this Act through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct. The President may suspend the provisions of sections 3 (a) and 3 (c), and clause (1) of section 302 (c), of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to the extent that such sections are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, but he may not under the authority of this Act suspend any other law or part thereof.

"SEC. 3. No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this Act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture—

"(1) The parity price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials) or, in case a comparable price has been determined for such commodity under and in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, such comparable price (adjusted in the same manner), or

"(2) The highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942 (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials), or, if the market for such commodity was inactive during the latter half of such period, a price for the commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in line with the prices, during such period, of other agricultural commodities produced for the same general use;

"and no maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this Act or otherwise for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefor equal to the higher of the prices specified in clauses (1) and (2) of this section: *Provided*, That the President may, without regard to the limitation contained in clause (2), adjust any such maximum price to the extent that he finds necessary to correct gross inequities; but nothing in this section shall be construed to permit the establishment in any case of a maximum price below a price which will reflect to the producers of any agricultural commodity the price therefor specified in clause (1) of this section: *Provided further*, That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs: *Provided further*, That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing: *Provided further*, That in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as provided for by this Act, adequate weighting shall be given farm labor.

"SEC. 4. No action shall be taken under authority of this Act with respect to wages or salaries (1) which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the National Labor Relations Act, or (2) for the purpose of reducing the wages or salaries for any particular work below the highest wages or salaries paid therefor between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942: *Provided*, That the President may,

without regard to the limitation contained in clause (2), adjust wages or salaries to the extent that he finds necessary in any case to correct gross inequities and also aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

"SEC. 5. (a) No employer shall pay, and no employee shall receive, wages or salaries in contravention of the regulations promulgated by the President under this Act. The President shall also prescribe the extent to which any wage or salary payment made in contravention of such regulations shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purposes of any other law or regulation.

"(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent the reduction by any private employer of the salary of any of his employees which is at the rate of $5,000 or more per annum.

"(c) The President shall have power by regulation to limit or prohibit the payment or double time except when, because of emergency conditions, an employee is required to work for seven consecutive days in any regularly scheduled work week.

"SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act (except sections 8 and 9), and all regulations thereunder, shall terminate on June 30, 1944, or on such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President by proclamation, may prescribe.

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by striking out 'June 30, 1942' and substituting 'June 30, 1944.'

"(b) All provisions (including prohibitions and penalties) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 which are applicable with respect to orders or regulations under such Act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, be applicable in the same manner and for the same purposes with respect to regulations or orders issued by the Price Administrator in the exercise of any functions which may be delegated to him under authority of this Act.

"(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to invalidate any provision of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (except to the extent that such provisions are suspended under authority of section 2, or to invalidate any regulation, price schedule, or order issued or effective under such Act.

"SEC 8. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available upon any crop of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts harvested after December 31, 1941, and before the expiration of the two-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such commodity for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such crop is harvested, loans as follows:

"(1) To cooperators (except cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 90 per centum of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year;

"(2) To cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn, at the rate of 75 per centum of the rate specified in (1) above;

"(3) To noncooperators (except noncooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 60 per centum of the rate specified in (1) above and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

"(b) All provisions of law applicable with respect to loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, be applicable with respect to loans made under this section.

"(c) In the case of any commodity with respect to which loans may be made at the rate provided in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), the President may fix the loan rate at any rate not less than the loan rate otherwise provided by law if he determines that the loan rate so fixed is necessary to prevent an increase in the cost of feed for livestock and poultry and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

"SEC. 9. (a) Section 4 (a) of the Act entitled "An Act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. I, title 15, sec. 713a-8), is amended—

"(1) By inserting after the words 'so as to support' a comma and the following: 'during the continuance of the present war and until the expiration of the two-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated,".

"(2) By striking out '85 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '90 per centum'.

"(3) By inserting after the word 'tobacco' a comma and the word 'peanuts'.

"(b) The amendments made by this section shall, irrespective of whether or not there is any further public announcement under such section 4 (a), be applicable with respect to any commodity with respect to which a public announcement has heretofore been made under such section 4 (a).

"SEC. 10. When used in this Act, the terms 'wages' and 'salaries' shall include additional compensation, on an annual or other basis, paid to employees by their employers for personal services (excluding insurance and pension benefits in a reasonable amount to be determined by the President); but for the purpose of determining wages or salaries for any period prior to September 16, 1942, such additional compensation shall be taken into account only in cases where it has been customarily paid by employers to their employees.

"SEC. 11. Any individual, corporation, partnership, or association willfully violating any provision of this Act, or of any regulation promulgated thereunder, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000, or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or to both such fine and imprisonment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
PRENTISS M. BROWN,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report; and if my request be agreed to, I shall make the point of no quorum, so that the Members of the Senate may be present.

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

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gerry | O'Mahoney |
| Andrews | Gillette | Overton |
| Bailey | Guffey | Pepper |
| Ball | Gurney | Radcliffe |
| Bankhead | Hatch | Reed |
| Barbour | Hayden | Reynolds |
| Barkley | Herring | Rosier |
| Bilbo | Hill | Russell |
| Bone | Holman | Schwartz |
| Bridges | Johnson, Calif. | Shipstead |
| Brown | Johnson, Colo. | Smathers |
| Bunker | La Follette | Spencer |
| Butler | Lee | Stewart |
| Byrd | Lucas | Taft |
| Capper | McCarran | Thomas, Idaho |
| Caraway | McFarland | Thomas, Okla. |
| Chandler | McKellar | Thomas, Utah |
| Chavez | McNary | Tydings |
| Clark, Idaho | Maloney | Vandenberg |
| Clark, Mo. | Maybank | Van Nuys |
| Connally | Mead | Wagner |
| Danaher | Millikin | Walsh |
| Davis | Murdock | Wheeler |
| Downey | Murray | White |
| Doxey | Norris | Wiley |
| Ellender | Nye | Willis |
| George | O'Daniel | |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business in connection with the Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on business of the Senate in connection with investigations of the Truman committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan explain the agreement?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, section 1 of the conference report follows section 1 of the Senate bill; in fact, I can say that very generally the conferees adopted the Senate bill with some slight modifications. The principal change in section 1 is that the Norris amendment which gave the President an all-over control of public-utility and common-carrier rates is stricken from the bill. There is substituted for it a provision which will require any public utility which asks for an increase in rates to notify the President and to assent to the appearance of such agent as the President may designate to appear in behalf of the consuming public before the appropriate railroad or public utility commission, be it a State, Federal, or municipal commission.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me ask how much notice must be given.

Mr. BROWN. Thirty days' notice, as I recall, must be given to the President and consent must be filed to the appearance of the agent of the President in behalf of the consuming public.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does that also apply to railway rates, truck rates, and bus rates?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; to all public-utility rates.

Mr. President, let me say that in addition to what is contained in the bill, I have stated, on authority of the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, that the committee would consider the bill which has been referred to it and which was introduced by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] covering the same subject matter; and it is expected that early next week that matter may be taken up in the committee.

It was felt by the House conferees that inadequate consideration had been given to the general subject matter, and they were unwilling to accept the Senate amendment. They were unanimous in their views; and it was impossible for us to persuade them to accept the Norris amendment. However, the conferees did make the arrangement which I have indicated and which was entered into after some consultation with the senior Senator from Nebraska. We told him we thought this was the best we could get on this subject matter.

There is no change in section 3 of the bill, which is the so-called farm-labor section. There is no change in section 4 of the bill of any particular moment; but, in order to enable the President to adjust wages or salaries from the September 15, 1942, level, it is necessary for him to find that not only does gross inequity exist but that it is necessary to so do in order effectively to prosecute the war. That was the amendment offered by my colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. It was felt that it would be better to write it in section 4 of the bill rather than in section 1.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the word used "or" or "and"?

Mr. BROWN. Both conditions for the action must exist—gross inequity and the effective prosecution of the war—which was the intent and meaning my colleague had in offering the amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. As the bill is now framed, am I to understand that the President can raise or lower, as in his judgment may be necessary in order to carry on the war or to adjust inequities?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; the Senator is correct in his understanding. The President may do either; he may adjust—raise or lower. "Adjust" is the term used.

The senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has asked me a question sotto voce, but I shall answer it out loud: The so-called farm labor section, section 3, remains identically as the Senate passed it.

Section 5 of the bill, the wage section, which prohibits payment of wages and salaries in contravention of the regulations promulgated by the President is left identically as the Senate passed it. Section 6 as to the termination of the law or the powers contained in the law likewise remains intact. The powers will terminate on June 30, 1944, or on such earlier date as the Congress, by concurrent resolution, or the President, by proclamation, may prescribe.

There is no change whatsoever in section 7.

The commodity credit section is changed in two particulars. First, Senators will recall, the Senate provided a 90 percent floor under basic commodities and commodities, the production of which the Secretary of Agriculture encourages for the period of the war. In the House substantially the same provision was in the bill, but it extended the period for 3 years after the war. The conferees agreed upon a 2-year period after the war.

There is some apprehension upon the part of Senators that the 90 percent floor may be expensive to the Federal Government. I think that fear is based upon what may be in the minds of some, a slight misapprehension. The loans are not based upon the prices of commodities, but upon the parity of commodities. Of course, if the experience of the second World War is the same as the experience of the first World War, a decline in prices will result in a decline in parity. Therefore the probability of loss is not so great as it would be were we underwriting a price. We are underwriting parity, and not a price.

The change with respect to livestock and poultry feed is as follows:

> In the case of any commodity with respect to which loans may be made at the rate provided in paragraph (1) of subsection (a)—

That is, 90 percent parity—

> the President may fix the loan rate at any rate not less than the loan rate otherwise provided by law—

Which is 85 percent—

> if he determines that the loan rate so fixed is necessary to prevent an increase in the cost of feed for livestock and poultry and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. When that is inserted in the bill, as I pointed out a few days ago, it is a discrimination against the wheat farmers and the corn farmers. I do not intend to make a fight against it, but I think a grave injustice is done when such a provision is written into the bill.

I can see no reason whatsoever, after fixing a 90 percent loan floor on part of the farm products, for giving the President discretion to reduce it in the case of wheat and corn.

At the present time the wheat farmer in my State is getting for his wheat only the loan value. If the price went to parity, he would be getting about $1.34. But as to those crops which have not reached parity, the proposal is to give the President discretion to penalize the producers.

If the wheat farmer were to get a 90-percent loan, it would undoubtedly mean that the price of wheat would rise a few cents a bushel, and it would probably mean that the cost to the chicken raiser in the East who feeds wheat to his chickens would have to pay a few cents more for his wheat. But the wheat farmer is not getting parity, as provided by the bill. He is getting far less than parity. If the price of his product had risen so that he would be getting parity, there would not be any discrimination against him whatsoever, but to my notion the proposal is a rank discrimination against the wheat farmers of the country.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator from Montana for his statement. What I stated upon this subject when the bill was under discussion in the Senate pretty well covers my own views, and I do not care to go into a further discussion of the question.

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, I merely want the RECORD to show that I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. There is no excuse for this discrimination. If it is proper to have discrimination as to the price of one of these basic commodities, it is proper and fair to have it as to six of them; but any attempt to single out two of the six commodities and give discretionary powers which will hold them down, and grant a 90-percent loan to the other four commodities, is discriminatory, unjustified, and unfair.

Mr. BROWN. I know the Senator's views upon the question, and it is with the greatest regret that I have taken part in this matter. I had hoped we could avoid the discrimination, which is a real discrimination; but the practical situation is such that I could take no other course.

I may say that there are other commodities which could be affected by this measure.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is discretionary power vested in the President with regard to reducing the loan on cotton?

Mr. BROWN. No.

Mr. McFARLAND. The cotton loan remains at 90 percent?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. The measure merely covers agricultural commodities which are used for feed.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Of course, I do not know the interpretation the administrators may put upon the clause referred to, but under that clause they could include any one of the basic commodities mentioned in the bill.

Mr. BROWN. No; the Senator is not correct about that. It could cover only commodities used for livestock and poultry feed. I assure the Senator that it is in line with his desires.

Mr. BUTLER. A byproduct of cotton is one of the most indispensable feeds.

Mr. BROWN. I hope we will not have a long discussion about it. We had one day before yesterday, and it would be much better if the Senator would accept his victory than to pour more hot oil on the wounds which have been caused by this measure.

Mr. WHEELER. I am perfectly willing to remain here and discuss the question at great length, if any Senator wishes to discuss it.

Mr. BROWN. I do not care to discuss it.

Mr. WHEELER. What is being done is in the interest of the cattle feeders, who do not raise the cattle, but buy them on the plains, and then feed them grain which they obtain from the producers of corn. What is being done is to discriminate in favor of the feeder of cattle rather than the grower of cattle, and there is discrimination in favor of the chicken raiser as against the producer of wheat on the farm.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I think the Senator from Michigan has done a very good job, the best he could do, under the circumstances. I think he understands the whole situation. I hope we will not quarrel about the matter this evening.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much for his statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

The summary is as follows:

Section 1 of the conference agreement authorizes and directs the President, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries affecting the cost of living.

All prices which affect the cost of living, including the prices of services, commodities and property, are subject to control. Since virtually all such prices affect the cost of living, directly or indirectly, it is apparent that the scope of this authority over prices is extensive.

The terms "wages" and "salaries" are equally inclusive in their application. All employers and all employees are subject to control. It is immaterial whether the employer is a large corporation or a small independent enterprise. It is immaterial whether the employee is a wage earner, a salaried worker, or a corporation officer or director. In addition to the ordinary compensation paid by any employer to any employee, section 10 of the bill makes clear that all additional compensation for personal services shall likewise be subject to regulation. This includes all bonuses, fees, and commissions, and other forms of direct or indirect remuneration.

Section 10 expressly provides, however, that such additional compensation shall not include insurance and pension benefits in a reasonable amount to be determined by the President. Section 10 also provides that additional compensation may not be taken into account in determining wages and salaries for any period prior to September 16, 1942, except in those cases where it has been customarily paid by employers to their employees.

The conference agreement further states, as in the Senate amendment, that the general order to be issued by the President shall, so far as is practicable, stabilize prices, wages, and salaries on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. This authority is, of course, flexible in that the levels of stabilization may either be general or industry-wide, or those which prevail in individual establishments.

After issuing the general order, the President may provide for adjustments, either upward or downward, whenever in his judgment such adjustments are necessary to correct gross inequities, or to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, subject, of course, to the other limitations in the act.

It is important to recognize, in analyzing the legislation, that the power granted by section 1 over the prices of agricultural commodities is subject to the limitations contained in section 3, and that the power granted by section 1 over wages and salaries is subject to the limitations set forth in section 4. These limitations will be discussed separately.

COMMON CARRIER AND UTILITY RATES

The special provisions contained in the conference agreement with respect to public-utility and common-carrier rates provide in effect that no common carrier or other public utility may charge or collect for services rendered after the effective date of the act a rate higher than the rate charged by that carrier or utility on September 15, 1942, unless 30 days prior notice is given to the President, or such agency as he may designate, and unless consent is given to timely intervention by such agency before the authority having jurisdiction to consider the increase in rates.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Section 3 of the conference agreement contains limitations on the establishment and maintenance of maximum prices for agricultural commodities which follow the pattern of comparable limitations contained in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. Section 3 (a) of that act provides four different limitations below the highest of which farm prices may not be fixed. The conference agreement authorizes the President to suspend this subsection and provides instead that no maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of the bill or otherwise below a price which will reflect to growers the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture: First, the parity or comparable price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials) or second, the highest price between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942 (adjusted in the same manner), or if the market was inactive during the latter half of such 9-month period, a price for the commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in line with the prices, during such period, of other agricultural commodities produced for the same general use.

In substance, therefore, the parity price or the highest 9-month price, whichever is higher, has been substituted for 110 percent of parity and the other limitations contained in section 3 (a) of the Price Control Act. In determining whether these limitations and the other maximum price limitation and standards contained in section 3 have been satisfied, parity payments and other direct or indirect Government subsidy or other payments shall continue to be taken into account.

Section 3 (c) of the Price Control Act prohibits the establishment or maintenance of any maximum price on any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which reflects to growers a price equal to the highest of the four limitations specified in section 3 (a). Section 3 of the conference agreement contains a comparable provision to the effect that prices on such derivative products must reflect a price equal to the higher of the prices specified in clauses (1) and (2) referred to above. Thus the conference agreement provides substitutes for subsections (a) and (c) of section 3 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

Parity or a comparable price, if one has been established, is an absolute limitation below which no maximum price on any agricultural commodity may be established, but the highest price between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, is subject to adjustment by the President, upward or downward, whenever in his judgment such action is necessary to correct gross in quities.

Section 3 of the conference agreement also directs that maximum prices on agricultural commodities or derivative products shall be modified, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes.

Another proviso contained in section 3 states that in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing. Substantially the same standard is contained in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. Maximum prices and margins under that act must be at such levels as in the judgment of the Price Administrator will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of section 1 thereof. The limitation regarding margins contained in section 3 of the conference agreement provides a similar standard for the President in fixing prices under the new legislation.

Nothing in section 3 authorizes or directs a change in the formula by which parity is presently computed by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The bill simply provides that maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity or any derivative product shall be modified, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, when by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producer of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum price so established will not reflect such increased costs. The bill further provides that in fixing maximum prices on such commodities adequate weighting shall be given farm labor. Whenever price increases on any farm commodity since January 1, 1941, are more than offset by general increases in the costs of producing farm commodities, the bill therefore requires that the return to the grower shall be adjusted. Increased labor costs as reflected in rising wage rates for hired farm labor must be included in determining the extent of increased costs to growers.

LIMITATIONS ON POWERS OVER WAGES AND SALARIES

Section 4 prohibits any action, under the authority of the act, with respect to wages and salaries (1) which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the National Labor Relations Act, or (2) for the purpose of reducing the wages or salaries of any particular work below the highest wages and salaries paid therefor between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942. Authority is conferred, however, to adjust wages and salaries without regard to the limitation in clause (2) to the extent that the President finds it necessary in any case to correct gross inequities and also aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

TAFT DOUBLE-TIME AMENDMENT

This amendment reads:

The President shall have power, by regulation, to limit or prohibit the payment of double time except when, because of emergency conditions, an employee is required to work for 7 consecutive days in any regularly scheduled workweek.

The amendment was offered to validate the President's recent Executive order dealing with double time on Sundays, unless that day is the seventh consecutive day of work (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7644, September 30). Attention has been called to the fact that the Executive order also deals with time-and-one-half pay on Saturdays, Sundays, and certain specified holidays, except as otherwise provided by law. The Executive order itself permits wide exceptions and is the subject of great controversy between large segments of the labor movement, including different locals of the U. A. W.-C. I. O.

In order to remove any doubt concerning the interpretation of the Taft amendment, let me say:

First. The Taft amendment simply authorizes Presidential action; it directs nothing.

Second. The Taft amendment is not understood as limiting the President's broad authority over wages as Commander in Chief, or under section 1 of the bill, to prescribe adjustments affecting premium wage rates, for the purpose of correcting gross inequities or aiding in the effective prosecution of the war, except as otherwise provided by law.

Third. In brief, notwithstanding the Taft amendment, the President can withdraw, modify, or renew his Executive order.

PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS

Section 2 gives the President broad power to issue such regulations as may be necessary or proper to carry out the provisions of the act, and authorizes him to delegate and provide for the delegation of any power or authority conferred upon him by the act to or by any department, agency, or officer. It is through the exercise of this rule-making powers conferred upon the President will powers conferred upon the President will make the appropriate adjustments, will implement and supplement the President's general order, and generally will seek to attain the broad objective of stabilizing the cost of living. This section also authorizes the President to suspend the limitations of section 3 (a) and 3 (c), and clause (1) of section 302 (c) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to the extent that such sections are inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

Section 7 (b) makes clear that all regulations or orders issued by the Price Administrator in the exercise of any functions which may be delegated to him under the authority of this act are subject to protest under section 203, and judicial review under section 204 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. This insures that such regulations and orders issued by the Price Administrator will be subject to review in the Emergency Court of Appeals and will hereby gain the protection of the exclusive jurisdiction provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

Section 7 (c) insures that the authority of the Price Administrator to issue or continue in effect regulations, orders, and price schedules under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 will not be impaired by the enactment of this legislation.

ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

Section 5 of the conference agreement makes unlawful the payment by the employer and the receipt by the employee of wages or salaries in contravention of any regulations issued under the act. That section authorizes the imposition of a number of sanctions for violations of this prohibition. Thus, for example, the President is authorized to instruct the executive departments and other governmental agencies to disregard any wage or salary payment made in contravention of regulations under the bill, in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purpose of any law or regulation. Under this authority, for example, the Treasury Department could be instructed to disallow such excessive salary or wage payments as deductions for the purposes of the revenue laws.

The procurement agencies of the Government could be instructed to disregard, or require to be disregarded, such excessive payments as costs under any contracts affecting commodities, articles, or materials directly or indirectly purchased by the United States; and the Price Administrator could be instructed to disregard such excessive payments for purposes of determining whether regulations or orders heretofore or hereafter issued by him are generally fair and equitable.

Section 7 of the conference agreement makes applicable to any regulations or orders issued by the Price Administrator, in the exercise of any functions which may be delegated to him under the authority of this bill, the same penalties and sanctions as are already applicable to regulations or orders issued by him under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. These include criminal penalties, treble damages, revocation of licenses, and civil injunctions. In addition, a general penalty provision is provided by section 11 for willful violations of the act and regulations promulgated thereunder. The penalty provided by such section is a fine of not more than $1,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY LOANS

Sections 8 and 9 of the conference agreement provide for increasing the loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation upon the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco and peanuts, and upon certain nonbasic commodities, from 85 to 90 percent of the parity price for such commodities. Such increased loan rate is to apply to crops harvested after December 31, 1941, and before the expiration of a 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January after the date upon which the President by proclamation, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated.

The President may, however, fix the loan rate at any rate not less than rate otherwise provided by law if he finds that it is necessary to do so to prevent increases in the cost of feed for livestock and poultry and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to refer to the action of the conference committee in including in the conference bill the language which the Senator from Michigan read and which takes the place of the amendment offered by me when the measure was before the Senate for consideration. It relates to utility rates and charges.

What has been substituted by the conference committee for the original language agreed to by the Senate does not, technically, afford any relief whatever, although, morally, I think it will result in considerable relief.

I intend to vote for the conference report, but I wish to call attention to the legal effect, as I understand it, of the language which has been substituted.

The committee has provided that no utility rate shall be increased unless 30 days' notice shall be given the President by the corporation seeking the increase. There is also the requirement that in the notice it shall be agreed that the President may have the right, through any instrumentality he may select, to appear before the body having jurisdiction of the rate. I think I have stated the legal effect correctly.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator has stated it correctly.

Mr. NORRIS. That does not give the President any right to pass on the question. It does not give him any right to appeal in case the Board's decision is against his representative's ideas.

Mr. BROWN. I would not be sure, if the Senator will pardon me, that his last statement is in accord with my own views. I think he would have the same right to appeal that any other interested party would have.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not look at it that way. If he would have that right, it would add a great deal to the legal effect of the language which has been placed in the measure.

Mr. BROWN. He becomes a party to the proceedings, that is, his agent does.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, he does. The Senator's idea is that if under the law and the rules and regulations of the body having jurisdiction to hear the complaint, or the request, as it would be, an appeal is provided for, the President could avail himself of that right of appeal.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I hope that will be the construction placed upon the language.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I am assuming in asking the question that even though the President's representative would be technically a party in an appeal, he would merely have the right formally to present his views, or the views of the administration, to the regulatory body, but he would have nothing to say about its decision. If its decision were that the increase in rates should be granted, the decision would be final.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from Michigan has the correct idea, the President or his representative would have the right to appeal, as any party to the dispute would have the right to appeal.

Mr. BROWN. But with absolutely no authority to participate in the decision.

Mr. NORRIS. No; with no authority to participate in the decision.

Mr. BONE. That is what I meant by my question.

Mr. NORRIS. As I said, I think that would have a great moral effect. The only thing the President's representative could plead for or urge when he appeared at the hearing would be that if the body then hearing the dispute should increase the rate, it would very likely interfere with all that the Price Administrator had done in the fixing of prices, because no one will dispute that utility rates enter directly into the cost of living. If gas rates, or electric rates, or water rates, or freight rates, or streetcar rates are increased, every single item of

increase goes directly into the cost of living and hence interferes with any attempt to prevent inflation. After all, that is why I am deeply interested in this proposition; I want to prevent inflation, if possible. That is the object of our giving someone the authority to fix prices and freeze them at a certain level. If any persons or corporations have the power to increase any item of the cost of living, and it is done contrary to the order of the President or the Price Administrator, it will tend directly to overthrow the prices so fixed and will throw the whole structure out of gear, thus tending to increase the cost of living, and making it necessary to increase all other prices which enter into the cost of living, with the result that, as I believe, inflation will follow immediately

There would be a moral effect, however. When the President's representative appears before a tribunal having jurisdiction to fix or increase utility rates, he could say—and that is about all he could do—that if the requested increase were granted, it would tend to increase the cost of living, and hence throw out of gear the entire machinery designed to prevent inflation. If the tribunal increased utility rates during the war, notwithstanding the kind of showing made by the President's representative, it would in my judgment have a great effect upon public sentiment. The tribunal, board, or commission which acted to increase rates, in the face of a showing that such action might lead to the worst kind of inflation, would find itself in a position which no board would want to be in. I think the provision in question will have a great moral effect. Therefore, I myself feel disposed to accept this language and vote for the conference report.

Mr. President, I think I realize as fully as does any other Senator the earnestness, the fidelity, and the good faith with which the conferees on the part of the Senate have labored. We are all anxious to get through with this measure, and I think we should all be willing to sacrifice something we believe ought to be in the measure in order to have it finally passed. For that reason I do not believe we are justified in rejecting the conference report simply because in some particular it has not met completely with our ideas.

I wanted to say this much, and by saying it in the Senator's time it is unnecessary for me to make a speech on the subject in my own time.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator from Nebraska, and I want to say to him that I shall do what I can to expedite the hearing upon his bill which deals with the matter he has discussed.

Mr. NORRIS. I am of the opinion that it would be rather useless to crowd that bill if the language now contained in the conference report becomes the law.

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

Mr. BROWN. I promised to yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and then to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, for the reasons expressed by the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], I feel constrained to vote for the conference report, but I do not want my vote to be misunderstood. I wish I could feel the assurance which the Senator from Nebraska feels about the moral interposition of the President in this matter, because if the moral interposition of the President had counted in the control of prices we probably would not have wasted the time we have wasted on this measure. Perhaps I am a little cynical, but I have seen an absence of moral effect in cases of this kind over a long period of years, and I am not constrained to lay too much weight on that kind of influence.

Every Member of the Senate knows—he would not be here if he did not know—that the aggregate value of the utilities in this country is probably greater than the aggregate value of any other business group in the country.

The utilities reflect literally billions of dollars of value. Transportation, power, telegraph, and telephone, all the so-called regulated industries, together constitute the largest bloc of industrial and economic property in the United States. Any change affecting their income and expenditures and their operations is immediately felt in the current of our everyday life.

It is common knowledge of everyone who has ever looked into it, that for the last 20 years, under decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, utilities, such as power companies, have been permitted to pass on to the public all their taxes, which are incorporated in light and power bills, so that in practical effect the companies do not pay any tax at all. All the taxes they pay are enshrined in their light and power bills. On that point there can be no doubt. The Supreme Court in the Galveston case and in the Georgia Light and Power case laid that question at rest many years ago.

If anyone has any question about the power of pressure groups, I think he need have no illusions in his mind about the ability of the pressure group to which I have just referred to make its influence felt. I sat in this chamber at one time and saw a very able and distinguished Member much perturbed by receiving 29,000 telegrams in 1 day from private power companies, or which were at least stimulated by private power companies.

I give you my word, Mr. President, that in no campaign affecting any bill involving organized labor or the farmers have I received 1 percent of that number of requests to oppose or support a measure—not from the so-called farm bloc or the so-called labor bloc. However, one Senator told me that from private power utilities alone he had received the number of communications I have mentioned. That is pressure of the de luxe variety. Yet we squirm under criticism. Much of it has been so unfair that we properly resented it.

The press of this country, or at least a segment of it, has not hesitated to say that Congress was cowardly and that it yielded to pressure groups. In this provision we are confronting the greatest pressure group in the United States. If it can pass on its taxes to the consuming public—and it can and will under existing conditions, because the authority is enshrined in the law—that means that the war burden which the mass of the people are carrying will not be carried by the utility organizations. Every Member of this body knows that to be so. Every well-informed news writer or publicist knows it to be true. It is the one type of business organization which can slide off onto the public all its tax burdens, so that its owners do not carry any of them. If there is an increasing tax burden, it is reflected in a $4 light bill to the consumer instead of a $3 light bill. The extra dollar is the consumers' contribution to a private power company or some other form of utility organization, which will assume the attitude before the public that it is a heavy taxpayer and a heavy contributor to the war effort, whereas in truth and in fact the consumers have contributed its tax share of the burden of carrying the war. Everybody knows that to be true; and yet we are walking away from it.

I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not hesitate to press his bill, because hundreds of millions of dollars of taxes which the utilities of this country will pay from now on in this ghastly war effort will be paid by consumers. If I buy a railroad ticket I will pay the railroad's taxes. If I turn a switch and use a kilowatt-hour of electrical energy, I will pay the taxes of a private power company, although it will be brazen and impudent enough to present to the public a picture of it paying taxes.

If any Senator feels that I am in error, I wish he would rise now—there are able lawyers in this body—and tell me wherein I am mistaken.

Mr. BROWN. I hope no Senator will do so, because we are anxious to get through.

Mr. BONE. It is important because utilities represent the greatest aggregate of business in the country. Congress will not be able to escape its responsibility. When we charge labor and the farmers with not wanting to carry their fair share of the burden, I think we can take unto ourselves a large share of the responsibility. The critics of Congress have proved a part of their thesis.

I hope the Senator from Nebraska will go ahead with his bill. If we do not meet this issue head-on, but allow the largest single aggregate of corporate wealth in the country to escape taxes entirely, and make all the people pay such taxes in higher living costs, we shall not be discharging our duty.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Michigan will recall that during the course of the debate on the price-control bill I called his attention to the fact that one agricultural product was selling for 5 cents less in 1942 than it sold for in 1941, and that under the wording of the bill it would be impossible, in my judgment, to apply the law without an amendment. The Senator from Michigan was very sympathetic, and stated that he did not feel that an amendment was necessary. I did not want to put an

exception in the general phraseology of the law, so I did not offer the amendment.

Let me ask the Senator what the present status of that commodity is. The commodity to which I refer is Maryland tobacco, which sells for 5 cents less a pound in 1942 than it sold for in 1941, due to the loss of foreign trade. Most of the tobacco went into foreign trade, which is now extinct.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] raised the point in the conference. We were faced with the fact that clause (2) of section 3 of the Senate amendment was identical with clause (2) of a similar section in the House bill. After some considerable discussion, and full recognition of the justice of the position which the Senator from Maryland has discussed, we decided that it was not within our power to make a change. I invite the Senator's attention to the language in the latter part of clause (2), which reads as follows:

The highest price—

Speaking of an agricultural product—

received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942 (adjusted by the Secretary for grade, location, and seasonal differentials)—

Then follows the provision—

or, if the market for such commodity was inactive during the latter half of such period, a price for the commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in line with the prices, during such period, of other agricultural commodities produced for the same general use.

The Senator from Kentucky pointed out that the market was not inactive with respect to Maryland tobacco. There was a market, but because of the condition to which the Senator alludes—the fact that Maryland tobacco was mainly an export commodity—that provision would not apply. So there is only one "out." Clause (2) has, of course, the "gross inequities" provision.

Mr. TYDINGS. And the seasonal provision.

Mr. BROWN. It has the seasonal provision in it, and it has the limitation of a bottom. Mr. Henderson, if he were in charge of the administration of the act, could permit the price of that commodity to go to a higher level, just as the President may permit the price of any other argicultural commodity to go to a higher level.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, because the time limit is from January to September 1942, Maryland tobacco would be excluded under that particular wording; but it is the Senator's judgment that the remainder of the section, providing for seasonal adjustments, together with other provisions in the bill, would permit the Price Administrator to treat Maryland tobacco the same as any other agricultural commodity would be treated. Therefore, if the Administrator should see fit, in the interest of equity, he might add 5 cents, and thus assume that the operation was in the period of 1942 rather than in the period prior thereto.

Mr. BROWN. For the reasons which the Senator states, and also for the reason that this is not a top limitation which may not be exceeded, but which is a bottom below which the Administrator may not go, therefore he could do as suggested with respect to that commodity.

Mr. TYDINGS. I bring up the question now only because it is my understanding, as it is the understanding of the Senator from Michigan, and I know of the Senator from Kentucky, that ample machinery is in the hands of the Price Administrator to deal with this single agricultural commodity, which, so far as I know, is the only agricultural commodity which commands a lower price in 1942 than it commanded in 1941. The prices of most other agricultural commodities have gone the other way.

I only wished to make sure that all agricultural commodities which might be in the same category with Maryland tobacco would, under a broad interpretation of the law, be subject to equitable treatment at the hands of the Price Administrator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I simply wish to concur in the conclusion of the Senator from Michigan in regard to this question. In the matter of selling tobacco, the markets open at different times in the various sections of the country, depending upon the State and geographical location. In North Carolina, South Carolina, and portions of Virginia the markets opened weeks ago. It so happens that the price of the 1942 crop on the markets which have opened is from 5 cents a pound to 10 cents a pound higher than the price of tobacco in the 1941 season.

As to the markets that have not as yet opened, and where there has been no sale of the 1942 crop, and will not be any until December or January, of course, it would be obviously unfair to make the basis the period from January to September, since during that period there was no market at all, and no tobacco was sold.

It so happens that the market for the 1942 Maryland crop has not as yet opened. Because of the failure of the Maryland growers to be able to export their tobacco, on account of the war, the price of the 1942 crop is less than that of the 1941 crop.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the fact that the highest price is the floor, not the ceiling, and in view of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to adjust the seasonal prices so as to make them in line with the prices of similar agricultural products, there is no question, in my judgment, that the Price Administrator may adjust the price on the Maryland tobacco so as to put it in line with that of other tobacco.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I like the Senator's remarks, but they require a slight correction. In Maryland, when the tobacco crop is harvested in the fall—I do not live in the tobacco-growing section, but I know it to be so—the crop is not available for market purposes, and does not become available for market purposes until sometime during the following summer; because it goes through a curing process, whereas most tobaccos are available for the market in a short period of time. The method employed in Maryland to cure tobacco takes a longer period. Therefore, unless the bill were interpreted as the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Kentucky have pointed out, this fall a very substantial group of farmers in my State would be subject to a discrimination to which no other group, so far as I know, would be subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. Furthermore, it could be said—and, I think, without any technical interpretation—that the market for the 1942 crop of Maryland tobacco was not active during the period which we have put in the bill, and therefore it would be covered.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that the original Price Control Act conferred no power on anyone to undertake to fix prices or wages and salaries?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, that is a question which is difficult to answer in one sentence.

Section 1 provided that it should be the policy of the departments of the Government agencies having charge of labor and wage matters, such as the War Labor Board, the Department of Labor, and so on, so to correlate their policies with the wage-control policies as to effect the purposes of the act; but, as the Senator intimates, in a subsequent section there was a prohibition against any regulation of the wages or salaries paid by employers to employees.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That was my construction of the act. Let me ask whether it is not also a fact that the existing law does not provide for anyone to have control of utility rates.

Mr. BROWN. The existing Price Control Act does. As the bill passed the Senate day before yesterday we had eliminated that prohibition. Now, by reason of the change—the striking out of the Norris amendment—that regulation goes back into the law.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am talking about existing law, and not the pending bill.

Mr. BROWN. The existing law prohibits the fixing of public utility rates by the Price Administrator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That was my understanding.

This bill, when approved by the President, will confer upon someone the power to fix, control, regulate, and adjust wages, salaries, and utility rates, will it not?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Oklahoma was not here during the early part of the discussion of the conference report. The Norris amendment was not accepted by the House. The conferees substituted a provision for it; and we have arranged that if the Senator from Nebraska desires us to take up his bill we may do so. But the House conferees were adamant against the inclusion of the Norris amendment in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. My broad question is, When the bill shall have become law, what prices will not be

subject to being controlled by the President or by anyone whom he may designate to administer the two laws?

Mr. BROWN. I should say that the prices of commodities and the wages and salaries of individuals are fully covered by the bill. Public-utility rates are left to regulation by the bodies which now regulate them. The matter of income by way of profits, merchandising, and professional services, and so on and so forth, is not covered by the bill. But, if I have the figures accurately, of a total of about $115,000,000,000, let us say, of national income, approximately $90,000,000,000 will be covered by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in my own time, if I may have the floor for a minute.

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator pardon me? I still have to make my nightly campaign speech over the radio.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I assure the Senator that I shall not detain him long.

Mr. BROWN. Very well, I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I voted for the original price control bill when it passed the Senate and contained the O'Mahoney amendment. The conferees eliminated the O'Mahoney amendment from the bill, and submitted to the Senate their report. On that report I voted "no". However, fairness compels me to admit that the Price Administrator under that act has done practically a perfect job. The bill was passed during the latter part of January. It took the Administrator several months to perfect his organization. His organization was perfected, and became a functioning bureau of the Government about the first of May. On May 2 the general price level stood at 98.7. At that time the Administrator began to function and began to curtail, restrict, and block increases in prices. That was 5 months ago today. During those 5 months the general price level has increased from 98.7 to 99.4. On yesterday the general price level stood at 99.4. That means that in 5 months the general price level, which means the general prices of all commodities—900, at least—has increased on the average slightly in excess of one-tenth of 1 point per month. In other words the dollar has lost in buying power 7 mills since the 2d day of May.

Mr. President, I contend that any organization or any group or any administrator that over a 5-month period can handle the prices of all the things we have to buy in this country and can keep the general price level—embracing the millions of things which are bought and sold, and the price level itself embracing 900 commodities—from fluctuating more than within one point, has done practically a perfect job. Although I voted against the bill, I want to make that statement.

One more statement which I should like to make is that for 10 years or more some of us have been doing considerable talking on the floor of the Senate advocating economic and monetary measures which would permit the price level to rise until it reached 100. In 1933 we set out to raise the price level. There was no pronouncement on behalf of the administration as to the point to which we would try to raise that level. At that time the level was down to 64, or thereabouts. We decided deliberately to raise the price level, to increase the prices of the commodities which our people produce. We have been successful. While it has been the goal of some of us to get the price level to 100, it has not yet reached that point. The general price level today is six-tenths of 1 point below 100.

Of course, I feel very greatly gratified that conditions have been such that those in authority have not seen fit to put the brakes entirely on prices when the level was much below 100. As I have said many times on this floor, I shall be content, when we reach a price level of 100, or approximately 100, with any kind of steps which may be taken to check the advance and freeze the prices, if necessary, at that point, until we can take stock of our economic condition, and decide what shall be done from that time on.

I am hopeful that the record, which is so fine to date, will be maintained during the emergency. There is no reason why it cannot be maintained, and I think it will be. The Government, which is made up of all the people, is now spending six or seven billion dollars a month, which means that you and I, Mr. President, and all other citizens are buyers, and while we are forced to be buyers in the public market of supplies for the war effort, it is good business to keep the prices down. Then, after the war shall have terminated, we can take stock of our condition, and decide what should be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] has been called from the Chamber for 5 or 6 minutes, and I am sorry he is not present to hear what I am about to say.

I feel that I should be remiss in the performance of my duty if I did not express my deep appreciation for the constructive work which has been done by the Senator from Michigan, as the chairman of the subcommittee which helped to write the original Price Control Act, and as the member of the Committee on Banking and Currency charged with the responsibility of conducting the pending measure through the Senate.

I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as I am of the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, of course, as a member of those committees, as well as because of the position I hold as majority leader, it is my duty to cooperate with the members of those committees, as well as all other committees, in the passage of measures by the Senate.

Especially as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency it has been my opportunity and my privilege, in connection with the pending measure, to work with the Senator from Michigan, and all other members of the committee, and I think I have been able to assess the value of his work in this particular field of price control.

I should not be performing my duty if I did not say here publicly that, in my judgment, the American people owe to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] a debt of gratitude for the sincerity and the broad statesmanship he has exhibited, as well as for the hard work, mental and physical, which he has devoted to this subject. I wish to pay him that compliment because I think he deserves it, and, in my opinion, the Senate and the country feel that he deserves it.

I wish also to express my great appreciation for the cooperation of other Senators outside the committee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the minority leader, and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I could extend the list, but I thank these Senators for the magnificent way in which they have assisted in the construction of the proposed legislation.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has been interested in the welfare of agriculture ever since he came to the Senate, as have the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and, indeed, in reality, all of us. We came here committed to agriculture, and committed to proposals and efforts to put agriculture upon an economic basis at least approaching the level of that of industry and other interests of the country.

We have had our differences, and we have debated and argued not only on the floor, but behind the scenes as well. The arguments, representations, and efforts to reconcile our differences behind the scenes have been as interesting and sometimes as controversial as they have been here on the floor of the Senate.

I wish to include the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] among those who have aided materially and constructively in the framing of the bill and the consummation of what now seems to be a happy ending of our efforts.

I am especially happy over the matter not only because of the fine piece of legislation which I believe has been written, but because I believe that, under all the circumstances, it is a constructive bill, one under which the President can do everything he wants to do and feels it necessary to do, and at the same time it is one which preserves the economy of the American people without doing an injustice to any branch of American industry or activity.

Above all I am gratified because the final agreement on the measure has justified the legislative process, and has vindicated Congress. Regardless of what anyone may say, I think Congress has brought about an acceptable and commendable result in the writing of the bill. I am happy over it because we know how Congress has been subjected to criticism. I find no fault with anyone who feels that Congress has now and then been remiss in the performance of its duty, or has probably devoted itself now and then to the consideration of small matters. We are a cross section of the American people. It may be the

people could have elected a better Congress than the one which they have elected, but they did not do so. They elected the one which they now have, and they will elect others in the future, as they have chosen the ones which represented them in the past. It may be that they could have done better than they did in choosing the two present branches of Congress, but the Congress which they chose has attempted to function in good faith.

I wish to congratulate those who have had a part in framing the bill we have been considering. In addition to the Senators I have already mentioned, I wish to include the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], who, in private conversation and negotiation, has assisted materially in attempting to iron out differences which existed, and I desire to express to him publicly my appreciation for the service he has rendered.

At this moment, in view of the consummation of our duty and our task, after our hard and controversial labors, I feel an infinite pride in the vindication of the democratic way of handling important questions such as the one with which we have been confronted. While not every one can be satisfied with the compromise which legislation must always be, the American people on the whole will find that in this instance we have done an acceptable job. When the bill shall have been signed and become a law it can be lived with by those who must administer it. I believe it will demonstrate the wisdom of the Congress in its enactment, and I shall be happy to have it behind us and placed on the statute books.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Now that the distinguished majority leader has complimented so many Senators, I think I might say, as a Republican, that the country owes a "thank you" to the majority leader. However, I do not rise for that purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to say, if the Senator will permit me, that I also deeply appreciate the sincere cooperation and constructive help which has been given by the Republican minority of the Senate in the construction of the measure about to be enacted. I think they have, as we all have tried, to meet this problem in the light of our duty, and I believe we have performed it in that light.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator one question. Can he assure the Senate that the bill in its present form is acceptable to the President?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not in a position to speak for the President——

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator from Kentucky is not, no one is.

Mr. BARKLEY. But if I were a gambling man I should be willing to wager considerable odds that it will not be rejected by the President of the United States.

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



Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I shall take but a moment. Like the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] I did not want all these bouquets to be passed around so generously by our leader without saying a word. I am one of those who have not always been in accord with the majority leader. I regret it when I am not in accord with him, because I like very much to travel along the same road that he is traveling. But I merely want to say in all earnestness, and in all sincerity, that the compromise to which the Senator has referred would never have been worked out if it had not been for the wise consideration and the generous leadership of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course I agree with all that the Senator from Kentucky has said about this bill and about its effect and about those who have taken active part in its enactment. I think we have obtained a good result. I am entirely satisfied with the bill so far as I am concerned, and I think, too, the Senate is, and I hope the country will be.

I especially wish to offer my congratulations to the distinguished, able, and diplomatic Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], who has borne the brunt of this fight. In my judgment, he has done a masterly job, and has stamped himself upon the country as being one of its ablest and best legislators. I congratulate all those on both sides who have brought about the passage of the bill.

My purpose in rising was not to say these things, but to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question about one item in the bill. The Senator offered in the Senate an amendment which was agreed to, affecting the prices of tobacco in States or districts in which the tobacco season has not as yet opened. Did that amendment remain in the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. That amendment remained in the bill unchanged.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy to know that that is true.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very briefly I wish to approve everything that the Senator from Kentucky has said. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee I worked with the Senate majority leader, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the chairman of the committee, and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], both in the handling of the original Price Control Act and in the management and consideration of the pending measure. I, of course, differed with these gentlemen from time to time on some questions. They have represented the administration in large measure, and I am generally an administration man. But I want to pay tribute to the fairness and justice of these three leaders in the management of this price-control measure.

I particularly want to pay a tribute in a brief way to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. He was the active author of the bill in cooperation with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. He has been fair and just and reasonable all the way through the consideration of the bill. He has taken into consideration in a proper and appropriate way the interest of the administration, the interest of the laborers, the interest of the farmers, the interest of the consumers. He has had the full cooperation of our distinguished majority leader and the Senator from New York in all those activities.

Mr. President, I am satisfied with the bill. I think it is a good, workable bill. I did not want the bill at all. I thought we had a good law. But I am not disappointed. We have reached a very fine and satisfactory conclusion. As one who is generally regarded as a minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency on many questions, I should not feel satisfied if I did not pay this tribute and express my feeling of gratification, of satisfaction, of appreciation, and admiration for these three men, and particularly—and I hope my statement will not be regarded as invidious—for the great Senator from Michigan, who primarily had the responsibility for the management of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the Speaker is waiting to sign the enrolled bill, which he cannot do until we adopt the conference report. I understand the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] desires to address the Senate at this time. Therefore I yield the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, first I want to congratulate the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and all other Senators who offered amendments which were rejected in the course of the consideration of this measure. [Laughter.]

I think it no more than right, Mr. President, that the majority leader in the course of his report to the Defense Inspector, who has been absent during the past 2 weeks while the bill was under consideration, should call attention to the headline in this morning's newspaper, particularly in the light of his eulogies here this afternoon.

President attacks Congress as hampering war effort. Roosevelt hits price bill haggling—

Says the Washington Post. All the time, Mr. President, while it was being represented to the country that the President was engaged in some life-and-death struggle with the Congress, he was not even in Washington.

Mr. President, I have just as much admiration for the legislative process as has anyone else. I do not yield even to the majority leader in my regard for it. I heard the Senator from Michigan [Mr.

BROWN] on September 30 say, as he turned to the Senator from Alabama—and I read from page 7625 of the RECORD:

I again appeal to the Senator from Alabama. I am sure that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and I are willing to be committed to see that the Senator's amendment with respect to the crops in which he is primarily interested is carried out. If we cannot agree on anything else, we can include the 90-percent provision.

At page 7627 the RECORD will show the following colloquy:

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator from Michigan a question. When he speaks, as he purports to do, only for the majority conferees whom he already knows, and when he says he will protect the interests of the Senator from Alabama, is it his purpose to go into the conference and to accept the proposal that a 90-percent loan rate be guaranteed for 3 years after the war? Is that a part of his proposal?

Mr. President, let me recall to Senators, and let the RECORD show that there was not one word in the record of the hearings as to the post-war effect of a continued 90-percent parity guaranty. There is not a single line in the record as to the effect of this proposal. There was no testimony, no development of the proposition. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] answered:

Mr. BROWN. No; I did not say that.

Mr. DANAHER. When the Senator says it is his intention to protect the interests of the Senator from Alabama, is that what he means he will do?

Mr. BROWN. I intend to protect the interests of the Sentor from Alabama "as is."

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Michigan does not mean to protect the Senator from Alabama or anyone else by accepting the proposed provision for a 90-percent loan rate to be guaranteed for 3 years after the war, does he?

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

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator from Connecticut is a member of the committee, and he knows that in the committee I withdrew that part of the amendment, and did not even submit it to the committee.

Later the Senator from Michigan said:

I voted for it—

Meaning the 90-percent loan rate—

because I thought that it was desirable to have a 90-percent floor in the joint resolution in order to encourage Senators representing farm States to go along with the measure, as they have done.

Mr. President, there is the legislative process. That is what was done in connection with this measure. We did not hear any debate in the Senate about a post-war, 3-year guaranty, but it was in the House bill. The 90-percent parity rate emanated from the President of the United States and came from the President to the particular majority in control of the measure. It was offered in the committee as an amendment by the Senator from Alabama. At that time he did have a post-war guaranty proposal in his proposed amendment. It was already in the House bill, and the Senators in charge of the bill knew it. It is in the House bill this minute. But the Senator from Alabama withdrew it. He knew, as the questions put by me and the statement of the Senator from Michigan indicated, that were that proposal in the bill, without any record, without hearings, and without the development of the post-war effect of that continued guaranty, a very large number of Senators—possibly scores—would have refused to accept it.

But, no; we had to guarantee and protect the interests of somebody. Mr. STEAGALL had it all fixed; the Senator from Alabama had it all fixed, and the majority had it all fixed. That is the way it was in the conference. There was not a word about it in the Senate amendment when the bill went to conference, but the subject was not under discussion more than 5 minutes when the period was made 2 years, in the form in which we now find it in the bill.

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

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I invite attention to the fact that both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided that the loan to wheat farmers should be identical with the loan to cotton farmers; but, notwithstanding the fact that both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained identical provisions with reference to wheat farmers, the Senate conferees must have made a desperate fight for the wheat farmers of the Northwest in order to obtain a compromise so that the President could change the loan value.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator from Montana that, as the Senator from Michigan explains, he made these agreements to the end that he might encourage Senators representing farm States to go along with the measure, as they have done, as he has pointed out to us.

Mr. President, I submit that when the war is over and the post-war rehabilitation problems confront us will be the time when we should decide what to do. We do not know the degree to which our economy will be affected by the exhaustion of war. We have no concept whatever of what the results are likely to be upon the consuming public of the Nation, but we do know that at this minute there are protections in the law to the effect that Government-loan cotton and similar commodities may not be sold. Those limitations are already in existing law. So for 2 years we guarantee that the producers of those commodities may continue to receive 90 percent of parity and again load their surplus commodities onto the Government, at the expense of the public. Such commodities may not even be sold for the benefit of consumers.

That is what has been done. That is the sort of thing which is involved; yet the record is barren of fact or incident to disclose the effect upon the economy of the American Nation of what has now been written into the conference report.

Mr. President, it seems to me that that is fundamental. In the light of the developments of the past 2 weeks, and particularly in retrospect, when we find that Congress is being attacked, let the record show what happened. That is my purpose in arising at this time. I also believe that a word of caution properly could and should have been injected into the whole proceeding, to the end that we postpone until the post-war period, when we are in a position to assay our condition, the decision as to what steps, if any, should be taken with respect to the continuance of a 90-percent parity loan.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in view of the spirit manifested by the Senator from Connecticut, I think it is proper that I should make a brief statement on the subject. He has mentioned my name.

This is the first time I have ever heard criticism of a conference committee because it adopted a provision in the bill of one House which was not originally included in the measure passed by the other House. He seems to believe that because there was no hearing on this phase of the bill, the Senate conferees should not under any circumstances have acceded to the request of the House.

This provision was included in the House bill. It was approved by the House committee, was adopted in the House, and was a part of the House bill. It was a part of the bill in conference between the two Houses.

The Senator from Connecticut said something about my knowing that Mr. STEAGALL was going to get it through. I had no knowledge in advance about what the committee would do, or what the House would do. Action in the Senate committee was taken before the House committee had taken action, and before the House had taken action.

The Senator from Connecticut said that the matter was settled, as though there were some conspiracy. I had no special interest in the provision, and did not even press it. I think it is a wise provision. I know that it was recommended by the President. I think that is what turned the Senator from Connecticut against it. It was a part of the program advocated by the President in his message to Congress.

Instead of settling it in 15 minutes, I know that the members of the conference committee who are present will all testify that that particular subject had more discussion in the conference than probably any other phase of the subject between the conferees. It was brought up from time to time in discussions in the conference committee. It was not agreed upon until late this afternoon, because the Senator from Michigan stood firm against the insistence of the House conferees to have the 3-year period retained in the bill. He would not agree to it. There was protracted discussion in the conference committee. Instead of the question being settled in 15 minutes, as I stated, it required a large part of the time. Finally, in order to get an agreement, the matter was settled by the acceptance of a 2-year extension, which I understand had been recommended by the President of the United States.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. This discussion ought not to be concluded without reminding the Senate of the fact that at least 3

months ago the Committee on Banking and Currency, after deliberate consideration, brought in a bill authorizing a 100-percent loan on farm crops, at the time when 110 percent of parity was the basis of the Price Control Act. That bill passed the Senate practically without opposition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; we had a pretty vigorous fight over it, but it was fully considered.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was a substantial majority.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There was a substantial majority; and it was fully considered.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was fully considered and passed. It went to the House. The House Committee on Banking and Currency reported it to the House, and it is now on the calendar; but the House did not act upon it because a rule was not provided in the House by the Rules Committee. That was because there was a general understanding that there would be a sort of informal recess for a couple of months.

The bill providing for 100-percent loans was based upon the 110-percent provisions of the Price Control Act; and when we were drawing this legislation and reducing the loans to approximately 100 percent, the Senator from Alabama was one of those in the committee who insisted that we should not provide for a 100-percent loan because it might result in the farmers' turning their crops over to the Government itself.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Because there was not room enough above it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. So that subject was given careful consideration by the committee some 2 or 3 months ago; was given careful consideration by the Senate, received a substantial majority of the votes of the Members of the Senate, went to the House, was put on the calendar, and would have become law except for the failure of the Rules Committee, because of a formal recess, to bring it up for consideration. So, it had ample consideration by both the committees of the House and Senate and by the Senate. I think that statement should be made at this time.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I am very anxious to have the conference report on the bill agreed to. The bill has been the subject of practically a month's work. Therefore, I shall not make any reply to the speech made by my good friend, the Senator from Connecticut.

I wish I might take the time of the Senate to compliment the Senators who have taken part in this matter in words similar to those used by other Senators in describing me and others of my colleagues who have participated in this struggle.

I merely want to say that the Senator from Connecticut was perfectly willing to perpetrate this terrible crime upon the American people for 1 year, but he did not want to do it for 2 years. In the discussion which we had, the House wanted the period to be 3 years after the war. The Senate wanted it to be merely the war period. The chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee insisted upon having the period 3 years. We insisted upon having no post-war period. We finally compromised on a 2-year period, with the Senator from Connecticut very desirous of making it a 1-year period.

So, I want to say there was not a great deal of difference between us. If it would have been good for the country for 1 year, it will be good for the country for 2 years. I think we can live with it. I do not think it will cause great loss to the Treasury of the United States, and I know that it is a very satisfactory safeguard to American agriculture.

Mr. President, I have but one object, and that is to have the Senate dispose of the bill and send it on its way to the White House, where it can be considered by the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

### AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to affix his signature to the enrolled bill during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 5, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 2, 1942:

### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George Wadsworth, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to act as diplomatic agent and consul general of the United States of America near the Government of the Republic of Lebanon, at Beirut, and near the Government of the Republic of Syria, at Damascus.

### THE JUDICIARY

Hon. Harold E. Stafford, of Hawaii, to be third judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. Judge Stafford is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired June 24, 1942.

Hon. John A. Matthewman, of Hawaii, to be fifth judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. Judge Matthewman is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired June 24, 1942.

### UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Vernon I. Richard to be an examiner in chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

Ernest F. Klinge to be an examiner in chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

#### ALABAMA

William H. Elam, Brent, Ala., in place of Grace Ward, resigned.

Elias B. Reid, Cherokee, Ala., in place of E. B. Reid. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William F. Croft, Crossville, Ala., in place of W. F. Croft. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

A. Kate B. Patterson, Falkville, Ala., in place of A. K. B. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ernest D. Manning, Florala, Ala., in place of E. D. Manning. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Herman Pride, Georgiana, Ala., in place of Herman Pride. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Roy J. Ellison, Loxley, Ala., in place of R. J. Ellison. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William M. Moore, Luverne, Ala., in place of W. M. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lawrence F. Howell, Moulton, Ala., in place of L. F. Howell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harry J. Wilters, Robertsdale, Ala., in place of H. J. Wilters. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles B. Lampkin, Jr., University, Ala., in place of J. A. Anderson, retired.

#### ARIZONA

George C. Wright, Clifton, Ariz., in place of G. C. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1942.

John E. Wagner, Jerome, Ariz., in place of J. E. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1941.

#### ARKANSAS

Fagan B. Richardson, Ash Flat, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Otis H. Parham, Bald Knob, Ark., in place of O. H. Parham. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Thomas B. Gatling, Bearden, Ark., in place of T. B. Gatling. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

W. Ernest King, Clarksville, Ark., in place of W. E. King. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

J. Dot Fortenberry, Imboden, Ark., in place of J. D. Fortenberry. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James T. Alderson, Malvern, Ark., in place of J. T. Alderson. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

Guy Stephenson, Monticello, Ark., in place of Guy Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Claude M. Farish, Morrilton, Ark., in place of C. M. Farish. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James H. Nobles, Parkdale, Ark., in place of J. H. Nobles. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

#### CALIFORNIA

Gilbert G. Vann, Arbuckle, Calif., in place of G. G. Vann. Incumbent's commission expired May 27, 1942.

Jacob Golden Land, Feather Falls, Calif., Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Paul W. McGrorty, McCloud, Calif., in place of P. W. McGrorty Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1942.

John Carlos Rose, Milpitas, Calif., in place of J. C. Rose. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

Robert L. Turner, Mojave, Calif., in place of J. J. Nestor, resigned.

Julia M. Ruschin, Newark, Calif., in place of J. M. Ruschin. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1942.

Lindsey L. Burke, Norwalk, Calif., in place of L. L. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1942.

Charles A. Turner, Oceanside, Calif., in place of C. A. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1942.

Icy June Murphy, Project City, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

George H. Treat, San Andreas, Calif., in place of G. H. Treat. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

Louis J. McNeill, Tuolumne, Calif., in place of L. J. McNeill. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

COLORADO

Mary E. Vogt, Burlington, Colo., in place of M. E. Vogt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Glenn G. Ellington, Delta, Colo., in place of G. G. Ellington. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1942.

Lewis Hollenbeck, Salida, Colo., in place of Lewis Hollenbeck. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

CONNECTICUT

Harold Olin Grant, Manchester, Conn., in place of T. J. Quish. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

FLORIDA

Kirby D. Rooks, Bonifay, Fla., in place of K. D. Rooks. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

LeRoy E. Diggans, Delray Beach, Fla., in place of L. E. Diggans. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ralph W. Hartman, Stuart, Fla., in place of R. W. Hartman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

GEORGIA

Charles D. Bruce, Sea Island Beach, Ga., in place of C. D. Bruce. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

ILLINOIS

John G. Rehwald, Altamont, Ill., in place of J. G. Rehwald. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1942.

Charles G. Sowell, Granite City, Ill., in place of C. G. Sowell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

INDIANA

William J. O'Donnell, Gary, Ind., in place of W. J. O'Donnell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Joseph P. Sullivan, Whiting, Ind., in place of P. D. Sullivan, resigned.

KANSAS

Clarence O. Masterson, Wilmore, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

KENTUCKY

Earl H. Jackson, Corinth, Ky., in place of D. L. Sullivan, removed.

Owen W. Hisle, Richmond, Ky., in place of Elmer Deatherage, deceased.

MARYLAND

James F. Stack, Ridgely, Md., in place of J. W. Davis, removed.

MASSACHUSETTS

Charles H. McGrath, Randolph, Mass., in place of F. S. Roddan, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Robert E. Lee, Byron, Mich., in place of R. E. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

George Merriman, Manchester, Mich., in place of Bert Lowery, deceased.

Lynn J. Pardee, Three Oaks, Mich., in place of J. E. Bommerscheim. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1940.

MONTANA

Oren D. Clement, Livingston, Mont., in place of O. D. Clement. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1942.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Harold B. Pinkham, Milton, N. H., in place of C. E. Tanner, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Viola J. Kearns, Netcong, N. J., in place of A. J. Hans, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Josephine Lorenzo, Dawson, N. Mex., in place of J. Q. Welch. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

NEW YORK

Ward C. Wells, Barneveld, N. Y., in place of W. C. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

William A. Horan, Castle Point, N. Y., in place of E. T. Hayden, removed.

OHIO

Walter T. Ault, Findlay, Ohio, in place of W. T. Ault. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harry A. Higgins, Xenia, Ohio, in place of H. A. Higgins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OREGON

Euna Pearl Burke, Astoria, Oreg., in place of E. P. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Robert H. Fox, Bend, Oreg., in place of R. H. Fox. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Glen C. Smith, Independence, Oreg., in place of G. C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Winifred G. Wisecarver, McMinnville, Oreg., in place of W. G. Wisecarver. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles T. Bonner, Glen Riddle, Pa., in place of C. T. Bonner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Cornelius McCullough, Lansdowne, Pa., in place of Cornelius McCullough. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marea Stover, Shrewsbury, Pa., in place of M. J. Gerry, resigned.

TENNNESSEE

Bernard R. Duncan, Linden, Tenn., in place of B. R. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harry Robinson, Signal Mountain, Tenn., in place of E. H. Stanfield. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1942.

TEXAS

Milton L. Burleson, El Paso, Tex., in place of M. L. Burleson. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1942.

Mollie S. Berryman, Willis, Tex., in place of M. S. Berryman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

UTAH

D. Grant Ingersoll, American Fork, Utah, in place of S. T. Shelley, deceased.

WASHINGTON

George B. Day, Walla Walla, Wash., in place of G. B. Day. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Julius W. Singleton, Charleston, W. Va., in place of J. W. Singleton. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

Denny B. Browning, Logan, W. Va., in place of D. B. Browning. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Mary Drossart, Casco, Wis., in place of W. E. Drossart, transferred.

Frank R. Hughes, Chippewa Falls, Wis., in place of F. R. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Earl F. Moldenhauer, Clintonville, Wis., in place of E. F. Moldenhauer. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Carl J. Mueller, Jefferson, Wis., in place of C. J. Mueller. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

Bethel W. Robinson, Superior, Wis., in place of B. W. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

---

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 2, 1942:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PROMOTIONS IN THE TEMPORARY SERVICE

*To be major generals*

Julian C. Smith
Charles D. Barrett

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

*To be second lieutenants*

| | |
|---|---|
| Robert A. Downing | James W. Sperry |
| John S. Hudson | Clayton S. Rockmore |
| Robert L. Gillis | John L. Gifford |
| Delmar M. Persinger | Fred C. Eberhardt |
| Irving B. Hayes | Henry V. Joslin |
| Richard W. Mirick | Lyle K. London |
| William J. Howatt | Robert H. Daley |
| William G. Shoop | Harry A. Hadd |
| David S. Randall | Floyd M. Johnson, Jr. |
| Norman C. Bayley | Paul O. Engelder |

POSTMASTER

KANSAS

Cleora Hila Creed, Turon.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We are grateful to Thee, O Thou God of goodness and grace, that Thou dost turn Thy countenance upon the upturned faces of Thy children. Sacred forever are those steps worn by the feet of Thy saints of old. We praise Thee that the divine voice whispers into the human soul at the altar of Him whose deathless sacrifice has swept the thoughts, the dreams, and the hopes of the centuries. Thou Christ, sorely fearful, strengthen our hearts lest we labor without Thy guidance.

Blessed Lord, as faith, love, and industry make the true man, may we be very sure that these will grow on a low plane unless inspired by the teaching of the Book of Life. We rejoice that Thy mercy forgives and Thy deep seas bury forever sins forsaken. We pray that we may honor all men; speak no evil, nor listen to it; teach high thoughts by amiable words; bear no ill will; love the truth and all that makes a good man. In the spirit of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5719. An act to abolish the Guilford Courthouse National Military Park Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6601. An act to reorganize the system of land offices and land districts in Alaska; and

H. R. 7152. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House

is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7121. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1869. An act for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered property losses as a result of the failure of the Big Porcupine Dam on the Fort Peck project, Montana;

S. 1968. An act to amend section 13 (c) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, so as to permit the sale of certain publications not published or sold for profit;

S. 2398. An act amending the provisions governing the issuance of patent for certain lands to the town of Fletcher, Okla.;

S. 2528. An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico;

S. 2623. An act authorizing the construction of certain public works in the basin of the Connecticut River for flood control;

S. 2635. An act to provide for granting to the State of New Mexico the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in New Mexico;

S. 2691. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior;

S. 2706. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), and "Title IV of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941," approved September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 883);

S. 2723. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942;

S. 2762. An act 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;

S. 2776. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect;

S. 2798. An act amending the first sentence of Article of War 52, relative to execution of court-martial sentences; and

S. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Senate reported print of H. R. 7378, a bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7565) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. An amendment was inserted in the Senate to give the administration the right to prohibit increase in utility rates and we are very much interested in that amendment, because the report that came to my desk this morning from the Electric Institute shows the domestic electric consumers in almost every State in the Union are overcharged about 100 percent. We want to know if the House conferees are willing to bring that provision back and give the House an opportunity to vote upon it, in case they do not agree to it.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that he is not correctly describing the amendment to which he evidently refers. The amendment to which the gentleman refers is not directed solely at power rates. It is much broader than that, and all I can say to the gentleman is that the conference committee has that matter under consideration. What their action will be I am not in a position to tell the gentleman at this time.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. What I am interested in is the electric light and power rates that are likely to spiral to where the overcharges that amount to 100 percent now will probably spiral to 400 or 500 or 1,000 percent. I am interested in the conferees giving us the right to vote on that provision in case the House conferees fail to agree to it.

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, the gentleman is one of the best trained parliamentarians in this House and he knows what his rights are with respect to that. I cannot state to the gentleman now what will be done by the conferees in connection with that amendment.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I just want to emphasize to the gentleman from Alabama that unless the House conferees agree to that provision, we are going to demand a separate vote upon it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to ask the gentleman from Alabama or the majority leader of the House what we can expect today. Conflicting rumors have been circulating as to the time we may receive the report of the conference committee.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, the conferees are working now in the hope of finishing the conference in time to make a report to the House today at such an hour as will permit action upon the report by the House this afternoon. There is good reason to hope that we shall be able to do that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GIFFORD.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill just sent to conference may make their report during the day and that it may be in order to consider the report when it is filed.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman will try to bring the legislation back sometime today, early enough to have the report acted upon?

Mr. STEAGALL. I have hopes that we will be able to act upon the report today.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 548), as follows:

*Resolved*, That WILLIAM H. LARRABEE, of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE PRESS

Mr. NELSON. 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?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, this is newspaper week. The press of the United States has just been put to the greatest test in the history of journalism, asked to sacrifice news, its very lifeblood. This test was fully met, met in keeping with the best traditions of an agency which has never failed America in its hour of need. From time to time we are told of how without this or that, whether reference be to food or to the output of factories, the war could not be won. Doubly difficult would it be to win the war without the support of newspapers, whether the smallest country weekly or the most powerful metropolitan publication. In these days of drive and endeavor, and sometimes of doubt, when the fate of civilization itself hangs in the balance, there are few issues of any publication which do not carry in their columns material vital to our cause. Space represents the goods which the paper must sell if it is to survive, yet hundreds of thousands of columns, if not actually millions, are contributed by the press of America. All credit and all honor to this press, fair and unafraid, and which in the interest of that which means more than money, cooperates not only in giving publicity to promote the war effort but withholds from its columns news of the greatest interest to its readers. Again, all credit to the press.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE PRESIDENT ATTACKS CONGRESS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include as a part of my remarks an article appearing in the Washington Post this morning headed "The President attacks Congress," together with supporting statements.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'CONNOR addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ANTI-INFLATION LEGISLATION

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. 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?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a significant speech by Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[By unanimous consent, Mr. SATTERFIELD was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.]

APPOINTMENT OF WHITE HOUSE POLICE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CIVIL-SERVICE LAWS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2584) to permit appointment of White House Police, in accordance with the civil-service laws, from sources outside the Metropolitan and United States Park Police force.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question. According to the Chief of Police of the White House force, there is authorized now for the White House police force 80 men for the regular force and 40 to be detailed from the Metropolitan Police. That would make 120, but there are now on duty about 101 as of yesterday. As I drove around the White House this morning I noticed 15 Army men guarding the White House grounds. I could only get on the south and north sides of the White House. The east side, next to the Treasury Department, and the west side, next to the State Department, were closed to pedestrians. So if they had 15 more on those 2 sides of the White House there would be at least 100 soldiers there during a 24-hour period guarding the White House. If they have over 100 policemen and 100 Army men to guard the White House, that is more policemen than it takes to guard the people in a city of 100,000 people. When no one is permitted to go around the grounds of the White House, do you think it is necessary to include 20 or 30 more men on that force? I am one who does not think so. I want to give all the protection to the President of these United States that is necessary. I have no desire that he shall not have full and proper protection, but it seems to me as a matter of common sense and wisdom, when we are going in the red over $12,000,000,000 since the first of July and here we can save the services of 20 to 40 men who can be used in other industries or on the District police force, and who can be used in thousands of places where they are needed, where they can be of use to our country in time of war when manpower is scarce, and I believe that that should be done. I do not think this bill ought to be passed. But I do not want to put the Rules Committee to the bother of granting a rule. I agreed not to object to it, by unanimous consent, but I think from the standpoint of good ordinary common sense this bill should not be passed; from the standpoint of the Treasury, I know it should not pass. I am willing to have it taken up by unanimous consent, but I believe it is wrong and I think the Congress sought to reject the bill. If you do not reject it then I am sure you do not know what is best for our country and the majority who have control of the votes will continue to rubber stamp through this House unnecessary legislation, extravagant legislation. It is up to you, the House of Representatives. Do your duty and kill this bill. I warn you of your duty. I would kill it if I thought by my objection that would do the job, but I know I cannot do it.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the representatives of the secret-service organization and the Treasury Department who appeared before our committee stated that it was vitally necessary to have these vacancies filled. This involves no additional appropriation whatever. The White House grounds are very extensive grounds. They are serviced by policemen both from the standpoint of the grounds and the standpoint of the buildings on the grounds. The policemen work in several shifts each day. I think that in these war times particularly it is highly important that we keep that force up to the authorized strength.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand this is a unanimous report from your committee, after full hearings?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. And the bill has already passed the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, in addition to appointment from members of the Metropolitan Police force and the United States Park Police force, as provided in section 2 of the act of September 14, 1922, as amended (U. S. C., title 3, sec. 62 (a)), members of the White House Police force may be appointed, and vacancies in such force filled, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the regulations issued pursuant thereto.

SEC. 2. Members appointed pursuant to this act shall be entitled to the same privileges as to salary, grade, uniforms, equipment, transfer, leave, relief funds, retirement, and refunds as members appointed from the Metropolitan Police force and the United States Park Police force.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution No. 546 was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. DONDERO, Mr. RAMSAY, and Mr. GUYER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I delivered in Columbus last week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the President has just made a 2 weeks' trip across the country to learn at first hand what the people are thinking and saying. He says his trip was not a political one. I am inclined to believe him.

We are completing action on the price-control bill today, and must wait 2 weeks for the tax bill to come back to the House for action. Therefore, following the example of the President, I have decided to leave Washington for a 2 weeks' trip over my district to learn at first hand what my people are thinking and saying. With the election only a few weeks away, I wonder if my people would be inclined to believe me if I said my trip has no political implications.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE WAR EFFORT

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I see the President of the United States has repudiated the remarks of Assistant Secretary Bard and General Somervell that we are losing the war, and has reprimanded them.

I wonder if he will remove them and Elmer Davis, head of the Office of Information, who passed on those remarks before they were uttered?

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, without getting into this controversy I think, in all fairness to Assistant Secretary Bard—and I have met the gentleman only once—I should say I certainly did not place any such interpretation upon his remarks as a flat statement that we are losing the war. I think the whole theme of his remarks was that we could lose the war. I think the whole purpose of his speech was to convey to the American public the fact that it was only with grim determination that we will win the war. I believe further it was an effort to remove the feeling of self-complacency that exists in some directions. With this construction I personally am in agreement. He did use one sentence which removed from the rest of his speech employed the language "We are losing the war," or something to that effect; but when you read and consider his speech as a whole no such interpretation could honestly be placed upon it. Let me say again I have no personal reason for defending the gentleman, having met him but once. In justice, however, to my own sense of intellectual honesty I place no such interpretation upon the speech; and I cannot sit here and allow such a misinterpretation to go out to the country. He was conveying to the American public the thought that we could lose the war if we did not do those things that were necessary to win it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from today's New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE WAR EFFORT

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. The American people have been bewildered and confused by the statements emanating from public officials in Washington that we are losing the war. All Americans, Republicans and Democrats alike, are united in their determination to win this war, cost what it may in blood, tears, and money. They are in favor of an all-out war—all-out in effort, service, and sacrifice until final victory. They want to know why it is we are losing the war, according to certain high New Deal spokesmen and officials of the War and Navy Departments.

There is a constant note which pervades all these defeatist statements from the administration; they use one expletive in trying to bring home to the American people the horrible fact that we are losing this war; they say, for instance that the American people may "damned well realize that we are losing this war." My answer to these defeatists is that the attitude of the American people is just that they "will be damned if they lose this war."

We are going to win this war!

When the President was asked yesterday at his press conference if he agreed with the statement of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard, that "we are losing this war," his only answer was "I wouldn't have said that."

What the American people want to know is, Is that true? We are going to win this war because we cannot afford not to. The consequences of losing the war are too horrible to contemplate. We are going to win this war because we have got to win it, and although we have two strikes on us already because of the bungling and manhandling to date, we must win it in spite of the starry-eyed New Deal radicals now running it, who want it to last at least until their entire program is carried out world-wide.

We must win it in spite of the New Deal incompetency admitted by their own spokesmen. We must win it in spite of—but why go on; we must win.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD; and second, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the gentleman from Massachusetts got his information concerning what Mr. Bard said on the 28th of September. The statement he just made as recorded by the stenographer is not in accord with the statement inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A3440. Here is what Mr. Bard said:

> We go around saying "We can lose the war," but—we may as well admit it—every time one of us says we can lose the war we think of this as pure rhetoric, part of the old pep talk. The assumption is, of course, we can't lose the war, but scare 'em a little and then in the wind-up of the talk give 'em the build-up about our great American heritage of freedom and what-not and how our courage and our self-sacrifice will bring us to victory over the forces of evil.

Then, Mr. Majority Leader, Mr. Bard said:

> We are still losing this war, and we should damn well understand it. It will take all we have got to win. What are you going to do about it?

He did not say we could lose the war; he said—

> We are still losing this war.

That is what he said.

And we all, including the President, are late in making the defeat of our enemies our one and only purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

UNJUST CRITICISM OF CONGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage of the countryside that says, "Never whip a horse when he is pulling his best." I was grieved—yes, saddened—this morning to read in the papers where the President had inferred that Congress had not done its part in the war effort.

It is not disturbing to hear or read of criticisms of Congress by un-American groups or by disgruntled professional politicians, but it disturbs me to have our President make the inference that Congress has not lived up to its obligations. On the 7th day of December I vowed that I would never utter one word, commit one act, nor have one thought that would not contribute to winning the war. I have fulfilled this vow by cooperating with all Federal departments, by my attitude in my committee, and by my conduct and statements on this floor. No living man can convince me that our beloved Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, who already has publicly stated that Congress has given the President every dollar and every power he has asked, has not used his every effort to win this war. No man can make me believe that the majority leader, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, and the minority leader, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., have not made every effort to further the war program to the best of their ability and with as little partisanship as was humanly possible. No man can convince me that there is a Member of Congress on either side of this aisle that is not wholeheartedly in favor of winning this war.

If I had access to the White House, I would ask the President to be a little charitable to the legislative branch of our Government. I would ask him not to lend encouragement to critics whose whole purpose is to discredit Congress in the eyes of the American people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Fort Wayne (Ind.)

News Sentinel, stating that thousands of United States troops are aiding in harvests vital to the Allies.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a brief article from the pen of Chester H. Rowell, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "The Free Press." It seems as if the press is very much worried about being unable to give the public the news and they do not like it. I think that the people of this country should be given the news that is not detrimental to the winning of this war. We are trying to muzzle the press.

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

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I am not mistaken I heard another enthusiastic Member ask and receive consent to insert that same editorial ir the RECORD a few moments ago. If it is already in the RECORD I submit to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that with his idea of economy he should not burden the RECORD with it the second time.

Mr. RICH. I certainly do not want it in the RECORD twice, but the newspapers of this country are desirous of disseminating news to the public and I think they ought to know. If it is in once, it will not be in twice.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I have written on the subject of National Newspaper Week.

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

There was no objection.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. HOBBS. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, that the poll tax is a qualification prerequisite to the privilege of voting and not a mere regulation or condition is too clear for argument. Take for instance section 178 of the Constitution of Alabama, which reads in its pertinent part as follows:

> To entitle a person to vote in any election by the people, he shall have paid all poll taxes.

That is a qualification pure and simple. It cannot possibly be construed as anything else. It relates not to the "how" of any election, but to the "who" of the electors. It certainly has nothing whatever to do with the time, nor place, nor manner of holding any election. Since, therefore, section 4 of Article I of the Federal Constitution is the only grant of power to Congress over elections, and that reads:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators—

Congress has no power at all to legislate on anything save State regulations of the times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives. The poll-tax requirement is not a regulation, but a plain qualification or condition precedent to voting, and hence, is beyond the power of Congress to make, unmake, or alter in any way.

Not only is the poll tax a qualification, but also it is a reasonable one. It provides a pertinent test or yardstick. Why should anyone claim to be qualified to vote who has not enough interest in his own or his neighbors' children to pay less than one-half a cent a day for the support of the public schools of his State? What hope have we that such a person would post himself on the candidates and issues involved and would perform his duties in an intelligent manner as a voter even if he qualified? If any person places no higher value upon the privilege of voting than is indicated by failure to pay a poll tax of a dollar or two a year, it is doubtful if such a person would prove a good elector under any circumstances. One who values the personal privilege of suffrage at less than one cent a day surely has little interest in voting. Especially is this true when, in States like Alabama, every cent of the poll-tax money goes to the cause of education.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Red Oak Express by Ralph Overholser.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a platform adopted by the Young Democrats at their convention held in New York recently.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe everyone will agree that the morale of the country at large has been greatly improved and enhanced as a result of the highly successful inspection trip just made by the President of the United States. I think the President of the United States was acting as the spokesman of all the people in the country yesterday when he voiced some criticism of several different minority groups. He criticized not only the minority groups in the newspaper and the radio fields and in the Congress but also his own subordinates. In view of that, I say that he spoke the voice of the American people, and that his criticism of these four minority groups is entirely justified. In other words, in my opinion, the President grabbed the ball and made a touchdown. I am certainly glad that I am on his side and that I have supported him through all these trying months.

[Here the gavel fell.]

A TIME FOR TEAMWORK

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 mintue.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the House will agree that I am generally restrained in my references to the President, yet after what has been said and in view of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania I wish to make a comment.

It may be true that the President has grabbed the ball and made a touchdown, as the gentleman has said, but my ex-

perience in football was that it was never good teamwork or strategy for the captain, or the quarterback, to kick the rest of the team around nor to use the players on his team for a football.

If we are going to win this war, the coordinate branches of the Government must win this fight working together.

The fact is that the reason the Congress has taken a little time to look over this anti-inflation bill is that a year ago when the matter first came up, the President opposed the inclusion of anything to control wages. A ceiling on farm prices related to parity was placed in that bill. It may have been too high, but the ceiling was there. The Price Control Act, however, specifically prohibited doing anything about wages or salaries. Some of us at the time voted against the bill because it attempted to put a ceiling at the end sale without stabilizing wages and certain other items that must enter into costs. The bill became law in that form and now we have the job of correcting that mistake. The President told the country about it in his Labor Day address but presented a one-sided picture, throwing the onus of a spiraling inflation on the farmer, and paying no attention to the fact that the Price Control Act was breaking down because of the exemptions written into the act by administration request, a year ago. Indeed, he told the Congress to lower the ceiling on farm prices and leave wage controls to him. So, it is not to be wondered at that Congress as a coordinate branch of the Government and a member of the team has wanted to play its part, too. This is a time for teamwork and no grandstanding by anybody, not even by the quarterback.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DUNCAN. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose now nor will it be to be giving out statements in reply to people who make political statements or speeches but Mr. Frank Gannett, assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee, Wednesday enlisted, theoretically, in the board of military strategy, by telling a gathering of Congressmen of his party and his executive committee what this country should do to win the war.

Possibly he was actuated by the martial declarations of Finance Director Pettingill and Executive Director and Publicity Chief Kelland, of the Republican high command, in which they arraigned the administration and practically accused the Commander in Chief of at least bad faith. The author-politician made this charge:

> There seems to be a disposition on the part of the powers that be to postpone an all-out war effort, with the sacrifices it entails by the public until after the elections. There seems to be apprehension lest the asking of necessary sacrifices now may have a political effect and loss of votes.

This statement got newspaper headlines, but some of the solidest of their own newspapers were horrified at the implication and scolded them about it.

Mr. Gannett boldly announces decisions on questions over which our highest military authorities have been debating and differing for a generation, but the up-state New York publisher knows all the answers. He insists we should have a unified command. In my own nonmilitary mind I have always supposed the President, Commander in Chief under the Constitution, was the unified commander. Mr. Gannett demands a separate air department, which involves the addition of one more branch of the Cabinet. For all I know he may be right in this, but I doubt if either he or I am competent to make such a decision on which the chiefs of the armed forces, whom we educated to guide us in such matters hold diverse opinions. He even tells the Army general staff and the Naval chief of operations how many pilots we need.

For the rest of the speech, charging the administration with fumbling the war, meaning to control the press, and so forth, the Republican vice chairman is well within his functions as a politico. Those are the things he is expected to say—possibly he construes them as being in accord of eliminating politics for the duration—but what education or other qualification have these self-appointed desk admirals and generals to dictate on military matters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the remainder of the day for the Speaker to declare recesses and the House to meet at the call of the Chair on 15-minute notice to the Members.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think at this time it might be well for the majority leader to notify the House of the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very pleased to do that.

Monday, of course, there will be the call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are there to be any suspensions?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I am glad the gentleman has asked that question. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] gave notice the other day of a suspension on a bill out of his committee relating to the hospitalization of certain veterans of the present war. This will be brought up under suspension of the rules unless, of course, it may be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It does not appear to be very controversial.

Mr. McCORMACK. From every indication I have seen on the few occasions it has been sought to be brought up, there does not seem to be much serious opposition.

The same day I hope to bring up S. 2471. That is a bill to amend the famous or infamous Hatch Act, according to how one looks at it, to exempt teachers from the operations of that act. If that bill does come up Monday and is debated, if there is to be a roll call upon it, it is my intention, if it is agreeable to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], that the vote be taken on Tuesday.

Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will be agreeable. Would there be any opportunity to amend that legislation to be presented on Monday? That is, we might want to go a little further.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer that. Of course, that question would depend somewhat upon the germaneness of the amendment that might be presented, and, if the amendment is not germane, whether anybody raises the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, if it is an amendment to the Hatch Act, almost anything would be germane, according to my parliamentary knowledge.

Mr. McCORMACK. The main thing is I am advising the House that I am in hopes that that bill will be brought up on Monday. Then, if there is to be a roll call, that the vote will go over until Tuesday. In any event, if it is not brought up Monday, it is the intention to bring it up sometime next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill comes up under a rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. On Tuesday there is a call of the individual bills on the Private Calendar, and thereafter a call of the omnibus private bills. The House agreed to that one day earlier in the week. Then there is a deficiency appropriation bill which I am in hopes will be brought up either Wednesday or Thursday. I notice the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is present in the Chamber. I wonder if he could give the House any information, in the absence of the chairman of the subcommittee, as to when this bill is likely to come up.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We hope to have it on Wednesday or Thursday—probably Thursday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think that we can pass it on Thursday?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think so.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the program for next week.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

PRICE-CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr STEAGALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7565) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7565) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, the President is authorized and directed, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living; and, except as otherwise provided in this Act, such stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. The President may, except as otherwise provided in this Act, thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities: *Provided*, That no common carrier or other public utility shall make any general increase in its rates or charges which were in effect on September 15, 1942, unless it first gives thirty days notice to the President, or such agency as he may designate, and consents to the timely intervention by such agency before the Federal, State, or municipal authority having jurisdiction to consider such increase."

"SEC. 2. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this Act; and may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by this Act through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct. The President may suspend the provisions of sections 3 (a) and 3 (c), and clause (1) of section 302 (c), of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to the extent that such sections are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, but he may not under the authority of this Act suspend any other law or part thereof.

"SEC. 3. No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this Act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture—

"(1) The parity price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials) or, in case a comparable price has been determined for such commodity under and in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, such comparable price (adjusted in the same manner), or

"(2) The highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 194. . and September 15, 1942 (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials), or, if the market for such commodity was inactive during the latter half of such period, a price for the commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in line with the prices, during such period, of other agricultural commodities produced for the same general use;

"and no maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this Act or otherwise for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefor equal to the higher of the prices specified in clauses (1) and (2) of this section: *Provided*, That the President may, without regard to the limitation contained in clause (2), adjust any such maximum price to the extent that he finds necessary to correct gross inequities; but nothing in this section shall be construed to permit the establishment in any case of a maximum price below a price which will reflect to the producers of any agricultural commodity the price therefor specified in clause (1) of this section: *Provided further*, That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs: *Provided further*, That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing: *Provided further*, That in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as provided for by this Act, adequate weighting shall be given to farm labor.

"SEC. 4. No action shall be taken under authority of this Act with respect to wages or salaries (1) which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the National Labor Relations Act, or (2) for the purpose of reducing the wages or salaries for any particular work below the highest wages or salaries paid therefor between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942: *Provided*, That the President may, without regard to the limitation contained in clause (2), adjust wages or salaries to the extent that he finds necessary in any case to correct gross inequities and also aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

"SEC. 5. (a) No employer shall pay, and no employee shall receive, wages or salaries in contravention of the regulations promulgated by the President under this Act. The President shall also prescribe the extent to which any wage or salary payment made in contravention of such regulations shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purposes of any other law or regulation.

"(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent the reduction by any private employer of the salary of any of his employees which is at the rate of $5,000 or more per annum.

"(c) The President shall have power by regulation to limit or prohibit the payment of double time except when, because of emergency conditions, an employee is required to work for seven consecutive days in any regularly scheduled work week.

"SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act (except sections 8 and 9), and all regulations thereunder, shall terminate on June 30, 1944, or on such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President by proclamation, may prescribe.

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by striking out 'June 30, 1943' and substituting 'June 30, 1944'.

"(b) All provisions (including prohibitions and penalties) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 which are applicable with respect to orders or regulations under such Act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, be applicable in the same manner and for the same purposes with respect to regulations or orders issued by the Price Administrator in the exercise of any functions which may be delegated to him under authority of this Act.

"(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to invalidate any provision of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (except to the extent that such provisions are suspended under authority of section 2), or to invalidate any regulation, price schedule, or order issued or effective under such Act.

"SEC. 8. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available upon any crop of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts harvested after December 31, 1941, and before the expiration of the two-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such commodity for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such crop is harvested, loans as follows:

"(1) To cooperators (except cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 90 per centum of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year;

"(2) To cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn, at the rate of 75 per centum of the rate specified in (1) above;

"(3) To noncooperators (except noncooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 60 per centum of the rate specified in (1) above and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

"(b) All provisions of law applicable with respect to loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, be applicable with respect to loans made under this section."

(c) In the case of any commodity with respect to which loans may be made at the rate provided in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), the President may fix the loan rate at any rate not less than the loan rate otherwise provided by law if he determines that the loan rate so fixed is necessary to prevent

an increase in the cost of feed for livestock and poultry and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

"SEC. 9. (a) Section 4 (a) of the Act entitled 'An Act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. I, title 15, sec. 713a-8), is amended—

"(1) By inserting after the words 'so as to support' a comma and the following: 'during the continuance of the present war,'." and until the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated,'.

"(2) By striking out '85 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '90 per centum'.

"(3) By inserting after the word 'tobacco' a comma and the word 'peanuts'.

"(b) The amendments made by this section shall, irrespective of whether or not there is any further public announcement under such section 4 (a), be applicable with respect to any commodity with respect to which a public announcement has heretofore been made under such section 4 (a).

"SEC. 10. When used in this Act, the terms 'wages' and 'salaries' shall include additional compensation, on an annual or other basis, paid to employees by their employers for personal services (excluding insurance and pension benefits in a reasonable amount to be determined by the President); but for the purpose of determining wages or salaries for any period prior to September 16, 1942, such additional compensation shall be taken into account only in cases where it has been customarily paid by employers to their employees.

"SEC. 11. Any individual, corporation, partnership, or association willfully violating any provision of this Act, or of any regulation promulgated thereunder, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000, or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or to both such fine and imprisonment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
PRENTISS M. BROWN,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7565) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are in general substantially similar but they differ in a number of respects, as follows:

Section 1 of the House bill directed that stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of levels which existed on August 15, 1942. The conference substitute directs that stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942.

The conference substitute directs that the President shall issue, before November 1, 1942, a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries affecting the cost of living. No such requirement was included in the House bill.

In section 1 of the House bill the President's authority to make adjustments was confined to the making of adjustments "to the extent that he finds necessary to correct gross inequities." In the conference substitute this authority is given "to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities."

In section 1 of the conference substitute there is included a provision requiring that no common carrier or public utility shall make any general increase in its rates or charges which were in effect on September 15, 1942, unless 30 days' notice is given to the President or to such agency as he may designate, and consent is given for the intervention by such agency before the public body having jurisdiction of the matter. The House bill contained no such provision.

Section 3 of the House bill provided that for the purposes of the act parity prices and comparable prices for any agricultural commodity shall be determined as authorized by existing law but shall also include all farm labor. This provision is not contained in the conference substitute. The provision in the conference substitute relating to this subject appears in section 3. It makes no change in the parity formula provided for under present law. It provides that modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity, and for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum price so established will not reflect such increased costs. There is also included the same provision contained in the House bill relating to the fair and equitable allowance of a margin for the processing of agricultural commodities. There is also included a provision to the effect that in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, adequate weighting shall be given farm labor.

The provisions of section 4 of the conference substitute, placing limitations upon the authority which may be exercised under the act with respect to wages and salaries, follow the provisions of the Senate amendment, except that the President's authority to make adjustments may be exercised only to the extent that he finds necessary in any case to correct gross inequities and also aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

In order to carry out the recommendations of the President with respect to establishing a floor for the prices of agricultural commodities, the conference substitute contains provisions which raise the loan rate for basic agricultural commodities to 90 percent of the parity price therefor; except that the President is authorized to fix the loan rate for any commodity at any rate not less than that otherwise provided by law if he determines that such action is necessary to prevent an increase in the cost of feed for livestock and poultry and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. The loan rates provided for in the conference substitute are to be maintained until the expiration of a 2-year period after the end of the war. The conference substitute also provides that for a similar period the Secretary of Agriculture shall undertake to maintain at 90 percent of the parity or comparable price the price for any commodity the production of which he has undertaken to encourage.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 7565, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is not necessary to tell Members of the House of the diligence with which the Committee on Banking and Currency has undertaken the consideration of this bill. The country must realize that the House has expedited this legislation in every possible way.

The chief matter of controversy in connection with this measure was the question requiring calculation of the cost of farm labor in imposing limitations on the prices of farm commodities. Members are familiar with the language of the House bill, which very specifically required that all wages—hired labor, family labor, and the labor of farm operators—be calculated in imposing price limitations on farm commodities. The Senate bill was identical with the House bill in the establishment of two specific limitations upon the authority conferred. One was that no ceiling may be established on the prices of farm commodities that will not reflect a parity price to the producer. It is well understood that if a ceiling should be imposed fixing the price of farm commodities at parity it would be impossible to maintain parity prices. This is for the reason that if ceilings were placed at parity the prices could not go higher than parity and all operations would necessarily be below parity. The bills are identical in that particular respect.

Another provision is that no ceiling may be established below the highest price of any commodity between the 1st day of January 1942, and the 15th day of September 1942.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Just let me proceed a little further, please.

The Senate bill provides that the President shall give adequate weighting to farm labor in fixing maximum price ceilings. This provision is embodied in the conference report. This particular language is different from the language in the House bill. I submit that, given its proper interpretation, it means practically the same thing. There can be no doubt under the language carried in the conference report now before us that the reference is to "maximum prices" not "readjustments" or "modifications" of ceilings or orders fixing maximum prices. The requirement is that farm labor shall

be given "adequate weighting" in establishing maximum prices.

It was insisted that this change in language was desired to avoid any interpretation that it was intended to make any change in the present parity formula under existing law. In that connection let me say that in neither the Senate bill nor in the House bill was there ever any provision, or any action ever contemplated, the purpose of which was to change the parity law as it exists today. The only thought was that there should be this additional restriction upon the power to fix maximum prices on farm commodities.

In view of the fact that this action was so unprecedented, so out of line with all our habits of thought and legislative policies, it was not in any sense in contravention of anything in the existing parity law as such, but a simple restriction upon the extraordinary action authorized under this bill in fixing farm prices.

Let me say in that connection that if a mere change, such as an arbitrary basis as exists in the present law, or such a provision as I have referred to now incorporated in the pending legislation, would operate as a change in the present parity law it follows that every suggestion of any price higher than parity price would in itself amount to a departure from the parity formula, a nullification of the provisions of the present parity law to the extent of such provisions.

It will be remembered that in the President's message he laid down two formulas. One was parity and the other was the highest price obtaining at any recent date. Under that standard there would be prices considerably above the standards in the existing parity law. Such was not the purpose of the President's message and such was not the purpose of the amendment adopted by the House.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULMER. I would like to ask the gentleman if the provision that was carried in the House bill still remains in the present law that we are now considering. That is, you take parity or the highest price between the dates of January 1, for instance, and September 15. Is that still in the bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is quite true; those provisions were in both bills and are incorporated in the conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. STEAGALL. And let me say in this connection that it is not a simple parity price we authorize under this legislation. It is such a price as will reflect a parity price to the producer, which is quite a different thing.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I ask the gentleman if the committee in the course of its consideration of this provision made any determination as to what were the highest prices reached by the various agricultural commodities affected by this bill during the period of January 1 to September 15?

Mr. STEAGALL. That matter was only hastily considered by the Banking and Currency Committee, but there were extended hearings by the Senate committee. I am not in position to give the gentleman the exact figures he has in mind.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Would the gentleman have any objection to my inserting at this point an authoritative report giving the highest prices at which basic agricultural commodities sold in the open market during that period?

Mr. STEAGALL. I should be happy to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress which is self-explanatory.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
*October 2, 1942.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANNON: This is in response to your request of October 1, 1942, for the highest price quoted in the Chicago Tribune for hogs, cattle, wheat, and cotton from January 1 to September 15, 1942.

The highest price hogs reached was $15.30 per hundred pounds (Chicago market). This was on August 15 and 17.

The highest price cattle reached was $16.65 per hundred pounds (Chicago market) and this occurred on August 12, 15, 19, 22, and 26. (The highest price steer reached was $17.25 per hundred pounds. This was reached during the week of April 22–29. This quotation is from the Chicago Journal of Commerce. The Tribune gives only one cattle quotation.)

Wheat (No. 2 Hard) reached its peak on January 25, 1942, at a price of $1.32½ per bushel (St. Louis).

No spot cash quotations on cotton are regularly made in Chicago. The Tribune gives futures only. The highest "10 point spot market" price (average of the closing prices at the 10 most important cotton markets) as reported by the raw cotton division of O. P. A. was $0.2047 per pound on April 9, 1942.

Sincerely yours,
LUCY SALAMANCA MOREY,
*Chief, Inquiry Section,*
*Legislative Reference Service.*

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I also call attention to the fact that these prices are controlled prices. The Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration have exerted every effort and exhausted every resource at their command to depress the prices of these commodities—at a time when the sky has been the limit on wages, salaries, profits, and bonuses. Advancing under the impetus of the law of supply and demand, against every influence the Government could bring to bear, the price of hogs reached $15.70 at Chicago this morning. In a free market they would have reached 1919 prices long ago.

But, Mr. Speaker, the farmers do not ask the prices they received in the last war—although labor and industry are receiving more than twice what they received in the last war. But they do ask bare parity and barely enough to pay the increase in their labor costs.

Donald Nelson told a House committee yesterday that the farmers are doing the best job of any group in America—and they have not stopped work while their prices were being determined. Surely they deserve something more than the unwarranted, unjust, and unbridled abuse heaped upon them by those they have served best.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am reading on page 9 of the bill:

> That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing.

Does the language reported back by the conference committee provide that the President shall give weighted consideration to increased cost of labor as it enters into the price of farm commodities at their source as well as into the processing of farm commodities?

Mr. STEAGALL. It does.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Does that contemplate that in doing so the President will allow the individual farmer to include his own wages? Or does that just mean the wages of the man he hires to work for him?

Mr. STEAGALL. The language was intended to embrace all farm labor. I do not see how anyone could contend that you could give adequate weighting to farm labor without including all farm labor, and that provision, it must be remembered, relates to the price-fixing powers carried in this bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. All right; as the gentleman understands it then, it includes the wages for the farmer who does his own work.

Mr. STEAGALL. Quite right.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If it does, you will more than double the price of farm commodities to bring him up to the level of industrial labor.

Mr. STEAGALL. I think the gentleman is mistaken. Various figures have been given, but I have not yet heard any figure that approaches that suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I hold in my hand a copy of the comparative print of the bill. Referring to page 2, line 3, section 3, did the conferees change the language of section 3 as passed by the Senate?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; that language was changed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the chairman tell us in what respect?

Mr. STEAGALL. It was not materially changed from his standpoint, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] takes the position that it was not altered. I want to get the matter clear.

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes. If the gentleman will turn to the provisions of the bill he will see that the President is empowered to adjust wages, salaries, and prices to correct gross inequities. That language was changed not to effect a

change but as a safeguard. The purpose was to make certain that the limitations in other portions of the bill would apply to the exercise of the powers conferred in that provision respecting adjustments to correct gross inequities or to aid in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the chairman will permit, may I substitute a similar question with reference to section 4?

Mr. STEAGALL. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To what extent was that changed by the conferees?

Mr. STEAGALL. That provision was changed exactly as was the language in the provision to which I referred in section 1.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question on section 4?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. During the consideration of the bill in the House the gentleman will remember I offered an amendment to strike out a provision relating to the Little Steel formula, so-called. My understanding is that as the Senate passed the bill they did not embody the Little Steel formula, and the conference report does not restore it.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is quite right; the Senate adopted a different standard and it is embodied in the conference report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then the authority of the Administrator in the new act is not tied to the Little Steel formula.

Mr. STEAGALL. It is not. In lieu of that the provision adopted operates to prevent any action by the President where wages and salaries have not reached the highest point in any work between the first of January 1942 and the 15th day of September, 1942; and I will say to the gentleman that the advocates of that provision say that the purpose was to bring that provision into harmony with a similar provision applied to farm commodities.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the distinguished chairman assure the House, or give the House any information, as to whether this legislation as it now stands is acceptable to the administration?

Mr. STEAGALL. I have no reason whatever to answer the gentleman except in the affirmative. I have not had a direct expression from the Chief Executive in that regard, but I think I would be safe in saying there need be no fear that this legislation will not be approved as embodied in the conference report.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I want to make a comment and ask the gentleman's observation.

This bill is an improvement over the measure passed by the House on September 23. I wish the conferees had retained definite legal safeguards for the millions of white-collar employees who cannot be classed as war workers, and whose wages thus far have not increased either in accordance with the standards set up by the War Labor Board, or to adequately meet the increased cost of living. I hope the President will find he has sufficient authority under this bill to handle this problem equitably.

In the interest of speedy action to combat inflation, I support this bill.

I would appreciate the gentleman's comment on my statement.

Mr. STEAGALL. My comment is, I am glad the gentleman is going to support the bill at this time.

Mr. SACKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SACKS. In the House bill we had the clause protecting, as the preceding speaker stated, those millions who have not had a raise from January 1, 1941, until the passage of this bill.

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman, if that is his question, it is still carried in the bill, with its possibilities for enormous inflation in the United States, which I will not go into further at this time.

Mr. SACKS. I do not know about inflation, but they ought to be protected.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BOREN. The language that the gentleman has just explained as a substitute for the Brown amendment means that the Brown amendment is taken out; is that correct?

Mr. STEAGALL. I have just explained that.

Mr. BOREN. There was an amendment inserted that was designed to take from State corporation commissions power over rate making.

Mr. STEAGALL. That provision is not retained in the bill. In lieu of that proposal—and I am reliably informed that this is acceptable to the author and to those who favored it in committee—there is in this legislation a provision which requires that the various governmental agencies dealing with rates of utilities and common carriers shall give notice to the President for 30 days in order that the administration may intervene to express views in connection with such proposals which would raise rates.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COX. As to the effect, good or bad, that this bill has on the farmers of the country, everything depends upon administration; is that not true?

Mr. STEAGALL. Undoubtedly that is true of this legislation and it is true of almost every measure that the Congress passes, but may I say to the gentleman that I think we can trust the administration to follow reasonably well the expressed intent of Congress; and may I say further to the gentleman, that in my opinion, this bill, everything considered, is better legislation for agriculture in the United States than the present law? May I say something else in that connection?

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman permit another observation? I am not protesting, the gentleman understands; I am hopeful that we will get a sympathetic administration.

Mr. STEAGALL. May I say, Mr. Speaker, if nothing else has been accomplished, the consideration of this legislation has developed the facts before the American people that they are entitled to have and which they have not been given until their Representatives saw fit to bring them out and submit them to the people of the United States. If we have not accomplished anything else than to correct the misrepresentations that have been made and to answer the abuse and aspersions that have been indulged in and efforts that have been expended, the time would be more than justified a hundredfold.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said during recent days about the farm lobby. As one Member of this House I want to say, I thank God that we have a farm lobby in the United States and I hope we keep it. The farmers of this Nation were victimized and impoverished for more than a half-century. While they staved at home and worked others controlled legislation and the administration of the law by the employment of hired lobbyists in Washington. It is only since farmers have had some organization and some representation here that we have been able to achieve a small measure of comparative justice for the farmers of the United States.

I take my hat off to the heads of these organizations who have endorsed this legislation. I want to incorporate here a statement from them as a part of my remarks and to pay tribute to Albert S. Goss, master, the National Grange; Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; C. C. Teague, president, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; and Charles W. Holman, secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

These men are not profiteers, these men do not represent inflationists and profiteers. These men are patriotic citizens who are striving to secure justice for the people who toil to produce the wealth upon which we live and which is indispensable to the prosecution of the great war in which this Nation is engaged. As a citizen of Alabama, I am glad to pay tribute to Ed O'Neal, of that State, a citizen who is highly honored there, with a long line of forebears, running back for almost a century, who have done honor to the State in peace and in war, who have enjoyed the highest honors at the hands of the people of Alabama. I pay tribute to him, and as a citizen of Alabama I am proud to be associated with him in the work that he and other representatives of the farmers of this country have done in Washington in spite of the vituperation and aspersions that have been employed against them.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. May I ask the gentleman from Alabama one question? On page 8, line 25, there was a provision inserted by the Senator from

Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] which reads as follows:

*Provided*, That rates charged by any common carrier or other utility on September 15, 1942, shall not be increased without the consent of the President.

That is the only brake that has been put in this bill on utility rates. They fix the price of everything else. Now they put a ceiling on farm prices, they put a ceiling on the price of every other commodity and turn these utilities loose. I would like to know what was done with that amendment in conference?

Mr. STEAGALL. I have just explained to the gentleman what was done with that amendment.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOUGH. In view of the reference made by the distinguished chairman of the committee to the statement prepared by those to whom he referred as representing the farm interests, I wonder if the gentleman will be gracious enough to read the statement for the benefit of the House, inasmuch as he has secured unanimous consent to include it as a part of his remarks.

Mr. STEAGALL. In the interest of saving time, I hope the gentleman will not insist on that. It will be available for everybody in the RECORD.

Mr. McKEOUGH. It is very brief. I thought the House might like to hear it.

Mr. STEAGALL. It would take several minutes to read it.

The following is the statement signed by A. S. Goss, master, the National Grange; Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; C. C. Teague, president, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; H. E. Babcock, vice president, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; and Charles W. Holman, secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation:

The organizations represented by the undersigned did not ask for legislation amending the Emergency Price Control Act. They were forced into the struggle. They have been on the battle front in Washington for the last two weeks fighting for the rights of the farm people, and to safeguard the future food supply of the Nation and our Allies. In this battle both the House and Senate showed by a strong majority of votes they were sympathetic to our cause.

Farmers will be grateful for the valiant fight made by their friends yesterday and today in the Senate. They were not able to obtain all that is necessary to assure adequate food production. They compromised on the best terms they could make. How well the compromise operates depends upon the spirit in which it is administered.

Farmers were fighting for conditions which would insure adequate production. The Aiken amendment was a step in that direction.

The Congress, after hearing from the country, wrote into the bill by majority of both Houses, provision to recognize the cost of farm labor in production. With such recognition a matter of record, rather than quibble over words, the farm organizations were willing to make sacrifice for the sake of national unity in the passage of legislation to obtain that objective.

We accepted it, as we interpreted it, as mandatory to make the necessary adjustments to reflect the cost of all farm labor. If the bill as agreed upon does not accomplish the result, we are sure that our friends in Congress will enact legislation to correct injustices. Our whole purpose in supporting the Thomas-Hatch and Aiken amendments was to enable farmers to stay on the farm and produce the maximum amount of food and fiber for winning the war. Unless this is done there is grave danger of a critical food shortage next year. An additional result has been to make the country conscious of the necessity for including labor costs essential to farm production.

Even though the legislation should be finally passed in the most aceptable form, agriculture has before it a long, hard struggle to maintain an adequate food supply. Compensatory prices will be the controlling factor in determining volume of production.

A. S. GOSS,
*Master, National Grange.*
EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
*President, American Farm Bureau Federation.*
C. C. TEAGUE,
*President, National Counsel of Farmer Cooperatives.*
H. E. BABCOCK,
*Vice President of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.*
CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
*Secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.*

Before I conclude may I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the original price-control bill had certain specific exemptions. One of them was wages, another was common carriers and utilities. That legislation has never been considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency in a way that legislation of such far-reaching importance and with so many technical ramifications ought to be considered.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This is the only opportunity we have had to put a ceiling over the rising spiral of utility rates that is likely to take place now.

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

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

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman from Alabama, the able chairman of this committee, had charge of this legislation when it was being considered in the House originally. After the passage of the bill much of the press of the country referred to the Members of the House who supported the Brown amendment as inflationists. May I ask the gentleman, who as chairman of the committee was in charge of this legislation, and who knows personally most of the Members who supported the Brown amendment, whether or not he considers them to be inflationists?

Mr. STEAGALL. If I were to answer the gentleman as fully as I might, it would take a little time. I can say most emphatically that I know they are not. I can say also that I do not know anybody who is in favor of inflation or anybody who is opposed to any fair method of restricting and preventing inflation, insofar as it is in the power of Congress to do it.

I could call attention to some of the provisions of this bill which seem to have been forgotten by a great many people—provisions which not only make possible but invite inflationary increases in salaries and industrial wages which have not reached the level set forth in this legislation as constituting a fair standard, but I am not going to take time to do it now.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But it was not the Brown amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, it was not the Brown amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a tribute to the conferees on this bill because I know you realize what a terrible time they have had in trying to reconcile all these differences.

I think we should consider this bill, having in mind all the people. I have tried to forget that I represent any particular class. I try to remember that I have a preponderance of farmers in my district and a large number of laboring men, all consumers, all vitally interested in keeping down the cost of living. I have approached this with an open mind, having as my purpose a reconciliation of all of the differences between all of these groups in order that we may center the responsibility somewhere for price control as an adjunct of our anti-inflation program.

I know that this bill cannot be satisfactory to all classes, but if the American people, adhering to the principles of republicanism, remembering that we have three distinct, but coordinated branches of government, will analyze this proposal in the light of the desire which every one of us has to perpetuate our form of government, I think they will get some satisfaction out of the conference report.

In the first place, we have given the President the authority he asked for to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries. We have gone even further. "Mr. President," we have said, "you are not only directed to do this but you are directed to do it before November 1 of this year."

In order that there may not be too much restriction upon his power and authority, we have liberalized the provisions of the House bill so that he can make adjustments from the original order not only if he finds gross inequities—the language contained in the House bill—but even if he finds that such adjustments will aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

If you read section 1 of this bill and then read the other sections of the bill as guideposts, as standards to which he is bound, except as he finds that he must deviate from them to correct gross inequities or to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, you have this bill in a nutshell.

There are three vital points. I shall cover them in order as they appear in the bill. The first is one which developed to be very controversial today, known as the Norris amendment. We do not leave utility rates floating around in the air, we leave them under the same jurisdiction they have been under for generations. We have respected the constitutions of the several States, many of which provide that utility rates shall be determined by a utilities commission set up by the people of that State. Utilities must operate under franchises given by the people. I hope the time will never come when I shall see this Congress without deliberation and without consid-

eration take from the people of the States certain inalienable rights which they have under their several constitutions and delegate them to the President of the United States or any agency of the Federal Government.

However, we have provided as a substitute for the Norris amendment which we struck from the bill, a provision that the President or any agency that he may designate may intervene in any rate case; 30 days' notice must be given before any rate can be increased, allowing the Price Administrator or anyone else whom the President designates to intervene to protect the public interests, if they do not feel they are sufficiently protected by the utility commissions of the respective States.

Senator NORRIS, as I understand, has a bill pending before the Senate now which covers the substance of his amendment to the price-control bill and I understand that Senator NORRIS has been given assurance that his bill will be brought up for consideration before the appropriate Senate committee in the near future and, possibly, we in the House or our Interstate Commerce Committee, which is set up for that purpose, will have an opportunity to discuss that matter fully and at length, with a better understanding of the problem than the Banking and Currency Committee could have in the very few minutes it had to discuss the matter in conference. So I hope that provision will be acceptable to the House.

In keeping with the theory in back of the action taken by striking out the Norris amendment, and until this amendment can be adjusted to the satisfaction of all concerned in the bill pending in the Senate, we retain in the Price Control Act the inhibitions against disturbing utility rates by the President except in the manner authorized by law.

In respect to agriculture we have protected the parity formula and we have provided that the President may adjust any commodity price of an agricultural commodity to take into consideration farm labor provided he finds that farm labor has not been absorbed by an increase in farm prices. Then we have what I consider a rather innocuous provision further qualifying that by stating that adequate weighting shall be given farm labor.

Under the proviso which I have just mentioned he is directed to take into consideration farm labor and if he finds that farm labor has not been absorbed in the increase in farm prices, then he may make adjustments. I consider this weighting of farm labor rather innocuous because I do not, frankly, know what weighting means unless it means consideration and we have already said he should give consideration to it.

Now in respect of labor, wages, and salaries, we have stricken from the bill the so-called Little Steel formula or that part of it which we wrote into the House bill, but we have provided very definitely that all wages and salaries shall be frozen by a general order to be issued before November 1, stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, and if the President deviates from these standards in respect of labor and agriculture which we set up, and give him the right to do so to correct gross inequities or finds it is necessary to aid in the prosecution of the war—if he does that it is his responsibility.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the President allows wages to get out of alinement he is responsible for the start of the inflationary spiral. If the President allows agricultural prices to get out of alinement he is responsible for the inflationary spiral. Now we have given the President full authority to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries and we have told him that he has got to do it before a certain date. This is preserving democracy.

We have set up the standards, we have turned the administration over to the executive branch of the Government. Every bill passed by this Congress is dependent for its successful operation upon the manner in which it is administered. If this bill is not administered properly, the deficiency in its operation is executive and not legislative. I think we have done our duty in passing this bill to give the President this authority. We have done our duty in establishing certain standards, and if he deviates from them it is his responsibility. From now on there is not a likelihood, there is not any necessity for the President to come back to Congress for one iota more of power. He has the power in this bill to do the job he said he wanted to do in his message of September 7.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, there were at least a dozen amendments to be considered by this conference, not less than four of them highly controversial. I do not charge the committee with any lack of fair-mindedness in bringing them back under the circumstances without giving us an opportunity to see the exact language in the agreements made, but I for one do not find it possible to vote approval of a conference report, the exact language of agreement on at least four greatly controversial matters that are not before me even for examination, and I must oppose this conference report.

The agreements have been discussed here in glittering generalities and outside the half dozen who sat on the conference no one else knows what they really are. I have asked other individual Members of Congress, several dozen of you that are sitting here about to vote now, and all confess a complete lack of knowledge as to the actual provisions.

I cast my votes after careful deliberation on the exact proposals to be considered and no whip of compulsion can stampede me into voting for a bill the contents of which are not made known to us. These conferees only reached an agreement half an hour ago and even some of the conferees do not have copies of the proposals agreed on and then we are asked to vote without even reading the matter we are called to vote on.

I cannot follow an order to close my eyes and vote blind the dictates of anyone.

The work of Congress is the heartbeat of democracy and not a game of blindman's buff.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the distinguished chairman and the other members of the Banking and Currency Committee for their splendid effort, in what they have accomplished. It has been a difficult job—and they have done well—I am going to vote for the conference report. I think it is a clear direction to the President to consider and give weight to the tremendous increase in cost for labor in producing farm and livestock commodities which, in all justice and fairness to the producer, should and must be done. I feel confident that the President will do this in view of the message that he sent to the Congress wherein he stated:

> After all, parity is, by its very definition, a fair relationship between the prices of the things farmers sell and the things they buy. Calculations of parity must include all costs of production, including the cost of labor.

I call attention to some of the debates when the bill was under consideration in the Senate, and I ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency what he thinks about it. They were discussing what was known as the Thomas amendment in the Senate. Later on Senator BARKLEY introduced a substitute for that amendment, and the Thomas amendment was identical with what was known in the House as the Brown amendment. The Senator from Kansas referred to the substitute amendment and the Thomas amendment as being tweedledum and tweedledee—in other words, that there is a distinction with no difference. Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, agreed with that statement—that in substance there was no difference—and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains these statements. I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency if he does not agree with those statements?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I know of no conference report that has ever come before this House about which there has been so much confusion in the minds of Members, and I know there are scores of Members here who do not understand exactly what are the provisions with respect to the ceiling on wages. I have conferred with many of them, and I cannot get any exact information. I wish that somebody who knows specifically what the provisions are with respect to the ceiling on wages would explain them so that the Members who are interested in that subject would know how to vote, because I know personally that many of them have not yet decided what to do

with respect to this bill. I think it is due to the membership of the House that we have a more complete explanation. In other words, I am afraid that many Members will just toss a coin and vote one way or the other.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, give that information to the House?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will listen I shall read to him the short provision of the bill which I think is fair enough to give him all the information that he desires:

SEC. 4. No action shall be taken under authority of this act with respect to wages or salaries (1) which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the National Labor Relations Act, or (2) for the purpose of reducing the wages or salaries for any particular work below the highest wages or salaries paid therefor between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942: *Provided*, That the President may, without regard to the limitation contained in clause (2), adjust wages or salaries to the extent that he finds necessary in any case to correct gross inequities, and also to aid in the prosecution of the war.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to pay a richly deserved tribute to the able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. STEAGALL, who has borne the burden of this extended and arduous proceeding. It is but another of the many invaluable contributions he has made to the general welfare in his long and distinguished service in the House. But for him the Nation would today be in a much less advantageous situation and would command a much smaller supply of food and fiber. Through his wise and farsighted statesmanship in encouragement and support of agriculture we have today the greatest supply of agricultural products ever harvested in America—the most essential munition of war. And if he had had his way about this bill, we would have been in still better position to maintain adequate supplies in the future.

It is to be regretted that it was thought necessary to bring in this conference report in the form presented. It ought not be necessary—and it is not necessary—to violate the rules of the House to secure legislation, even this kind of legislation.

As it is, this conference report is subject to a point of order. It contains matter not carried in either the House bill or the Senate bill—matter that is not in disagreement between the two Houses.

The most regrettable feature of it is that the report was submitted sight unseen on a request for unanimous consent for its consideration, a condition which carries with it implied assurance that it contains no illegal matter. Considered under such circumstances it is too late to raise a question of order when the illegal matter is read from the desk.

It is clearly out of order. There is no provision in either House or Senate bill authorizing the President to reduce the 90 percent to 85 percent. To make it all the more emphatic, an amendment to that effect was offered in the Senate and defeated. And yet the conferees, legislating behind closed doors, put that provision in the bill. It is only necessary to glance at V, 6179-6181; 6417-6420; VIII, 3252-3284 of the Precedents of the House. This identical question has been submitted a thousand times and ruled out of order every time.

More than that, the provision is a gross discrimination against two farm products and two sections of the country. Only wheat and corn are to be hammered down. No other farm product is affected. Oh, you may say, those are surplus crops. But there are other surplus crops, cotton for instance, and they are not included. Wheat and corn alone are to be thrown to the lions.

Both the conference report and the manner in which it is presented are disappointing. They are in contravention of the rules of the House; a breach of trust and a heartless desertion of two branches of agriculture.

But, Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote for the conference report. It is nothing new for the farmer to be discriminated against. And he never holds a grudge; he never harbors resentment. No matter how little you pay him, how long his hours, he never stops. He goes right along feeding the Nation, as loyal and as faithful as the North Star. And we are going along here. Every farmer will continue to produce as best he can. But when he can no longer produce a dollar's worth for 85 cents and food supplies drop below military requirements, remember you asked for it in this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, let me say in response to what has just been stated by my good friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] I do not share the view that he seems to entertain with respect to the farm labor situation.

The House bill contained a provision for loans up to 90 percent, and those loans were to be continued for a period of 3 years following the termination of the war. The Senate bill contained a provision for loans of 90 percent during the war. As a compromise the conferees agreed upon the provisions now before us, which directs loans to be made at 90 percent of parity, and that covers all basic commodities and those that are in the same category under existing law. Those loans are to be made for 2 years following the termination of the war, as declared by a Presidential Proclamation or by enactment of the Congress. That was a compromise between the two provisions, and I will say to the gentleman from Missouri, sympathizing with his views as I do, that we would have accomplished a great deal when we got this floor under these prices if we had put them all on the basis of the present parity loan of 5 percent. But they are on a 90 percent basis and they are for 2 years after the war, unless the President shall see fit, on those commodities that are used for feed, to reduce them to 85 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the adoption of the conference report?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, yes; Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi moves to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the House conferees to accept Senate amendment No. —, on page 1, section 1, of the Senate amendment which reads as follows:

"*Provided*, That rates charged by any common carrier or other utility on September 15, 1942, shall not be increased without the consent of the President."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Forty-five Members have arisen, not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN)—ayes 257, noes 22.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the conference report on the bill H. R. 7565 may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE AND SIGN ENROLLED BILLS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Clerk be authorized to receive a message from the Senate, and the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled bill of the House [H. R. 7565], an act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a speech I delivered on last Saturday in my own city.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial printed in the publication The Union Servant.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a speech delivered by William E. Masterson, professor of law of Temple University.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address made by myself at the request of the Navy Department.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: First, to insert in the RECORD an endorsement by the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and second, to insert two resolutions, one by the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania and one by the City Council of the City of Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the conference report just passed and also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an address delivered by Mr. Hitchcock, of Pittsburgh.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter addressed to General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service, and Secretary Wickard by Mr. C. L. Beason.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the State Council of Young Men's Republican Clubs of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the price-control bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE SENATE REPORTED PRINT OF THE BILL (H. R. 7378) TO PROVIDE REVENUE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 32 authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Senate reported print of the bill (H. R. 7378) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and request immediate consideration thereof.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there shall be printed 8,500 additional copies of the Senate reported print of the bill (H. R. 7378) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, together with the accompanying report thereon, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate Document Room, 5,000 copies for the use of the House Document Room, 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNJUST CRITICISM OF CONGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt has come back to the White House from a tour of the defense areas, and immediately makes one of his typical attacks and deprecations of the Congress for the handling of the price-control bill.

I hope that some Democrat or New Dealer in the Congress will answer this charge and defend the legislative branch of the Government from such continuous attacks by the Chief Executive which tend to undermine the faith of the American people in their own form of government.

I want to take this occasion to point out that there is an overwhelming majority in both the House and the Senate of the same party of which the President is the leader, and that those majorities in both branches of the Congress are responsible for bringing in and passing legislation.

I know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are real Democrats before they are New Dealers, and I also know that they are good Americans before they are Democrats and that they will defend our legislative branch of the Government against unjustified and unwarranted attacks.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SCOTT. 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 Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

OPPOSED TO H. R. 7565

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was against H. R. 7565 and I wish it to be noted on the RECORD that I was 1 of the 22 Members of the House who at the last opportunity to express their opinion still voted against the final passage of this bill. I have heard nothing whatever said on behalf of the people who are essentially the ones the most to be damaged by the passage of this bill, the consuming public, the plain people who will have to pay the bill, who will have to sustain the tremendous inflationary cost that has been put upon them by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a bill to control inflation, it is not what the President asked for, and certainly we did not hear any request by the President for its passage today. It is, in my opinion, a bill to raise prices and should have been so designated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT LEARNS SOMETHING

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the local papers today carries on the front page the statement made by President Roosevelt upon his return from his 8,000-mile trip that the District of Columbia's war morale is the worst in the United States. It is more than passing strange that it should require a 14-day

trip through 24 States of the Union for the President to discover a fact which has long been evident to the greater part of our population.

Had he listened to the speech of Congressman ENGEL, made sometime ago, where waste and incompetency in government contracts was demonstrated, had he listened to some of the talks made on the floor of the House which have exposed racketeering and worse—racketeering protected by his administration—he would have known why it is that the war morale here in the District of Columbia is so low.

When the administration itself connives with and countenances racketeering, the levying of tribute upon defense workers, it is nothing strange that people here generally have lost confidence in it.

The strange thing is that it has taken the President, living here, so long to detect the odor arising from the bureaucracy, recognize the administration's own incompetency, its lack of coordination in the war effort.

INFLATION—THE ADMINISTRATION'S BABY

Facts, not charges, countercharges, nor arguments, are what the people want. This, that they may place the responsibility, or more important, determine the remedy—and how it can be applied.

It was on September 7 that the President told the people and Congress that the threat of inflation was an ever-increasing danger which would bring national disaster unless halted by legislation not later than October 1. He further advised the people and the Congress that unless the Congress passed adequate legislation by that date, he would use the power which he had to avert the disaster.

WHY HAS PRESIDENT DELAYED?

Some questioned why, if the disaster was so imminent and if he had the power, he did not long before take steps to avert it. But let that pass. The inflation which threatens us is with us because of the policy of this administration. Abnormal purchasing power is the thing which brings about inflation. Long prior to the war the administration's domestic policies of spending and spending, and the issuing of bonds has been steadily increasing the purchasing power in the hands of the people. Prior to the coming of the war and ever since, the President has followed a policy of increasing wages of industrial workers. Through various acts of Congress—such as the wage-and-hour law, which gives us a 40-hour week; Fair Labor Standards Act, put into force at the request of this administration—there has been a continuing rise in wages, until today in some parts of the country common labor is being paid at the rate of $1 an hour, while some skilled workers draw $2 an hour. Today it is not uncommon for schoolboys to earn as much as $50, sometimes $70, and in some instances it is said $100 a week, in industries engaged in the production of war materials. Nor is it uncommon for skilled workmen to receive $150, $170, and even more per week. The administration's labor policy has required, even on war work, the payment of a wage and a half for all hours worked over 40 per week; the payment of double wages for all hours worked on Sundays and holidays. This has meant in some instances men working more than 40 hours a week have received for the overtime $3 per hour; for Sunday and holiday work, $4 per hour. Everyone with any experience and knowledge knows that increasing the wages of industrial workers engaged in making the things our fighting men must have if they are to win results in less for the money available and a given amount of money will purchase far less when a wage and a half or a double wage is paid.

Everyone knows, too, that when these high wages are placed in the hands of workers, they in turn bid for the things which are for sale. Inevitably, the cost of the things we eat, wear, the rent we pay, every expenditure goes up because men and women with money—far more money than they ever had before—are bidding against each other in the open market for the purchase of the things which are for sale, and unfortunately as the bidding goes on the cost of living goes up and the workingman gets no more for his increased wage of the things he must have if he would live than he was able to purchase before.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not finding fault with the payment of high wages, nor so far as I know is anyone else finding fault with those high wages except as those high wages are paid to a privileged few and as the spending of them causes inflation and brings hardships to those who do not receive them. Along with the increase in wages to industrial workers has gone the administration's policy, backed up by Executive orders, by directives, by rules and regulations that only those who belong to unions, and certain unions at that, should receive these high wages. Coupled with that policy, extended to members of unions who belong to organizations headed by the President's political friends, has gone governmental protection to the leaders of those organizations to impose upon and collect from citizens desiring work in industrial plants producing munitions of war, a fee, so-called, for a work permit or for a license to work. Coupled too, with that privilege for receiving these high wages, has gone to the leaders of these organizations, the right to collect from these workers, weekly or monthly dues. Through the protection thus given by this administration there has grown up the practice of collecting membership fees and dues from the workers which has netted certain organizations millions of dollars in revenue and which will, before this war is over, add a billion or more dollars to their funds. Inflation has come about as naturally as day follows night because the President has used taxpayers' money and borrowed money to increase the wages of industrial workers. That policy has also resulted in the Government getting less war material for the money expended.

Inflation will not be prevented by this bill nor will it be prevented nor justice done by an Executive order, issued thereunder cutting down the price which the farmer will receive for the things he has to sell, cutting the price on butter, cheese, and milk or beef or pork and at the same time granting an increase in wages paid to those in industrial plants.

If this bill goes through I predict that the farmer will get less for some items at least and that before the President's signature on the bill is dry, there will be demands for an increase in wages.

ADMINISTRATION AGENCIES AND INFLATION

Another administrative policy which has lent aid to the program of inflation is that of various departments of the Government bidding against each other for the services of the men and women who work. Government officials recognize the danger. September 30, according to the press, Paul R. Porter, Chairman of the War Production Board Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, advised that—

> Unless the tendency of shipyards to outbid each other for labor is checked, there will be no limit to the cost of the shipbuilding program or to the inflationary influence of rising wages.

He further stated that—

> Hourly pay has advanced 16.2 percent on the Pacific coast, 18.2 on the Atlantic, and 19.7 percent on the Gulf since November 1940.

Adding that—

> The cost of living had risen 17.3 percent during the same period.

PRODUCTION DELAYED

Coupled with this situation there is also the fact, not germane to this discussion but nevertheless important, that in these industries where high wages prevail the Government is not getting wholehearted all-out cooperation or production. Now no one is so foolish as to charge or to believe that industrial workers are not as patriotic as any other group or class, nor is anyone so simple-minded as to ignore the fact that a few disturbers, self-seekers, racketeers, and worse, in charge of some union activities, are preventing patriotic workers from doing what they would like to do in the way of production. It is not necessary to cite specific instances. Almost every well informed person who gets about knows an incident in his own or a neighboring community which proves that fact. The rank and file of union labor do not approve of such a course and it is only because of the influence of some few of those in authority in unions that the practice of slow-downs and wildcat strikes is permitted at all. These slow-downs, these wildcat strikes, the practice of rendering less than full measure of service for the pay received, the practice of paying a wage and a half or a double wage for more than a 40-hour week's work, are hindering the war effort.

Two letters in the editorial columns of a Washington paper from soldiers on the fighting front tell what the fighting men think of these delays in war production. Copies of those letters as printed are included herein.

(See exhibit A.)

CAUSE OF INFLATION

Go back now to this question of inflation. Inflation comes about because and only because people have an excess

of money as compared with purchasable goods and services. Having money, more money than usual, prospective customers and consumers bid against each other for not only the luxuries but the necessities of life and the price goes up.

THE FARMER THE GOAT

When on September 7, the President warned that the disaster from inflation must be stopped he intimated that the cause of inflation was the high prices paid for the products of a farm. Intentionally or otherwise, he gave the impression that the farmer was to blame because there was danger of inflation. One of the Washington daily newspapers in a cartoon depicted the farmer as a hog—seeking more than his share of the national income. Those familiar with the facts know that while common labor in industrial plants has been paid from 75 cents to $1 per hour; that skilled labor has received from $2 to $4 per hour, common labor on the farm if rendered by a hired man has received around 40 cents per hour, and the farmer, a skilled worker, has received no more than 50 cents per hour and many, many times far less than that, while his wife and children who often render service as difficult, as arduous as that rendered by the factory worker have received nothing at all over and above a place to sleep, clothes to wear, and food to eat. Now when it is proposed in this bill in fixing a parity price for the thing the farmer grows and sells, to include in that price a fair wage for the service which he, the members of his family, and those he employs render, the cry goes up that the farmer is seeking a special privilege, is asking for something more than that given to the industrial worker. The farmer is charged with being unpatriotic, greedy, avaricious selfish because he asks that when he produces the things which the industrial worker must have if he is to live; when he produces the crops to feed the soldiers, he be given compensation, not equal to that of the industrial worker, but sufficient to cover the cost of production and to enable him to pay his taxes and live.

SERFDOM

On top of the denial of justice to the farmers comes the threat of General Hershey, head of the draft organization, who, speaking before the Agriculture Committee of the House, proposed that to remedy the growing farm labor shortage, any physically fit draft-age man who leaves the farm for a higher paid city job, be immediately inducted into the military service. If that is to be the rule for the farmer and the farm workers who produce the food that sustains the soldiers, fighting men, and factory men as well, why not apply it to the industrial workers? Is not that statement of General Hershey proof, if proof were needed, of this administration's granting of special privileges to the industrial worker? Discrimination against the farmer? The farmer is to be frozen to his 30-cents-an-hour job; denied a chance at the high-wage industrial job. Is the farmer to be tied to the plow handles, to the spray rig while the politically powerful groups work where they will, when they will, for a wage many times that permitted the farmer? Why should the farmer be denied 50 or 40 or even 30 cents an hour for his work, while the industrial worker is paid $1 or $2 or $3 an hour for his services?

The result will be disastrous. It is all very well for General Hershey to advise that the farmer must readjust himself, but if the draft board continues to take farmers into the fighting forces, if industry continues to entice them from the farms by high wages, it is certain there will come a day, and that in the not distant future, when this country will find itself unable to plant, cultivate, and harvest the crops which are necessary to feed not only our armed forces, our industrial workers, but the civilian population. All any man with eyes, with reasoning power and judgment needs to do to test this assertion is to take a trip out through the dairying, farming sections of this country and see for himself what has happened, what is happening, what will come.

THE REMEDY

The remedy is clear; the remedy is simple. All this Congress needs to do is to itself adopt a stabilization bill which will fix the price of farm products, of merchandise, the compensation to be paid for services as of some period a few months ago or a year ago. It matters not so much what period is used, or what price is fixed, so long as that price for any service, for any farm product for any manufactured article, on a comparative basis, is just. Our people will make any sacrifice demanded of them. About that there is no question, but farmers will not, because they cannot, go on producing if they are to be deprived of the labor necessary to plant, cultivate, and harvest their crops. They are patriotic but unless they, for their labor and the labor of their families, receive compensation sufficient to enable them to buy the things they need to operate their farms, they will not produce—not because they do not desire to do so, but because they cannot.

WE MUST HAVE UNITY AND EFFICIENCY IF WE ARE TO WIN

The administration's war news agency told us not long ago that "we could lose the war."

July 3, last, General Somervell, speaking at Lansing, Mich., said:

> We've taken a terrific shellacking all around the globe.

September 28, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard, addressing the president and members of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, made the following statements:

> We go around saying "we can lose the war, but"—we may as well admit it—every time one of us says we can lose the war we think of this as pure rhetoric, part of the old pep talk. The assumption is, of course, we can't lose the war, but scare 'em a little and then in the wind-up of the talk give 'em the build-up about our great American heritage of freedom and what not, and how our courage and our self-sacrifice will bring us to victory over the forces of evil.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> How about, for a change, just saying that we are still losing the war. And realize that we damn well mean it.

He concluded his address with these words:

> We are still losing this war, period. And we should damn well understand it, period. It will take all we've got to win—what are you going to do about it?

Just a day later, on Tuesday, the 29th of September, General Somervell, commanding general of the Services of Supply, speaking at St. Louis, Mo., repeated his former warning that—

> We and our Allies have taken a terrific shellacking all around the globe.

One day later, Wednesday, September 30, Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the United States Navy's Bureau of Yards and Docks, speaking at Toronto, Canada, told American leaders assembled there that—

> Although the people cannot live without labor, they can live without labor unions and "they will damn well live without them here if all of us don't get in there and pitch."

Referring to the war itself he further said, and I quote:

> We are losing it now.

He then made an appeal to employers and employees alike to avoid action which would interfere with war production.

These high Government officials who have warned us, undoubtedly know the facts which inspired them to tell us this bitter truth that "we are losing the war." The President may demand sugar coated words but the truth is what the people want and will get.

The Congress has given the President full authority to conduct the war. It has given him all the legislative measures for which he has asked. It has given him every dollar which he has requested for war purposes. Losing the war is not the result of a lack of fighting ability of endurance, or of courage on the part of our fighting men. It is due to the incompetency, to the muddling, to the playing of politics by this administration. The losing of the war is not due to the lack of willingness of our people to make sacrifices or to follow administrative requests. The only thing that we the people and Members of Congress can do to change the fact that we are losing the war to a situation where we can truthfully say that we are winning the war, is to oust from the legislative halls and from the executive departments of our Government those who believe in the overthrow of our form of Government either by force or by subterfuge, drive out of their places in our Government those who are impractical, those who continue willfully to disregard the operation of nature's laws, who appear to believe that crops can be planted, cultivated and harvested, that armies can be created, equipped, and maintained by the making of a fireside chat, a patriotic oration, the passing of a law or the issuance of an Executive order, directive, or regulation.

Let those who are in authority return to the despised horse and buggy days, where sound, common sense guided our

actions, where industry, thrift, and determination carried us to success.

Let the people of the several congressional districts and the States see to it now that in November they send to Washington patriotic, realistic representatives who believe in America, in her future, and in the soundness of those principles which for 150 years pointed the way toward freedom, prosperity, and opportunity.

EXHIBIT A

THE SOLDIERS ARE MAD

Some administration quarters keep minimizing the effects of strikes in war industries. But the boys who are fighting the war aren't.

Two letters from soldiers came to our attention on a single day. One was written by a Marine, fighting on a Pacific island. Marine fashion he pulls no punches.

"I haven't one ounce of patience with a guy who would do anything contrary to the war effort and I would like nothing better than to express my sentiments personally to such a guy. I can understand set-backs on the war front, but there is no excuse for willful and deliberate strikes which facilitate and aid such set-backs.

"You can imagine the feelings of a man who is doing his damndest to keep the Japs off his neck when he learns that the man in the factory doesn't want to put out because he isn't getting his cut.

"I have always thought that a union for the workingman was as much an essential as our daily bread, but it is a privilege that is available only under a democracy and he is abusing that privilege while there are thousands risking their lives to save it. What do you think would happen if all the men on the fighting front sat down until they got a raise of 5 cents an hour for a 40-hour week? They would soon be pulling rickshaws for the Japs for fish heads and rice worth less than 5 cents a day."

The second letter was written from a southern camp by a former steel mill employee, to thank his employer for a letter recommending him for admisison to an officers' training camp.

"I am a little heartsick to see the shortsightedness of labor continue in this crisis.

"The seriousness of this war and its demands is becoming increasingly apparent to us all. We are not being kidded into believing that every minor success is a victory. Flatly, we realize that today—right now—we are losing a war.

"Moreover, we realize that we are losing the war because of a problem of supply. It is increasingly obvious that if our job is to be done, more of the materials of war must be produced with the utmost speed. To do this we know that all other issues between labor and management must become secondary.

"The men to whom these facts are being revealed are becoming angered at the stand of labor, and for the most part they are the sons, brothers, and husbands of laboring folks. In their letters home they are beginning to demand that this foolishness be brought to an end—that they be given the tools they need.

"This is something new. Instead of management making the plea, this demand is reaching workers via the back door, and several million men can raise one hell of a howl.

"This feeling in the Army is too emphatic to be a figment of the imagination, and it's growing every day."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GIBSON (at the request of Mr. RIVERS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. O'TOOLE, for 3 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. CROWTHER, for 30 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. MCINTYRE, indefinitely, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1869. An act for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered property losses as a result of the failure of the Big Porcupine Dam on the Fort Peck project, Montana; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1968. An act to amend section 13 (c) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, so as to permit the sale of certain publications not published or sold for profit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2398. An act amending the provisions governing the issuance of patent for certain lands to the town of Fletcher, Okla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2528. An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2623. An act authorizing the construction of certain public works in the basin of the Connecticut River for flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

S. 2635. An act to provide for granting to the State of New Mexico the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2691. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2723. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2762. An act 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 Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 2776. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2798. An act amending the first sentence of Article of War 52, relative to execution of court-martial sentences; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Thursday, October 1, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 346. Joint resolution extending for 2 months the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241).

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned under its previous order until Monday, October 5, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will hold hearings beginning Tuesday, October 13, 1942, at 10 a. m., in the Committee Room, 1015 House Office Building, on H. R. 7620, a bill to provide for adjusting royalties for the use of inventions for the benefit of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1953. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, for each person commissioned from civilian life from July 26, 1942, and in the Coast Guard from August 1 to September 30, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1954. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments; to the Committee on Military 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. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1413. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider certain claims arising after January 1, 1926, out of the Tariff Act of 1922; without amendment (Rept. No. 2504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7556. A bill authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7330. A bill to provide for granting to the State of New Mexico the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in New Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 2508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAGNUSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1468. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a fuel depot at Middle and Orchard Points, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2327. An act to provide for payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers and travel allowance of enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 2510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7575. A bill to expedite the prosecution of war, and for other purposes;

with amendment (Rept. No. 2511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of California: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7619. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), and "Title IV of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941," approved September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 883); without amendment (Rept. No. 2512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARTER: Special Committee on Aviation of the House Military Affairs Committee. Interim report on United States military aircraft and their performances; without amendment (Rept. 2515). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 2461. An act for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders; without amendment (Rept. No. 2502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 2717. An act for the relief of Charles H. Koch; without amendment (Rept. No. 2503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6015. A bill for the relief of the Truscon Steel Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7263. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. R. Bennett; without amendment (Rept. No. 2506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2364. An act for the relief of former First Lt. William J. Tepsic, One Hundred and Seventy-sixth Field Artillery; without amendment (Rept. No. 2514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 7634. A bill to provide for vocational rehabilitation and the return to civil employment of certain persons disabled under circumstances entitling them after discharge or separation from the military or naval forces of the United States to a pension or retirement pay; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GWYNNE:

H. R. 7635. A bill to incorporate the United Service Women of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7636. A bill to exempt persons in the military and naval forces of the United States from Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 7637. A bill to repeal section 541 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1941 relating to certain exemptions from admissions taxes and to amend retroactively section 1701 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 7638. A bill to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 7639. A bill to protect naval petroleum reserve No. 1; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 7640. A bill to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R. 7641. A bill authorizing the payment of necessary expenses incurred by certain Indians allotted on the Quinaielt Reservation, State of Washington, in securing their allotments; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7642. A bill to provide that allowances for quarters for dependents of enlisted men shall be allocated to such dependents; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to investigate increases in rental rates for business property in District of Columbia since January 1, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. Res. 548. Resolution directing the Committee on Patents to investigate the extent to which failure or reluctance of war agencies to share patents or processes with Allies may be impeding our progress in the war; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 7643. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 7644. A bill for the relief of Michael Soldo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 7645. A bill for the relief of Ruth E. Studley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr HARE:

H. R. 7646. A bill for the relief of Fred Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 7647. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of "The General State Authority" of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7648. A bill granting an increase of pension to Malinda J. Conwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7649. A bill for the relief of Ralph B. Randall, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Visalia, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7650. A bill for the relief of Col. Leo A. Luttringer, United States Property and Disbursing Officer for Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7651. A bill for the relief of William F. Perkins, Rural Rehabilitation Supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Pinal County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7652. A bill for the relief of Warren M. Engstrand, Grant Supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Bakersfield, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7653. A bill for the relief of Ensign Donald L. Grunsky; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7654. A bill for the relief of Morris Lindenblit; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 7655. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ellen Moffatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3353. By Mr. CARLSON: Petition signed by Mr. E. J. Dreiling and 650 other citizens of Kansas in opposition to S. 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3354. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Charlotte Toewater and 71 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, urging the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3355. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Western Plant Board relative to allocation of sufficient funds and adequate priorities for the protection of vital food, fiber, and seed crops; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3356. Also resolution of California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the agricultural manpower problem in California, and urging Congress to amend and enlarge the Selective Service Act to cover necessary manpower engaged in essential activities in industry and agriculture for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3357. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution adopted by the Kanawha County National Farm Loan Association, Charleston, W. Va., recommending that the Federal Land Bank of Baltimore and the Federal Land Bank Commissioner be authorized to make proper loans to small and needy farmers in Kanawha County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3358. By Mr. WASIELEWSKI: Petition of the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee relative to the water diversion down the Chicago drainage canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

# SENATE

## MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1942

The Reverend T. L. Holcomb, executive secretary-treasurer, Baptist Sunday School Board, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, we stand in Thy presence this morning to express the gratitude of our hearts for every blessing that has come from Thy hands, and also to confess our sins. As we face the obligations and responsibilities of a new week, we pray, Heavenly Father, that to each there shall be given wisdom to know and courage to do that which is right and pleasing in Thy sight.

We pray, Heavenly Father, for the President of the United States and for every department of our Government. We pray for the armed forces, and we pray for our Allies. Speed the day, Heavenly Father, when victory shall be given to them in order that we may have in the earth an enduring peace, based upon justice.

We pray Thy particular and peculiar blessing upon this body now assembled, and ask Thee to keep us close to Thine own Self. For Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 2, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.