

H. R. 1137. A bill granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Burdick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1138. A bill granting an increase of pension to Phinia E. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1139. A bill for the relief of Benjamin F. Short; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1140. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Hinkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 1141. A bill authorizing the President to present a Distinguished Flying Cross posthumously to the late Chief Marine Gunner Elmo Reagan, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Nannie May Blythe and Claudia Blythe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1143. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie M. Elben; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Flanders; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1145. A bill for the relief of Mark D. Dukes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1146. A bill for the relief of Annie E. Griffith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1147. A bill granting a pension to J. L. Parish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1148. A bill for the relief of John N. Crotty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1149. A bill for the relief of Richard Macleod Hull; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1150. A bill for the relief of Hosea Aldred; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of Wallace L. Edenfield; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1152. A bill for the relief of Gus Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1153. A bill for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1154. A bill for the relief of Ludvig Vingerhagen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1156. A bill for the relief of F. J. Rozier; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1157. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Daniel A. Brinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1158. A bill for the relief of Homer H. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1159. A bill for the relief of Frank Burgess Bruce; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. R. 1160. A bill for the relief of Alva Burton Riskey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1161. A bill granting a pension to Lena P. Riddick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1162. A bill for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

our hearts unto wisdom. In a confused day, keep our minds clear and clean and uncluttered by prejudice. In a darkened day, give us the sight and insight of the pure in heart, that we may see God and the godlike everywhere. In a clamorous day, filled with angry accents of hate, give us ears to hear the voices that speak of justice and freedom and world brotherhood. In a mad and sad day, grant us sanity of mind and spirit and a glad hope which sees a shining ray far down the future's broadening way.

"Lord, in this hour of tumult,
Lord, in this night of fears,
Keep open, O keep open
Our eyes, our hearts, our ears.

Not blindly nor in hatred,
Lord, let us do our part.
Keep open, O keep open, dear Lord
Our eyes, our mind, our heart."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 11, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF W. B. RUTLEDGE TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of that committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of January 22 at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the office of the committee, upon the nomination of Wiley Blount Rutledge, of Iowa, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Any persons who may be interested in the matter may make representations to the committee at that time.

THE SULLIVAN BOYS OF THE U. S. S. "JUNEAU"

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the loss of any American serviceman in this war is a heavy loss to the Nation and particularly a bitter sorrow to his family, and, of course, is worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by reference, but such a procedure would be impracticable. Within the last few days the Navy Department has made public a report which for poignancy and stark tragedy has seldom been equaled. Five brothers of a family living in Waterloo, Iowa, were serving together on the light cruiser *Juneau* which was sunk. These brothers had entered the Navy in a spirit of resentment over the loss of a boyhood pal who was killed in the attack on Pearl Harbor. They all enlisted and asked to serve together, and were serving on the *Juneau* when she was sunk. They are all listed as missing in action. The Navy Department has stated that in all the history of the Navy there is no record of such a tragedy happening to any family. In view of the unusual circumstances, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my re-

marks a letter received by me from the Chief of Naval Personnel.

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

JANUARY 12, 1943.

Hon. G. M. GILLETTE,

United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Pursuant to my conversation with you this morning with reference to the Sullivan boys who are reported missing following the loss of the U. S. S. *Juneau* as result of enemy action on 13 November 1942, I am furnishing you a few of the details.

These boys, Francis Henry, coxswain; Joseph Eugene, seaman second class; George Thomas, gunner's mate second class; Madison Abel, seaman second class; and Albert Leo, seaman second class, are the sons of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas F. Sullivan, of 98 Adams Street, Waterloo, Iowa. Only one, Albert Leo Sullivan, is recorded as having been married, and his wife, Katherine Mary Sullivan, resides at 2228 Hawthorne Street, Waterloo, Iowa. All five sons enlisted in the Navy on 3 January 1942 at Des Moines, Iowa.

When the loss of the U. S. S. *Juneau* was reported the Bureau contacted Lt. Comdr. Truman Jones, the officer in charge, Naval Recruiting Station, Des Moines, Iowa. He was instructed to proceed to Waterloo, Iowa, to convey to the parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sullivan, and to Mrs. Albert Leo Sullivan, the news as to the fate of the Sullivan boys, which mission has been accomplished. A confirming telegram has been sent to the parents and the wife by this Bureau.

Sincerely yours,

RANDALL JACOBS,

*Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
The Chief of Naval Personnel.*

A. C. JACOBS,

*Lieut. Commander, U. S. N. R.,
The Head of the Casualties and
Allotments Section, by direction.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to personnel of the land forces on November 30, 1942, under the Selective Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ORDINANCES ENACTED BY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of several ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, enclosing a report of withdrawals and restorations of public lands as of December 31, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

REPORT AND STATEMENT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a classified report showing the permits and licenses issued by the Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, the parties thereto, the terms prescribed, the moneys received, if any, and an account thereof, and also a statement showing as of

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and glory, so teach us to number our days that we may apply

June 30, 1942, the names and compensation of persons employed by the Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT

A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the year ended December 31, 1941, with other information relating to the regulation and operation of the public utilities in the District of Columbia coming under the jurisdiction of the Commission, with related data (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from the president and assistant secretary of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., reporting, pursuant to law, on the operations of the company for the calendar year 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EMPLOYEES WHO RECEIVE SALARIES OF \$3,000 PER ANNUM OR OVER

A letter from the Rubber Director, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 322, Seventy-seventh Congress, a list of persons employed in the office of the Rubber Director whose salaries are \$3,000 per annum or over, etc.; a letter from the Assistant Deputy Petroleum Administrator, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 322, Seventy-seventh Congress, a report covering employees of the Petroleum Administration for War whose salaries are \$3,000 per annum or over, etc.; and a letter from the Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 322, Seventy-seventh Congress, a statement showing the persons in that office who draw salaries of \$3,000 per annum or over, etc. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, Navy, and Agriculture (15); Federal Security Agency, and The National Archives which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

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

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WALSH:

A petition of sundry citizens, instructors, and employees of Wentworth Institute, of Boston, Mass., praying for the prompt enactment of the Rum pay-as-you-go income-tax plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STEWART:

A joint resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

"Whereas the President of the United States, his Cabinet, military aides, and the Congress have worked untiringly and unselfishly in giving their leadership for the prosecution of the war; and

"Whereas considering the magnitude of their task, we feel that they have led us in making most excellent progress toward saving our Nation and the world from tyranny and slavery: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring), That we hereby express our sincere appreciation and gratitude to the President, his Cabinet, and other aides, and the Congress for their invaluable and sacrificial services which they have rendered to the Nation since our country has been at war; and be it further

"Resolved, That this body most heartily endorse the general idea of a 'world congress' to keep the peace, when, through God's help, we shall have attained it, so that our posterity may be saved from the constant recurrence of war, and the dire threat of the annihilation of our civilization; and be it further

"Resolved, That this general assembly assure said leaders of the Nation that it is most anxious to cooperate in any way possible toward hastening the day of victory; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Hull, and to each Member of Congress from Tennessee, and that it be spread upon the journal of the house and senate."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 343. A bill providing for transportation home during furlough for noncommissioned officers and other enlisted men on active military service in the land forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 344. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of lode or placer mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; for the relief of owners of gold mines required to suspend operations by reason of restrictions arising from the war effort; and for the suspension of assessment work on lode and placer claims for the duration of the war because of the shortage of manpower and materials; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MURDOCK (for himself and Mr. GILLETTE):

S. 345. A bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 346. A bill for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; and

S. 347. A bill for the relief of the Forest Lumber Co., the Lamm Lumber Co. and the Algoma Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 348. A bill to authorize the construction of the Umatilla Dam in the Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash.; and

S. 349. A bill authorizing construction of an entrance channel connecting the facilities of the proposed port development at Arlington, Oreg., with the navigation channel of the Columbia River, in the interest of national defense; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 350. A bill to amend section 75 (s) (2) of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, to provide a further stay of judicial proceedings in the case of certain farm debtors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. 351. A bill for the relief of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 352. A bill establishing a Board of Appeals in the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 353. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig through his trustee in bankruptcy;

S. 354. A bill for the relief of The Wilson Co., a New Mexico corporation; and

S. 355. A bill for the relief of R. S. Howard Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 356. A bill to aid small independent business of the country by the collection and dissemination of knowledge of business management and its application to specific problems and opportunities, that the American system of free enterprise may be strengthened, and that individual small business may be continued at a profit both to the businessman and the community; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 357. A bill to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 358. A bill for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 359. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Hogan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 360. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 361. A bill for the relief of John F. Thomas; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 362. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances Coffman; and

S. 363. A bill granting a pension to Minnie O. Draper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 364. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 365. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 366. A bill for the relief of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 367. A bill for the relief of dependents of Frank Edward Dace; and

S. 368. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 369. A bill to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 370. A bill to modify section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to certain funds collected in connection with the operation of Indian Service irrigation projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 371. A bill for the relief of settlers on the International Strip at Nogales, Ariz.;

S. 372. A bill for the relief of Ward S. Powers;

S. 373. A bill for the relief of Charles Favors;

S. 374. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. Poteete and Julia Poteete;

S. 375. A bill for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.; and

S. 376. A bill for the relief of C. Y. Webb; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 377. A bill authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 378. A bill to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument;

S. 379. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument; and

S. 380. A bill to authorize the participation of States in certain revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas under the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. McFARLAND, and Mr. SCRUGHAM):

S. 381. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 382. A bill to permit the marketing without penalty of excess wheat produced by persons who have subsequently entered upon active duty in the land or naval forces; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 383. A bill for the relief of Irving Kilburn Bills;

S. 384. A bill to correct the record of Ralph Everett Crawshaw;

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Lewis Alfred Dearborn;

S. 386. A bill for the relief of Vincent Andrew Donovan;

S. 387. A bill for the relief of Ray Funcannon;

S. 388. A bill for the relief of Louis Ger-shon;

S. 389. A bill for the relief of George Anthony Goldsborough;

S. 390. A bill for the relief of Angus Winslow Gray;

S. 391. A bill for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas;

S. 392. A bill for the relief of William Forest Jackson;

S. 393. A bill for the relief of William Kovatis;

S. 394. A bill for the relief of Frederick Elmer Lewis;

S. 395. A bill for the relief of Dominick Edward Maggio;

S. 396. A bill for the relief of Thomas Joseph Malloy;

S. 397. A bill for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou;

S. 398. A bill for the relief of Albert L. Sliney; and

S. 399. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Walden; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 400. A bill for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMAS of Idaho:

S. 401. A bill for the relief of Julian Uriat; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 402. A bill granting a pension to Mabel E. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 403. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida;

S. 404. A bill for the relief of Richard Barker;

S. 405. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuseller Sigler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 406. A bill to revise the method of determining the payments to be made by the United States to the several States with respect to conservation lands administered by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 407. A bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to permit eviction proceedings

brought thereunder to be instituted in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLGREN (for himself and Mr. BONE):

S. 408. A bill to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project and substitute any additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 409. A bill authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 410. A bill for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 411. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911; to expand the public educational facilities of the several States and provide each with a State nautical academy; to create a new public-school system for education of masses of American youths in nautical, aviation, and technical fields relating thereto; to increase the national defense in the realm of radio; to improve navigation; to provide marine conservation and development; to establish and extend full legal rights to the United States Maritime Service as a supplement to the Naval Reserve; to provide an abundant supply of native Americans, trained personnel to operate the new United States ships afloat and in the air; to provide the technical machinery for further maritime improvement; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 412. A bill for the relief of Herbert A. Magley; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 413. A bill to authorize the President to purchase certain lands in Arlington County, Va.; and

S. 414. A bill for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 415. A bill granting an increase of pension to Gus Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of civil government in the far West, the blazing of the Old Oregon Trail, and the epochal immigration of 1843; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. L. 807); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. GLASS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 53), which was referred to the Commit-

tee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. MALONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 54), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 55), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS WITHIN JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized to sit during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress at such times and places as it may deem advisable, to make investigations into all matters within its jurisdiction, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary, and to report in due course to the Senate the result thereof; to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ such expert stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all the

expenses incurred in pursuance hereof shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF CIVIL AIRCRAFT AND ITS USE IN WORLD AIR COMMERCE

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Whereas it is imperative that the United States maintain its proper sphere in world air commerce during the immediate post-war period of development; and

Whereas immediately following the end of World War No. 1 it became necessary to readjust aircraft production to civil needs of the United States; and

Whereas immediately following the end of the present war it will be necessary to establish a civil aviation program for the United States for both domestic and foreign air commerce; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 specifically provides for the encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense; and

Whereas the time to determine international air rights for civil air transport to establish a charter for freedom of the air is during peace treaty negotiations; and

Whereas it is desirable and necessary to accumulate and compile adequate data prior to such peace treaty negotiations; and

Whereas such data have been heretofore accumulated by various and sundry interdepartmental committees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the chairman of such committee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to (1) the feasibility of adapting current types of aircraft used in the war effort to use in civil-air transport; (2) the feasibility of incorporating in the construction of civil aircraft such features as will make them readily adaptable for immediate conversion and use for war purposes; (3) the feasibility of using world air transport as an international air police force to enforce peace terms; (4) the program of training and providing a reserve of skilled aircraft personnel, including ground crews and operations personnel for the immediate mobilization of civil air forces to adequately meet war emergencies, as well as preliminary training of personnel to be directly available to the War and Navy Departments in a war emergency; (5) the provision for world-wide weather observation facilities for forecasting weather over all civil airways, both domestic and foreign; (6) the provision for adequate landing and refueling facilities for world air commerce; (7) the planning, development and construction of aircraft which will assure to the United States at all times its proper sphere in world air commerce; (8) the coordination of civil air transport with other means of transportation; and (9) any other matters which such committee or subcommittee may deem it necessary to investigate for the purpose of obtaining adequate information to enable it to make recommendations for the supremacy of the United States in world air commerce. The committee shall report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeed-

ing Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, documents, and other records, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

ECONOMIC JUSTICE—INTERVIEW BETWEEN THE VICE PRESIDENT AND RAYMOND CLAPPER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an interview between the Vice President and Mr. Raymond Clapper, broadcast over the Mutual Network on December 31, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION OF JEWISH MILITARY FORCES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Stop Mass Murder," delivered by him at a meeting held under the auspices of the committee on a Jewish army, at New York City, on December 16, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACE AND WAR—STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement issued on January 3, 1943, by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, with reference to the issuance of the publication entitled "Peace and War," which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERVIEW BETWEEN EARL GODWIN AND LT. (JR. GR.) STEPHEN FULLER

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an interview between Earl Godwin and Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Stephen Fuller, of Chevy Chase, Md., relative to the latter's experiences on the aircraft carrier *Hornet*, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR AND ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION AFTER THE WAR—ADDRESS BY RT. REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Labor and Economic Reconstruction After the War," delivered by Rt. Rev. John A. Ryan, D. D., at the annual convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society at Cleveland, Ohio, on December 29, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERIM REPORT OF NEW ENGLAND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO INVESTIGATE THE FUEL OIL SITUATION

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an interim report of the New England Members of the Congress of the United States to investigate the fuel-oil situation, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY REV. DR. JOHN P. BOLAND AND PAUL M. HERZOG

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Rev. Dr. John P. Boland, chairman of the New York State Labor Relations Board, and an address delivered by Paul M. Herzog on the occasion of a testimonial dinner to Dr. Boland, which appear in the Appendix.]

ABERDEEN'S SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement entitled "Aberdeen's Scientific Contribution to the War Effort," which appears in the Appendix.]

BERNARD BARUCH—EDITORIAL FROM SPARTANBURG HERALD

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Bernard Baruch," published in the Spartanburg Herald of December 25, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIEW OF PROSECUTION OF THE WAR IN 1942 BY RAYMOND GRAM SWING

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a speech broadcast over the Blue Radio Network by Raymond Gram Swing on December 31, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXES—ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Pay-As-You-Go Taxes," by Ernest K. Lindley, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter from O. B. H. Miller, of Winchester, Ind., referring to agricultural conditions, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Alken | Green | Overton |
| Andrews | Guffey | Pepper |
| Austin | Hatch | Reed |
| Barbour | Hawkes | Revercomb |
| Barkley | Hayden | Robertson |
| Bilbo | Hill | Russell |
| Bone | Holman | Scrugham |
| Brewster | Johnson, Colo. | Shipstead |
| Bridges | Lodge | Stewart |
| Burton | Lucas | Taft |
| Butler | McCarran | Thomas, Idaho |
| Capper | McClellan | Tobey |
| Chandler | McFarland | Truman |
| Chavez | McKellar | Tunnell |
| Clark, Idaho | McNary | Vandenberg |
| Connally | Maloney | Van Nuys |
| Danaher | Maybank | Wagner |
| Davis | Mead | Walgren |
| Downey | Millikin | Walsh |
| Eastland | Moore | Wherry |
| Ellender | Murdock | White |
| Ferguson | Murray | Wiley |
| George | Nye | Willis |
| Gerry | O'Daniel | |
| Gillette | O'Mahoney | |

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

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the morning business is concluded, I wish to offer a privileged resolution with reference to the organization of the Senate. I send it forward, and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 47), as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March 1890 on the subject.

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

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

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous action of the Republican conference held a few days ago, I am pleased and privileged to suggest the name and to nominate the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] for the position of President pro tempore. I therefore move to strike out the name of CARTER GLASS and to insert the name of ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this important but not entirely doubtful vote I am paired with the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. Not knowing how either of us ought to vote, I withhold my vote. [Laughter.] The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would, if present, vote "yea," and allow my vote to stand. I understand that, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] are absent because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, these two Senators would vote "nay."

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who, if present, would vote "nay," is detained in one of the Government departments. He is paired with

the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who, if present, would vote "nay," is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], who, if present, would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "nay," is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who, I am advised, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who would vote "nay," is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained in Government departments. I am advised that if present and voting they would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. I announce the following pairs on this question:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "nay"; and

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who would vote "nay."

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

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—29

| | | |
|----------|-----------|---------------|
| Atken | Ferguson | Robertson |
| Austin | Hawkes | Shipstead |
| Barbour | Holman | Taft |
| Brewster | Lodge | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bridges | McNary | Tobey |
| Burton | Millikin | Wherry |
| Butler | Moore | White |
| Capper | Nye | Wiley |
| Danaher | Reed | Willis |
| Davis | Revercomb | |

NAYS—43

| | | |
|----------|--------------|----------|
| Andrews | Chavez | Ellender |
| Barkley | Clark, Idaho | George |
| Bilbo | Connally | Gerry |
| Bone | Downey | Gillette |
| Chandler | Eastland | Green |

| | | |
|----------------|-----------|----------|
| Guffey | Maloney | Scrugham |
| Hatch | Maybank | Stewart |
| Hayden | Mead | Truman |
| Hill | Murdoch | Tunnell |
| Johnson, Colo. | Murray | Van Nuys |
| Lucas | O'Daniel | Wagner |
| McCarran | O'Mahoney | Wallgren |
| McClellan | Overton | Walsh |
| McFarland | Pepper | |
| McKellar | Russell | |

NOT VOTING—23

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Bailey | Clark, Mo. | Reynolds |
| Ball | Glass | Smith |
| Bankhead | Gurney | Thomas, Okla. |
| Brooks | Johnson, Calif. | Thomas, Utah |
| Buck | Kilgore | Tydings |
| Bushfield | La Follette | Vandenberg |
| Byrd | Langer | Wheeler |
| Caraway | Radcliffe | |

So Mr. McNARY's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Republican Members of the Senate I second the nomination of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to be President pro tempore of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to express not only my own appreciation and the appreciation of the Democratic side of the Senate, but, I am sure, the appreciation of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], of the very generous action by the Senator from Oregon.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 48), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Edwin A. Halsey, of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 49), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Leslie L. Biddle, of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the majority of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY

Mr. McNARY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 50), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the minority of the Senate.

ELECTION OF CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 51), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, of Washington, D. C., be, and he is hereby, elected Chaplain of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM IOWA—ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the junior Senator-elect from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is present, and I ask that he be permitted to take the oath at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-elect will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered.

Mr. WILSON, escorted by Mr. GILLETTE, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY. I send to the desk a Senate resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 52), as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph 1 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and it is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

"Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of 20 Senators.

"Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 25 Senators.

"Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to consist of eight Senators, to which shall be referred all resolutions directing the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same: *Provided*, That any such resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

"Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 20 Senators.

"Committee on Civil Service, to consist of 10 Senators.

"Committee on Claims, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Commerce, to consist of 20 Senators.

"Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of 15 Senators.

"Committee on Education and Labor, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on Enrolled Bills, to consist of three Senators, who shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives, and which, or some one of which, shall examine all bills or joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

"Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of eight Senators.

"Committee on Finance, to consist of 21 Senators.

"Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of 23 Senators.

"Committee on Immigration, to consist of 14 Senators.

"Committee on Indian Affairs, to consist of 14 Senators.

"Committee on Interoceanic Canals, to consist of eight Senators.

"Committee on Interstate Commerce, to consist of 21 Senators.

"Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to consist of 17 Senators.

"Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on the Library, to consist of 10 Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

"Committee on Manufactures, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Military Affairs, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on Mines and Mining, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Naval Affairs, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on Patents, to consist of eight Senators.

"Committee on Pensions, to consist of 11 Senators.

"Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to consist of 19 Senators.

"Committee on Printing, to consist of eight Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

"Committee on Privileges and Elections, to consist of 17 Senators.

"Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to consist of 14 Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

"Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to consist of 15 Senators.

"Committee on Rules, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to consist of 17 Senators."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the resolution which has just been adopted, I move that the Members whose names I send to the desk representing the majority be assigned to the committees set out in the list of committees contained in the resolution. I make the motion by order of the Democratic steering committee. I understand the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], wishes to present a list of the minority Members to be represented on the committees.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Republican conference, I submit a report containing the list of minority Members to be placed on the Senate committees, and ask that like consideration be given these Senators as members of the committees as is given to the Senators contained in the list submitted on behalf of the majority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the lists of committee assignments on behalf of the majority and the minority, and, without objection, they will be considered together.

The Chief Clerk read the majority and minority assignments, which, in the form of an order, were agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Senate of the Seventy-eighth Congress:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Smith (chairman), Wheeler, Thomas of Oklahoma, Bankhead, (Mrs.) Caraway, Hatch, Bilbo, Gillette, Ellender, Lucas, Stewart, Russell, McNary, Capper, Shipstead, Willis, Aiken, Nye, Millikin, and Bushfield.

On Appropriations: Messrs. Glass (chairman), McKellar, Hayden, Thomas of Oklahoma, Tydings, Russell, McCarran, Overton, Bankhead, O'Mahoney, Truman, Green,

Maloney, Chavez, Mead, Maybank, Nye, Bridges, Lodge, Holman, White, Gurney, Brooks, Reed, and Burton.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate: Messrs. Lucas (chairman), Tydings, Hayden, Wallgren, Scrugham, Tobey, Brooks, and Nye.

On Banking and Currency: Messrs. Wagner (chairman), Glass, Barkley, Bankhead, Maloney, Radcliffe, Clark of Idaho, Downey, Murdock, Maybank, Scrugham, McClellan, Tobey, Danaher, Taft, Thomas of Idaho, Butler, Capper, Ball, and Buck.

On Civil Service: Messrs. Downey (chairman), McKellar, George, Byrd, Mead, Scrugham, Langer, Burton, Aiken, and Brooks.

On Claims: Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Bailey, Stewart, Tunnell, O'Daniel, Clark of Idaho, Kilgore, Eastland, Capper, Wiley, Robertson, Wherry, and Wilson.

On Commerce: Messrs. Bailey (chairman), (Mrs.) Caraway, Clark of Missouri, Overton, Bilbo, Maloney, Radcliffe, Pepper, Mead, Wallgren, O'Daniel, McCarran, McNary, Johnson of California, Vandenberg, Barbour, Brewster, Burton, Wiley, and Robertson.

On the District of Columbia: Messrs. McCarran (chairman), Glass, Tydings, Bankhead, Reynolds, Bilbo, Overton, Clark of Idaho, O'Daniel, Capper, Bridges, Holman, Burton, Buck, and Bushfield.

On Education and Labor: Messrs. Thomas of Utah (chairman), Walsh, Murray, Pepper, Ellender, Hill, Chavez, Tunnell, Eastland, ———, La Follette, Taft, Bridges, Aiken, Ball, Hawkes, and Wherry.

On Enrolled Bills: Mrs. Caraway (chairman), Messrs. Truman and Reed.

On Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Messrs. Hill (chairman), Van Nuys, Barkley, Green, McClellan, Davis, Aiken, and Ferguson.

On Finance: Messrs. George (chairman), Walsh, Barkley, Connally, Bailey, Clark of Missouri, Byrd, Gerry, Guffey, Johnson of Colorado, Radcliffe, Lucas, La Follette, Vandenberg, Davis, Lodge, Danaher, Taft, Thomas of Idaho, Butler, and Millikin.

On Foreign Relations: Messrs. Connally (chairman), George, Wagner, Thomas of Utah, Van Nuys, Murray, Pepper, Green, Barkley, Reynolds, Guffey, Gillette, Clark of Missouri, Glass, Tunnell, Johnson of California, Capper, La Follette, Vandenberg, White, Shipstead, Nye, and Davis.

On Immigration: Messrs. Russell (chairman), Maloney, Andrews, Stewart, Radcliffe, Maybank, Eastland, ———, Johnson of California, Holman, Burton, Ball, Buck, and Ferguson.

On Indian Affairs: Messrs. Thomas of Oklahoma (chairman), Wheeler, Hatch, O'Mahoney, Chavez, Wallgren, McFarland, Van Nuys, La Follette, Shipstead, McNary, Langer, Bushfield, and Moore.

On Interoceanic Canals: Messrs. Clark of Missouri (chairman), Pepper, Downey, Stewart, Chandler, Lodge, Bushfield, and Hawkes.

On Interstate Commerce: Messrs. Wheeler (chairman), Smith, Wagner, Barkley, Bone, Truman, Johnson of Colorado, Hill, Stewart, Clark of Idaho, Tunnell, McFarland, White, Austin, Shipstead, Tobey, Reed, Gurney, Brooks, Hawkes, and Moore.

On Irrigation and Reclamation: Messrs. Bankhead (chairman), McCarran, Overton, Hatch, O'Mahoney, Chavez, Clark of Idaho, Downey, McFarland, O'Daniel, McNary, Johnson of California, Gurney, Thomas of Idaho, Butler, Millikin, and Langer.

On the Judiciary: Messrs. Van Nuys (chairman), McCarran, Hatch, Connally, O'Mahoney, Chandler, Kilgore, Murdock, McFarland, Wheeler, Andrews, Austin, Danaher, Wiley, Langer, Ferguson, Revercomb, and Wherry.

On the Library: Messrs. Barkley (chairman), McKellar, Thomas of Oklahoma, (Mrs.)

Caraway, Bilbo, Radcliffe, McNary, Brewster, Willis, and Hawkes.

On Manufactures: Messrs. Overton (chairman), Smith, Russell, Gerry, Guffey, Mead, Bilbo, McClellan, La Follette, Barbour, Millikin, Ball, and Buck.

On Military Affairs: Messrs. Reynolds (chairman), Thomas of Utah, Johnson of Colorado, Hill, Downey, Chandler, Truman, Wallgren, Kilgore, Murray, O'Mahoney, Austin, Bridges, Gurney, Holman, Lodge, Revercomb, and Wilson.

On Mines and Mining: Messrs. Guffey (chairman), Thomas of Utah, Johnson of Colorado, Chandler, Wallgren, Kilgore, Maybank, Scrugham, Davis, Reed, Millikin, Revercomb, and Robertson.

On Naval Affairs: Messrs. Walsh (chairman), Tydings, Smith, Russell, Bone, Byrd, Gerry, Andrews, Gillette, Ellender, Lucas, Davis, Johnson of California, Barbour, Wiley, Brewster, Tobey, and Willis.

On Patents: Messrs. Bone (chairman), Smith, Pepper, Clark of Idaho, Lucas, White, Danaher, and Hawkes.

On Pensions: Messrs. Bilbo (chairman), Wheeler, Walsh, Thomas of Utah, Tunnell, McFarland, ———, Shipstead, Brooks, Aiken, and Moore.

On Post Offices and Post Roads: Messrs. McKellar (chairman), Hayden, Bailey, Chavez, Ellender, Mead, Downey, O'Daniel, Scrugham, Eastland, McClellan, Reed, Langer, Buck, Bushfield, Ferguson, Moore, Robertson, and Wilson.

On Printing: Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Walsh, Truman, Pepper, Maybank, Willis, Ball, and Wherry.

On Privileges and Elections: Messrs. Green (chairman), Smith, Connally, Hatch, Mead, Stewart, Chandler, Tunnell, Kilgore, Murdock, Austin, Bridges, Butler, Ferguson, Moore, Revercomb, and Wilson.

On Public Buildings and Grounds: Messrs. Maloney (chairman), Tydings, Walsh, Connally, Truman, Andrews, Gillette, Green, Barbour, Taft, Brewster, Revercomb, Wherry, and Wilson.

On Public Lands and Surveys: Messrs. Hatch (chairman), Wagner, O'Mahoney, Murray, McCarran, Andrews, Wallgren, Murdock, Johnson of Colorado, Nye, Gurney, Holman, Thomas of Idaho, Willis, and Robertson.

On Rules: Messrs. Byrd (chairman), McKellar, Gillette, Andrews, Lucas, Bankhead, Maybank, Gerry, Vandenberg, Barbour, White, Wiley, and Thomas of Idaho.

On Territories and Insular Affairs: Messrs. Tydings (chairman), Hayden, Clark of Missouri, Reynolds, Bone, Wheeler, Gerry, Chavez, Murdock, Ellender, Vandenberg, Lodge, Danaher, Austin, Taft, Brewster, and Butler.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 217. A bill 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 2);

S. 218. A bill to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge; without amendment (Rept. No. 3);

S. 219. A bill to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 4);

S. 220. 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; with an amendment (Rept. No. 9);

S. 221. A bill to amend sections 1 and 2 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation

Act approved July 9, 1918, relating to the protection of life and property in waters endangered by activities of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 5);

S. 222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 6);

S. 224. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 8); and

S. Res. 33. Resolution extending the authority for an investigation of the technological resources of the United States; without amendment, and, under the rule, it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

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

S. 223. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 7).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. Res. 17. Resolution further continuing the authority for a general survey of the condition of Indians in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 11), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

As in executive session,

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported favorably the nominations of several officers for temporary appointment as general officers in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution 54, submitted today by Mr. MALONEY, reported it without amendment and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution 55, submitted today by Mr. ELLENDER, reported it without amendment and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a

cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 8, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; in line 8, after the word "committee", to insert a comma; and in the same line, before the word "to", to strike out "expenses thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 9, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof", and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 10, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, after the word "subject", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 11, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in the same line, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 16, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof", and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 32, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents a hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 34, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration, or any subcommittee thereof, is au-

thorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 35, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof", and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 38, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that

the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 40, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, after the word "subject", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expense pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 41, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 8, before the word "to", to strike out "expenses thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the

Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 43, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and, in the same line, after the word "the", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 44 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to know if all the resolutions provide for the revival of old hearings, or whether any new hearings are contemplated by the resolutions.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the able leader of the minority that all the resolutions deal with the standing committees of the Senate, and the amendments offered to each are the same. The amendments deal primarily with the limitation of \$5,000 on money which can be expended by each committee. Heretofore the resolutions which have been presented have provided no limitation of funds, but under the rules it is very plain and certain that limitations should be placed, and that is what the amendments provide. No resolutions as to any special committees of any kind are being taken up today.

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

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, before the word "said", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in the same line, after the word "the"; to strike out "expenses thereof", and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Patents, or any subcommittee thereof be, and is hereby, authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings

as may be had in connection with any subject which may be referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 45, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, after the word "subject", to strike out "before" and insert "referred to"; and in line 7, before the word "to", to strike out "expense thereof" and insert "total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 46, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 46) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

PRODUCTION OF GOLD AND SILVER—REFERENCE OF SENATE RESOLUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded. Under Rule VIII, the call of the calendar is in order, and the clerk will state the measure on the calendar.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 20) to authorize the continuation of the Special Committee on the Production of Gold and Silver.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the resolution should go to the Committee on Banking and Currency, because under the rule all resolutions for investigations that involve expenditures must go to a standing committee, and, in addition to that, a special committee cannot, I think, under the rule, bring in a resolution continuing itself and authorizing further expenditures by it. Under the rule all such resolutions must go to the standing committee concerned, and I am sure that this one was referred to the special committee by oversight.

Therefore, I hope that the resolution may be sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have no doubt that it will promptly report. However, if one special committee could act on a resolution continuing itself, others could do likewise, and that would be in violation of the rule which has been established. I hope that the course I have suggested will be taken.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that I am interested in the resolution, as the majority leader knows.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think I may safely state that when the original resolution was adopted in the last days of the last session it was understood that it would be readopted and put in force again.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. The majority leader, the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I had that understanding.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the resolution goes to the Committee on Banking and Currency—and I think the majority leader is entirely correct in his attitude on that point—I hope that the resolution may be reported promptly to the Senate so that certain work which has been started may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that, and the Senator is correct about the understanding. The same understanding was had about other committees in order that we might clear the slate of any deadwood and reestablish committees which needed to be continued and were really active. I appreciate the Senator's attitude on the point I have made, and I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WAR PROBLEMS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the Record a letter, written by T. Harry Williams, appearing in the New York Times of January 10. The letter refers to a proposal to establish a joint committee of Congress, and I am offering it for the Record because on October 22, 1942, and again on January 7, 1943, I submitted a concurrent resolution which would establish such a committee.

I also ask unanimous consent that immediately following the letter there be printed a copy of the aforementioned resolution which I offered, and thereafter a copy of an editorial appearing in the

New York Times of January 10, and an editorial, referring to the same resolution, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the letter, resolution, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 10, 1943]

PRECEDENT EXISTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL WAR COMMITTEE—BUT OUR EXPERIENCE WITH RADICAL REPUBLICAN GROUP IN WAR BETWEEN THE STATES WAS NOT A HAPPY ONE AND MAY SERVE AS A WARNING AT THIS TIME

(The writer of the following letter is assistant professor of history at Louisiana State University. He is the author of "Lincoln and the Radicals," published by the University of Wisconsin Press in 1941.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Congressional leaders who have recently advocated the establishment of a joint committee of Congress to sit down with the Executive and the military to formulate war policies and war legislation can find a precedent for their proposed organization in the Civil War. It is a precedent, however, that they might not care to advertise. The congressional agency of the Civil War was the Committee on the Conduct of the War—the most powerful body ever created by Congress in our wartime history. In general, its influence upon the conduct of the war was bad and its interference with the military machine had highly unfortunate results.

The committee was the brain child of the radical Republicans, that faction of the dominant party which determined to make the abolition of slavery and the destruction of the southern social system the great objective of the war. The radicals were sneeringly contemptuous of Abraham Lincoln's announced intention to conduct the war for the sole purpose of restoring the Union, and fiercely determined to sabotage his program. They wanted a remorseless and revolutionary war. They demanded that the important military commands be given to generals who believed in the radical war aims. They shouted for an all-out offensive that would crush the Confederacy.

OPPOSED TO LINCOLN

In 1861, at the beginning of the war, the radicals raged because the Lincoln administration was following a policy diametrically opposed to their own. The President, striving to unite the people in support of the war and to hold the border slave States in line, had proclaimed the restoration of the Union as the only war aim of the Government. He refused to touch the issue of emancipation.

In the Army the major and brigadier generalships were overwhelmingly held by men known as Democrats or conservative Republicans. The general in chief, George B. McClellan, was a Democrat, and so were his two most important subordinates, Buell and Halleck. The radicals believed that McClellan and other Democratic officers secretly sympathized with the southern cause and hoped that a resort to arms would be unnecessary.

Visions of McClellan in the role of Cromwell, purging Congress of Republican members and restoring the Union, and slavery, with the aid of southern bayonets, haunted the Radical mind. The Radicals ascribed the inactivity of the Federal armies in 1861 to the southern sympathies of the Democratic generals. Why didn't McClellan advance and sweep the Confederates into the Potomac? they cried. Why was he wasting all this time in drill and training and other West Point foolishness? Because he didn't want to hurt his friends?

STRONG FACTION

Before December 1861, the Radicals had manifested dissatisfaction with the administration and conduct of the war by sniping

at Lincoln from the stump and the press. In that month they decided that some more adequate weapon of protest than mere "growing and showing of teeth" would be necessary to force Lincoln to adopt the Radical war aims.

The Radical faction in Congress was strong and aggressive; it did not have an absolute numerical control, but it was powerful enough to dominate Congress on most issues. The Radical leaders resolved to channel or institutionalize their opposition to the administration's war program in the creation of some congressional agency to represent the legislative branch in the formulation of war policies. Such an agency could delve into the secrets of military administration, supply the faction with needed information for the enactment of military legislation, and act as a liaison body between Congress and the Executive and the military.

The obvious device was a joint investigative committee, "to probe the sore spots to the bottom," as one Radical Senator grimly exclaimed. So in the first part of December the Radical bosses piloted through Congress a measure establishing such a committee, composed of three members from the Senate and four from the House. This was the agency that came to be known as the Committee on the Conduct of the War. It was granted spacious powers to investigate "the general conduct of the war," past, present, and future, and to summon before its bar "persons and papers."

ASSERTED AUTHORITY

The speeches of the Radical sponsors of the committee showed that they intended it to exercise more important functions than the mere digging up of facts. Thus one Senator proclaimed that the committee's big job would be "to keep an anxious, watchful eye over all the executive agents who are carrying on the war at the direction of the people. . . . We are not under the command of the military of this country. They are under ours as a Congress."

The Committee on the Conduct of the War was an important experiment in the relations between the legislature and the executive, the civil and military authorities of a democracy at war. The guiding spirits of the committee were resolved that it should be more than an investigative agency. The chairman, Senator "Bluff Ben" Wade of Ohio, envisioned it as a representative of Congress whose function was to insure the legislative branch a voice in the conduct of the war and the determination of war policies. Congress, he asserted, expected the committee to obtain such facts as would be useful in determining the causes of military failure, "in order to apply any remedy that may be necessary."

STORMY SCENES

Whenever the inquisitors in the course of their inquiries decided that something was wrong with the conduct of the war, they asked for an interview with Lincoln and sometimes with the Cabinet. At these sometimes stormy meetings the committee would demand that the President remove some general suspected of treason or incompetency or that he order the armies to advance. If Lincoln demurred, the members threatened to stir up Congress and the people against him. When Lincoln felt strong enough, he defied the committee. At other times he yielded to its dictates.

Although not a single member possessed either military experience or education, the committee did not consider that this should preclude it from investigating Army affairs or rendering judgments on the capabilities of military men. The inquisitors, like most civilians of the sixties, felt a profound contempt for any claims that military science was a specialized, technical subject, mysterious to anyone not educated at West Point or Annapolis. Convinced that their opinions

on questions of strategy and tactics deserved as much respect as those of any general, the members never hesitated to overrule the military men.

This was especially true when the committee attempted to impose its concepts of strategy upon commanding generals. The members possessed very positive ideas about how the war should be fought, and they continually urged their plans upon the generals and Lincoln. They believed that wars were won by fighting; their notion of strategy was perpetual attack. "In military movements delay is generally bad—indecision is almost always fatal," was the committee's maxim. The committee always censured officers who, before a battle, took precautionary measures to insure a safe retreat. Such measures, the members thought, indicated a lack of resolve and the will to win.

ARMY MEN ANNOYED

Most of the witnesses who testified before the committee were officers of the Army. Many of these men, products of West Point and the Regular Army, viewed the committee as a meddling civilian agency and objected to supplying it with information of a military nature. This was most marked when the committee, eager to find out the plans of generals like McClellan, tried to persuade witnesses to disclose what operations were proposed for the future. When the investigators failed to get this information from the commanding generals, they endeavored to secure it from subordinate officers. The Army, insisted Wade, had no right to withhold secrets from Congress. Most military men recoiled from such questions. Not only did the soldier deem it dangerous to reveal military secrets to a number of civilians but his training inhibited him from discussing the plans of his superior with other people, especially civilians.

The committee met much the same reaction when it asked officers to discuss and criticize the actions and decisions of other officers. It encouraged subordinates to speak freely about their superiors, to give opinions about battles they had not seen, and to say what they would have done had they been present on a certain field. To the members, seeking to ascertain the causes of Union defeats, it seemed perfectly natural to collect the opinions of all Army witnesses, regardless of rank. For a subordinate to criticize his superior was heresy to the military creed, and many officers refused to answer. There were always some officers, however, ambitious for place and angling for the committee's support, who were willing to give the inquisitors what they wanted. The net result was to sow seeds of dissension and faction among the officers which sprouted into sordid intrigues and seriously impaired the morale of the whole Army.

SECRET HEARINGS

Certain rules of procedure adopted by the committee and its incessant attempts to secure the removal or subordination of generals opposed to the radical war policies caused hostile critics to label it a court of star chamber or an inquisition conducting military trials. At its first meeting the committee decided that all hearings would be secret, and the members swore not to reveal any of the testimony. This was obviously a wise regulation for an agency that received vital military information. The committee, however, sometimes violated its own rule. The members surreptitiously furnished material drawn from witnesses to the radical press or announced the results of their findings in speeches in Congress.

The secret hearings gave the committee a sinister and unfair advantage when it was seeking the downfall of some general and summoned him before it to testify. He appeared alone, unrepresented by counsel. He was not permitted to examine the previous testimony, and hence could not know what

charges against him the committee was framing. In fact, he might not even dream that the committee was after his military scalp, and innocently he would supply testimony that helped to bring about his own destruction.

The committee exercised a tremendous influence during the war. On several occasions it was largely instrumental in forcing Lincoln to order premature offensive movements. It took the lead in pushing radical legislation through Congress. It poisoned Lincoln's mind against McClellan and helped to bring about that general's eventual removal. On the eve of McClellan's most important campaign the committee persuaded Lincoln to withdraw 40,000 men from the Army on the false plea that the general had left Washington undefended. With his Army thus sabotaged, McClellan failed. The committee secured the removal of several other Democratic officers and the arrest of one, General Stone; it smeared in its reports the records of the generals whose disgrace it could not accomplish.

IN TUNE WITH TIMES

The committee was an experiment in civilian, Congressional control of the executive and the military in a democracy at war. In no other of our wars has Congress made such a successful attempt to dictate military operations and the personnel of the Army. The committee was a powerful agency because it was a product of the times, and the American public of the times expressed a contempt for scientific military education and a preference for amateurism in war.

Again, the committee reflected the popular spirit in its concepts of strategy and tactics—constant offensive movements and ceaseless fighting. The members were scornful of generals who spoke about the necessity of adequate training of troops, careful preparation, siege machinery, and proper precautionary measures in case of defeat. The guess might be hazarded that any similar congressional agency in this war would be animated by the same impatience for a quick, smashing victory.

The history of the committee provides some valuable lessons concerning the functions that an investigative body of Congress should exercise in wartime. The committee's influence was bad, because, in the first place, it assumed to impose its inexperienced knowledge of military affairs upon trained experts in the art of war. The members were civilians. They vaguely grasped the broad concepts of strategy as related to the whole theater of war, but the important details of battlefield tactics and the problems of logistics they rarely understood.

SOME GOOD WORK

On the other hand, when the investigators turned their attention to such subjects as the production of war materials, where they could act with a degree of competence, they did worth-while and needed work.

The second fault of the committee was the violent partisan bias which characterized its every thought and action. Whether any congressional committee, composed of politicians, can divorce itself from politics is open to serious doubt. If it can and if it restricts its duties to matters where it can speak with authority, it will perform a valuable service. If it cannot meet these conditions, it had better not be born.

T. HARRY WILLIAMS.

BATON ROUGE, LA., January 6, 1943.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on War Problems (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee"), and to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be selected by

the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives to be selected by the House of Representatives. Not more than three of the members of the joint committee selected by the Senate, and not more than three of the members of the joint committee selected by the House of Representatives, shall be from the same political party. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a special study and investigation of the problems arising out of the war under existing and future acts of Congress; to confer with the President, and with the various departments and agencies of the Government, from time to time, with respect to such problems; to consult with other committees of both branches of the Congress, and to report to the Congress from time to time, together with such recommendations with respect to legislation as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed \$, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

[From the New York Times of January 10, 1943]

CONGRESS IN WARTIME

We publish on this page today a letter from Prof. T. Harry Williams, on the Congressional Committee on the Conduct of the War which was formed in December 1861, shortly after the outbreak of the War between the States, and continued until June 1865. In view of the proposals in Congress for another joint committee on the conduct of the present war, Professor Williams' account should serve as a warning. Because the 1861 committee did so many things that it should not have done, and did them often in so partisan a spirit, it does not follow that no congressional committee with a similar purpose should be formed now. But if it is, it has much to learn from the errors of its predecessor.

Writing on the same subject in 1917, Prof. W. W. Pierson expressed the belief that in spite of its shortcomings the 1861 committee had "brought speed and energy into the conduct of the war; that they ferreted out abuses and put their fingers down heavily upon governmental inefficiency; and that they labored, for a time at least, to preserve a balance and effect a cooperation between the legislative and executive departments." Prof. Lindsay Rogers, similarly, has expressed the opinion that "the most valid objections to the committee were to its members and to their behavior, rather than to the device as such."

It is academic to ask at this point whether there ought to be congressional committees or the conduct of the present war. We

already have several such committees—the Truman committee in the Senate, the Tolan committee in the House, the various standing committees on military and naval affairs, and so on. The present question is whether some of the committees should not be consolidated into a single joint committee. As Professor Williams concedes, in spite of the particular faults of the committee of 1861–65, if a congressional committee today can keep within its proper sphere and act without partisanship it can perform a valuable service.

It is not the function of Congress, or of any committees representing it, to conduct the war. But it is the function of Congress to see that the war is well conducted. For this function a properly organized single joint committee, dominated by a cooperative and genuinely patriotic spirit, could prove of the first importance.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]
THE WHITE HOUSE AND CAPITOL HILL

Senator MALONEY, of Connecticut, has announced that in the new Congress he will seek to revive a bill lost in the shuffle of the old, to provide for a bi-partisan congressional super committee which would consult with administration officials in advance of requests for legislation. Senator MALONEY's plan calls for a 12-man committee composed of Members of both Houses, with Republicans and Democrats represented equally. He hopes that these men, by expressing the congressional view beforehand, will eliminate or diminish friction and controversy between the White House and Capitol Hill on war legislation.

The success of such a device depends, of course, upon the spirit in which it is operated. It might easily become a focus for increased resentment between the executive and legislative branches. But if both Congress and the administration accept it frankly as a method of promoting cooperation for the solution of the vital problems facing the Nation, it can have immense advantages in the conduct of the war and in preparations for the peace.

Many Congressmen have expressed fear lest wartime measures be converted into permanent peacetime instruments without congressional approval. Others have been displeased by the proliferation of administrative government under blanket grants of power—to say nothing of such open attempts by the Executive to circumvent the expressed will of Congress as the \$25,000-a-year salary limit. A public temper which is critical of the administration, reflected in the election returns last November, adds to these specific grounds for suspicion, and with the close party balance in the new Congress could easily lead to a stalemate, blocking essential legislation and hampering the progress of the war.

Congressional investigations after the fact may help to correct errors or to inform public and congressional opinion as to the course of the administration. But they also lead to irritation, use up valuable time, and do not provide for constructive congressional participation in policy making. Only frequent and candid consultation between the President and congressional leaders can do that. Nor can the President select only leaders representing his own party for this purpose without running the danger of such revolt as cost Wilson his leadership and left the Nation without a fixed policy at a critical time. That tragedy must not be repeated, and it is certainly not too early to organize relations between the President and Congress in such a manner as to avoid it. Senator MALONEY's plan merits careful consideration.

CONSTRUCTION OF FUEL-OIL PIPE LINES

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, because of the deep interest of our citizens and State and municipal officials along the Atlantic seaboard in the shortage of the supply of oil, renewed interest has been developed in the progress that is being made in the construction of oil pipe lines to meet future needs.

I request that there be inserted in the RECORD a memorandum from the Navy which indicates the progress in the construction of these pipe lines.

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

1. That the first section of the pipe line from Longview, Tex., to southern Illinois is practically completed—all the pipe is laid—but materials for some of the pumping units have not yet been received. He expects the line to be in operation by February 1. This will increase the eastern oil supply, as tank cars will have a shorter run, as many of them will run only as far west as Illinois instead of going to Texas.

2. The pipe is now being processed for the second section of the line; that is, from southern Illinois to the Philadelphia-New York area.

This project is going along satisfactorily, and this section should be in operation by next fall. The priorities on the materials for this section of the line are now satisfactory, and they hope to retain these priorities. This pipe line will be capable of delivering 300,000 barrels daily.

INTERIM REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—BARGES (PT. 1 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, at the request of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, and at the instance of the chairman of that committee the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], I submit a report on the barge program. It is referred to as an interim report on barges.

Mr. President, the shortage of petroleum products in the east coast region of the United States is primarily a shortage of transportation rather than a shortage of the products themselves. When this shortage became apparent it was immediately necessary to explore every means of increasing the facilities for transporting petroleum and petroleum products.

In the spring of 1942 this committee made an investigation to ascertain what progress had been made in converting existing dry cargo barges and building new wooden barges for the purpose of transporting petroleum and petroleum products. The committee found that there had been a great deal of discussion about barges but that no important action had been taken.

Shortly thereafter a committee appointed by the President—consisting of Secretary Harold Ickes, Department of Interior; Secretary Jesse Jones, Department of Commerce; Mr. Leon Henderson, Administrator, Office of Price Adminis-

tration; Major General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, United States Army; Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Office of Defense Transportation—recommended to the President that a specific program be adopted to obtain increased use of the intercoastal and intracoastal waterways for the movement of petroleum. The President's committee also recommended that existing bulk cargo steel barges be converted to make them suitable for transporting petroleum and urged that 500 wooden barges with a capacity of 6,000 barrels each, 100 wooden-hull tugboats of 600 horsepower each, and 20 steel-hull river towboats of 2,000 horsepower each should be constructed.

These facilities together with additional terminal facilities and a trans-Florida pipe line were expected to provide for the movement of 50,000 barrels of fuel oil per day from Texas to Illinois for transshipment to the east-coast region, 50,000 barrels of fuel oil per day from Texas to Florida for transshipment by rail to Norfolk and intermediate points, and 35,000 to 50,000 barrels per day of gasoline and other petroleum products from Texas to Florida for use in the south Atlantic seaboard area.

By the end of July the President approved the recommendations of his committee and the Corps of Engineers of the Army reported to the Office of Defense Plant Corporation that with the necessary priorities the program might be expected to be completed on or before April 1, 1943.

In August the program for the conversion of existing bulk cargo steel barges was reduced by one-half from 259 to 130 barges by the requirements committee of the War Production Board. The War Production Board also decided that the balance of the program for the construction of new wooden barges, towboats, and tugboats was to be held in abeyance.

So the report of the President's committee—an adequate report, a report which, in my judgment, should be followed to the letter—was not only reduced by one-half but was eventually entirely eliminated.

This action was taken because of the shortage of steel and on the report of the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department that the most likely source of Diesel engines was the General Motors Corporation, all of the facilities of which would be required until the middle of April 1943 for essential Navy programs. The Diesel Engine Section of the War Production Board was not even consulted concerning availability of smaller Diesels.

In September the Office of Defense Transportation reported to the Defense Plant Corporation that steam engines and 250 horsepower Diesel engines could be made available for use in towboats and tugboats, and the Defense Plant Corporation and the Office of Defense Transportation joined in urging that the War Production Board reconsider the towboat program. In October the War Production Board concluded that the program should be resubmitted in the spring of 1943 on the theory that so much time had been lost that towboats could not be

completed until February or March of 1943, when it would be too late to have any effect on the oil shortage during the winter of 1942 and 1943.

In November 1942 Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, authorized a reexamination of the matter, when his attention was called to the suggestion that a gasoline engine built by the Chrysler Corporation known as the sea mule might be used as a possible substitute for Diesel power. A test of the sea mule has been ordered, but will not be completed for some weeks. The Diesel Engine Section of the War Production Board finally was consulted and reported that Diesels in the 1,000- to 2,000-horsepower class would not be available for the proposed program, but that there was no question of the availability of steam engines and boilers and small Diesel engines and power units for tugs and towboats. This report resulted in the resubmission of the barge program by the Defense Plant Corporation to the Requirements Committee of the War Production Board. At the time of resubmission the Office of Defense Transportation asserted that every available tank barge was in service and that the conversion program was not being held up by a lack of motive power but rather by the failure to convert the existing steel bulk cargo barges. The Office of Defense Transportation asserted that sufficient tugboats and towboats could be made available by transfers from existing nonessential uses and by the transfer of tugboats and towboats which could not be used in their normal operations during the winter months because of freezing conditions.

Up to December 31, 1942, contracts had been let by the Inland Waterways Corporation on behalf of the Defense Plant Corporation for the conversion of only 84 of the 259 steel bulk cargo barges. These contracts represent a total capacity of 1,005,000 barrels. Little progress had been made on the conversion program. Only 4 barges with a capacity of 15,000 barrels each had been converted as of December 31, 1942. The explanation for the lack of progress assigned by the Office of Defense Transportation was that the conversion program was being held up by financial and other restrictions imposed by the Defense Plant Corporation, which made it difficult to use available shipyard capacity.

Late in November, Mr. Donald Nelson asked Mr. Jesse Jones either to modify the contract restrictions or to proceed by letters of intent, and he asked Mr. Joseph B. Eastman to take drastic steps to increase the petroleum deliveries by barge. Mr. Nelson also asked Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, chairman of the requirements committee of the War Production Board, to take the barge-construction program personally in hand.

Mr. President, if this had been accomplished as it should have been, as required by the President's committee, it would not be found necessary to close schoolhouses and in some instances, perhaps, churches, as well as factories and industries in the northeastern section of the country.

Thereupon, after the matter had been referred to Mr. Eberstadt by Mr. Donald Nelson, the Program Adjustment Committee of the War Production Board considered a revised barge program substituting motive power which had been found to be available, but the Navy and Maritime Commission representatives suggested that even the revised program might interfere with Navy and Maritime Commission programs, and it was again held up. At a later meeting it developed that the Navy's opposition was on the theory that the barge program might conflict with its requirements for lumber and that the Maritime Commission's opposition was based on the theory that steel was more urgently needed for tankers and ore carriers. An examination of the lumber situation developed that sufficient quantities of yellow pine could be made available and an examination of the steel situation developed that although it was tight, it was not sufficiently critical to require the abandonment of a program as essential as the barge program. Mr. Eberstadt as chairman of the Requirements Committee approved the barge program and assigned it an AA-3 priority rating without dissent. The Requirements Committee further decided that where the necessary materials could not be obtained on such a priority rating, application could be made for a higher rating, and where the program was found to conflict with the Navy program the Navy could appeal for reconsideration.

On December 18, 1942, it was agreed by the departments concerned that the construction of the towboats should be pushed with all speed by the Inland Waterways Corporation so as to be ready upon completion of the barges. It was also agreed that contracts for the construction of tugs, wooden barges, and terminal facilities would be let by the Engineer Corps of the Army and financed by the Defense Plant Corporation. The Corps of Engineers estimated that it would require from 4 to 6 weeks of preliminary work such as negotiation, placing of orders, and delivery of material before the shipyards could get into actual production and that the entire program could be completed by the summer of 1943.

Mr. President, from the time the President called this committee together, and from the time the committee submitted what they assumed to be an adequate program, there were certain activities in the various bureaus, to an account of which we have listened, which had to do with the setting up of this program and providing it with material. The postponement reached until the first of the year, and I wish to read to the Senate at this time the conclusions arrived at by our committee:

CONCLUSIONS

The committee believes that there has been unnecessary delay and confusion in carrying out a program essential to the national welfare. The delay which occurred prior to the recommendations of the committee appointed by the President is most regrettable, but the delay which occurred after the matter had been studied by that committee and after its recommendations had been approved by the President is inexcusable.

The lengthy and frequent conferences which took place between the numerous agencies involved produced many arguments but few decisions.

The program recommended by the President's committee and approved by the President ought not to have been discarded on the Navy's suggestion that high-powered Diesels necessary for motive power could not be obtained without exploring whether existing tugboat and towboat power could be made available by a transfer from other uses and without exploring whether steam engines, gas engines, or smaller Diesel engines could be made available.

The following committees and agencies all had a hand in making decisions with respect to barges: The President's Committee to Investigate the Problem of Supplying Additional Means of Transportation to Satisfy Petroleum Requirements of the Eastern Seaboard, and a technical subcommittee thereof; the Defense Plant Corporation; the Army Engineer Corps; the Requirements Committee, War Production Board; Program Adjustment Committee, War Production Board; Diesel Engine Section, War Production Board; Office of Procurement and Materiel, Navy Department; Bureau of Ships, Navy Department; the Maritime Commission; and the Inland Waterways Corporation, Department of Commerce. The confusion resulting from this overlapping of authority and duplication of effort is revealed in the following discussion of facts—

Which I shall submit with the report—

There was simply too much talk and not enough action.

Valuable time has been lost. If the barge program had been carried out expeditiously, the shortages of both fuel oil and gasoline in district 1 (the east coast region), particularly the southern and western portions thereof, would have been much less severe. The committee recommends that no further delays be permitted to occur in this vital program.

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

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does not the Senator feel that the administrative ineptitude and confusion which have been so glaringly illustrated in the report which the Senator has submitted are calculated to undermine the confidence of the country generally in the efficiency with which the war effort is being carried on?

Mr. MEAD. With that statement, Mr. President, I cannot quite agree, for the reason that in the main the over-all production directly connected with the war effort has been little less than miraculous. But as it applies to carrying on essential programs, and the production of items directly connected with and yet perhaps removed from the actual scene of conflict, as well as essential civilian programs, it has not met with the same prompt response as has been the case with the direct program, such as the production of tanks, ships, planes, guns, and so forth.

The reason for that can be found in analyzing this report. The President recognized the situation and set up a committee. That committee realized the situation and adopted a program, and, insofar as that is concerned, there was no delay. But when the matter was referred to the War Production Board and to the very necessary subcommittees, one having to do with Diesel power, another having to do with materials, another having to do with priorities, there were

of necessity conferences with the military and with the Maritime Commission, and it was the postponements in most cases ordered in connection with those military activities that caused a great deal of the delay. I presume the delay ensued because it was felt that the program would interfere first of all with the direct war effort, namely, the production of guns, tanks, and ships. But if the matter had been analyzed a little more deeply, if it had been investigated a little more thoroughly, ways and means could have been found for the completion of the greater portion of the program assigned by the President's committee to the various agencies for their consideration.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator agree that all our observations in the past 2 years have argued strongly toward the fixing of individual responsibility in these programs, as distinguished from that of committees?

Mr. MEAD. Perhaps in a number of instances that suggestion would apply appropriately, but, unfortunately, in setting up any over-all agency such as the War Production Board, we must of necessity break it down into sections, as the Senate breaks down its membership into committees, and the committees are broken down, again, into subcommittees. Each section must be consulted with reference to the authority delegated to it, just as we delegate authority to full committees and to subcommittees.

While there are at times suitable reasons why power should be given to an individual rather than to a committee, there is in the study of the program as it has been set up ample justification for the apparent need for conference, whereby several agencies handling one program must of necessity come together. I know of no method whereby we might take away from Mr. Eastman, the Director of Defense Transportation, all the transportation facilities that have anything to do with the transportation of petroleum, and yet it might be considered proper, if we were going to have a system whereby individual responsibility, and individual responsibility alone, should rule, that the Oil Coordinator have all that authority. So there must be a division.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very much interested in the suggestions which have been made. I heard the distinguished mayor of New York, who, I think we all recognize, is a very good administrator, urge very strongly before the Maloney committee, that Mr. Ickes be given that very responsibility, and he said he saw no reason why Mr. Ickes should not control the tank cars which can be used for no other purpose, in view of orders which the Office of Defense Transportation has only very recently put into effect which are vital to the supply of oil to New York and to New England.

Mr. MEAD. I have no argument, because I am not making an argument for either the committee method or the administrator method, but the Senator can see that if the program which he now suggests were put into effect, then Mr. Eastman would have charge of the box cars on the railroads and Mr. Ickes would have charge of the tank cars on

the railroads, and the Senator would by the method he suggests divide the responsibility with respect to the railroads. It is difficult to draw a line so there will be no overlapping of authority. Wherever it must be drawn, however, I agree thoroughly with the Senator's suggested principle that authority be lodged in the individual rather than in a committee or in a section of a given agency.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it was not my intention in my first question to do anything other than raise the point of individual responsibility as distinguished from committee responsibility. I agree that we must have certain overlapping, but let us take the case of Mr. Eastman and Mr. Ickes. The Senator will agree that it is much wiser to place all the power we can in Mr. Ickes, and all the power we can in Mr. Eastman, rather than in a tribunal composed of half a dozen men who never can get together on their actions. With that general conclusion, I think the Senator from New York will agree?

Mr. MEAD. I agree with that; and then these two gentlemen in turn should report, as they do, and as they did in this case, to the President of the United States.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. As I understood the Senator's statement of the report of the committee, the report places emphasis on the fact that the President's committee had reached a conclusion on the policy that a certain number of barges should be constructed?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Through the nine agencies the Senator named there has been inevitable delay, perhaps by reason of the number of agencies and the number of people involved. As a result the Senator is pointing out that at this time the greatest need in this country is the saving of time in the production of barges and war material. The investigating committee is devoting itself to speeding up these operations and eliminating confusion.

I notice that the Senator from New York stated at one point that the agencies had overlooked the fact that there was a committee on Diesel engines in the War Production Board, and that there was an absence of a report from that committee on Diesel engines. It is a question of eliminating the extra committees and agencies and individuals, and the need is for greater speed in the production of barges.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I assume we can find an answer to some of the delays, principally the ones encountered in the War Production Board, in the fact that for the first time in all our history we were called upon to enter into a global conflict, and to build for that conflict an overwhelming volume of new equipment; that in every field of war production we were pioneering, and we were without knowledge as to how we could attain quotas. The Army, agreeing that we have the first line of defense well bolstered, would object when it came to the carrying on of programs which were not

directly associated with the battle front; the Navy might step in and say, "The carrying on of such programs may interfere with our program"; and the Maritime Commission might do likewise. But today, after pioneering in this war effort for a year, we have established quotas, and we are able to make more accurate estimates, and now by a scientific division of material we may be able to allocate a certain quota of material for one activity, and realize that we will have a certain amount of the material left for another activity. In other words, as was proper, we were emphasizing the war effort, as it applied to the battlefields of the world, and at the same time we were groping for a new concept of the volume of goods necessary to conduct this all-out mechanized war with materials and equipment we never before heard of. So there probably has been some reason for the delay, but that reason will not be valid from now on.

Mr. BURTON. We say we have developed a way by which we can determine our quotas and our policies, and what we need now is action to put them into effect.

Mr. MEAD. That is quite right.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the very able Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] for the excellent manner in which he has made his report to the Senate. It is the unanimous report of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, before the discussion is concluded, I wish to say that in our investigation, the magnificent contribution of the railroads to the transportation of petroleum products was brought to the committee's attention. Let me say a word of high commendation of the employees and the management of our railroads for the splendid response they have made in this emergency. I think the railroads throughout the United States are doing an excellent job in the handling of every commodity, they are doing a magnificent job. The emergency which confronts us at this time has made us realize how indispensable the railroads are.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator from New York, and I agree with him entirely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] will be received and printed.

OIL FOR THE FIGHTERS OF AMERICA—
ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an able radio address dealing with the oil situation, delivered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I wish to call attention to the fact that the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, of which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] was the chairman, went into the oil situation as it affects production, and made a recommendation that Mr. Ickes be placed in complete charge.

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

OIL FOR THE FIGHTERS OF AMERICA

The Washington Star has asked me to discuss the petroleum problem because a bill which I sponsored to stimulate the discovery of new sources of supply on lands belonging to the United States in the Far West was put through Congress in the closing hours of the Seventy-seventh session and is now on the President's desk for signature. This measure had the unanimous support of the Public Lands Committees of both the House and Senate and was actively urged in committee and on the floor by Congressman J. WILL ROBINSON of Utah, chairman of the House committee, Senator CARL A. HATCH, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate committee, and by Senator ASE MURDOCK, of Utah, who had charge of the measure, in the closing day in the Senate.

The bill was needed because new supplies of oil are needed and because in the public land States, there still are possibilities of new discoveries, provided only that men are encouraged and permitted to search for new deposits. In his letter of November 10 to former Congressman William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, who for 9 years was head of the petroleum study of the House Committee on Interstate Commerce, President Roosevelt stated the simple truth when he said:

"The immediate discovery of additional sources of oil is imperative."

It is so imperative that unless new supplies are made available, we stand in grave danger of not having enough petroleum with which to fight the war. The present supplies are definitely not sufficient and we have not as yet taken adequate precautions to be prepared for the crisis that is now upon us. The fact that as a war measure, gasoline was last week denied to all except the most essential civilian uses in 17 Eastern States and the District of Columbia is proof enough of the desperate nature of the crisis. We have been trying to meet war needs by rationing civilian uses. We have been trying to meet the demands of the military forces by diverting supplies from the civilian economy and, until the passage of this bill, no substantial effort was made to bring in new reserves, but new reserves are what are most needed because we are confronted by military demands which are almost beyond imagination.

Let me say here, that no discussion of any problem associated with the war economy should omit acknowledgment of the perfectly remarkable job of mobilizing our resources which has been accomplished. The President and his aides have taken a country which was geared only to peace and in a short year have transformed it into a powerful military unit. They have accomplished wonders and to analyze some of the things that must yet be accomplished is not to be interpreted at all as withholding credit for what has been done.

The magnitude of the task we must perform grows as we contemplate it. Military estimates of materials needed expand steadily as the weeks pass. The Army and the Navy know now that they will need more oil than they dreamed of 6 months ago, because they have new instruments that burn it up.

UNITED NATIONS DEPEND ON OUR OIL

We now have more and larger airplanes in actual combat service than was deemed possible a year ago. Flying Fortresses which, early this year were almost unknown in the South Pacific theater of war, are now turning back every Jap attempt to retake Guadalcanal and are helping MacArthur to avenge Bataan. More than that, only last Monday we learned that American tanks have reached our forces now hammering at Buna Mission. The delivery of these planes and tanks to

our men on that far distant front is in itself a most remarkable accomplishment for which our military and production command are deserving the highest praise. But these planes and tanks are burning up oil in an area which was scarcely within contemplation 6 or 8 months ago. And we are delivering this oil to the South Pacific. It comes from our supplies and it is being sent to a portion of the globe which is itself rich in petroleum, the supplies of which, however, have unfortunately fallen into the hands of the Japanese.

On February 2, 1942, more than 10 months ago, when I introduced the bill to stimulate the discovery of new sources of petroleum on the public domain I pointed out that even then the Japanese armies in the Dutch East Indies were being followed by drilling crews to sink new wells in the oil fields the Dutch had tried to destroy, and that it was incumbent upon us to begin immediately to develop new oil deposits.

Not only have our East Indian supplies of oil been cut off, but the German drive in the Caucasus has seriously endangered the Russian supply, and at the same time the Nazi U-boats have cut us off from Venezuela, from which in the days before the war we received on the east coast approximately 200,000 barrels of petroleum every day.

Two years ago exports and imports of oil, so far as the United States was concerned, were approximately balanced. Now imports have been cut off, but exports have been tremendously increased—exports for our allies as well as for our own forces. Thus United States deposits of petroleum have become practically the only sure and certain source from which the United Nations may draw their essential supplies of oil.

MILITARY DEMANDS GROWING

Meanwhile, the demand is so great and is growing so rapidly that failure on the part of the Government, the oil industry, and the people to prepare immediately can only result in disaster. American production of crude petroleum is now running at the rate of something more than 4,000,000 barrels every day. This was sufficient in the days before the war to take care of all industrial and civilian needs, but it is totally inadequate to fuel the tanks and planes that must carry the war to Tokyo and Berlin. It is not too much to say that it will require considerably more than that amount to fuel the air raids upon which the American Air Forces and the Royal Air Force have already been launched. Every bomber which leaves a United Nations airfield must carry its own supply in sufficient quantity to carry it to its objective and back again. When we talk of a flying radius of say 1,500 miles, it becomes at once apparent that we are talking in terms of gasoline consumption far exceeding anything to which we have ever been accustomed. When we talk of building bigger and bigger air fleets capable of longer and longer flight we are talking in terms of oil consumption that no one, either in the oil industry or in the Army or Navy, dreamed of 2 years ago.

The complexity of the problem is further enhanced by the fact that these air armadas need for their efficient operation a type of high-octane gasoline which is only now coming into manufacture in quantity and which is extraordinarily expensive in terms of crude petroleum, for scarcely 10 percent of a barrel of oil as it comes out of the ground can finally be manufactured into the sort of gasoline that is needed to supply power to our air armadas.

In addition to high-octane gasoline for airplanes, great quantities of ordinary gasoline are needed for tanks and trucks, great quantities of fuel oil for the Navy, large amounts of toluene, a byproduct of petroleum for the manufacture of explosives, and, finally, large amounts of butadiene, another

byproduct, for the manufacture of synthetic rubber. It may be that grain alcohol will become an increasing source of the gasoline needed to make rubber, but to date petroleum rather than any agricultural product is the principal source of this material.

It thus becomes perfectly clear how necessary crude oil is to the winning of the war. I am told by those who are in a position to know that two-thirds of the tonnage shipped to our military forces consist of petroleum. It is the realization of this fact which has prompted Congress to pass the bill, the objective of which is to stimulate the discovery of new sources of oil upon the public domain. The measure undertakes to do that by providing a lower royalty to the Government for a period of 10 years for new discoveries. Under the present law, lessees of Government oil lands pay the United States a royalty which ranges from 12½ to 32 percent, according to the amount and the value of production. Under the new law any lessee who brings in a new oil field or who, on an old lease, brings in a new deposit of oil will be rewarded by being required to pay not more than 12½ percent for a period of 10 years after the discovery.

I would be the last person to predict that the passage of this bill will solve the petroleum problem. It will not; first, because even though there may be a large supply of undiscovered petroleum in the public-land States, the process of exploration and discovery is a long and arduous one and it may be doubted whether very many discoveries can be made under this bill in less than a year. Meanwhile, we shall be drawing upon our known reserves of petroleum at a rate which will hasten their depletion.

NEW DISCOVERIES ARE ESSENTIAL

The gravity of the situation will be understood when I point out that the amount of petroleum which has already been drawn from the ground and is in storage ready to be shipped, amounts to only about 250,000,000 barrels, or less than one-fifth of the annual production. The oil which is under the ground can only be estimated and may not in fact be as much as petroleum engineers believe. Whatever it amounts to, however, it cannot be withdrawn too rapidly without extreme danger to the deposits, for the amount of oil which may be taken from any field depends upon the maintenance of gas pressure at the bottom of the well. When a great many wells are drilled in a small area the producing life of the area is proportionately reduced. This is the reason why so-called conservation practices have been followed in most of the oil-producing States.

The rate of discovery of new fields has been falling off and, as a consequence, we have not been bringing in new supplies to make up for the withdrawals which are being made.

In 1942, according to the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator, the United States produced 6 percent more crude petroleum than it did in 1941, but if there are no new discoveries the production in 1943 will be 10 percent less than in 1941 and in 1944 there will be almost 20 percent less, indicating again how necessary it is to promote the search for new sources of oil. If we are to maintain the balance during 1943, disregarding completely the new demand, it will be necessary to discover, either in new fields or by extensions of old fields, enough new oil to amount to 400,000 barrels every day.

To promote the discovery of this oil, no other step has been taken than the passage of this bill, which affects only the public domain. The Senate Committee on Public Lands, which has given months to the study of the problem, has recommended not only the enactment of this measure, but it has also recommended that the Petroleum Coordinator, the War Production Board, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation un-

dertake immediately to finance exploratory drilling wherever oil may be found. Government loans to the so-called wildcaters are necessary because under present conditions the independent operator is unable to secure the necessary loans through ordinary banking channels. A short-term loan is not sufficient. The independent operator, who does not have the backing of large financial reserves, must have the support of long-term Government loans because in the present economic situation banks and other private sources of capital are unable to meet the emergency.

POSITION OF INDEPENDENT OPERATOR

How important this is to the maintenance of what we are pleased to call the free enterprise system will be recognized when I point out that the position of the small independent operator has been steadily growing weaker. In 1939 an examination of authoritative statistics showed that the major oil companies at that time controlled 52.7 percent of all the proven crude oil reserves in the United States. In 1942 they controlled almost 70 percent.

This is because the wildcat operator, when he discovers oil, usually seeks a purchaser for his discovery and usually it is a major oil company which buys the newly discovered oil lands.

The history of the oil industry is the history of the search for new fields by pioneers. It is the pioneer who takes the chance. It is the pioneer who plays the long shot and at a time like this when every petroleum expert and every congressional or executive investigator agrees that new reserves are imperative, it is essential that an inducement should be held out to the independent. The reduction of royalties upon the public domain and long-term loans upon good security through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are two methods by which the Government may support the independent operator in the essential search for new sources of oil supply.

But even both of these inducements are not enough. The most serious obstacles to the search for new oil supplies are shortages of material and shortages of manpower. Unless there is a relaxation of present priority rules with respect to materials that are needed for the drilling of wells it is inevitable that even with lower royalties and long-term loans, fewer and fewer wells will be drilled to completion. It is the testimony of all who know the industry that the amount of critical materials needed for drilling wildcat wells is much less than that which is needed to complete a producing well, but when a well is drilled to production the resulting supply of new oil is of such great importance that priority rulings should be unhesitatingly relaxed to make certain that the new supply is brought in.

Much can be done also to relieve the situation by improvement in the means of transportation, Congressman Cole, who made his final report to the President on October 22 as he was resigning from the House of Representatives to take a seat upon the United States Customs Court, more than a year ago sponsored the Cole Pipe Line Act, but the construction of the pipe lines authorized by this law was delayed for months. Even now, largely by lack of steel and other materials, we are not doing enough to make existing oil reserves available. In west Texas, in New Mexico, and in Wyoming, there are not sufficient transportation facilities to bring into immediate use existing supplies of oil.

The areas in which oil is produced and in which it is refined and used are separated by such great distances that the problem of transportation is one of the most difficult of all factors. For example, in the eastern area, which refines normally about 15 percent of the total amount of crude oil produced,

there is less than 2 percent of the total reserve, whereas in the Southwest 68 percent of the petroleum reserves are found while the local requirements for refining amount to only 37 percent.

Lacking in sufficient pipe lines and with the accustomed tanker service cut off by reason of the war, the petroleum industry was forced to turn to the railroads for relief, but although the railroads are now transporting approximately 850,000 barrels of oil a day as compared with less than 5,000 barrels 2 years ago, the facilities are not adequate. The tankers used to carry more than a million barrels a day and the cost was \$750,000 less daily than railroad transportation.

PROBLEM OF PRICE

This raises the last and probably the most important factor, namely, the factor of price. The House Committee on Interstate Commerce, through Congressman Cole, on October 22 recommended to the President not only that there should be a centralization of Government authority over the production and distribution of petroleum, but that there should be an over-all increase of price.

The Senate committee, on the other hand, while recommending the reduction of Government royalties, Reconstruction Finance Corporation long-term loans and concentrated authority, did not make any recommendation with respect to price because the Public Lands Committee was of the opinion that that was a matter which was beyond its jurisdiction. It did, however, receive testimony upon this question. The industry, including the independents, urges a price increase and justifies it upon the ground that the war has utterly changed all of the conditions of production and distribution and, second, upon the ground that only an increase of price will enable the producer both of crude and of the refined products to meet the increased costs.

For the refiner it is pointed out that in normal times ordinary gasoline was the principal product and that the price which was received for the gasoline consumed by the civilian economy enabled the production and distribution of other byproducts, including fuel oil, at low prices. Rationing of gasoline, however, and the increased demand for fuel oil, as well as for other byproducts, made it necessary for refiners to produce larger quantities of the product which was sold for the smallest price. The Petroleum Coordinator, in his testimony before the Senate Public Lands Committee, referred "to the changes we have had to order in refinery yields so as to produce from crude oil more heating and industrial oils and less gasoline." He went on to say that "when a refiner is asked to make less and less of his high-value product and more and more of the low-value product, his net returns diminish toward the vanishing point," and that, in these circumstances, small refiners "are faced with the alternative of going out of business altogether or of being consolidated into their larger competitors."

Independent operators, too, urged an increased price of oil. Said one of these, Mr. Bert Aston, of Roswell, N. Mex., at our Artesia hearing:

"The oil man doesn't want a subsidy. He isn't that kind of an animal. He doesn't want the Government or anyone else to subsidize him. All we need is an adequate price for our oil. * * * I say to the Government quite frankly: If you help us get a reasonable price for our oil we will go out and get the wildcats. I represent dozens of fellows like me that drill them and pay for them. We miss them and hit them. We hit a few and miss a lot, but if you will help us get an adequate price you don't need to worry about the oil reserves. The independents will take care of that."

Congressman Cole, in his report to the President, also pointed out the readjustment

of refinery production and the increased costs of wildcatting, leading to the following conclusion:

"An adjustment in the price of oil and a collateral adjustment in the price of products is a necessary war measure to insure the drilling of wildcats, to continue production of stripper wells, to rehabilitate wells long shut down and make possible secondary recovery operations in many fields where the oil is needed."

Opposed to this is the policy of the Office of Price Administration. Mr. Henderson, in his testimony to the committee was definitely of the opinion that a price increase would result in unnecessarily large profits for the companies which dominate the petroleum industry. His position was that it would be preferable for the Government to pay subsidies in necessary cases to stimulate production rather than to grant an over-all increase of price which would be paid by all civilians and by the Government in the purchase of petroleum products. It would be better, according to his testimony, for the Government to expend \$250,000,000 in direct subsidies to the discoverers of new oil than by an increase of 50 cents per barrel on a daily production of 4,000,000 barrels to incur an additional cost of \$730,000,000 for a year's oil supply.

Then, too, I remember the testimony of the late Mr. W. S. Farish, president of the Standard Oil of New Jersey, who told the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1939 that the Nation's oil reserves had been increased during the previous 14 years from 5½ billion barrels to 17 billion while the average price of crude oil was usually under \$1.20 per barrel. The average price last year was \$1.12. Of course, when Mr. Farish was testifying he was the head of the world's largest oil refinery. He was not the spokesman of the producer.

MAJOR COMPANY HOLDINGS

Whether price increase or Government subsidy is the device for stimulating the discovery of more oil, one thing is certain, namely, that more oil must be found. The royalty bill is an effort to open the public domain to renewed exploration. It must be supplemented by more complete exploitation of the undeveloped land now held by the twenty major oil companies. Though they control almost 50,000,000 acres, they are producing from only 3,750,000 acres. This tremendous undeveloped area must be explored. I am glad to be able to report that the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator is now working on this problem and that as a result of the suggestions of Secretary Ickes, the big companies at this moment have far more seismograph crews at work searching for new oil possibilities than at any previous time in history.

Seismograph search, however, is not enough. We must have drilling. It is not difficult to predict that if the independents and the majors fail to drill, the demand will grow for a drilling campaign under the direction of the United States Army engineers. The Army and the Navy must have the oil.

The testimony to the Senate Public Lands Committee raised the central question which lies at the heart of the whole current debate over price control. The Price Control Act authorized the payment of subsidies, but fixed no standards to guide the administrator, and Congress has not yet appropriated any money specifically for the payment of subsidies either for petroleum products or for agricultural products. This fundamental issue of whether the price system should be used in the traditional manner to bring needed commodities into the market or whether when a price ceiling prevents a producer from getting his costs out of his operation a subsidy should be paid is one which will have to be settled in the new Congress. It is not a question to be discussed here.

I am content to point out that the Office of Price Administration has recognized in some cases that price increases should be granted for the purpose of stimulating production and that this can be done without an over-all order. It has already been done in Pennsylvania with respect to lubricating oil which indicates the need for a price increase. There is another instance in the case of fuel oil. In Wyoming, there are 21 known fields capable of producing what is called black oil, that is to say, a heavy oil which is used for fuel purposes. Before the war there was comparatively little demand for this oil and at one time when the Government, through the Interior Department, sought to fix a price of about 90 cents a barrel on this oil it failed because there was no market for the oil at that price. Lack of market meant lack of development, but that was before the war. When the Office of Price Administration fixed the prices on crude oil of this character, it fixed them as of October 1, 1941, before the need for new production had developed.

The result is that the price of this oil, which is now very much needed, is fixed at the 50-cent level which was in effect October 1, 1941, at a time of little demand. Our committee was told that if the price of that oil were increased it would be possible to multiply the amount of production perhaps threefold; that is to say, to increase the daily output from 30,000 to 90,000 barrels.

California producers of fuel oil likewise assert that an increase of price would result in an increase of production. These questions are now under consideration in negotiations between the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator and the Office of Price Administration.

Whatever may be the merits of the controversy between price and subsidy, this is clear, that to win the war we need more oil. The military needs are the primary needs; and if we do not have sufficient petroleum to fuel our airplanes, our tanks, our battleships, airplane carriers, and destroyers, all questions of price and profit and of civilian use will be idle.

OIL IS THE MOST ESSENTIAL WAR MATERIAL

Whoever uses petroleum today must know that he is using the most essential of all war materials. It is true that the modern army moves only on rubber. It is true that no army can fight without weapons and equipment of steel, but the Armies and Navies of the United Nations could have unlimited supplies of both rubber and steel, but without petroleum they could not move.

To me, when I think of what the men on the front are doing, when I read the dispatches from the South Pacific and from north Africa, when on the radio I hear of the flying fortresses going out over enemy territory and sometimes suffering the loss of gallant men who will never return, I know that all theories of price, profit, and economic control are unimportant. The all-important thing now is the production and distribution of the materials that the men on the fighting front must have if they are to win the war for us.

The following is the full text of the new law which was signed by the President on Christmas Eve, December 24:

"An act to encourage the discovery of oil and gas on the public domain during the continuance of the present war

"Be it enacted, etc., That during the period of the national emergency proclaimed by the President May 27, 1941 (Proclamation No. 2487), upon a determination by the Secretary of the Interior that a new oil or gas field or deposit has been discovered by virtue of a well or wells drilled within the boundaries of any lease issued pursuant to the provisions of the act, approved February 25, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 30, secs. 181-263), the royalty obligation of the lessee who drills such well or wells to the United States as to such

new deposit shall be limited for a period of 10 years following the date of such discovery to a flat rate of 12½ percent in amount or value of all oil or gas produced from the lease.

"Approved, December 24, 1942 (Public Law 832, 77th Cong.)"

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is agreeable at this time, the Chair will administer the oath of office to Mr. Halsey, elected Secretary of the Senate.

Thereupon Mr. Edwin A. Halsey advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office was administered to him.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 56), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Edwin A. Halsey, of Virginia, as Secretary of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 57), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Edwin A. Halsey, of Virginia, as Secretary of the Senate.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM ON ANTHRACITE COAL STRIKE

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a short report from the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, on the anthracite coal strike, which is now going on in Pennsylvania.

Early in January a number of the members of the United Mine Workers engaged in mining anthracite coal in Pennsylvania went on strike. By Wednesday, January 6, the strike had reached serious proportions and by Saturday, January 9, almost half of the 40,000 miners in the anthracite field were on strike.

The strike was not authorized by the United Mine Workers, which had a contract with the anthracite mine operators which does not expire until April 30, 1943. The reason assigned by the strikers for leaving work was the action of the operators in deducting from wages dues at the rate of \$1.50 per month per man. The operators were compelled to make the deduction by their contract with the United Mine Workers.

The dues which have been charged by districts 1, 7, and 9, the three anthracite districts, had been \$1 per month per man, from which the international received 50 cents and the district and local union 25 cents each. The constitutional convention of the United Mine Workers, held October 6 to 14, 1942, amended the constitution so as to provide:

Sec. 12. The local dues to be paid by each member shall not be less than \$1.50 per month, together with such assessments as may be levied by the different branches of the organization.

This required the three anthracite districts and about one-half of the bituminous districts to raise their dues by 50 cents each. It was not necessary for some of the other bituminous districts, which were charging \$1.50 or more per month per man, to change their dues.

The reason for changing the constitution was to enable the international to receive 90 cents per month in dues from each man, instead of 50 cents as originally provided. The constitutional convention adopted the following provision:

SEC. 13. Every local union shall pay direct or cause to be paid to the international secretary-treasurer a per capita tax of 90 cents per month per member and such additional assessments as may be levied by an international convention or referendum vote of the members, payment of per capita tax to be based upon the amount of dues collected each month by the local union.

This change from 50 cents to 90 cents per month per man dues to be paid to the international did not cause an increase in its revenues because during the period from February to November of 1942 the international had been collecting in addition to the 50 cents dues per month per man an assessment of 50 cents per month per man or a total of \$1 per month per man. The assessment was collected pursuant to section 26 of the constitution, which provided that the board shall have power to levy and collect assessments when necessary, and the collection of the assessments was ratified by the constitutional convention.

The board referred to is the International Executive Board of the United Mine Workers of America, which consists of 1 representative for each of the 25 bituminous districts and the 3 anthracite districts. The power of that board to levy assessments was stricken by the constitutional convention.

The net result of these changes was that the international would receive 90 cents per month per man instead of \$1 per month per man, but would not be able to levy any further assessments unless the assessment was made by a constitutional convention or by a referendum of the membership.

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

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the able Senator from Missouri whether he has received any information concerning the amount of money now reserved in the treasury of the United Mine Workers of America.

Mr. TRUMAN. I have been informed that it is \$7,000,000.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the Senator been informed why, with a reserve fund on hand of approximately \$7,000,000, the dues of approximately 100,000 miners were increased during the past year, beginning with last February, to the extent that the yearly increase amounts to more than a half million dollars?

Mr. TRUMAN. I have no information on the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has there been any showing, so far as the inquiries of the able Senator from Missouri are concerned, which would indicate why such an enormous increase in revenues is essential during the war period?

Mr. TRUMAN. No such showing has been made, to my knowledge. I know of no such information available.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has there been any indication that the miners are contemplating a more serious strike?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes; there is a more serious strike in contemplation, with regard to which I shall speak a little later.

Mr. BREWSTER. Indicating that the anthracite workers may contemplate going on strike to demand an increase in wages in defiance of their existing contracts?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is possible.

Mr. BREWSTER. This action has been characterized by the majority leader in the other House, who is a gentleman who uses his words very carefully, as approaching treason. Without saying that such a characterization is justified, it is certainly to be remembered—and I have discussed this subject with the Senators from Pennsylvania, who are most vitally concerned—that as a result of the strike by the anthracite miners some years ago the users of anthracite in New England and other places began to learn how to get along without anthracite. Anthracite substitutes were found, and the consumption of anthracite declined. As we face the most critical winter in the history of New England we are now being told that there are substitutes for anthracite and we are being urged to use them. If there is no other recourse we shall be forced to use Yankee ingenuity and invention to discover ways in which we may use means other than anthracite to solve our problems.

I hope that the gentlemen concerned with the promotion of the agitation referred to will realize the terrific injury they may be doing to their industry by precipitating this issue at the present time.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the situation with respect to anthracite has been tight throughout the year because of the difficulty in obtaining labor in the anthracite mines and because of the inability of the operators in the mines to do the necessary exploitation work to open up new faces for additional mining.

Anthracite is principally used for domestic heating at home, particularly in New England, and for space heating of offices, apartment houses, theaters, school houses, and the like.

Many anthracite dealers were not successful in obtaining the quantities of anthracite they would like to have had, because of the great demand for anthracite and the relative scarcity, and some of them now have no anthracite in their yards at all. Consequently, the loss to date of several hundred thousand tons of anthracite production has had a serious effect, and the continuation of the strike would have a most serious effect, especially in northern New York and in New England. This is true even though Mr. J. Elmer Thomas and Mr. Howard Gray, Deputy Administrators of Solid Fuels, have informed the committee that there is a relatively free supply of bituminous coal. Some of the grates used for home heating, and some of the stoker

equipment used for space heating, are so designed that it would be difficult or impossible to use bituminous coal as a substitute for anthracite. Also, many of the dealers, particularly in New England, are not dealers in bituminous coal and cannot easily obtain supplies of bituminous coal. However, the committee is informed that the Deputy Administrators of Solid Fuels are using every effort to see to it that supplies of bituminous coal are rushed to the areas where the need is great.

The committee has kept closely advised of the facts with respect to the anthracite strike almost since its inception, and has discussed the facts with respect to it with Mr. Harold Ickes, the Administrator of Solid Fuels; Mr. J. Elmer Thomas and Mr. Howard Gray, Deputy Administrators; Mr. John R. Steelman, Mr. H. Ross Colwell, and Mr. Frank J. Sheehan, of the Labor Department; Mr. Thomas Kennedy, secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers; and Mr. John L. Lewis.

Representatives of the Labor Department and the War Department attended a meeting at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on Saturday, January 9, at which representatives of the locals on strike were informed that if the strike continued there would be widespread suffering due to the inability to obtain anthracite with which to supply heat to homes, Army camps, and other essential installations dependent thereon. At that meeting demands were made by some of the representatives of the locals there present that Mr. John L. Lewis personally come to the anthracite field and promise, first, to take action to decrease the dues; and, second, to start active negotiations for an increase of \$2 a day in the wage rate, despite the fact that the contract with the operators does not expire until April 30, 1943. Threats were expressed at the meeting that unless these demands could be met production would be stopped in all anthracite mines by January 15. That threat still exists.

On Monday, January 11, the committee sent the following telegram to Mr. John L. Lewis as president of the United Mine Workers and to the presidents of the various locals in the three anthracite districts which are on strike:

The Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program is informed by United States Government officials that suspension of anthracite-mine operations has created a critical situation for homes and Army camps dependent on anthracite for heat. The committee urges all mine workers to return to work at once and arrange for conferences to settle differences within the union at the earliest possible date, at the same time patriotically supporting the war effort by seeing that the flow of anthracite coal is not stopped by internal differences within the union. Anthracite production must be maintained and increased. The Nation expects and demands that this coal be produced.

That telegram was signed by me as chairman of the Special Committee of the United States Senate Investigating the National Defense Program.

Mr. Lewis and Mr. Kennedy proceeded to New York on Monday, January 11, and attended a meeting of the so-called

Committee of Twelve, which consists of six representatives of the anthracite operators and six representatives of the United Mine Workers. This committee's telegram was read by Mr. Lewis to the Committee of Twelve, which thereafter sent telegrams to the locals which were on strike, directing that work be resumed. On Monday, January 11, the Labor Department notified the War Labor Board of the seriousness of the situation, and the War Labor Board also sent telegrams to the locals urging the men to return to work.

On Tuesday, January 12, this committee was informed by representatives of the United Mine Workers that the number of men on strike had been reduced to 10,350, and that there were signs which indicated that the strike might end. Representatives of the Labor Department stated that they thought that the telegram sent by this committee had a salutary effect.

After reviewing these facts the committee met in executive session on Tuesday, January 12, reviewed the above facts, and adjourned 1 day in order to wait for action by the miners in view of the telegrams.

On Wednesday, January 13, this committee was further informed by representatives of the United Mine Workers that the number of men on strike had been further reduced to 9,350, that meetings of the locals would be held later that day to vote on a return to work, and that it was believed by these representatives that most of the locals whose men were on strike would vote to return to work.

However, at the special meetings of the locals 10 of the 16 locals involved voted to continue the strike, 2 voted to return to work, 2 had not held meetings, and reports of action were not received from the remaining 2. According to the latest report received by this committee this morning from representatives of the United Mine Workers, approximately 9,000 men still remain on strike.

I am now informed by 2 authorities that 40,000 men are engaged in mining anthracite coal, and I am informed by the United Mine Workers that 100,000 men are engaged in anthracite coal mining, and that 85,000 of the men are at work. I do not know which figures are correct. We are going to find out before we get through.

The amount of the dues to be collected is so slight that it is doubtful whether that was in fact the cause of the strike. That it was not is indicated by the demands that have been made for an increase of \$2 a day in the wages to be paid. If the true cause of the strike should be the desire to obtain an increase in wages, it would involve an attempt to force by unauthorized strikes an amendment in the agreement between the anthracite operators and the United Mine Workers of America prior to its expiration on April 30, 1943. To grant such a request would destroy not only the validity of the agreement entered into voluntarily by the United Mine Workers but also would create a differential between the miners of anthracite and the miners of bituminous which might result in unauthorized but widespread strikes among miners of bituminous coal. Such

a strike would be most serious, as the production of bituminous is roughly ten times that of anthracite, and both are required for heat during this unusually severe winter, in which we have had to restrict the use of fuel oil for heating.

The committee has called a special executive session for 4 o'clock this afternoon, at which are to be present representatives of the United Mine Workers, the War Labor Board, and the Fuel Administrator, and I hope that we can arrive at some conclusion that will obtain a result—which is coal. We are trying to get coal.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The suggestion which the Senator made, that the 50-cent assessment could not be solely responsible for the strike, seems to be indicated by the fact that every one of the men on strike during the past 10 days has already sacrificed approximately \$75 to prevent what would appear to be an imposition by an assessment of 50 cents a month. Unless some profound issue of taxation without representation is involved, that would not seem to reconcile itself with common sense; but I gather that there is confusion of authority within the union, exactly as we have found confusion of authority within the agencies in Washington concerned with the Government as to the methods which should be pursued to end this difficulty.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator; what he says is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a remark?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to point out to the Senator, if the matter has not already been called to his attention, that 2 days ago the mayor of Boston, Mr. Tobin, was in Washington testifying before the Oil Shortage Committee, and he pointed out the relationship of the strike to the oil shortage situation, by saying that he already had under way the conversion of a number of public buildings to the use of anthracite coal, but because of the strike he had ordered those conversions to stop, and therefore he was left in the position of being unable to meet a situation which otherwise would have been met. Of course, that condition will spread rapidly from the city of Boston to other places if the strike continues longer.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion which has just taken place, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Work or Fight," appearing today in the Philadelphia Record.

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

WORK OR FIGHT

The strike of 20,000 anthracite miners is going into its sixteenth day.

It is a strike in violation of the non-strike pledge given to President Roosevelt

by John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, and 11 other national representatives of labor in December 1941.

It is a strike in violation of a contract between the union and the mine operators.

It is a strike against the war, over the comparatively trivial issue of an increase of 50 cents a month union dues and a sudden demand for a \$2-a-day pay increase while the contract has more than 3 months to run.

Yesterday, by a tremendous majority, 10 of the largest locals in the anthracite field rejected the ultimatum of the War Labor Board to return to work.

Unless the miners are back in the pits within 24 hours the United States Government should crack down and crack down hard. The War Labor Board must make good.

The Board has declared that stock piles of anthracite are "at a critically low level and endangering the health of our people and the prosecution of the war."

That statement alone should be enough to make any miner forget his hatred of John L. Lewis and his grudge against the operators and go back to work.

If they fail to return to work, they are hindering the war just as much as a draft dodger, or a mutineer in the Army.

They are stopping production just as completely as if the mines had been dynamited by saboteurs put ashore from a German submarine.

The United States dare not countenance sabotage either by German agents or irresponsible strikers.

The Federal Government should tell the able-bodied men who have been given occupational deferments from the draft:

"Dig coal or fight."

As for the others, the Government has several alternatives. It could, as the RECORD has suggested previously, form special labor battalions at Army pay for outlaw strikers, such as these, who obey neither their own union nor their own Government.

Or it could take the mines over with full protection for the owners (who have not broken contracts or defied the War Labor Board) and put the Army in charge.

Maybe, as Lewis said in 1941, at the time of the captive coal strike, "you can't dig coal with bayonets," but they can make the miners wish they were digging coal.

There is no doubt the miners have grievances. They are sore at Lewis, who, so far, has done nothing to end the strike except to write a letter to the strikers. Federal Conciliator Thomas Lambert has been trying to arrange a meeting with Lewis but hasn't even received a reply.

And they want more money because the owners have been given an increase by the Office of Price Administration.

But any grievances they have can be taken up with the War Labor Board, after they go back to digging coal.

Uncle Sam must get tough. Continuance of this strike will mean cheers in Berlin and Tokyo, and groans in North Africa.

Mr. MAYBANK. I concur in what the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] has said. Not only are the miners doing themselves a great deal of harm; but in South Carolina and other sections of the South strikes in wartime are not the least bit appreciated but are bitterly resented.

NOMINATION OF EDWARD J. FLYNN TO BE MINISTER TO AUSTRALIA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is my observation in looking about the Chamber today that the stench of the Flynn appointment has become so nauseating to the majority Members of the Senate that when it was known quite generally that the Senator from New Hampshire would make further remarks

regarding Mr. Flynn a great majority of them "beat it" to the cloak rooms. Mr. President, I have on my desk a paving block, one of the stolen paving blocks from which "Paving Block" Flynn secured his name. It was brought to me by a group of civic-minded citizens of New York City. I hope it will represent Flynn's political tombstone, because in my judgment it will be a fitting tombstone, politically, for him. I am glad that at least some open-minded gentlemen on the majority side are present in the Chamber at this time. My compliments to them.

The purpose of my remarks is to focus the attention of the people of America and the Members of the Senate upon the most despicable appointment yet made by the President of the United States. In every city and town and at every crossroads in the country people are alarmed and concerned over the appointment and what it typifies. I know this because from practically every State of the Union I have received letters or communications opposing the Flynn appointment. The people are concerned because in every city and town and at every crossroads in America are people who have sons, daughters, brothers, and husbands in the armed services, and tens of thousands of them are in Australia today.

I am glad that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is now entering the Chamber. I hope he will come over to my desk and examine the paving block which I have before me, one of the stolen paving blocks from New York City, so that he can look it over and perhaps study it and give it some thought before his committee meets.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations is prepared, whenever the committee meets, to perform his duty, whatever he may feel that is.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. CONNALLY. But at the moment I regret that I cannot follow the Senator from New Hampshire around through the newspapers. I cannot be with him constantly in advance of the committee hearings and in advance of the testimony.

Mr. BRIDGES. All I ask is that the Senator do his duty as chairman of the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the chairman of the committee certainly will wait until he hears some of the testimony, instead of reading speeches in the newspapers. A committee cannot very well be guided by newspaper enthusiasm or by oratorical breast-beating.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator will first provide public hearings and then will be guided by the testimony offered, he will have no other course than to come before the Senate and advocate the rejection of the nomination of Edward Flynn.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. I had not wanted to interrupt the Senator. I merely came in to listen, not to take part in the controversy. I am glad to inform the Senator now that the Committee on Foreign

Relations expects to meet tomorrow at 10:30 a. m. The Senator will be welcome, and I am sure the committee will receive whatever charges he cares to file. After we receive them we shall try to give them proper attention.

For 2 or 3 days I have been looking for the new front; we have heard much said about opening a new front. It is here; it is the Flynn front. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, following my remarks in the Senate in opposition to "Paving Block" Flynn, representative New York citizens came to my office with certain evidence regarding "Paving Block" Flynn's unfitness for any diplomatic post. After reviewing that evidence, I announced yesterday afternoon that today in the Senate I would present certain charges. These charges are sufficiently serious and sufficiently supported by the testimony of representative citizens, documentary evidence, and affidavits to warrant a thorough investigation by the Foreign Relations Committee at a public hearing.

First, I charge that Edward J. Flynn, through the law firm of Goldwater & Flynn, represented a Mr. Serge Rubinstein, who at the time of his retainer with Flynn had large Japanese interests, and that this Mr. Rubinstein was closely associated with one Guiji Kassai, who was a registered agent of the Japanese Government and was in this country until 2 weeks before Pearl Harbor. Mr. Rubinstein also presented a gift of money to the Japanese Government at a time when our relations with Japan were clearly strained. The story of the Flynn-Rubinstein combination is one of international import that has a direct bearing on anyone who represents us in this international crisis in which we are involved in war with Japan.

Second, I charge that Edward J. Flynn, as chamberlain of the city of New York, invested public funds in the State Title & Mortgage Co., causing the city to lose over a million dollars. Flynn's law firm subsequently became general counsel to this company; and his law partner, Mr. Monroe Goldwater, served as a director. Adolph Berle, now Assistant Secretary of State, who succeeded Flynn as chamberlain, pointed out that the State Title & Mortgage Co. had received more business from the city than any other similar company during Flynn's incumbency, and denounced Flynn's administration as chamberlain. This is the same Berle who is potentially Mr. Flynn's superior officer in the Department of State, and who will be if his nomination is confirmed.

Third, I charge that Edward J. Flynn appointed Dutch Schultz, noted criminal and murderer, a deputy sheriff when Flynn was sheriff of Bronx County. Schultz was appointed by Flynn just a few months after Flynn took office, and Schultz served the full tenure of Flynn's incumbency as sheriff, even though he was a known criminal and a fugitive from justice from many States. It is evident to me that a person who selects as his deputy a man of Dutch Schultz's character is certainly unfit to hold a diplomatic post in our foreign service.

Fourth, I charge that the grand jury investigation of the paving-block scandal

was conducted by a political stooge of Flynn's and was improperly handled, to the disgust of at least one member of the grand jury, who will appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, if given an opportunity, to tell why Flynn was exonerated; and I further charge that the foreman of the jury, Mr. Daniel Daly, received a Federal appointment about 2 months after the Flynn whitewash, and is now employed by a Federal department in New York City.

Reputable citizens are prepared to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee to present evidence and proof of each of these charges. It is neither my duty nor my intention to explore in detail these charges here today. That is the duty of the Foreign Relations Committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. That committee can and should subpoena witnesses; it can and should publicly and thoroughly explore for the Senate and the American people the fitness of "Paving Block" Flynn for the high diplomatic post to which he has been appointed. I cannot conceive of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate dodging that responsibility. Having seen much of the evidence American citizens have to offer, I fail to understand how any Member of the United States Senate can conscientiously vote for the confirmation of the nomination of "Paving Block" Flynn. I hope that in the Chamber today the Senator from Texas may not only assure us that the matter will be taken care of, as he has said, but that he will have full public hearings to which the public will be invited to come and at which those in opposition to the Flynn appointment may suggest to the committee the subpoenaing of various citizens. I may say that among those who I hope will be summoned will be Sidney Baron, secretary of the committee to reopen the Flynn case; Mr. Paul Kern, former chairman of the civil service commission of New York City, who was thrown out of his position as the result of Flynn's activities; the chairman of the grand jury, who now has a lucrative Federal position in New York City; a member of the grand jury who made a statement after it was all over as to unethical practices; Mayor LaGuardia, who in times past has expressed himself relative to Mr. Flynn; Cordell Hull, the able Secretary of State; Sumner Welles, his able assistant; Adolf Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, who, in the past, has condemned Mr. Flynn. Then I want to see J. Edgar Hoover, or a representative of the F. B. I., invited to tell the committee what they know of Mr. Rubinstein. I think it will be found they know something of Mr. Rubinstein and some of his associates. I should like to have summoned a representative of the Naturalization Bureau, which, I understand, is investigating this man's entry into this country.

Now, I desire to speak of one other angle to this case and that is the obligation of the Senate and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to protect Australia in this matter.

Australia is in a difficult situation today. Australia as a nation is a partner

of the United States in a great war; Australia is today receiving hundreds of millions of dollars of lend-lease military equipment, supplies, and food; there are tens of thousands of American boys over there offering up their lives for the protection of Australia. The people of Australia and the Government of Australia know that their future life depends upon the action of this Government and of this administration. So they are a little restrained perhaps about making a protest against Mr. Flynn's appointment. Therefore, we have the double duty of protecting from such a man a government and a people with whom we are associated in a great war.

I think Mr. Flynn's appointment is one of the most glaring examples of the necessity of confirmation by the Senate of Presidential appointments for diplomatic posts. I have already been told by members of the majority party on the other side of the aisle that if they vote for Mr. Flynn they will have "to hold their noses" to do it; that the stench has become so great that they are almost nauseated by it. I also realize that "Paving Block" Flynn is chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and that fact causes them some embarrassment; but I assure you, Mr. President, they will be doing a great service to the country and to their own party if they rid the country and their party of the incubus of Mr. Flynn.

Mr. President, I have before me various interesting articles and editorials which I desire to have printed in the RECORD. For instance, I have an editorial from the Chicago Sun. As is well known, the idea of that newspaper was hatched in the White House. It is published by Marshall Field and his associates, and is solidly behind the President and his general program. Yet the Chicago Sun, in an editorial entitled "Rebuild the Foreign Service," opposes the appointment of Mr. Flynn.

I have an editorial from the Chicago Daily News opposing the selection of Mr. Flynn. I have also an editorial from the Boston Herald entitled "A Smelly Choice." I also have an editorial from the Daily Mirror of New York.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.
Mr. BREWSTER. I shall not presume to prejudice this situation or to give counsel to the Committee on Foreign Relations as to their duty in the premises; but I assume that the Senator from New Hampshire, in his emphasis upon the disqualifications of Mr. Flynn for the post, does not mean to preclude the far broader field than the question of whether he has been guilty of any or all the charges which the Senator from New Hampshire and others have leveled against him. I refer to the far more serious question, even if he should be found not guilty of these charges beyond a reasonable doubt, of in what particular way he is affirmatively qualified for the enormously responsible and delicate position of Minister to Australia and roving ambassador in the

southwest Pacific at this time when thousands of American boys are offering up their lives, when General MacArthur is carrying one of the greatest responsibilities that have rested upon a military authority in the history of our country, and when even the great Dominion of Australia is faced with an extremely delicate situation internally to which our Minister must necessarily address himself in serving the welfare of our country and our armed forces and serving also the great cause of humanity to which America has dedicated its resources. I hope that no emphasis upon Mr. Flynn's past difficulties will blind us to that far greater question which it seems to me the Senate must necessarily determine.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may answer the Senator by saying that it is most important to send a man of outstanding ability, with untarnished reputation, to represent us in Australia at this time.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not mean to minimize in any way or disagree with the importance of what the Senator from New Hampshire is saying as to the necessity certainly of removing doubts along those lines, but I think that, having passed through that zone, if the Committee on Foreign Relations should simply determine that it has not been demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt that Flynn was guilty of any or all the crimes or misdemeanors with which he has been charged that still would be a very long way from determining that he was, therefore, qualified for the tremendously responsible post for which he has been nominated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say, in answer to the Senator, that when I mention the Japanese connection I am not questioning Mr. Flynn's patriotism. I am saying that any man who has had the connections that Flynn has had with Rubinstein, who, in turn, was associated with an agent of the Japanese Government, certainly will not have my confidence nor do I believe he will have the confidence of the American people in representing us in Australia and in the southwest Pacific; nor do I believe he will have the confidence of the Australian people or the Australian Government, no matter what they may say through expediency.

Mr. President, before the interruption, I was asking that certain editorials be printed in the Record. In addition to those already mentioned, I now ask to have inserted in the Record an editorial from the Daily Mirror of New York entitled "The Aussies Know All About Flynn"; an editorial from the Washington News entitled "Something Good For Ed"; an editorial from the New York Sun entitled "What a Price to Pay"; an article from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Chicago Daily News Hits Flynn"; an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Totally Unqualified"; from the Baltimore Sun an editorial under the title "Mr. Paving-Blocks Flynn as Diplomatic Material"; from the New York Times an editorial entitled "Mr. Flynn in the Wrong Place"; another editorial from the New York Herald Tribune under the headline "An Unmitigated Insult"; an editorial from

the New York Sun under the title "Put an End to This Stench"; an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror under the head "More Than Just Paving Blocks"; an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Dear Eddie." I present next an article by Frank Kent, one by David Lawrence, one by Mark Sullivan, one by Gould Lincoln, and one by Raymond Clapper.

All these go to the heart and root of the Flynn appointment, and are of interest and vital concern to every American. I ask that these be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun of January 13, 1943]

REBUILD THE FOREIGN SERVICE

For reasons previously set forth, we hope the Senate will reject the President's nomination of Edward J. Flynn as minister to Australia. Today we submit a more fundamental proposal: The controversy over the nomination of this party boss should inspire a general overhauling and strengthening of our top diplomatic representation.

The principle behind the Flynn appointment is hoary. All too often, over the generations, our ambassadors and ministers have been appointed in payment of political debt. Since salaries fall far short of meeting expenses in many embassies and legations, it is a convenient old custom to appoint rich campaign contributors.

That, of course, is not the only system. The Presidents repeatedly have picked from private life men without riches or special political claims, on the basis of talents deemed especially useful. And career diplomats have become ministers and ambassadors. Some of these have been very able. Yet, unless endowed with exceptional backbones or private fortunes, the careerists are handicapped. When duty bids them to tell the State Department that its policies are wrong, duty is all too likely to run counter to self-interest in protecting a future career. Nor is service under the State Department the best of training in what most of us mean by American democracy.

The fact is that, with exceptions, our ministers and ambassadors are not up to their jobs. We cite, for example, the careerist, Clarence E. Gauss, Ambassador to China. It is an open secret that he is the man of whom Mr. Willkie spoke when he said that despite 20 years in the country of his assignment, a certain diplomat had not troubled to learn the language of the people to whom he was accredited. Mr. Gauss has ability. If China were a colony he doubtless would be a satisfactory high commissioner. As Ambassador to our most valued ally in Asia he should be replaced forthwith.

In Russia our Ambassador is Admiral Standley. His talents have been a great boon to the Navy. He has tackled his job in Moscow with characteristic devotion. But for that diplomatic mission of incalculable import for teamwork to produce victory and a lasting peace, a younger, more vigorous American, whom the Russians would recognize as one of our outstanding and independent leaders, ought to be selected.

How can we secure ambassadors and ministers able to do justice to their jobs? Two steps are needed; Congress should provide remuneration sufficient to permit men, irrespective of private fortune, to represent America in dignity. And the President should bury at once the time-honored practice of making diplomatic appointments po-

litical plums or rewards for careerists who fall short of the mark.

Time was when our foreign affairs demanded little more from top diplomats than protocol. Today the needs of teamwork in a coalition war, and peace through unprecedented cooperation after the war, make it imperative to rebuild the foreign service.

[From the Boston Herald of January 12, 1943]

A SMELLY CHOICE

A man who has been closely identified with Tammany politics all his life and whose acts while holding political office were investigated by a grand jury is hardly the proper man to serve as our Minister to Australia. That will be a key post from now on. It calls for the selection of somebody who is eminently fitted for it by experience and otherwise, about whose qualifications there cannot be the slightest doubt.

Edward J. Flynn, who himself announced the appointment in advance of the formal nomination by the President yesterday, was unknown to most persons outside of New York until his appointment as Chairman of the Democratic National Committee first brought him to general attention. People heard little else about him until a grand jury investigated the alleged misuse by him of city-owned material. No true bill was returned, but the incident left a bad odor which still persists and will cling to him if the Senate should so insult the public as to confirm the nomination.

It doesn't make much difference whether the President named Mr. Flynn in order to make room for another, more acceptable chairman of the Democratic National Committee or to reward him for political services rendered to the party, or for both purposes. He is simply not the sort of man in whom the American people take pride. Surely this is no time for the playing or even the appearance of the playing of politics in the old, old way, for the discharging political debts at the expense of the Nation.

Wendell Willkie's comment yesterday that the selection is, "so crassly cynical that it must be revolting to all decent citizens" probably expressed the view of most persons. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations owes it to the people to investigate Mr. Flynn's career thoroughly before voting on the subject. Acts which did not justify an indictment might very well be ample ground for rejecting a man who is to speak abroad for his country.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of January 11, 1943]

THE AUSSIES KNOW ALL ABOUT PAVING

It won't work, Mr. Flynn. You say the President says he's going to appoint you, and you expect the Senate to confirm the appointment, and you may indeed get the job. But it won't work. We'll tell you why.

Next door to the office in which this column is written, there is the small, neat office of the Sydney Daily Mirror and the Australasian Truth, over which presides a pert and pretty Australian, Miss Betty Riddell, who is that rare thing among women: she is a "news-paperman."

That is, she is a good reporter who knows a story when she smells one.

She knew it was a story "down her alley" Friday, when you announced that the President was making you his "Ambassador" (capital A) and personal representative to Australia, and would send your nomination to the Senate Monday as Minister Plenipotentiary.

IN SEARCH OF BIOGRAPHY

So she came into our office and asked us if we could help her get some background material on this Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, chair-

man of the Executive Committee of the Bronx County (Democratic) Committee.

We are always anxious to cement inter-Ally solidarity, so we loaned her our copy of "Current Biography" for the year 1940, in which the story of your life appears.

"But," said Miss Riddell, "this is only up to 1940, and it will not include the story about the paving blocks."

So we gave this Australian correspondent access to our "morgue," the casual term for a newspaper's library and files, in which, as in St. Peter's book, the record of big and little people, the great, near-great, and merely notorious is kept.

Now, it is a long way from Lake Mahopac to Sydney, Australia, Mr. Flynn, but soon the story of your life was speeding there by cable—at 14 cents per word. The story was complete, accurate, and fair, for it included the fact that a Bronx grand jury cleared you of any wrongdoing in the use of city-owned paving blocks to cobble the Belgian courtyard of your country estate.

But, you see, the story of the paving blocks was read way down under, and people in Sydney, Canberra, Port Darwin, Brisbane, etc., are wondering about it.

You can't stop people from wondering, either there or here.

We can imagine that people in Australia are wondering why a Minister Plenipotentiary to that great, friendly, and strategically vital country should not be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion.

Of course, when and if you step off a plane or destroyer in Australia, the people there will treat you with full hospitality, but you will know they are thinking:

"That's the paving-block chap. He was a big politician in the States. Had a lot of diplomatic experience in helping Roosevelt get elected to the third term."

And a lot of people will wonder in this country, too, particularly in view of the President's plea to Congress the other day for a moratorium on politics for the duration.

Your appointment, if it is an appointment, will seem to have a political color.

It will seem of the same stamp as the appointment of other repudiated or defeated New Deal Democrats to high official posts.

[From the Washington News of January 12, 1943]

SOMETHING GOOD FOR ED

President Roosevelt serenely ignored the storm of public protest aroused by his shameless abuse of wartime diplomacy to provide a pay-off for his political henchman, Democratic National Chairman Edward J. Flynn. The President has not only sent the nomination to the Senate but also, in a personal letter to "Dear Eddie," he expatiated on the high honors in store for him, not alone as Minister to Australia but as Mr. Roosevelt's "personal representative with the rank of Ambassador" in a "very large area of the Southwest Pacific."

All this for a man whose diplomatic experience has never been broader than that of a party ward heeler and vote getter, who has earned his party's promotion only by his political activities as a party boss, and whose political reputation has been clouded by scandal.

We are reminded of the easygoing attitude of Bronx County Judge Lester Patterson, who presided at the proceedings of the grand jury that whitewashed Flynn in the affair of the city-owned paving blocks. After the whitewash Judge Patterson, informally discussing what he called the "Flynn gesture" of Robert L. Moran, then Bronx Works Commissioner, said:

"That's all Bob Moran was doing when he sent Flynn those paving blocks. He wanted Ed to have something good."

LXXXIX—11

Now it's the President of the United States who wants Ed to have something good. And to see that Ed gets it the President is ready to flout diplomatic standards, affront Australia in a critical wartime situation, and send Ed roving over the Southwest Pacific on a high-titled difficult job that he has never done one thing to merit.

Playing politics with war diplomacy and war needs is both disgraceful and dangerous. The Senate should block the Flynn appointment. Our wartime diplomatic relations with Australia should not be degraded merely to produce something good for Ed.

[From the New York Sun of January 12, 1943]

WHAT A PRICE TO PAY!

A diplomatic envoy ought to enjoy the confidence of the people whom he represents and the respect of the government to which he is assigned. In peacetime he should know the history of the place to which he is sent. In wartime he ought to know the part which that place is taking in the conflict. It is plain that Edward J. Flynn, nominated by President Roosevelt to be American Minister to Australia and "my personal representative, with the rank of Ambassador," does not qualify on any of the points named.

This is not the first time that a President has paid a political debt with a diplomatic appointment. Usually, however, no actual harm has come of it, the appointee having capable subordinates to carry on for him. But we do not recall a political appointee who went abroad with such a load of discredit as the paving block scandal has attached to Mr. Flynn. It is useless for him to plead that the scandal was instigated by "a discredited public servant," meaning Mr. Kern. Commissioner Herlands, who is still in office, went over the same ground and with almost the same results.

No Democratic Senator can vote to ratify this nomination unless he accepts the idea that Mr. Flynn must be richly compensated for relinquishing the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee. But what a price it is to pay!

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 14, 1943]

CHICAGO DAILY NEWS HITS FLYNN

CHICAGO, January 13.—The Chicago Daily News, of which Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, is the owner, urged editorially today that the Senate refuse to ratify the appointment of Edward J. Flynn as special envoy to Australia.

The editorial, headed "A step backward," noted that it is vital to appoint as representatives abroad in wartime "the very best qualified men that can be found," and added: "In the career of Edward J. Flynn we can find nothing, absolutely nothing, to warrant the appointment."

"He is not a diplomat. He has had no foreign experience. He has had no military experience. He has no particular familiarity with Australia or with the problems of the Pacific," the editorial continued.

"For years our Consular and Diplomatic Service suffered under the practice of using it as a dumping ground for political 'lame ducks' and job seekers. This practice is supposed to have been officially ended some 20 years ago. To revert to it at any time would be a step backward. To revert to it now is inexcusable."

Reviewing Mr. Flynn's activities as a "Tammany politician" in New York, the News said: "He has been involved in the usual number of public scandals that seem to go with Democratic pay-roll careers in the life of our great sister State in the East."

When he was appointed Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox placed control of the newspaper in the hands of a committee of editors.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 12, 1943]

TOTALLY UNQUALIFIED

It is true. In the silence that fell upon the White House on the heels of Edward J. Flynn's announcement of his own appointment as diplomatic Lord High Everything Else to the southwest Pacific, it was still possible to hold to some faint hope that Mr. Flynn had made an inexplicable error; that he was trying to force the President's hand or that the President would belatedly recognize the impossibility of giving Mr. Flynn a diplomatic post. It was particularly difficult to believe in the reality of the Flynn appointment in the atmosphere of high purpose created by the President's stirring report on the state of the Nation. But now the appointment is official; Mr. Roosevelt really has appointed the Democratic national chairman as Minister to Australia, naming him, in addition, "my personal representative with the rank of ambassador."

The United States has sent some odd figures to represent the Nation in foreign capitals. The use of diplomatic office to pay political debts has often placed square pegs in round holes—sent men of ability in their own lines to flounder helplessly in the intricacies of international affairs or to write their personal prejudices into the record of American diplomacy. The American foreign service, in the noncareer positions, at any rate, has been a sort of grab bag with numerous shining successes, many miserable failures, along with a fair proportion of comfortable mediocrities. But certain standards of achievement were required of candidates for diplomatic office. Mr. Flynn does not meet them. He represents nothing but politics in the narrowest sense—quite apart from the affair of the paving blocks, in which, as everyone knows, he was declared free from stain by grand-jury action.

It is now up to the Senate to reject Mr. Flynn. This is not a party matter, although some Democrats appear to view it in that light. It is a question of the dignity of the United States, at a time when that dignity must be upheld with especial care. It involves a diplomatic task of exceptional delicacy, intimately concerned with the winning of the war. Mr. Flynn is totally unqualified. The Senate must say so in unmistakable terms.

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 12, 1943]

MR. PAVING-BLOCKS FLYNN AS DIPLOMATIC MATERIAL

Good performance in office is a normal qualification for advancement to higher office. It is difficult to recall, in recent history, a case in which a President has, instead, named to high diplomatic office anyone who has been so notorious a misfit even in low office as to require his relinquishment of that low office.

This unhappy precedent President Roosevelt has now established in nominating Eddie Flynn, boss of the Bronx and, briefly, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, as United States Minister to Australia and "personal representative with the rank of Ambassador." Of all the personal favors at Government expense which the President has bestowed, this is probably the most completely cynical. Flynn is to succeed Mr. Nelson Johnson, one of the best of our career diplomats, who had 34 years of Foreign Service experience before going to Australia. It is difficult to recall in Mr. Flynn's experience any foreign relationship save that with Belgian paving blocks.

Such skillful and intelligent professionals as Mr. Johnson and Mr. Joseph C. Grew, admirably qualified by character, training, and experience in Far East affairs, have been of

incalculable aid to Secretary Hull during this past critical year. To have such men succeeded by a politician whose presence as national committee chairman had embarrassed even the Democratic Party, and in a year which is more rather than less critical, is to unload on an overworked State Department an appalling burden.

The United States Senate's custom is to gag on inept appointments, but finally to swallow them, on the comfortable theory that it is better to embarrass the Nation than to irritate the President. In this instance it would be a silly custom. The Senate would help itself and the country—and, in final analysis, the President himself—by rejecting this clownish appointment and reminding the President that the needs of a nation are more important than personal friendships.

[From the New York Times of January 12, 1943]

MR. FLYNN IN THE WRONG PLACE

The relationships between a President and his Ambassadors and Ministers are necessarily and properly so personal and so confidential that the Senate is seldom justified in withholding its approval of any candidate for diplomatic office. We believe that the case is different when a candidate is as poorly fitted for a post as is Mr. Edward J. Flynn to be Minister to Australia, and when the results of confirmation of his appointment, both at home and abroad, would be uniformly bad.

Mr. Flynn is a county boss, elevated to the post of Democratic national chairman, who has become a political liability to his party because the public is angry about the celebrated case of the Belgian paving blocks. Mr. Flynn's field is the Bronx. There is no reason to believe that he has more than the most perfunctory knowledge of Australia. He has certainly not had the slightest experience as an international diplomat. The extent of his natural talent for "diplomacy" is accurately measured by his haste in beating the White House to the gun in announcing the news of his own appointment.

To send Mr. Flynn to Australia at this critical stage of the war, when we cannot send the supplies for which our friends are begging, would be equivalent to confirming the suspicions of the Chinese, as well as the Australians, that we do indeed regard the Pacific front as of second-rate importance. On our own home front the concurrence of the Senate in this action would strengthen the cynical belief that Mr. Flynn has been promoted to the high councils of the United Nations and the planning of the better post-war world in order to relieve the Democratic Party of the political embarrassment of having him continue as national chairman.

Any dispute between the President and the Senate is deeply unfortunate in wartime. But the President has made the issue here, and it would be better to risk a dispute than to suggest to our Pacific allies that there has been no public protest in this country against Mr. Flynn's appointment.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 9, 1943]

AN UNMITIGATED INSULT

The appointment of Mr. Edward J. Flynn as Minister Plenipotentiary to Australia (with some sort of unorthodox roving commission) is an insult to the people of the United States—whom he is supposed to represent—and to the people of Australia. There is a real need now for an American of high standing, able and sympathetic, to serve his country in Canberra. The Australians are alarmed about the military and naval effort which the United States is putting forth in the southwest Pacific; they are sensitive concerning what they feel is an in-

sufficient appreciation of their plight. It has been suggested that Prime Minister Curtin make a personal trip to Washington to present the point of view of the Commonwealth. All of this suggests poor liaison between this country and its Pacific partner.

To restore the situation the President proposes to send a very ordinary politician with extraordinary hard luck, to say the least, in the matter of certain paving stones. One can only assume, with charity, that the President postponed the nomination of Mr. Flynn until a new Congress took office, which, he has reason to expect, will be less amenable to Presidential suggestion. But, even if the Senate rejects Mr. Flynn, as it is that body's obvious duty to do, the President must still bear the onus of having made one of the worst appointments in a career which includes many bad appointments.

[From the New York Sun of January 11, 1943]

PUT AN END TO THIS STENCH

Most Americans acquainted with the paving-block scandal comforted themselves over the week end with the suspicion that Edward J. Flynn was suffering from a delusion when he announced that President Roosevelt would nominate him for Ambassador or Minister to Australia. Theirs, not Flynn's, was the delusion, for the President has done exactly what Mr. Flynn said he would do.

So the unbelievable thing becomes the fact. If the Senate gives its consent to this shocking appointment the great South Sea dominion of the British Empire will be asked to accept the New Deal boss of the Bronx as the representative of the United States.

The situation would be unpleasant enough in time of peace. It is created at a time when Australia looms as the center of our Pacific operations in the war on Japan. It is a shameless and shameful situation. The Senate should end it before the stench rises further.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of January 13, 1943]

MORE THAN JUST PAVING BLOCKS

The Flynn appointment goes deeper than the paving blocks. It goes deeper than the obvious inadequacy of Edward J. Flynn, the Bronx politico, to hold a diplomatic post that is currently one of the most important within the giving of this country.

The appointment, yet subject to Senate confirmation, seems to us to highlight two grave weaknesses—the one a personal weakness of the President's, the other a weakness of his war administration.

The first, the President's personal shortcoming, is his proclivity for appointing weak persons to high posts for no other apparent reason than that they are his personal satraps.

This weakness has given us a Secretary of Labor who is not and never was a Secretary of Labor, but who has been maintained in Cabinet rank despite the fact that her duties and responsibilities have had to be taken from her and placed in the hands of a succession of boards and other agencies.

This weakness has supported a Secretary of the Treasury whose administration has been marked by the employment of taxation as a weapon of class warfare; a Secretary so distrusted at the Capitol that the Seventy-seventh Congress, by statute, gave itself the power to go over his head in the search for fiscal information.

This weakness has nurtured the Rex Tugwells and the Harry Hopkinses, the latter so well that the byword in Washington today is, "If you want to see Roosevelt, you've got to see Hopkins first."

This weakness has resulted in the rule that worshipful new dealers, though they may

be defeated and repudiated at the polls, can't be swept out of the Government; they are appointed to something better than the offices for which the voters rejected them.

This weakness, finally, has given us the nomination of Flynn, not only as Minister to Australia but as the President's "personal representative with the rank of Ambassador."

It is not lese majeste for us to ask the question that is being asked in Australia and in the United States:

What reason, other than political, could have motivated the appointment of such a man to such a post?

The overtone of irony, of course, is that only last Thursday, in his masterful and conciliatory speech on the state of the Union, the President impressed Congress with a determination to forego politics for the duration.

OUR NO. 2 WAR

The second grave weakness silhouetted by the Flynn appointment is the apparent failure of the war administration to realize that we are fighting two great wars, not one big war and one little war.

Our relations with our allies, in what the administration seems to regard as the little war, are being strained.

Only a week ago, the Chinese Military Mission, headed by brilliant Gen. Hsiung Shih-fei, ignored and slighted for 9 months, never once invited to sit in the councils of the Allied high command, was recalled from Washington to Chungking by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

Only 2 weeks ago, Prime Minister Curtin of Australia warned that Japan is consolidating her gains and voiced his fear that the policy of dealing first with Hitler and the European war was being overdone. He said:

"The United Nations in the Pacific are being denied resources for their total war effort which are invaluable to them, and resources are being reserved by Japan for building up her capacity not only to wage war, but to resist an offensive."

Now, into the clouded Pacific atmosphere, is injected the personable but preposterous Flynn. He is named to replace a distinguished career diplomat, Nelson T. Johnson.

It will be for the Senate to decide what effect upon our delicate Pacific relations the confirmation of the Flynn appointment would have.

We are realistic enough to know that, in a Senate where Democrats outnumber Republicans 57 to 38, such confirmation is not only possible, but probable.

We are idealistic enough to hope, almost to trust, that straight partisan voting will not be the rule in this issue that is so much deeper than the small, smelly scandal of the paving blocks, although that is the incident which gives it its drama and symbol.

In any event, the Senate decision should be by roll call, and for the record.

The constituents of every Senator are entitled to know his decision in the "affaire Flynn."

[From the Washington Post of January 12, 1943]

"DEAR EDDIE"

The President's nomination of Edward J. Flynn, retiring chairman of the Democratic National Committee, as Minister to Australia is bound to come in for sharp challenge on the floor of the Senate. We hope it will be rejected. In this way two services will have been gained: The President will have discharged his political debt and the country's dignity will have been sustained. There is little to add about the Bronx boss to what we have already said. It was in keeping with Mr. Flynn's irregular conduct that he himself should have been the first to announce the nomination.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 13, 1943]

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—IN WAR AS WELL AS PEACE, PUBLIC CAN REFUSE TO TOLERATE QUESTIONABLE POLITICAL APPOINTMENTS

(By Frank R. Kent)

It is the White House thesis, concurred in and supported by all the administration spokesmen, that it is extremely reprehensible to point out that so far from rising above partisanship and politics in the conduct of the war, the President is consistently mindful of politics and his New Deal aides are using the war as a screen behind which to play their New Deal political game.

It is a shocking thing that this should be so but the proof is overwhelming. Nor is the performance rendered more palatable by the effort to make it appear that all protests are partisan and unpatriotic. Apparently this administration wants support of its war policies to include freedom to do, without comment or criticism, exactly what it pleases in domestic affairs.

The effrontery of this attitude is supreme. It assumes that the people as a whole are boobs, who, because we are engaged in a great war, must abandon their own sense of right and wrong and accept the idea that Mr. Roosevelt's every act is commendable.

SILENCE OFFERS NO CURE

A more nationally stultifying notion could hardly be advanced; nor one better calculated to weaken our fiber as a people in this great struggle.

Instead of silent acquiescence to the acts of this administration—instead of accepting them as something that should not be mentioned because we are in a war and Mr. Roosevelt is Commander in Chief—instead of that, these things should be exposed and expounded, denounced, and condemned, until those responsible for them cease doing them and an end is made to this sordid political maneuvering in, perhaps, the most serious period of our history.

No other course can be justified. To permit these things to pass without protest is unintelligent, unwholesome, and against the national interests. Take, for example, the occurrences of the last few days. The country had hardly ceased applauding the President's really good speech on the progress of the war when he stepped down from the lofty plane upon which that was delivered to a level low enough to permit him to name Edward J. Flynn, the New York politician, Minister to Australia.

Mr. Flynn, whose paving-block experiences made unfeasible his retention as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, is thus—if the Senate confirms him—to succeed an outstanding career diplomat as the President's personal representative to a sensitive nation whose friendship is of very great importance to us.

OTHER POLITICAL DOINGS

The inexcusable nature of this appointment of a man without any known qualification for such a post, is further aggravated by the news that, through presidential influence, an important post in the War Department is to be conferred upon Charles Poletti, former lieutenant governor of New York and for some 20 days acting Governor in the gap between Gov. Herbert Lehman's resignation and Thomas E. Dewey's inaugural.

Mr. Poletti is another New York politician who distinguished himself in those 20 days by releasing from jail an unprecedented number of criminals, among them a labor thug, whom he pardoned without consultation with either presiding judge or prosecuting attorney.

In addition, Mr. Roosevelt, as other Presidents have done, recently has provided jobs for various "lame duck" Representatives and Senators defeated in the last election. These

are not particularly creditable, though not bad enough to cause concern or call for criticism. But the Flynn appointment is without excuse or defense.

Here, this politician, replacing a man with a fine record and conceded ability, is given an important post in an Allied country where our interests are vital and our relationships delicate—a post for which he is totally unfitted and to which he has no claim. The Senate cannot do anything about the Poletti appointment, but it can about that of Mr. Flynn.

Support of the war and loyalty to the President's foreign policies ought not to include tolerance of such a selection as this. Rejection by the Senate would be beneficial to this country, an act of friendship for Australia and helpful to the President, in that it might convince him that he cannot, with impunity, follow the noble words of a fine speech with such ignoble acts.

[From the New York Sun of January 12, 1943]

TODAY IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

FLYNN APPOINTMENT HELD CONTRARY TO WAR INTERESTS

WASHINGTON, January 12. — President Roosevelt has made one of those unfortunate mistakes in judgment which he probably didn't realize would not only do a distinct disservice to the war effort but would complicate the fulfillment of the lofty aims for a better world when peace comes.

Mr. Roosevelt has undertaken to pay off political obligations in the midst of the most critical period of history, when international relations are delicate and the Nation is asked to furnish to the war effort its best energies. The President has given away the post of Minister to Australia—a country in the active theater of war—to a politician.

If the appointment of Edward J. Flynn was approved by the Department of State, then the prestige of Secretary Hull and everybody connected with the Department must necessarily suffer. If it wasn't approved by the Department of State, then the President is disregarding the many years of painstaking work that has been done by men in the diplomatic service to keep politics out of our foreign embassies.

RELATIONS ARE DELICATE

It has happened in peacetime, of course, that Republican Presidents have paid off big campaign contributors with diplomatic appointments, but the new dealers have never been anxious to use precedents of the "wicked Republicans" to chart their own course here. And in the middle of war, it is to be presumed that political obligations are subordinated to the Nation's broader interests, such as, for instance, winning the war.

The matters at issue at this time between the Australian Government and the United States Government are of a delicate nature. There are many people here who feel that there should be a closer understanding between the two countries and that the task of bringing Australia and America into better relationship is of such delicacy that only the ablest diplomat in America should be chosen.

There are many diplomatic representatives who are on the Government pay roll already and are back here because the countries to which they were accredited, have been conquered by the enemy in this war. There is Ambassador Grew, for instance, who knows the Pacific situation intimately. It is puzzling that the President shouldn't have selected a man of Mr. Grew's intellectual stature and diplomatic experience to go to Australia.

The problems as between America and Australia have for reasons of forbearance been touched upon lightly by the press in the hope that behind the scenes such things might be worked out, but when Mr. Flynn is asked to go to Australia, the appointment is no compliment to the great nation in the South Pacific.

OBSTACLE TO NATIONAL UNITY

It is not so much the man chosen but the attitude of the President toward an important diplomatic appointment in the midst of war which shakes confidence. There are altogether too many people in America who belonged to the isolationist school of thought before Pearl Harbor and who think Mr. Roosevelt is more interested in third terms and fourth terms and in personal ambition than in keeping the war effort free from all political taint. These isolationists found their ranks swelled in the last congressional election by many who felt that the President was not administering the war restrictions on a fair basis and that there was too much special privilege and too much politics in his New Deal set-up.

These charges now will be given added weight as the antiadministration elements which do not believe in Mr. Roosevelt's post-war program point to his misuse of public power during the war as proof of what might be expected afterward.

The biggest obstacle to national unity has been the charge that the present administration will seek to use the war powers for political purposes. Appointment of the Democratic national chairman to be Ambassador to Australia with undefined jurisdiction, probably including other areas, is good news for the opponents of American participation in post-war arrangements and bad news for those who believe in an international organization to maintain peace. It is not the kind of news that the troops and sailors fighting for America will understand. "Politics as usual" is not a good slogan for wartime and Mr. Flynn would spare the President much embarrassment if he declined the appointment.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 13, 1943]

POLITICAL DEBT SEEN CATCHING UP WITH ROOSEVELT IN CASE OF FLYNN—MARK SULLIVAN SUSPECTS PRESIDENT MAY HAVE MADE APPOINTMENT WITH "SOUR FACE" AND ONLY BECAUSE "CREDITOR" PRESSED HIM HARD

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, January 12.—About the appointment of Mr. Edward J. Flynn to be Minister-Ambassador to Australia, the momentary question is, Will the Senate confirm him? The practically universal judgment of thoughtful persons is that refusal of the Senate to confirm would be a tonic to the national spirit, a relief to the State Department and the Diplomatic Service, and a help to the morale of Government servants generally. It is a fair guess that it might also be a relief to President Roosevelt. In making the appointment, Mr. Roosevelt is paying a political obligation—and there are signs that he pays with a sour face and only because the creditor pressed him hard. Last July there was a story that Mr. Flynn was to be made Ambassador to Mexico. Early publication of the story led to such protest, including from inside Mexico, that Mr. Roosevelt got a 6-month extension on his debt. Whether the Senate will confirm Mr. Flynn is the question that momentarily rages. But the more permanent aspect of the Flynn appointment is the light it throws on the political situation in which Mr. Roosevelt now finds himself in a long swing tide of American politics. This is important as respects the Presidential politics of 1944 and for some years after.

THE HAGUES AND THE NORRISSES

Mr. Flynn is a type, a politician of the big cities, his practically lifelong career that of officeholder in New York. And Mr. Roosevelt is so involved with him and the background he reflects that it is necessary to give him a diplomatic post for which he is inappropriate. The appointment is made not only because Mr. Flynn wants it as reward. It is made also for the effect on leaders of other big-city machines—upon whom Mr. Roosevelt feels it necessary to make an impression of living up to his political obligations. The Flynn appointment is made in the same spirit in which last July Mr. Roosevelt appointed a Federal judge to please the leader of the Jersey City political machine, Mr. Frank Hague. About that appointment, New Deal Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, said the appointee "is a pawn of the greatest political machine in the United States. He is a Hague nominee."

Mr. Roosevelt's principal political support is now composed mainly of two groups not only diverse but fundamentally opposed—the hard-boiled Hagues and the star-eyed Norrises. Utterly opposed to each other, they unite in supporting Mr. Roosevelt. He holds the Hagues and Flynn by patronage, the Norrises by idealistic policies.

In the beginning and until recently Mr. Roosevelt had a third group, the Midwest farmers. But in the congressional elections last November he lost them disastrously. In 12 Midwestern States, out of a total of 128 Members of the House the Democrats elected only 25, the Republicans 103. In those Midwestern States, in the country, and in Congress, Mr. Roosevelt has lost the farm and small-town rural vote. If a survey of last November's vote were made by counties it would probably be found the Republicans carried 80 to 90 percent of the counties (outside the solid South). The counties carried by the Democrats were mainly those containing big cities, such as the counties composing New York.

LABOR FOLLOWING MAY-SHIFT

The groups remaining with Mr. Roosevelt—the big-city machines and the ardent New Dealers—overlap the labor vote. As long as Mr. Roosevelt had these and the farmers, too, he was triumphant and he was master. With the farmers gone it is doubtful—if, indeed, there is any doubt at all—whether he can continue triumphant in 1944. And when he is no longer triumphant it is doubtful if he is master of the groups who still give him support. Today it is a question whether he leads them or follows them, commands them or obeys them. He feels obliged to give to a city political leader a diplomatic appointment going counter to his sense of fitness.

The relation between Mr. Roosevelt and the labor leaders has become much the same. The labor leaders are supposed to be his following, and because of what he has done for them they ought to be. But as of today the labor leaders do not do what Mr. Roosevelt wishes. On the contrary, they embarrass him, go counter to his policies, resist the agencies he has set up to handle labor relations. As respects the labor leaders, Mr. Roosevelt is now in a position in which to hold them, he is called upon to yield more and more.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 12, 1943]

THE POLITICAL MILL—FLYNN'S APPOINTMENT TO AUSTRALIAN POST ATTACKED ALONG A WIDE FRONT

(By Gould Lincoln)

The appointment of Democratic National Chairman Edward J. Flynn to be United States Minister to Australia was the political sensation over the last weekend and it prom-

ises to remain in the limelight for another week or two. The Republicans began shooting at Mr. Flynn the moment he made known the coming appointment at his office in New York. They are demanding a thorough hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—which probably means delving again into the now cause célèbre of the Belgian blocks, formerly owned by the city of New York but which were used to improve Mr. Flynn's country home.

As a matter of fact, 2 grand juries in New York have gone into that matter and have exonerated Mr. Flynn, who was away from home at the time the blocks—some 8,000 of them—were placed in his garden by city labor. According to Mr. Flynn, when he got back and found out about the improvement he insisted upon paying for work which had been done.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, its chairman, Senator CONNALLY of Texas, says, will meet Friday. It may decide what shall be done about the case of Mr. Flynn at that time. In view of the fact that Mr. Flynn has to be in Chicago the following Monday to attend a meeting of the Democratic National Committee, it is not likely, Senator CONNALLY said, that Mr. Flynn will be heard by the committee until some time next week, if the committee determines to hear him.

Under date of January 7, Mr. Flynn wrote Senator CONNALLY a letter in which he said he knew of the appointment which was to be made and declared himself in favor of a thorough investigation if anyone brought any charges against him. Mr. CONNALLY made the letter public late yesterday. Obviously, Mr. Flynn had some idea that Senators would go gunning for him as soon as the appointment became known. It was not until January 8, last Friday, that Mr. Flynn told the press that the President was sending his nomination to the Senate to be Minister to Australia.

WELCOMES INVESTIGATION

Mr. Flynn said in his letter to Senator CONNALLY that there was nothing in his past life to fear and that he would welcome a full hearing, if any charges or criticism were leveled at him.

Senator BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, lashed out at the Flynn appointment in the Senate yesterday, dubbing the newly appointed Minister "Paving Block Flynn." He suggested, during the course of his remarks, that Mr. Flynn was seeking to put a long distance between himself and the new Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, with the idea of keeping out of range of any investigation Governor Dewey might undertake.

Mr. Dewey, during his campaign for election as Governor last fall, speaking in the Bronx, where Mr. Flynn has been Democratic leader since 1922, said there had been a time when any Republican visiting the Bronx was naturally expected to attack the Democratic boss. He added, "But it is no longer necessary. Everybody knows about him now."

At that time it was rumored that Mr. Flynn was to be sent as Ambassador to Mexico, and Mr. Dewey's comment was: "The people of Mexico have more to worry about him than have the people of New York. What a strain on the good-neighbor policy." Mr. Dewey, when questioned about the Flynn appointment to Australia, said he would stand on what he had said in his Bronx speech last October.

Mr. Flynn has been Democratic national chairman since "Jim" Farley stepped out of that office in the summer of 1940, after the latter had split with the President over the third term candidacy. Mr. Roosevelt was elected in the campaign of 1940, over which Mr. Flynn presided, although the margin of Mr. Roosevelt's victory was much less than it had been in 1932 and 1936.

The National Capital is agog over the President's reasons for sending Mr. Flynn to Australia. Australia is in the Pacific war theater in a big way. It is in Australia that Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been placed in command of the United Nations forces. And Gen. Douglas MacArthur—without any effort on his part—whose name has been repeatedly used as a possible, or even probable, Presidential nominee in 1944. To the politician it might occur that Mr. Flynn's trip to Australia was for the purpose of keeping an eye on General MacArthur. This may be unfair to the President, General MacArthur and Mr. Flynn—but is being said in some quarters.

CONFIRMATION SEEN

Despite the roars from the Republicans, it is likely that the Democratic majority in the Senate will finally confirm the nomination of Mr. Flynn—that is, unless a hearing should reveal anything damaging, which Mr. Flynn insists it will not.

It's a poor system which places men in high posts in the American diplomatic system who have had little or no experience in foreign affairs. Mr. Flynn, however, is just another of those cases. Diplomatic posts have been the reward of political service—or contributions of one kind or another—for years and years in this country. The number of career men among the United States ambassadors and ministers is on the increase, fortunately.

Mr. Flynn's successor as Democratic national chairman will be Postmaster General Frank C. Walker, who has a host of friends on Capitol Hill as well as throughout the country. Mr. Walker will be elected at the meeting of the national committee which has been called for Monday. He was at one time treasurer of the national committee.

There has been talk of employing an executive director of the national committee—but it does not seem likely now. The job of the new chairman will be to raise money to keep the national headquarters in operation during the next year and a half, and to help pay off any debts of the committee. If he has an efficient finance committee, the chairman can leave the job largely to it. Presumably, however, the chairman will seek a publicity director for the committee to take the place which was occupied so long by Charles Michelson, who resigned not long ago. It will be a tough job duplicating Mr. Michelson.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 13, 1943]

CASE OF ED FLYNN

(By Raymond Clapper)

In this Ed Flynn case, I find myself sputtering not so much at Flynn as at Roosevelt. He's the one who ought to know better, and who does know better.

I don't believe the gossip that the President wanted a trusted politician in Australia to keep an eye on General MacArthur and watch for anything that looked like 1944 Presidential politics. Ed Flynn wanted to be an ambassador and Mr. Roosevelt undertook to make him one.

It was not surprising that Ed Flynn wanted a diplomatic post. He was eager to take almost anyone that the President would offer. Mr. Flynn has been beaten around in the paving-block affair. His stretch as chairman of the Democratic National Committee was marred by the constant reiteration of the charges despite the fact that two grand juries considered them and returned no indictments.

Quite understandably, Mr. Flynn wanted the kind of vindication and prestige that come from a diplomatic appointment. It would mean a lot to his family. Diplomatic life carries a glamor of distinction, or so the movies would lead one to think. The New York politician wears a morning coat and a high hat on special occasions, and he looks with awe on a craft in which, the movies

suggest, such are the working clothes. It was the most natural thing in the world that Ed Flynn should ask the President to fix him up with a diplomatic job.

But it is difficult to understand why Mr. Roosevelt should send Mr. Flynn to Australia. True, our Minister there is an old career man, Nelson Johnson, who has been in the foreign service 35 years and is ready to retire.

But Australia is a ticklish spot right now. The Government there hangs on by a majority of one. It is anti-Churchill. Australian politicians play a game of complaining frequently about inadequate aid from the United States. There have been strikes and other instances where the cooperation was not all that was wished.

General MacArthur has conducted himself with discretion in a most delicate situation, when it would have been so easy for such a spectacular figure to stick his neck out to the disadvantage of our mutual interests. Mr. Flynn himself broke the proprieties to announce his own prospective nomination. That is in itself a sufficient indication that he is likely to have trouble finding his way around in such a delicate and complicated situation as exists in Australia.

And it is unwise anyhow to be using the diplomatic field as a place for burying politicians, especially now when our relations with other governments are becoming more complex than they ever have been. We are entering a new period in our foreign relations and we shall need the very best technicians at all contact points.

I don't subscribe to the idea that no laymen should be appointed to our diplomatic posts and that everything should be left in the hands of career men. The professionals are needed in all missions to handle the technical work. But sometimes they are too restricted in their interests, and lacking in that political sense or feeling for the forces that may be surging around them.

Almost invariably they are tied in with the reactionary groups wherever they may be, because they play with rich people, and they are apt to be toadies. Yet a man like Joseph E. Davies, a filthy-rich capitalist, can go into Communist Russia as Ambassador and get on better than anyone else we ever had there. He had a shrewd judgment of what was going on. He sensed the things that career men sometimes muffle.

So the argument against Mr. Flynn isn't that nobody but career Foreign Service men should be appointed to be head of missions. The point is that when you shove a layman into one of those spots he ought to be very, very good indeed, a man of distinct achievement and one commanding respect in his own field—a man like Governor Lehman, for instance, who is better equipped to do the relief and rehabilitation work better than any career Foreign Service officer.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire, in this calm and temperate exposition of his views, has made a very distinct contribution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee will meet tomorrow, and we hope to perform our duty. We have been told by several Senators—notably the Senator from New Hampshire—what our duty is. The Senator from Maine is also willing to make his contribution.

I feel that I speak for the whole committee when I say that the Committee on Foreign Relations will try to do its duty as the facts will justify. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are members of the committee, and the Senator from Maine is likewise a member. There are

very distinguished and very useful minority members on the committee, and if any member of the committee should show any willful disposition to err, I am sure that some of those Senators would hold up the green light and warn us, and not let us commit grievous errors and legislative crimes. We shall try to handle this case in the best way we know of. We did not appoint Mr. Flynn, nor have we expressed the view that we would not let him be confirmed in advance of a hearing.

In the days when I was practicing law I was always suspicious of a juror who would send word that if we would get him on the jury, he already had his mind made up. I would never trust that kind of a juror, because I was afraid he had sent word to the other side to the same effect. I do not like to decide cases on the sidewalk, or in the cloakroom, or even in the newspapers. When great newspaper columns are glaring at you there is a temptation to try to swell up and fill out. I do not like to try cases in that way.

I may have the wrong idea. I used to be just an ordinary country lawyer, and I always felt that I had better luck when I tried cases in the courthouse. We had a record there, and could take an appeal if necessary. But I never did like to try cases at the blacksmith shop, or in the livery stable. The livery stable was a favorite place in the old days for trying a lawsuit. There one could "cuss" all he pleased, and spit tobacco juice on everything, and give everybody hell, without any proof except his own prejudice, his own predilections, or what Bill Jones said that Henry Johnson said that old man Jenkins said, to the effect that so and so was something.

I hope we can try this case in the regular way. I welcome the Senator from Maine. I have very great respect for the Senator from Maine, and a fondness for him. I assure him now that the members of the committee are going to try to do our duty, whatever it may be.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly; I never can resist the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the very generous comment of the Senator from Texas, and I am very sorry that, as I conceive, he misconstrued my very well-meant remarks, because I thought I made it very clear in the beginning that I was not presuming to either prejudge the case or to instruct the Committee on Foreign Relations as to its duty.

Mr. CONNALLY. We all appreciate instruction.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should never presume to instruct the Senator from Texas as to his duty in anything, because of his very much longer experience and his very acute intellect.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. My remarks were rather addressed to my good friend from our neighboring State, the Senator from New Hampshire. I was seeking to call attention to the fact that in his emphasis on Mr. Flynn's rather negative virtues it should not be presumed that affirmative qualifications are not required.

I was not at all meaning to prejudge the case.

Mr. CONNALLY. I accept the statement of the Senator from Maine. I realize the close kinship between New Hampshire and Maine. Maine has sent many emigrants into New Hampshire, having controversies with them in past years over boundary lines, and questions of that kind. I can appreciate the warm sympathy that exists, and his anxiety not to see the Senator from New Hampshire get off on the wrong tack.

Mr. President, I am just as anxious as are these Senators that the Senate should perform its duty and that the committees should perform theirs; but under the Constitution the Senate consists of 96 Members, not merely one Senator, and no one Senator has ever yet been given the responsibility of taking care of the consciences and the responsibilities and the duties of the other 95. Occasionally a Senator tries to do that, but in my short and uneventful career as a Senator I have never seen it work.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should be very glad to turn over to the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, this stolen paving block if he would like to have it as an exhibit in the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am surprised that the Senator from New Hampshire would allow himself to be put into the position of being in possession of stolen property. [Laughter.] He should see the district attorney, not the Senator from Texas. I am not in criminal practice.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator may be in criminal practice before he gets through with the hearing.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say a word further to the Senate. The Senator from New Hampshire is welcome to come before the Committee on Foreign Relations when it meets. I would rather he would not approach me in the corridor or in the hall and insist on my taking his stolen paving block; but if he desires to come before the Committee on Foreign Relations tomorrow, we will hear him, and we will look over anything he may bring with him.

THE CIVILIAN CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in the stress and strain of an all-out struggle, of total war, we are constantly looking, and properly so, with great concern toward the fighting fronts, and to heap our rightful praise and recognition upon those who have distinguished themselves in the actual fire of combat. It is indeed fitting and necessary that we should do this, for the sacrifices which those gallant fighting men are making in this great struggle are far above our poor power to repay or to emulate.

But oftentimes in our great concern over the ebb and flow of the battle line, we are prone to forget our tireless and patriotic soldiers on the home front, the thousands of men and women who comprise the civilian effort behind the war, and who devote untold hours of conscientious effort to their jobs—jobs which are the backbone of our civilian

and military machinery, jobs which are the fundamental essentials of a full and unimpeded national war effort. I speak of that vast army of civilian soldiers who comprise our selective service boards, our civilian defense organizations, and our war rationing committees.

There has been no greater example of unselfish service in our war effort than that which has been exhibited by our many draft boards, their appeal agencies, legal advisers, and employees. Overcoming almost insurmountable difficulties, they have performed well that Herculean task of registering and classifying millions of their fellow citizens, and they have effectively carried out all the numberless details which have resulted in the final induction of the millions of registrants who now comprise our powerful and ever-growing Army. That the functions of these boards are being carried out with but a minimum of public complaint is in itself evidence of the fine work being done by these very important agencies of the war effort.

The civilian defense organizations throughout the country are also performing an important and vital function in the war program, for it is this group of loyal, well-trained civilian soldiers which is standing by 24 hours out of every day, prepared for any emergency, alert and ready should the enemy strike, and guarding the Nation against the attempts of saboteurs who would spread demoralization either by rumor or by action.

The inspiring work which this organization very recently performed in combating the raging floodwaters of the Ohio River will never be forgotten by that vast multitude of citizens who were rendered homeless and shaken by that great tragedy. The work which these organizations performed under the most adverse conditions was truly magnificent and worthy of every praise.

Another important adjunct to the prosecution of the war lies in the war-rationing committees which can be found in every neighborhood of our vast country. These committees are charged with the very difficult and at times thankless task of seeing to it that the wartime commodities are fairly and efficiently rationed, and that the maximum constructive use is made of all commodities. The importance of their function becomes increasingly apparent with the steady inclusion of more and more articles on the list of rationed goods.

The cooperative and coordinated activities of these groups represent the very heart and fiber of America's civilian war program, and the importance of these activities must never be lost sight of. We must remember that the thousands of people who comprise these organizations serve largely without compensation, that they devote great portions of their time and talent to the common cause, and that they, like all true Americans, are performing their patriotic services in an efficient, if unappreciated and uncompensated manner.

Mr. President, these are no easy tasks, no honorary nor pleasurable callings. These are vital and sometimes disheartening chores. There is no great joy, no

unbounded enthusiasm, in deciding whose mother's son or whose child's father shall be sent into this raging maelstrom of military combat. There is no great pleasure in trying to explain to the American people the need for wartime rationing, and the profound necessity for using all commodities sparingly and wisely. Neither is it a pleasant thing to have heaped upon one's head all the wrath and criticism of a disgruntled and caustic public whose nerves are frayed and whose tempers are inflamed because of the mass of bureaucratic red tape and hopeless inefficiency which emanate from Washington. Neither is it a particularly enticing prospect to undergo months of detailed and careful training in any number of vital subjects, and then to go out and try to encourage the active cooperation of an all too lethargic public where such matters as air-raid precautions, fire drills, mock invasions, and like activities are concerned.

Mr. President, these are vital activities, and they are being performed effectively and efficiently by the many thousands of our workers who comprise these organizations. We must bear in mind also that the vast majority of these people receive no compensation whatsoever. They give willingly and freely of their time; they devote untold effort to their labor; yet rarely do they receive even so much as a kind word. More often than not they are subjected to all manner of criticism and censure. But, despite all these things, despite the fact that they remain unrecognized, uncompensated, and uncited, they continue in their vital work.

We have made reasonable provision for the compensation and recognition of our soldiers on the fighting fronts; we have made similar provision for recognition and compensation for our soldiers on the production line; but the appalling fact remains that we have provided nothing even by way of recognition, much less compensation, for these civilian-soldiers who are contributing so much to the preservation of America.

Mr. President, it is my contention and firm belief that we should devise some means—some appropriate medal or certificate of honor—for the recognition of these people. This is the least—the very least—that we can do to convey our appreciation to them, and to make them aware that we do recognize and appreciate the outstanding and commendable efforts which they, as soldiers on the home front, have made and will continue to make in behalf of American security and final victory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* a brief résumé of certain correspondence and communications which have come to my office, and which deal with the important matter about which I have just spoken—the real democracy of this glorious Republic on the home front at work during war.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

In Pennsylvania alone there is a total of 582,000 certified members in the defense corps,

quietly performing their varied tasks day in and day out, with no thought of reward or compensation other than the satisfaction of knowing that they have kept the faith at home while their sons and brothers are laying down their lives on foreign soil.

France was without any protective service of this kind, and when the unprecedented type of warfare was visited upon her, we all know the quick result. England, organized 2 years before the start of actual hostilities, presented a far different picture. And so, here in the United States with the broad and firm foundation of civilian defense already established and serving us so well, we should encourage continued vigilance and the expansion of these services. Even though we know that victory is certain to be achieved, we cannot relax; we must redouble our efforts. Our enemies, too, will know that ruin and death are fast and inevitably closing in. Typical of snakes and rats when cornered, who can say in what ways they will attempt to strike us at home in their maniacal desperation and all-consuming hatred?

RATIONING

Three weeks after Pearl Harbor businessmen throughout the country were summoned to the offices of the mayors and burgesses of their home communities and asked to volunteer to serve on ration boards in the localities in which they lived. The ration board set-up roughly approximated that of the draft boards that were already functioning.

The work, they were told, would entail only a few hours a week. No appropriation had been made, so that office space, stenographic help, telephones, stationery, etc., would have to be paid for by the members of the prospective rationing boards. Almost without exception these men consented to undertake the task set before them.

Since that time, you all know how the work of these boards, now designated as the War Price and Ration Board, has multiplied. The few hours per week has now increased to a minimum of 24 hours service at the board headquarters, with many additional hours of homework and study devoted to studying the multifarious regulations, changes of procedure, and instructions that emanate several times a week from Washington.

Members of the rationing boards are now required to check upon commodities that intimately affect the lives of their families and neighbors. If they do their jobs well, the best they can hope for is an absence of censure. They are harassed night and day, threatened, cajoled, and abused.

But I very strongly feel that our Federal Government, which has so much talent and time to devote to preparing complicated questionnaires and regulations for the rationing boards to administer, might take a little time off to give the members of these boards some concrete recognition of the patriotic service they are rendering. Some kind of commission should be conferred upon these men and women that they could treasure in later years as evidence that their Government recognizes and appreciates the sacrifice they have been making to insure our ultimate victory.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

The members of the draft board are citizens taken from every walk of life who have the rather unpleasant duty to perform of deciding which of their fellow citizens and neighbors shall be called to serve the country.

The employees of the board have been faithful from the time the Selective Service System was instituted. They do not know the meaning of holidays and very few Sundays are their own. In most localities, inductions are held early in the morning with the result that the employees arrive at their offices often at the hour of 6:30 and they then stay for meetings of the board which are held at least twice a week and often last until midnight.

Without this unselfish service which has been exhibited by the draft boards, Government appeal agents, legal advisers, and employees, it would have been impossible to carry out the functions of the Selective Service System and we would not now have in our armed forces the millions of our fellow citizens who are at present fighting for America on all parts of the globe.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, recent years have witnessed an abundance of charges leveled against men in public life. This is true concerning those who have entertained one view on international and domestic problems as well as those entertaining opposite views. One in public life learns to "take it" and to endure endless criticism; but there perhaps come times to all of us when we reach the saturation point. Through the years I have ignored many false accusations, being able to sense that to pause and give answer to obvious falsehoods would be only to waste much time and energy. In some instances I have been later made to wish that I had answered at the time the charges were made, finding here and there someone who has accepted the charge as fact simply because the charge was not answered.

Since that fateful day in December, in 1941, I have read endless charges, most unfair in their conception, most bitter and prejudiced in their presentation, starting with certain published accounts of an address I was delivering at the very hour when the Japanese were attacking Pearl Harbor. I have tolerated endless criticism and charges rather than in any degree to contribute to the disruption of the highest degree of unity attainable in this land in meeting the challenge which is ours by reason of the war. But I now come face to face with charges which reflect not only upon me but upon the people I am here to represent, upon my State—North Dakota—and I rise in my place here in the Senate to give answer to those who seemingly are not content with unity, those who will not have unity, if you please, unless unity carries with it the privilege, for them, to deride, berate, and falsely charge those who have not been in agreement with them respecting the conduct of foreign policy and the ways of accomplishing victory.

Before me is a news clipping from the front page of a Sioux Falls, S. Dak., newspaper, under the heading of "Finds Pro-Nazi Sentiment Is Heaviest in Dakotas; Seger, Former Member of Reichstag, Here for Talks." Under this heading I read a most amazing tale, the sponsorship of which could be attributed to no one less than a writer of fiction or a downright liar. The article is a report of an address delivered before a meeting of members of the B'nai B'rith Society at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., an address by one Dr. Gerhart Seger, represented to be a former member of the German Reichstag and a German World War pilot, who allegedly had escaped from a German concentration camp and is seemingly now here lecturing to the American people, and allegedly making a personal survey of all communities in the United States to determine what percentage of German-Americans are pro-

Nazi, what percentage are anti-Nazi, and what percentage are "on the fence."

This report of Dr. Seger's address finds him declaring that only in New Jersey is the percentage of Nazi sympathizers greater than in North and South Dakota. He complained that in one South Dakota town the German proprietor of a flower shop refused to wait on him when he recognized the lecturer as an anti-Nazi. Then he went on to say—and I quote what he was quoted as saying in the newspaper report—

There are 7,000,000 German-Americans in the United States today, and of that number 5 percent are Nazis and another 5 percent are anti-Nazis. That means that there are 350,000 Nazis in the United States and an equal number who are fighting the Nazis. The other 90 percent of the German-Americans are on the fence.

Mr. President, I insist that these charges by Dr. Seger, whoever he may be, respecting the people of the Dakotas, is as baseless, as foundationless, as any charge could possibly be. It sickens me to know that a foreigner, perhaps a refugee, should be left free to make such baseless charges which are not made, and could not be made, by responsible agencies of our own Government and country who have been ferreting out whatever Nazi sentiment there may be in our country.

I resent these charges to whatever degree they might reflect upon that part of the population of North Dakota which is in any degree of German descent. I know these people; I knew them before this Nazi war got under way; I have known them since our involvement in this war; and I know that those North Dakotans of German descent are just as largely loyal to the cause of the United States today, just as helpful in the winning of this war, as any other group of people within my State or any of the other 48 States of the Union. Nazi sympathy of which Dr. Seger speaks simply does not exist. I take great pride at this moment in calling attention to the fact that in the last 2 months my State of North Dakota has oversubscribed its Government bond obligations in greater percentage than is true of any other State of the Union. I am extremely proud of the people of my State, including those of German descent, who threw themselves into this year's agricultural effort in a way and to a degree which brought agricultural production in North Dakota this year to a total far in excess of production in the past, and this in spite of the handicaps and hardships which present-day policies were affording.

Senators are being given at frequent intervals reports by the War Department covering Army casualties by States. I hope I shall not appear out of place if I call attention to the release of January 2 by the War Department revealing casualties by areas and by States. I point out, Senators, that only one State in the Union suffered larger casualty lists than were suffered by my State of North Dakota as of that period. Thirty-six North Dakotans are listed. There were many times that number of heartaches and heartbreaks in my State of North Da-

kota. As I run through that casualty list I find that at least a third of the names are plainly of German origin—Geiger, Holzworth, Huffstutler, Kohnke, Pflugrath, Stimmel, Vettel, Weigel, and others which I might recite.

Mr. President, I find it in my heart to say, "Damned be any man who dares to rise and say that Americans of German origin in the State of North Dakota are not working, sacrificing, bleeding, and dying in the interests of American victory in this war, on a par with the sacrificing, laboring, bleeding, and dying of any other section of the people." There are moments when I would like to wring the very necks of the agitators and prejudice-builders, who would, if they only could, destroy the unity and the centrality of purpose which have so long possessed Americans and made them contributors to the creation of the greatest, most resourceful, and most enlightened Nation upon the face of the earth. I for one am quite done with standing idly by while some few go forth in the guise of "patriotism" with programs that are insulting and most destructive in their very nature, particularly when this kind reflect upon my State or its people, all of whom are doing just as great a job of helping to win this war as is being done by the people of any other State in the Union.

With that, and while I am on my feet, I shall devote myself to a more personal matter, yet a matter which is to some degree in keeping with the wanton effort I have just demonstrated as intended to destroy confidence in entire communities of people. I have written what I wish to say now, and I follow closely my manuscript, lest I let my feelings carry me away into words and charges that might not be in keeping with the dignity which ought to prevail in this Chamber.

I presume that Senators have all read yesterday's Merry-Go-Round column by Drew Pearson, appearing in the Washington Post. Some Senators may have missed it, since the Post is obviously relegating this Merry-Go-Round feature ever backward and backward in its pages until now it comes within one or two pages of the want-ad pages. But I should hardly be deserving of the respect of my colleagues if I did not rise here and now and give answer to Mr. Drew Pearson's allegation under the heading "Hitler's stooges." In particular, Pearson writes that Senator NYE—

Has also been active behind the scenes in aiding the appeal of George Sylvester Viereck, convicted for failure to register as a foreign agent and now indicted for sedition.

Mr. President, I label this with a term the meaning of which need not be misunderstood in any mind. It is a deceitful falsehood, frequently referred to as a lie. It was obviously intended to deceive those who would read it. If it was not deliberately a lie on the part of its author, then it is based upon deceitful information, and I wish there might be a way to ascertain the identity of the informant.

Perhaps this is what should be expected of one who deals in lying for profit,

A fortune, I understand, has been accumulated through ability to produce sensation; and when lies are necessary to produce sensation, there seems to be no hesitancy in lying. As a newspaperman it was my training that a lying reporter was the worst challenge to the continued existence of a free and objective press. Honest reporters and honest newspapers must suffer by reflection the opprobrium which Pearson has created for himself, because, after all, he does call himself a newspaperman, which some will insist is the biggest lie he has yet told.

It is to the credit of most newspapers that they want nothing to do with Pearson's Merry-Go-Round. An editor of some importance, who had considered taking on the Pearson column but decided not to do so, once remarked to his staff:

It is all right to read Pearson for entertainment, but keep in mind that every time he has written about anything we know about personally, he has always been wrong. If he is wrong on the things we have knowledge of, how the hell can we trust him on things we do not know about?

Pearson is a master of the half-truth. When a direct lie does not suit his purpose because it might be too dangerous, he can lie by inference by merely leaving out qualifying remarks and explanations. He is one who could quote from Mein Kampf and make Hitler seem a hero, or quote isolated verses from the Bible and make devils out of the Apostles.

With respect to his charge that I have aided in the appeal of Viereck, I say to my colleagues that there is not the faintest or slightest cause or ground. To one who hates the truth as much as Pearson seems to hate it, what I say here will be without force or effect, of course; but I want to have no seeming will on my part to let his quite direct falsehoods go unchallenged.

With all the force at my command, Mr. President, I insist that there is not the slightest basis for any such charge as Pearson has made and the Post has published. I have talked with Mr. Viereck only once or twice in my life. I have not seen or had any contact with Mr. Viereck in many months. On his last visit to my office he was abruptly rebuffed and made to understand that his calls were definitely not welcomed. This happened more than a year before Pearl Harbor. I have had no contact with Mr. Viereck or with anyone else who has even suggested my doing any act that would aid Mr. Viereck in his appeal. I do not know what more I could say to assert emphatically that I have not had the slightest interest in whatever might be the appeal of Mr. Viereck. I cannot conceive what purpose Drew Pearson or any publisher would have in drawing so completely upon falsehood as to warrant such a charge as Mr. Pearson has made.

There are other features about Mr. Pearson's comment in yesterday's newspapers to which I must devote myself for just a moment. Mr. Pearson said that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and myself are "working so feverishly for an investigation of the Justice Department and its prosecution of Hitler's stooges in the United States of

America." Mr. Pearson goes on to say that the reason for our interest is allegedly that of preventing disclosures involving ourselves, disclosures that are rather certain, allegedly, to develop if ever these conspiracy cases are brought to trial.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest fear of any facts which the approaching trials might produce. Fortunately, even columnists and commentators must be direct and explicit when they are reporting as witnesses in our courts. Innuendo and deception are rather easily met in a court of justice, and facts are a burden only to those who find facts unprofitable.

Speaking of deceptive charges, let me point to the charge now repeated by Mr. Pearson, to the effect that I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Nazi propaganda which was printed and sent out under my frank, loaned to the Steuben Society of America. I should like to make the record clear on this matter, now that I am dealing with it.

The Winchells and the Pearsons have often thrown this charge, which is intended to convey the thought that I had inserted in the RECORD something of Nazi origin which had been sneaked into public circulation by alleged "agents" and "sympathizers" with the Nazi cause. Now, what are the facts? Let me state them so that the record may be clear.

One of the finest American citizens it has been my pleasure to know is Mr. Theodore Hoffman, president of the Steuben Society of America, which is made up of a group of Americans, so far as I have been privileged to know them—and my privilege has been large—whose spirit is completely American, and who, I have found, thoroughly detest nazism. I find that it is a matter of record that early in the days of the American Bund, the American Steuben Society put its foot down on this undertaking without mercy, condemned it, and wrote itself off from any possible affiliation with this un-American group. I have great admiration for the Steuben Society of America because I know its purpose has been so emphatically American all the way. The society has been a distinct credit to that great German whom the society honors by naming itself after him, a German who contributed much to the creation of our country.

On April 30, 1941, Theodore Hoffman, the president of this society, delivered an address at Madison, Wis., which I inserted, under unanimous consent, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on May 20, 1941. The address was on the subject of Americans of Germanic extraction. I challenge any Senator to read that speech in its entirety and to come to any other conclusion than that which is mine, namely, that this address was worthy of a place in the RECORD, was a credit to the American who delivered it, and that it was anything but an address in sympathy with the cause of nazism. I find Mr. Hoffman saying in that address, among other things, this:

Ours is a Nation composed of citizens of all countries and no one has a place in our ranks whose allegiance is not wholly to the United States of America.

We deprecate and disapprove of any exhibition of foreign politics on our shores which

can have no other result than to create a feeling of hostility against those who exhibit it and the country which they claim to represent. We resent it as in conflict with the principles upon which our country is founded.

Again, as I scan that address by Mr. Hoffman, which I inserted in the RECORD, I find him saying:

Americans of Germanic extraction do not want communism, fascism, or nazism, and they do not want British imperialism. They want Americanism.

I suppose this is sordid Nazi propaganda, possibly written by Goebbels or even by Hitler himself.

Mr. Hoffman went on in his address to recite the aims and purposes of the Steuben Society as being "loyally to support the Constitution of the United States of America by advocating the proper application of its provisions and inculcating the principles underlying true democratic government; to quicken the spirit of sound Americanism; fostering a basic American spirit among all citizens; to aid in maintaining the independence and sovereignty of the United States of America and its freedom from all foreign influence; to establish cooperation among its members in the exercise of their civic duties, and to encourage among them an active participation in every phase of our national life; to promote the welfare and enhance the happiness of its members and their fellow men; to perpetuate itself as a patriotic and fraternal voluntary membership organization and to provide for its government; to guard our political liberty by maintaining an honest equality of citizenship regardless of the birth, origin, or religion of any citizen; to maintain the traditions of our country."

Senators, I submit that this address by Theodore Hoffman of the Steuben Society of America was deserving of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and not only do I have nothing to apologize for in having inserted it in the RECORD, but I say now that I am happy to have been privileged to offer it.

This is the speech which Mr. Pearson and Mr. Winchell would have their audiences believe was Nazi inspired, this speech which was so completely anti-Nazi even to the point of saying so.

Then come Pearson and Winchell with a broader insinuation concerning the manner in which this speech was circulated.

After its printing in the RECORD Mr. Hoffman desired copies of it printed. He paid the very nominal sum that was necessary for printing three or five thousand copies of his speech. These copies were given to him in my frank for the purpose of mailing to such as he chose. Instead of mailing them separately to individual addressees, he distributed some of this print to the officers of local Steuben societies in the country for distribution among their membership. This practice I dare say is one which has prevailed in Congress for many, many more years than I have been a Member of it. But someone—I think I know who—ran with complaint to the Post Office Department, and the Post Office Department made demand upon Mr. Hoffman and the Steuben Society for the

payment of postage on whatever part of these three or five thousand copies of his speech had been sent out under my frank. Mr. Hoffman advised me that he did not know exactly how many had been thus mailed, but that in order to be perfectly fair he paid to the Government a postage fee on more items than he knew had been mailed.

Mr. President, I shall not argue here the merit of the demand by the Post Office Department upon Mr. Hoffman for the payment of this postage. It certainly would be subject to debate, but I confine myself at this moment to the assertion that these facts hardly warrant the assertion by Mr. Pearson of yesterday that "Senator Nye has lent his frank to the Steuben Society for which the Steuben Society was fined by the Post Office Department."

Mr. Pearson knows how eagerly some forces tried to "get something" on Mr. Hoffman and the Steuben Society during those days when "smearing" was rampant to a degree that made the program hysterical. He knows that Hoffman and members of his staff were summoned before a grand jury here in Washington and that they submitted themselves and their books and records to closest study, yet no indictment resulted. Mr. Pearson's will to keep up the smear has led him, apparently, to anger not unlike that entertained when Hoffman went to West Point last summer and made the annual award by the Steuben Society. Some folks will not tolerate such a course of action by anyone who has been the subject of their smearing. Once smeared by them one is naturally expected to stay smeared.

I would not deny for one moment that I entertain grave doubts concerning the merit of the charges which have resulted in the indictment of some 30 Americans by a District of Columbia grand jury. To me, as to others in the Senate, there has been representation of alleged practices before the grand jury which left one wondering concerning the issue of personal liberty. I would hold no brief in any quarter for anyone guilty of contributing to the undermining of our defense, or undermining the morale of our armed forces, but I submit that with respect to the indictments returned against most of those involved in this alleged conspiracy they are no more guilty of conspiracy than I am, and have seemingly done nothing more than I and others of us here have done time and time again. Thus I am brought to the conclusion that possibly many of those who are facing trial under these indictments are no more guilty than are millions of other Americans who, prior to Pearl Harbor, were giving voice to their feelings respecting possible involvement in this war. I am driven at moments to feel that the indictment about which we have been reading through these many months is not an indictment of 20 or 30 individuals but is an indictment of 75, 80, or 90 percent of the people of the United States.

I would not want my remarks here to prejudice in any degree the trials which allegedly are about to ensue; but since the question has been raised, as it has

been raised by Mr. Pearson, I would not want to seem to be denying that I have considered, and that I have heard others considering, the possible justification for an investigation of the whole proceeding which has brought about the indictments. I would deny, however, that I or anyone of my acquaintance has been "working feverishly for an investigation of the Justice Department and its prosecution of Hitler stooges in the U. S. A."

I have nothing more to say, Mr. President. I appreciate the privilege which has permitted me to rise in my place and defend myself against the outrageous innuendoes and lies which have been so prominent during many months of seeming effort to smear, smear, smear one and all who dared, prior to Pearl Harbor, to differ with policies which some of us felt were policies which could not lead anywhere other than into war.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from North Dakota needs no defense from me or from anyone else. I do not subscribe to the Washington Post. My attention was called to the article written by Drew Pearson only yesterday. My attention also was called to an article in the Washington Post by Dillard Stokes.

First of all, let me say that when I first came to the Senate a newspaper in my State wrote an editorial derogatory to me. I thought about rising in the Senate and answering it. At that time, I was just a young man. I went to the office of the then Senator La Follette, and I showed him the editorial. He said to me, "I would not pay any attention to it. Remember that this man can afford to attack you every day, but you cannot afford to rise in the Senate and attack him every day." Then he said to me, "Remember that, as a Member of the Senate, you cannot afford to get into a contest with the little black animal which has a white stripe up its back." [Laughter.]

I have always remembered that. I have no desire to get into a contest with that kind of an animal today; and that is the kind of an animal, in my judgment, Drew Pearson is. He has not only lied about the Senator from North Dakota, but he has lied about the Secretary of State; he has lied about Jesse Jones; he has lied about the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYNINGS], and other Senators. If my understanding is correct, the Senator from Maryland wrote a letter to the newspapers of the country in which he called Pearson a liar, and even the Washington Post finally published a retraction of the Pearson story about the Senator from Maryland. Yet this man Pearson goes on the radio once a week, not representing some legitimate business enterprise, but representing some patent medicine—I think it is a cathartic. It is perfectly proper that he should represent that kind of a patent medicine. That is the only kind of an enterprise that would pay him to speak.

But he goes on week after week and week after week spewing forth his venom and lies about anyone and everyone who happens to disagree with him; and we have to permit it in the name of free speech. I am in favor of free speech,

and the only reason I ever wrote the letter to the Attorney General was because of the fact that I believed in free speech in America, and I did not want to see it prevented even during the war.

During the last war, when I happened to be a United States district attorney, and hysteria was sweeping over the country and there were demands for the prosecution of everybody who had a German name and everybody who had a Jewish name, and for the prosecution of some Irish societies, I refused to prosecute unless I was furnished with the evidence. Because of that fact I was attacked by the press. Yet, as I look back upon my career in public and private life, there is nothing that I cherish so much as the fact that I was not carried away by the hysteria of those times to use the force of my position to prosecute everybody who did not agree with the views I held.

I read the other day an article in a magazine stating that trials should be conducted in the United States such as were held in Russia when they purged many leaders. That was printed in a magazine called *The Jewish Survey*. I thought that of all the people in the United States who should be advocating anything of that kind this magazine was the last.

When I wrote a letter to the Attorney General of the United States, I said that, in my judgment, he owed it to himself to investigate the situation that had existed and the rumors which were going around in reference to the handling of the grand jury. When I did that, the Washington Post devoted to me two pages and a half, as I recall, in a Sunday edition. I felt highly honored that they would give me so much space. They intimated that they thought I was honest but I had been misled by a lot of Nazi stooges.

Now this fellow Pearson says that the reason I was interested was because of the fact that I was afraid something might come out about me. Let me say that there is nothing more that can be said about me than has been said. As a matter of fact, there is hardly any name that I could be called that was not applied to me before I came to the Senate of the United States. I came up the ladder of politics the hard way. Anyone who does not know about politics in Montana in the early days does not know what politics is. So it does not bother me, except that I dislike to have it intimated that I entertain any religious or racial prejudice. It so happens that my father was a Quaker, and he taught me never to let racial and religious prejudices enter my mind. I have prided myself that I have never done it, and yet I find some newspapers that know better charging me with having such prejudices. They ought not to make these charges for their own sake, for they are not doing me any harm; the only ones to whom they are doing harm are their own class and their own race.

Yesterday morning a newspaper was handed to me by a young man who formerly worked in my office who called my attention to an article which stated:

Hudson ran an isolationist, anti-British, anti-war propaganda bulletin in Omaha,

Nebr., plying his mailing list with vast flocks of propaganda under the franks of Senator BURTON K. WHEELER (Democrat) and others.

That is just a plain unadulterated lie; there is no other way to express it. Let me show why it is a lie. I have never met Hudson and did not recall any correspondence with him. However, when this statement was called to my attention, I had my files checked and I found therein a letter which I had written to Hudson on July 31, 1941, some 5 months before this Nation was in the war. When I wrote the letter a bulletin which Hudson apparently publishes at frequent intervals was called to my attention. In that bulletin Hudson had informed his readers that apparently I was not his kind of an isolationist, and he suggested in his bulletin that I might have been responsible for making known to the military authorities that speeches of various Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were reaching members of the armed forces.

Apart from that allegation, which concerned me but little, I was disgusted with Hudson's bulletin, which seemed to me to be a vile, un-American propaganda sheet, apparently designed to incite racial and religious hatred. Thereupon I wrote Hudson a letter. I do not expect the Washington Post or Stokes or Drew Pearson will have the honesty of purpose and decency to quote this letter, but I am sure the Members of the Senate will be interested in hearing what I wrote to Hudson on July 31, 1941:

JULY 31, 1941.

MR. CHARLES B. HUDSON,
Omaha, Nebr.

DEAR SIR: There has just come to my attention your bulletin No. 274, dated July 21, 1941.

I note your reference in the third paragraph on the first page of that bulletin to "spy activities of the two Jews on Senator WHEELER's staff." Your reference is completely and unequivocally false. If you had followed the facts in connection with the letters from selectees to Senators, you would have known that the facts were not as you portrayed them. Both the Army and the public learned of the origin of some of the telegrams and letters from selectees because copies of the messages sent me and other Senators were also sent to newspapers by the selectees themselves.

I tried to locate a copy of the bulletin to which I have called attention, but I could not find it. Then in my letter I said:

It is true that I have in my employ two Jewish people. I do not employ people because of their race, religion, or creed; I employ people who are capable, honest, and loyal. I do not approve of your attitude, because I deplore anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, or any ism which has as its basis the persecution of minorities, whether they be religious, racial, social, or economic minorities. I regard such activities as dangerous to democracies because they strike at the very heart of free democratic government.

Very truly yours,

B. K. WHEELER.

Does anyone think that, after that letter to Mr. Hudson, I sent to him any speeches or other matter to be circulated by him or any mailing list to whom they might be sent?

A newspaper in New York, one of the largest newspapers in that city, called

me up and said that the Fight for Freedom Committee had said that I was sending out speeches or circulars and giving them to anti-Semitic organizations. I inquired if the words "anti-Semitic organizations" were used, and was told "Yes." I said, "I can hardly believe that, because it so happens that the young man in my office who distributes and handles all that mail happens to be Jewish himself, and I do not think he is anti-Semitic." The one who called me up said that ought to answer it. Notwithstanding that fact, there is a little group in Washington that seeks to smear every Senator and every Member of the House who does not agree 100 percent with the administration. If they could not smear a man on one charge, they would try to smear him on some other.

If there is any member of the Senate who desires to debate with me my attitude before we entered this war, I am perfectly willing to debate it. I have not any apologies to make for anything I said or anything I did before we entered the war. I want that to go down in the Record, and I want it known that that is my position. I was opposed to our getting into this war. I thought we could keep out of it, and I was honest in my conviction. Not only did I myself believe that, but one of the men closest to the President spent some hours with me as late as October 1941, before Pearl Harbor, and said that the President was going to keep out of the war.

Mr. President, we hear much said about unity. Who is it that wants unity? So far as the Senate is concerned, there has not been a man here, Republican or Democrat, who has not said that we want unity and that we want to do everything we possibly can to win the war. I think that every Member of the Senate, Republican or Democrat, regardless of what his views were before the war, has done everything he possibly could to bring about unity in this country. But on the outside, in some of the executive departments, there have been many people, such as Archibald MacLeish, who have gone out and attempted to stir up disunity.

There was a time when the Communists in this country were all for keeping out of war. There was a time when the President denounced Stalin and there was a time when many people were denouncing Communists and saying that the Communists were sabotaging and destroying our industries, and wanted to take over the Government. During that period of excitement, when people were afraid that the Communists were going to ruin the Army of the United States, we passed the 1940 Sedition Act. I did not think it was a good law. I thought it would be misused; but it was enacted. And who opposed it in the House of Representatives? Who do Senators suppose filed the minority report? It was Maury Maverick, and Kvale, of Minnesota.

Maury Maverick is now one of the executives in the departments and he filed a report, which I have here. But since Russia was attacked by Germany, of course, these people have said, "We have to have unity with the Communists." Stalin was not then a dictator, but was a great democrat, and Russia became

overnight a democracy, and was no longer a Communist state. I believe we should help Russia—she has done a great job of fighting Hitler.

I always said that, so far as I was concerned, I was in favor of permitting Russia to have the kind of government she wanted, that it was not any of our business if they wanted the sort of government they had set up.

Some distinguished persons talk about isolationists, and denounce them. The first time I ever heard the word "isolationists" was when I read a speech by the President of the United States in which he said, "I am an isolationist." He said, "I am an isolationist to the extent that I want to keep out of war." That is the kind of an isolationist I have been. I wanted to keep out of war.

Let me serve notice on some persons in Washington that if they want to get into a controversy and debate some of these issues I am perfectly willing to debate them; but I am becoming sick and tired of trying to go along and to do everything I possibly can to win the war and then have a lot of snipers peddling out information to some of these columnists. Where do Stokes and the Washington Post get the information which they have been spreading about the evidence in the case, and about what is going to be said about Senators and Representatives? Where did they get the information on which was based the statement published in the Washington Post as to what was taking place in the grand-jury room? How did they get it? If it had been before almost any other district court in the United States they would have been haled before the court and charged with contempt for publishing what was going on and what was said before the grand jury. But here in Washington, nothing was said about it and no action was taken.

As I have said, I do not know any of these defendants. If they are guilty, I hope they will be convicted. I do not agree with one single thing they are charged in the indictment with having said. But whether I agree with them or whether I do not, they are entitled to have a fair trial, by a fair judge, before a fair jury, and by a decent and respectable prosecuting attorney in whom the people of the United States have some confidence, and in whom the Congress of the United States has some confidence.

I did not rise with the intention of speaking so long as I have spoken. I rose merely to brand the statement which appeared in the Post, written by Mr. Stokes, as a deliberate falsehood, and as libelous. I likewise brand what Mr. Pearson said as a deliberate falsehood, when he stated that the reason why I am trying to prevent an investigation or do something else—I do not remember the exact language—is that I am afraid of what is going to come out about me. If the Department of Justice, or if Mr. Meyer, or Mr. Pearson, or anyone else, has anything to bring out about me, I challenge him to produce it, for it cannot be produced.

When a former Governor of New York was told that some politician was against him, he said, "I cannot understand why that man is against me, because I never

did anything for him that I can recall." I can understand why Mr. Meyer is against me. Probably it is because of the fact that every time his name came up in the Senate for confirmation, I voted against him.

I could not understand why Drew Pearson was against me, because I did not remember anything I had done for Drew Pearson. Then I happened to recall that when there was an attempt to put him off the air at one time, when I was in the Orient with a group of Senators and Representatives, I was cabled and asked if I would not intercede for him; and I did, and helped to have him kept on the radio at that time.

On another occasion, when he and his partner were about to be thrown off one of the newspaper chains, he and his partner talked to me and I again tried to do something for them. When Pearson's father was appointed to office and was being attacked, again he came to see me, and I went to the support of his father. So I presume that is the reason why this man seeks to do everything he can to try to intimate to the people of the country that I am disloyal, and to try to smear those of us who were opposed to our country getting into the war.

I know some of my colleagues will say, "Why pay any attention to it? Nobody believes him, nobody trusts him, nobody has any confidence in him." I agree that no one in the Senate of whom I know has the slightest confidence in him, no one in the Senate of whom I know has the slightest respect for him, for his truthfulness, his honesty, or his integrity. But one gets weary of a man of that kind, who has access to the radio, speaking over the radio and attacking members of the Government. As I said, he has lied about Jesse Jones, he has lied about the Secretary of State, he has lied about Members of the House of Representatives, and he has lied about Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, the question may well be asked, "Does not such conduct tend to break down the morale of the people of the country? What effect will the dissemination of lies about members of the Cabinet have upon the armed forces?"

Mr. President, while the voice is the voice of Pearson, or the voice is the voice of Stokes, I sometimes wonder whether the hand is not the hand of Esau.

I apologize to the Senate for having taken up so much of its time in saying anything about these two disreputable persons.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. TYDINGS introduced a bill (S. 416) for the relief of the city of Baltimore, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 60), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 307, Seventy-sixth Con-

gress, agreed to October 9, 1940, and Senate Resolution 119, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 28, 1941 (providing for an investigation of airplane crashes), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INVESTIGATION WITH RESPECT TO FUEL IN CERTAIN AREAS WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 61), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942 (providing for an investigation with respect to fuel in certain areas west of the Mississippi River), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think there is nothing else to come before the Senate at this time, so I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O God, judge of all men, unto whom all hearts are open and all desires known, be pleased to make Thy presence known throughout the hours of this day. We thank Thee that ours may be the hope which is wrought by the Comforter, the joy of the forgiveness of sin and the grace of faith, full of cheer and gladness. Enable us to throw off all doubt that we may perceive truths of Thy word and all that it signifies. Grant that all goodness may abound, all graciousness, all trust, all zeal, and knowledge.

Blessed Lord, God, do Thou safeguard those influences which are striving in the union of nations for the advancement of civilization, for the enslaved and dying peoples who are begging to exist. May the crimes and the cruelties, the oppression and the suffering of this tragically inhuman war be remembered as the darkest sin of the night. Oh, quicken the pulse of a new day that the world may know that the rise and progress of our Republic is the grandest educational and religious epic that ever came out of the arteries of the historic past. We pray Thee to make us worthy; free us from all vanity, all corroding materialism; all divisive forces, and from every ambition to live unto ourselves; then shall we walk in the light, sharing its radiance with man everywhere. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 12, was read and approved.

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

There was no objection.

THE WILDCAT COAL STRIKE

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the unauthorized wildcat strike of the hard coal miners in Pennsylvania is an unspeakable affront to the people of this country. While the East is suffering from an acute shortage of anthracite the miners in that State, in defiance of their own leaders' agreement for a week's truce, go on strike primarily because Mr. John L. Lewis' united mine workers convention last October boosted their monthly dues from \$1 to \$1.50. There is no justification for such walk-out. In the lands of the Axis powers there are no strikes, but here at home, while Uncle Sam is fighting a war for the freedom of Americans, including the coal miners, they let the country down.

The President came before the Congress last week, not as the head of the Democratic Party, but as our Commander in Chief. In that role he warmed the hearts of Americans everywhere. His message was excellent, informative, and helpful. It stressed the importance of continuing the United Nations' wartime cooperation to maintain the peace.

We are now faced with a great fuel shortage and the situation in Pennsylvania is a grave one. It does not affect only that State, it has within it the seeds of our destruction. As a result of this sort of thing we can very well miss altogether the attainment of peace. Down this road lies the distinct possibility of our losing this war. The Commander in Chief has ready at hand a solution employed in World War No. 1 for such an unauthorized strike. In June of 1941, I wrote a letter to the President, calling attention to the manner in which President Wilson successfully dealt with a like situation. Answering a letter which I received from the President with reference to this problem, I wrote again on February 27, 1942, as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On June 3 last year I wrote a letter to you in which I called your attention to the method in which President Wilson dealt with the labor problems which beset him in 1917.

In reply to that letter you wrote me that the decision as to whether the drastic powers exercised by President Wilson should be used depended on the particular circumstances of each case and the choice of an appropriate time.

I do not believe that anything has given me greater concern in all my life than the labor situation with which you as the Chief Executive and the Congress have been wrestling for many months. On yesterday the debate in the House was very bitter on the Smith amendment to the war-powers bill. I do not

believe I have even seen the membership of the House so worked up. It is my judgment that their reactions truly reflect the intense feelings on the subject by their respective constituencies. All seem to agree that production must not be interrupted and yet, my dear Mr. President, there are interruptions.

Only three agencies can correct this situation, the Chief Executive, the Congress, and the unions themselves. Bossism is firmly entrenched in some of the unions in certain parts of the country, and there is little hope that a remedy will be forthcoming from this group. Those of us who serve in the House and who sincerely desire to correct this situation have time and again been beaten by the majority of our colleagues who are not only adamant against any antistrike legislation for the duration of the war, but strenuously object to any move which would have the effect of disturbing the present status of laws relating to labor.

History will record that upon your shoulders circumstance has placed the heaviest burden ever to be borne by any leader since the beginning of time.

I count myself as one of that number in the House who sincerely desire to assist you and to help you in any way possible. In view of the impasse in the House, and the inability of labor unions to cope with the situation, may I respectfully suggest in reply to your letter of June 11, 1941, that now is the appropriate time to apply the work-or-fight doctrine of Woodrow Wilson.

As I see it, we cannot afford to lose a moment or a single pair of hands. The blood of our boys now slowly dripping soon will be a crimson cascade. Certain it is that those who have reached high upon the shelves of their hearts and cheerfully given their sons will wholeheartedly subscribe to the course—work or fight.

Very respectfully,

DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, JR.

There are emergencies on the home front which require speedy action. A problem of fuel shortage in the middle of the winter for a people already rationed is one that cannot be solved by legislative enactment. Time is of the essence. The Chief Executive has issued many helpful directives lately. Now is the time, it seems to me, for our Commander in Chief to say to these people:

"So long as you regarded yourselves as indispensable to our war effort and so long as your services in the coal mines of this country were consistent with such an appraisal, well and good; but your conduct in selfishly leaving your countrymen to face the winter without adequate fuel puts you beyond the pale. Unless you continue in the mines pending the settlement of your complaints, your names will be certified to the selection boards in your respective localities and you will be inducted immediately into the armed service of your country."

I have an idea that such action on the part of the President will discourage strikes of this type for the duration.

In a recent issue of one of the newspapers in my home city—Richmond—a leading article announced the growing shortage of fuel oil and urged upon the citizens of Richmond cooperation with local officials of the O. P. A. It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that failure on the part of the Government to deal immediately and sternly with the situation in Pennsylvania will beget an understandable indifference on the part of Americans

everywhere, for if 20,000 miners are permitted to leave the coal mines on caprice, what earthly hope has the average citizen of securing coal even if his oil burner is converted?

There is a critical shortage in fuel oil. Are we to endure a deliberate creation of a shortage in coal as well? The President, in his letter to me of June 1941, stated that the work or fight order of President Wilson should be used only when careful reference had been made to the particular circumstances of each case and the choice of an appropriate time. I cannot conceive of a situation which provides a more appropriate time, in view of the gravity of our present position and circumstances.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. RICHARD P. GALE appeared before the bar of the House and took the prescribed oath of office.

HELP FOR THE O. P. A.

Mr. OUTLAND. 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. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there has been a great deal of criticism of some of our bureaus, especially of the O. P. A. All of us have at times joined in that criticism. I should like to suggest however that in addition to criticism we also offer constructive suggestions.

The Director of the O. P. A. in our county, Santa Barbara, in my district has sent me a very constructive list of suggestions. He suggests in the first place a greater amount of funds so that better personnel and more adequate space can be provided. In the second place he asks for a greater degree of decentralization and local authority.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this report in an extension of my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONGRESS SHOULD USE THE PROCESS OF IMPEACHMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for this House to protect itself and the country against the scorn and the abuse of bureaucratic dictatorship by resorting to the process of impeachment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests to submit: First, to extend my own remarks and include a couple of letters; second, to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from Collier's. This document, Mr. Speaker, is a speech, or an article, written by a Member of this House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and I want to place it in the RECORD. It will slightly exceed the limit,

but inasmuch as the House does not meet again until Monday, I ask permission to extend my own remarks and include the article notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. ANDREWS. 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. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD] a few moments ago outlined very clearly the situation of the country as a result of the coal strike. I live in western New York and want to point out how serious this situation is to the defense industries in the general Buffalo area. Within the past few days I have received protests from war industries, from war workers, from citizens at large, and from members of draft boards. It is my understanding that the mayor of the city of Buffalo has forcibly brought the matter to the attention of the Senators from New York State, and, of course, we all know what the situation of today is.

Draft boards say that they do not feel free to draw men and send them into the service to fight the Huns and the Japs. They want to know whether these miners are Americans. They want us to do something. The demand is made everywhere to do something. If this were a streamlined Congress—and I am sorry it is not—we would do something to pass a simple resolution, and it should be passed nearly unanimously, directing that immediate action be taken.

The President has the power, and the Labor Board has the power. We have an Army of three or four million men. We have plenty of troops in the vicinity of Pennsylvania. The time has come when the President or his Labor Board should take action and, if necessary, send the troops in there the way Grover Cleveland did in 1893.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an excellent article on the Speaker of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Reno Evening Gazette of January 8, 1943.

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

There was no objection.

JAMES AND FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT, JR.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and also 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 Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the announcement this morning of the citation of James Roosevelt, but I have information which came to my attention that he was jerked, without his consent, from Guadalcanal by the Commander in Chief immediately after the marines entered that place, and flown to Los Angeles.

Early in December another son, Franklin, left the battle front of north Africa and, according to an AP story, spent 4 days in a Philadelphia hospital with a slight cold before returning home. Both of these boys were apparently jerked, one from each front.

I challenge anybody to answer me to the contrary—this voice that from back of me here accused us isolationists prior to Pearl Harbor of being ostriches, burying our heads in the sand, afraid to fight—I am asking, Is it true that two sons of the President have been jerked from the battle fronts by the Commander in Chief? Somebody answer me to the contrary, if they know better than I do. There are a million homes in America interested.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], may I say that he makes no charges, but he tries to throw out to the country a suspicion. Any such thought is without foundation, and if the gentleman had the courage to make the direct accusation within the rules, I would say that he is making a complete misstatement of the facts. Outside of the House anyone making any such statement I would say tells a deliberate lie.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests; first, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter addressed to Senator MURRAY by the California Retail Grocers & Merchants Association, Ltd., and the other request is that when the business of the House and the other special orders have been concluded, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

THE ELECTION OF MR. MARION BENNETT, OF MISSOURI

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that both sides of the aisle will take a significant glance at the special election results in the Sixth District of the State of Missouri. This district is normally Democratic by from six to ten thousand votes. The Honorable Phil Bennett was elected during the last term and was reelected for another term shortly before he died. However, his son, formerly his secretary, 28 years of age, was elected by over a 14,000 majority in a total vote of some 54,000 votes last Tuesday, a very definite indication that the people of America are on the march for the return of free government.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch said editorially on Tuesday of this week:

A MISSOURI DISTRICT IN THE SPOTLIGHT

Has the Roosevelt administration improved itself with public opinion over the low point struck November 3 when a majority of the voters in the country voted for Republican candidates for the House of Representatives? Would an earlier beginning of the African expedition and earlier appointment of Food and Manpower Administrators have materially altered the results at the polls?

A partial answer will be provided today in the special election in the Sixth Missouri Congressional District for the seat of the late Republican Congressman, Philip A. Bennett. The candidates are Sam Wear, of Springfield, unsuccessful Democratic nominee last fall, and MARION T. BENNETT, also of Springfield, 28-year-old son of the last occupant of the seat, who was with his father in Washington during the recent session.

Since the total vote will be lower than in November, the main point to watch is whether the Democratic or Republican vote suffers the greatest relative decline. Obviously, the results will report the preferences of only those who go to the polls, but, after all, it is the votes of only those citizens who do go to the polls that count in American elections.

Mr. Speaker, the vote I have just reported to the House is the answer.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] has just told the House that in a by-election held in his State a few days ago the Republican candidate, Mr. MARION BENNETT, won by 14,000 votes in a district which until 1940 had been consistently Democratic. However, that news and that information was not carried in the interventionist and international press of the East, except for a few lines in the Washington Evening Star. If there had been a by-election in England, where the districts have one quarter the population, the election results would have been carried in every British and most American newspapers. However, when a noninterventionist, following the footsteps of his father, wins by 14,000 in a former Democratic stronghold, it is not mentioned in the papers of the East. If a New Dealer had been elected, Mr. Elmer Davis, or one of the White House secre-

taries, would have had it announced on the radio here and abroad as a great New Deal victory for Roosevelt's foreign policies prior to Pearl Harbor, and carried in the eastern press. The time has come for the internationalist newspapers to stop trying to fool 100,000,000 Americans who were not interventionists before Pearl Harbor, but who are now doing their part to win the war.

The election of Mr. BENNETT in Missouri last Tuesday, by 15,000 votes, to replace his father in Congress, is an indication of the temper of the American people and that they are not being deceived by New Deal and foreign propaganda of any kind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial on post-war planning.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. One, that on Thursday next I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of War Guilt Punishment, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special order heretofore entered. And at this time I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

THE ARREST OF EDWARD PAGE GASTON

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I read from an article appearing in the Times-Herald of this morning as follows:

Edward Page Gaston, self-styled founder and American director of the World Prohibition Federation, has been arrested on charges of illegally wearing the uniform of a captain of the United States Army, the Department of Justice announced last night.

Advocating the return of prohibition, he has appeared in public in an Army uniform in connection with publicity for his various dry activities.

He has button-holed Members of Congress constantly. He installed himself in the House Office Building, maintained by the taxpayers of the United States, where he set up prohibition propaganda machinery and where he mimeographed and sent forth for several months his prohibition articles, letters, and pamphlets.

It is pertinent to ask who gave this man authority to install himself in the House Office Building and to use Government machines to pound out his prohibition propaganda. It is also pertinent to state that water will always find its own level and the law has finally caught up with this self-styled prohibitionist, Edward Page Gaston.

Perhaps the Anti-Saloon League, the National Prohibition Party, and the International Reform Federation may

come forward with some statement concerning Gaston. He was their baby.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests; first, to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an editorial; and, second, that I may proceed at this time for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

THE RATIONING PROGRAM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe sufficient experience has now been derived from the operation of the various rationing programs so that the experience of the local rationing boards should be taken advantage of by the officials in Washington and elsewhere. I should like to suggest two things: First, that in the consideration by Congress of the problems of this whole great and difficult program, new to Americans, particular attention should be paid to strengthening the work of the rationing boards, giving them sufficient staff, equipment, and necessary forms, and insisting that they be given sufficient discretionary authority to deal with their local problems; second, that the officials of the O. P. A. should from time to time, and beginning soon, call to Washington experienced people who have been executive secretaries or chairmen of the local rationing boards, to consult with them about the problems that only members of and workers on the local boards know at first hand.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article by James Morgan appearing in the Boston Globe, Sunday, January 10.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address delivered by our colleague of the Seventy-seventh Congress, William G. Stratton, on the occasion of his inauguration as treasurer of the State of Illinois. I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article appearing in the seventh annual voice of business edition of the New York Sun, by Fred I. Kent, director of the Foreign Exchange Division of the Federal Reserve Board during the last war, entitled "The Alternative to a Post-War W. P. A."

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. HERTER, Mr. GWYNNE, and Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter written me by the New Jersey Taxpayers Association.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address by Gen. C. W. Wickersham last night.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the Helena (Mont.) Independent.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a brief resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address delivered by me in cooperation with the Office of War Information, broadcast short wave to the people of Italy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from the Comptroller General and some tables from the General Accounting Office.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a bill

which was endorsed by the Order of the Purple Heart of the regular Association of Disabled American Veterans. Also I would like very much to have included in my remarks a bill which I introduced, which is for the rehabilitation of veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONFUSION FROM WASHINGTON

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of this House at this time a paradox in headlines. I quote from two newspaper articles which appeared in the leading newspapers throughout the country on the same day. One article was captioned "Coffee supply grows, according to Office of Price Administration." The other article was captioned "Not enough coffee for United States, even on cup-a-day basis."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we do something about ending the clouds of confusion that are blowing out of Washington to the Nation through such conflicting statements that I have just referred to. I think it is high time that the Congress took some action about the maze of unsteady, unreliable, and confusing ideas being projected upon the national scene in such a critical period. In this connection I shall take the liberty of reading a few sentences of a letter which I received from one of the leading manufacturers of my district:

MY DEAR ED: No doubt you will wonder why the people of the United States don't have confidence in any of the orders issued from Washington. First, one fellow comes out with the information that the reason for the rationing of gasoline is not to save gasoline but to save rubber, then they turn around and make the 17 Eastern States save all the rubber for the entire country. Then another fellow comes out and says the rubber situation isn't as bad as it sounds, especially since they are making such a success of synthetic rubber, and then all of a sudden you don't hear anything about it any more.

Now we come to the coffee situation. Out of the Binghamton Press on January 9 I extracted a clipping where it is noted that there isn't enough coffee in the United States even for a cup-a-day basis. Then on Sunday out of the Philadelphia Inquirer I extracted a clipping issued January 9 from Washington to the effect that the Office of Price Administration advised that the coffee supply grows.

How in the devil is anyone in this country going to have any confidence in anything that is said about these restrictions? This would be a good item for you to bring up on the floor sometime when you have your fighting gloves on.

Yours,

C. A. MURRAY,

Endicott Forging & Mfg. Co.,

Endicott, N. Y.

It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that some sort of reaction grew up in the House to

take proper steps so that such confusion will not go forth in the future from this great Capital.

THE 49-CENT WHEAT PENALTY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am directing your special attention to a bill I have introduced to repeal the law that imposes a 49-cents-per-bushel penalty against farmers on wheat grown in excess of quotas allotted under the triple A program. This 49-cent penalty is in addition to forfeiture of rights to soil conservation and parity payments, as well as the right to have 85 percent of parity loans.

I am also reintroducing my bill to knock out the restriction that requires a farmer to pay 49 cents per bushel on his excess wheat before he can feed it to his own livestock and poultry. Of course, if we pass the first-named bill the latter will not be needed. I tried to get the Committee on Agriculture last year to at least lift the ban on penalties on feed wheat, but the triple A in Washington was against it. So the committee did not recommend it.

Mr. Speaker, there is no justification for making a farmer pay penalty on wheat he feeds to his own livestock and poultry. That just cannot be right.

Let me give you some rather interesting figures. In my State of Kansas in 1941 producers were penalized for raising excess wheat in the sum of \$5,194,822. About \$2,000,000 has been refunded to farmers who were still in the business, who put up bonds, and cut their production the next year to make up for the excess over the allotment. Last year, 1942, the Government collected and placed in escrow penalties on Kansas wheat the sum of \$763,000. About \$38,000 of this amount has since been refunded. I do not have the figures for the entire country, but it is estimated it amounts to about five times the above figures.

Mr. Speaker, there is no justification or excuse for continuing this sort of thing now.

Here is a rather odd situation. A farmer who feeds excess wheat he has on hand right now is required to pay 49 cents per bushel for every bushel he feeds to his own livestock and poultry. His neighbor, who does not raise wheat of his own, can buy a carload of wheat from the Commodity Credit Corporation, not at the market price of about \$1.24 per bushel in my part of the country, but for 86 cents per bushel, provided he feeds it to his livestock. Both are the same kind of wheat and grown on the same kind of land. One farmer pays a penalty to one agency and another buys from another agency of the Government for 35 or 40 cents under the market price and the wheat is used for the same purpose and fed to the same kind of livestock. That just does not make sense and we ought to know it.

Now, the situation is still more complicated when we find that still another

agency of the Government is fixing the price ceiling on flour in order to keep the price of wheat and wheat products from going too high.

Mr. Speaker, here we are facing the greatest food shortage experienced in this country in 80 years. People in other lands are starving and crying for food. The demand for increased production of food of all kinds is tremendous. The shortage of meat and many other foods is already becoming acute. It is going to become worse. To continue the practice and policy of imposing penalties and restricting the production of grain or any other food products is all wrong. It ought to be corrected right now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a poem.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have two or three requests. First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an article by Mary Carter Roberts.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

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

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Next, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today, I be permitted to address the House for 8 minutes.

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

MUCH BITTER FACTIONALISM

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

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

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those who would permanently take this country into the ever-recurring wars and revolutions of the nations of Europe should read the article by Ernest K. Lindley entitled "Much Bitter Factionalism" in the Washington Post of December 20. The writer deals with conditions in Yugoslavia. When racial hatreds in one nation can assume the proportions now displayed in that war-stricken country, when two factions of their unfortunate people, both fighting the Axis Powers, can carry on another war between themselves, it is not difficult to fully understand what conditions will be when the Axis Powers are defeated and the two factions are able to turn upon each other the full fury of their hatreds.

Mr. Speaker, there are few nations in Europe where internal hatreds do not exist. In a number of these countries, including Spain, France, and others, this feeling is suppressed at the moment, but in Yugoslavia and in the others the end-

ing of the present war will mark the opening of outbreaks of civil war that for viciousness will parallel anything the world has heretofore known.

Those who close their eyes to the teachings of history are willfully blind. Those who believe human nature has changed during the thousands of years of recorded history are stupidly blind. Wars since the beginning of the human race have stemmed from human selfishness. Desire for food, lust for power, lust for wealth in one form or another has provided the urge. This will continue until human selfishness is washed from the human heart. All the wars, all the negotiations, all the treaties between nations will not change this fact.

We are now engaged in the greatest war, the most horrible war, in all history. Every American desires to win this war in the shortest possible time and with the least loss of human life. That is one thing upon which the American people are agreed. On this there is no division of opinion. There is, however, Mr. Speaker, a very definite and widespread division of opinion as to what the national policy shall be when this war is finished.

In evaluating the proposals already set forth in the Atlantic Charter and elsewhere, having as the objective the sudden transformation of this wicked and selfish world into Utopia, it is well to bear in mind that when peace has come, and as time softens the memory of the horrors of the present conflict, the world still will be governed by selfish and powerful individuals such as have been responsible for all previous wars. The great war of a quarter century ago, with its millions of dead, injured, and maimed, with all its agony of human hearts, taught the world nothing. The war in which we are now engaged will teach the world nothing. I have no doubt that strong men, greedy men now in high places, and others of like character seeking high places are already intriguing, scheming to secure for themselves and the nations to which they belong those things which will give them an unfair advantage over others. This has been human experience since time began, and to me it seems both wishful thinking and folly to believe there can overnight be a complete transformation of individuals, singly and collectively, growing out of our present struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe that when this war is over and we have gained our security, we should look to that security in the future, and look long and well before we allow ourselves to be again projected into the quarrels and wars of other nations.

I present for the Record the article by Mr. Lindley entitled "Much Bitter Factionalism":

MUCH BITTER FACTIONALISM

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

Secretary Hull's appeal to all factions opposing the Axis to get together was not intended for French ears alone. Yugoslavia is another case in which bitter factionalism is hindering the most effective opposition to the Axis. Since the quarrels among the Yugoslavs were discussed in this column 5 weeks ago, they have gone from bad to worse.

The trouble is rooted partly in the old conflicts between the Serbs, on one side, and partly in political ideology; and partly in the Croats and Slovenes, on the other; opposing concepts of military strategy. The Serb Patriots, led by General Mihailovitch, favor straight guerilla warfare—maximum damage to German supplies and communications, with minimum losses. Mihailovitch opposes risking masses of troops in pitched battle with a better armed foe. He maintains perhaps 20,000 men in the field.

The Communist-led Partisans, operating mostly in Croatia and Slovenia, are now more numerous. They profess to have between 200,000 and 300,000 men in the field. They have recently wrested considerable areas from the Germans but in so doing have courted grave danger. It is always possible for the Reichswehr to throw in sufficient reinforcements to wipe them out.

The Partisan diversions serve Soviet strategy. Each German division tied down in Yugoslavia subtracts one division from the Russian front. Moscow has provided the Partisans with some supplies as well as leadership. And the Comintern has waged propaganda warfare against Mihailovitch, describing him variously as an Axis stooge and a tool of the ultranationalist Greater Serbia movement.

There seems to be little doubt that Mihailovitch has given the Italian overlords of Croatia at least temporary respite from attack in return for munitions and gasoline. And the communiqués indicate that his operations against the Germans have been crimped by clashes between his forces and the Partisans.

Responsibility for these clashes is difficult to fix. The Partisans apparently have pillaged Serbian farmers who supported Mihailovitch with taxes; he may have attacked the Partisans in reprisal. On the other hand, the virulent Communist propaganda against him may have inspired the Partisans to initiate the attacks.

As Office of War Information Director Elmer Davis has stated, our Government trusts Mihailovitch and considers his strategy sound. Diplomats who know him intimately say he had said and done nothing to indicate he favors the Greater Serb movement which, in the minds of the Croats and Slovenes, may mean post-war vassalage to the Serbs. Our experts justify this traffic with the Italians as a sound guerillist expedient which may also be useful in making friction between them and the Germans.

Various proposals have been advanced to close the breach. Mihailovitch, himself, suggested a Moscow directive requiring the partisan commanders to accept his leadership. The Yugoslav exiled government in London made representations to that end, but without result.

The Yugoslav government in exile is shot through with feuds. Our Government's decision to raise Yugoslav Minister Fotitch to ambassador's rank is an example. The idea was first broached during the Washington visit of King Peter. Croat leaders, who accuse Fotitch of secretly favoring the Greater Serbia movement, were incensed at this "endorsement."

The higher rank was nevertheless given Fotitch, in fulfillment of a promise to the King, and with the explanation to the Croats that the purpose was to honor Yugoslavia, not any faction or individual. The explanation did not suffice. Ivan Subacic, Governor of Croatia before the German occupation and deputy prime minister in the exiled government, resigned that post in a huff and went on an American speaking tour.

Last week, in a radio talk, Subacic's secretary, Ante Pavelich, said Mihailovitch was "in eclipse." Ambassador Fotitch, in a press release, repudiated him as a renegade, who had abandoned his post in the Yugoslav diplomatic service a few days after the German

attack and was formally dismissed from the Government service by royal decree last May.

Fotitch is understood to have expressed indignation at the failure of our censors to suppress the broadcast. Croats in the embassy have also incurred his disfavor. His military attaché, Col. Mirko Burya, a Croat, regarded by our officials as a capable officer and loyal Yugoslav, has been dismissed for a Serb. Burya has volunteered his services to our Army but has thus far been unable to obtain the formal Yugoslav release our policy requires.

Although the Yugoslav cabinet has proportionate representation for Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, the Serb group seemingly is dominant. The exiled government's propaganda exaggerated Mihailovitch's exploits and did little or nothing to correct the impression that the Croats were supine. Battles fought by the partisans were credited to Mihailovitch, leading the outside world to expect new exploits which neither his strategy nor his resources allowed.

Young King Peter has promised the restoration of the Yugoslav state as a whole, with full rights for the Croat and Slovene minorities. Mere pronouncements do not heal old sores or allay the present civil strife. But observance of the principles stated by the King by the members of the exiled government would moderate the hatreds now consuming the Yugoslavs. Beyond that lies a test of the ability of Moscow, London, and Washington to reach an agreement on questions of high military and naval strategy.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

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

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in these days of pyramiding propaganda units in practically all executive departments of government, America might well turn to the advice of Alfred E. Smith and adopt "Let's look at the record" as its guide book for determining where the praise or blame for governmental action should be placed. For that reason, I have today introduced a bill to substantially increase the number of copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be distributed without charge by our Government, specifically designating in part that all reading rooms of military establishments be provided with regular copies of the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, such action as I propose would be a valuable contribution to America's current victory book campaign. The country has recently been treated to a misguided tirade against Congress by radio commentators, newspaper columnists, magazine sophisticators, organized purge committees, and others. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tells the true story of Congress and reports the processes of freedom in action. Let us let the RECORD speak for itself. Surely the soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen of the country have a right to know what is going on in Congress from an unexpurgated source. The same is true of the students who are training to become the citizens of tomorrow. The cost of supplying these RECORDS will be but a tiny fraction of the money now being spent by the almost endless number of publicity bureaus and propaganda units maintained by the executive departments, some of which, themselves, have contributed to the program of misrepresen-

tation directed against the legislative branch of government.

The Seventy-eighth Congress is destined to recapture for the legislative branch its rightful position as a coordinate unit in this Government. In the long run it will prove wise economy and prudent Americanism to make copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD available to as many as possible of the citizens to whom this Government actually belongs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, January 13, 1943, on the passing of Gen. Agustin P. Justo. General Justo, who had served as President of Argentina, was a great soldier as well as a great statesman. He was a leader of foresight and vision, who had registered consistent dissent against the isolationist foreign policy of the present Argentine administration. Especially since the entry of the United States into the war, General Justo had been an ardent supporter of pan-American solidarity and the cause of the United Nations. His passing, particularly at this time, is a great loss to the cause of hemisphere solidarity and it is to be hoped that his farsighted and patriotic aims will be carried on to the successful conclusion for which he had labored.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Edwin A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

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

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

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

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

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

THE FAMILY-SIZED FARM

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I think we should learn something from the miners' strike now going on in Pennsylvania while the whole country is shivering from the cold. We might well visualize what would be going on all over the country now if the farmers of this country had taken the advice of the Administration and John L. Lewis for the last 6 years and organized with the C. I. O. The country then would not only have been suffering from the cold weather and the coal shortage, but it would be starving also if the advice of John L. Lewis had been followed.

After we have inaugurated our Governor in Pennsylvania next week, I propose to ask for 1 hour's time in which to discuss the matter of the farmer with the family-sized farm and his problems. The problems that we of the family-sized farm have to deal with are not understood in Washington.

UNAUTHORIZED STRIKES

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. 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. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I feel I should be derelict in my duty to my constituents, and to my country, if I did not now before this House take a stand with regard not only to the coal strike, but to all work stoppages that interfere with war production. In my campaign I openly stated my opposition to all those stoppages and I want to say now that in my opinion the first duty of this Congress is to promptly take definite steps to put an end to all stoppages that curtail or interfere with war production.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. COX. It certainly ought to be possible to find enough people with membership in this body who love their country well enough to support such an effort.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I believe so.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. 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. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, like all Members here I am receiving innumerable letters wanting to know what legislative program the majority intends to submit. We have been in session 2 weeks now and nothing has been said with regard to an agricultural program or any other kind of program, and we do not know how to proceed.

I yield to the distinguished majority leader to answer this question.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows, of course, that it takes some days to organize the House, to make committee assignments, and that this is now being done by the committee on committees of both parties. As the gentleman knows, there is no program for the rest of this week, for we have already agreed to adjourn until Monday when we adjourn today, and I see nothing so far as next week is concerned.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I do hope the majority leader will bring in some kind of program soon in order that we may be in position to tell our own people at least what to expect.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know of nobody whose experience and knowledge of legislative procedure is greater than that of my distinguished and dear friend from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have three consent requests to submit: First, that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today at the conclusion of other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, 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.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would say to the majority leader that while it may take him some time to get a program together that it does not take very long for the people in Michigan and other Northern States to get very cold these days when there is no coal.

Now, some of us here would be pleased to have the gentleman to ask his leader, the President, on one of his visits to the White House why he does not get after, not the miners in the coal mines but these union fellows who are assessing this additional 50 cents a month to the dollar a month the miners are now forced to pay the union. The miners are striking because the Administration is back of the union which now seeks to compel them to pay additional dues to the organizations, the unions, which contributed money for the New Deal political campaigns. Now, if that is not a rotten situation, you tell me one. Instead of continuously kicking the miner—the workingman—around, why not get after the union racketeer. "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," apply the boot where it is needed, not, in this instance, to the miners, working in the hard-coal mines, who protest this additional levy, but to those who are exacting it, the union. I have today introduced a bill to correct the evil.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EBERHARTER. 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. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania I want to go on record as saying that I feel very sorry and regret very much that the good name of the great State of Pennsylvania should be splashed in all the headlines of the country as a result of this very disgraceful strike in the anthracite mines. I have no sym-

pathy whatsoever with this strike, yet everybody knows that my position has always been in favor of organized labor. It is just such actions as this that do a great deal of harm to organized labor, local unions, and the great body of organized labor.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe there are today on the statute books sufficient laws to deal adequately with this situation in the anthracite mines. I hope in all sincerity that those who have the power under these laws will act immediately so that the morale of the country will not be broken down. These men should be compelled to go to work immediately or be compelled to get into the armed services.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, 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.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, first, permit me to extend my sympathy to the gentlemen whose constituents are now shivering up and down the Atlantic seaboard, in western New York, in Pennsylvania, in New England, and along the Great Lakes to Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and to say to them that they are largely to blame.

The people of Ontario, Canada, are not freezing, because they took time by the forelock and developed their water power, chased the Power Trust out of Ontario, and for years have been heating their homes with electricity.

To the people of New York, I say again that it is time you woke up to the fact that you are paying more than \$200,000,000 a year overcharges for your electricity, compared with the rates they are paying in Ontario just across the line. Your rates are so high you cannot afford to heat your houses with it; while the people of Ontario have been heating their homes with electricity for more than 30 years. Many houses have no chimneys or flues, but depend exclusively on electric heat—the finest, purest, and cheapest heat in the world, when supplied at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

In Pennsylvania they are paying more than \$75,000,000 a year in overcharges. They could heat the entire State of Pennsylvania and the surrounding country with electricity generated with their own coal, gas, oil, or water power. But you are dominated by the Power Trust, which will not let you do that.

Michigan can look across into the promised land and get a glimpse of the electric age in Windsor, Canada. If the people of Michigan got their electricity at the same rate the people of Windsor are getting theirs, they would save more than \$45,000,000 a year on their light and power bills alone.

We can take the fuel that is now imbedded in our soil, such as coal, gas, and oil, and the waterpower that is going to waste in this country, develop it, as Ontario has done and heat every home in America more satisfactorily, if not more cheaply, than they are being heated

today. Then we could let this oil and gasoline go to our boys who are fighting the battles of the world, and to our allies across the sea.

This is the program for which I have pleaded for years. If it had been carried out, as it was in the T. V. A. area, and as it was in Ontario, your people would not be suffering for want of fuel today; and the oil you are now using could be sent to our fighting forces on the various fronts.

For your information, I am inserting five typical bills from my home town of Tupelo, Miss., for the year from and including July 1940 to and including June 1941.

These homes never have a fire in them, but are electrified throughout. I will have some more recent statistics to submit later.

Space heating study—Monthly electric billing

Customer's name: Miss Cassie Williams.
Address: 112 North Madison St.

| | Kilo-watt-hours | Bill under old rate | Bill under new Tennessee Valley Authority rate |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| July 1940..... | 276 | \$12.54 | \$4.51 |
| August 1940..... | 224 | 10.46 | 3.99 |
| September 1940..... | 220 | 10.30 | 3.95 |
| October 1940..... | 282 | 12.78 | 4.57 |
| November 1940..... | 350 | 15.50 | 5.25 |
| December 1940..... | 776 | 32.54 | 7.25 |
| January 1941..... | 898 | 37.42 | 7.74 |
| February 1941..... | 852 | 35.58 | 7.56 |
| March 1941..... | 710 | 29.90 | 6.99 |
| April 1941..... | 552 | 23.58 | 6.36 |
| May 1941..... | 278 | 12.62 | 4.53 |
| June 1941..... | 232 | 10.78 | 6.36 |
| Total for 12 months..... | 5,650 | 244.00 | 69.05 |
| Saving per year under new rate..... | | | \$174.94 |

Customer's name: George Thompson. Address: 426 North Green St., Tupelo, Miss.

| | Kilo-watt-hours | Bill under old rate | Bill under new Tennessee Valley Authority rate |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| July 1940..... | 440 | \$19.10 | \$5.91 |
| August 1940..... | 638 | 23.02 | 6.30 |
| September 1940..... | 450 | 19.50 | 5.95 |
| October 1940..... | 698 | 29.42 | 7.69 |
| November 1940..... | 1,336 | 54.94 | 9.49 |
| December 1940..... | 2,010 | 81.90 | 12.94 |
| January 1941..... | 2,198 | 89.42 | 13.69 |
| February 1941..... | 2,408 | 97.82 | 14.53 |
| March 1941..... | 2,046 | 83.24 | 13.08 |
| April 1941..... | 1,626 | 66.54 | 11.40 |
| May 1941..... | 660 | 27.50 | 7.54 |
| June 1941..... | 576 | 24.54 | 7.20 |
| Total for 12 months..... | 14,986 | 617.44 | 115.72 |
| Saving per year under new rate..... | | | \$501.72 |

Customer's name: A. J. Eubank. Address: 420 Goodlett St., Tupelo, Miss.

| | Kilo-watt-hours | Bill under old rate | Bill under new Tennessee Valley Authority rate |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| July 1940..... | 462 | \$19.98 | \$6.00 |
| August 1940..... | 466 | 20.14 | 6.01 |
| September 1940..... | 500 | 21.50 | 6.15 |
| October 1940..... | 832 | 34.78 | 8.23 |
| November 1940..... | 1,482 | 60.78 | 10.32 |
| December 1940..... | 1,910 | 77.50 | 12.54 |
| January 1941..... | 2,198 | 89.42 | 13.69 |
| February 1941..... | 2,602 | 105.58 | 15.31 |
| March 1941..... | 2,642 | 107.18 | 15.47 |
| April 1941..... | 1,310 | 55.90 | 10.14 |
| May 1941..... | 606 | 25.74 | 7.32 |
| June 1941..... | 424 | 18.46 | 6.60 |
| Total for 12 months..... | 15,434 | 635.36 | 117.58 |
| Saving per year under new rate..... | | | \$517.78 |

Space heating study—Monthly electric billing—Continued

Customer's name: J. P. Nanney. Address: 346 North Green St., Tupelo, Miss.

| | Kilo-watt-hours | Bill under old rate | Bill under new Tennessee Valley Authority rate |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| July 1940..... | 650 | \$27.50 | \$6.75 |
| August 1940..... | 654 | 27.66 | 6.77 |
| September 1940..... | 652 | 27.58 | 6.76 |
| October 1940..... | 1,270 | 52.30 | 9.23 |
| November 1940..... | 3,018 | 122.22 | 21.08 |
| December 1940..... | 2,956 | 119.74 | 16.72 |
| January 1941..... | 4,052 | 163.58 | 21.11 |
| February 1941..... | 4,376 | 176.54 | 22.40 |
| March 1941..... | 3,874 | 156.46 | 20.40 |
| April 1941..... | 2,672 | 108.38 | 15.59 |
| May 1941..... | 866 | 36.14 | 8.36 |
| June 1941..... | 684 | 28.86 | 7.64 |
| Total for 12 months..... | 25,724 | 1,046.96 | 162.81 |
| Saving per year under new rate..... | | | \$884.15 |

Customer's name: Shelby Reed. Address: 359 North Green St., Tupelo, Miss.

| | Kilo-watt-hours | Bill under old rate | Bill under new Tennessee Valley Authority rate |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| July 1940..... | 1,096 | \$45.34 | \$8.53 |
| August 1940..... | 900 | 37.50 | 7.75 |
| September 1940..... | 1,100 | 45.50 | 8.55 |
| October 1940..... | 1,094 | 45.26 | 8.53 |
| November 1940..... | 3,184 | 128.86 | 22.67 |
| December 1940..... | 4,036 | 162.94 | 25.94 |
| January 1941..... | 4,254 | 171.66 | 26.82 |
| February 1941..... | 6,808 | 273.82 | 37.03 |
| March 1941..... | 5,224 | 210.46 | 30.70 |
| April 1941..... | 3,098 | 125.42 | 22.19 |
| May 1941..... | 1,328 | 54.62 | 10.21 |
| June 1941..... | 1,076 | 44.54 | 9.20 |
| Total for 12 months..... | 33,198 | 1,345.92 | 218.12 |
| Saving per year under new rate..... | | | \$1,127.80 |

Mr. Speaker, what is being done here can be done anywhere in America—and it will be done when the representatives of the people demand it. If you do not demand it, your successors will. It is just as sure to come as the night follows the day. We are moving into the electric age.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] today, I may be allowed 10 minutes to discuss the fighting Roosevelts and the "lie" of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]?

The was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 50 minutes.

THE WISCONSIN CHEESE SITUATION

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, aside from the subject that I want to discuss this afternoon, I cannot refrain from com-

menting on something that has just occurred. When the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi was talking about the utilization of coal for the manufacture of power and for the heating of the homes of New York and Pennsylvania, as well as the other States where coal is available, I wondered under present conditions how he is going to get that coal out of the mines so long as the miners refuse to work and refuse to bring that coal to the surface so that it can be used to manufacture power?

But I do not want to go into a discussion of that subject today. I want to call your attention to some things that I believe are of interest, not only to the people of my State, but, in view of the situation that is confronting the people of the Nation who may go hungry, to the people of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Tuesday last leaders of the Allied Nations in a Nation-wide broadcast called for an unprecedented production of farm products for 1943 from the farm families of America. Throughout the entire country farmers were urged to assemble in observance of Farm Mobilization Day. A message from the President to the farm families of America was part of this program. Every speaker stressed the importance of food and the vital place that American farmers occupy in the war program. Among other things, the President said, and I quote:

Food is a weapon in total war—fully as important in its way as guns or planes or tanks. So are other products of the farm.

Thus the high place of farm production in the war program was graphically portrayed by every speaker on this great radio broadcast. The President paid a long delayed tribute to the farm families of America when he said:

In spite of the handicaps under which the American farmers worked last year, the production victory they won was among the major victories of the United Nations in 1942.

The President closed his address with these words:

Our fighting men and allies and our families here at home can rely on farmers for the food and other farm products that will help to bring victory.

I believe that I am speaking the attitude of the farm families of America when I say that these people welcome the opportunity to meet any kind of a challenge for the production of farm products if such production will assure the preservation of our institutions of government and hasten the day of ultimate peace, provided they have some tangible assurance from their Government that they will be afforded equality in the distribution of the Nation's income. The farm people of this country are fully aware as to the legislative and governmental security that has been given to labor and industry in the war effort and in good conscience and justice they have a right to demand the same assurances of family security. They well know that when labor participates in a war-production program it knows in advance that it will be well paid.

The law protects the hours of labor and provides for overtime payments on the basis of a 40-hour week with time and a half for overtime and double time for certain days. Labor knows that it is protected in the enjoyment of its right to strike for better wages or on account of jurisdiction or other disputes. When industry was asked to convert its operations from normal business to war business, they were assured that the Government would absorb any loss sustained. They are given contracts for the production of war materials on a unit-cost basis and are protected in the enjoyment of assured profit. If they exceed the production requirements under the terms of their contract they have no worry about the disposition of the surplus. The Government encourages increased production and purchases any surplus and pays cash for it at unit-cost prices. The Government recognizes such efforts by special awards of E flags and through a system of priorities and allocations of materials assures to both labor and management continuous factory operation. This type of security the Government has extended to labor and to management and in speaking in behalf of the farm families of America, I am not critical of the security which has been attained either by labor or management. Common justice, however, demands that the attitude of the administration and many reflecting that attitude in editorial and radio comment, should now revise their critical attitude toward the farmers of America and once and for all begin to realize that if we and our allies are to eat, some form of adequate security must be given to the farm population of this country. They do not want any right to strike and they do not ask for time-and-a-half or double-time pay. They will continue to work the hours from sunup to long after sunset in order to help carry on this fight, and they not only will devote their own time but will utilize the services of their wives and children.

They only ask in exchange for this effort that they be permitted to enjoy the right to live in free America as decent human beings, and they have a right to know that when this war is over and the excessive demands of lease-lend and other governmental activities have ceased, that they will not again be thrown into the calloused hands of the bankruptcy court. If the farm people of this country are given the incentive of a decent wage during this period of increased production and assurance that greatly increased production will not ultimately destroy them when the war is over, they will produce the food and the fiber necessary to win this war.

At this time, however, they do not intend to be guided in their thinking by mere soft words of praise. They recall that sometime over a year ago the Federal Government pleaded for an increase in the production of milk. They accepted the Government's promise that the milk thus produced would find a market at a reasonable and fair price. In the months of October, November, and De-

cember of 1941, the farmers began to increase the production of milk, and they were paid during the 3 months indicated at the rate of about \$2.25 per hundred for milk testing 3.5 percent butterfat, less hauling costs. This period was the low production period of the year. In January 1942, in response to the Government's constant urging for more and more milk production, the farmers met the challenge and production began to climb. Instead, however, of meeting the Government's obligation under its promise, the price of milk began to decline. I might say in fairness that this price decline at that season of the year is of normal conditions. The farmers were assured, however, that conditions were not normal. They had prepared for abnormal conditions. They were stepping up their production to meet abnormal conditions, and in the face of this response by the farmers of America the price of milk began to drop, and after long hours of labor they received compensation at \$1.95 per hundred with a continued drop in price until milk reached \$1.80 in July. Thus, all of the high-sounding praise of the farmers was not reflected in the wage which the farmers received for his greatly increased labor.

The farmers felt, and had a right to feel, that they were being misled by their Government, and thus began a breakdown in the morale of the farm population of this country.

I know of no more patriotic loyal American group than are to be found in the farm families of America. This let-down, however, was not only unexpected by them, but constituted what they rightfully conceived to be a breach of faith.

Today, in line with the appeal of the President on Farm Mobilization Day, soft words are again being poured into the ears of the American farmer. While he appreciated the expressions uttered on that day, he has a right to demand now an assurance that it will be no repetition of the situation that confronted him in the first half of 1942. The farmers of this country want to know the facts. He wants these facts stated by somebody in authority to speak for the Government. He wants to know and is entitled to know that if he steps up his production that he will be afforded a market for his products that will guarantee him a decent place in our economic system. He needs to know these facts so he can plan for the future.

The farmer of America cannot plan his work from day to day. He not only must plan for the planting and rotation of crops, but he must plan his other production programs. All of these plans are dependent upon anticipated income, and even then his over-all planning may be destroyed overnight by insects or the elements. He must be able to plan his help and plan for farm machinery, for feed, and a multitude of things incident to the conduct of the farm.

In the over-all picture the price of farm products is all important. In this connection the recent attitude of the

Government in the matter of fixing price ceilings on dairy products clearly demonstrates to me another evidence of breach of faith.

May I say to you men and women of this country and to my colleagues in this Congress, those of you who saw that cartoon in yesterday's Star must be impressed with the fact that the people of America are facing today a deadly threatening food shortage and those of you who can only get a quarter of a pound of butter and who in a short time will not be able to buy a pound of natural American cheese better sit here and listen for a moment and not kid yourselves that we are just talking shop because the dairy industry happens to be a dominant industry in the State from which I come.

Let me be specific.

The State of Wisconsin, one of whose congressional districts I have the honor to represent, today produces between 50 and 60 percent of all the cheese produced in the United States. That cheese production consists of many types of cheese that have been developed over long years of effort. We produce a large volume of so-called foreign types of cheese. The Swiss, Brick, Limburger, and other foreign types of cheese have for many years absorbed a large volume of the fluid milk produced in Wisconsin.

Millions of dollars are invested in this enterprise and the products of these Wisconsin factories find a ready sale in the markets throughout the country.

In addition to these foreign types of cheese, Wisconsin produces today approximately 60 percent of all the American cheese that is produced in this country.

Overnight and almost without warning, a price subsidy was announced by the Department of Agriculture and the O. P. A. providing for the payment out of the Treasury of the United States of a subsidy of 3¾ cents per pound to be paid to the farmer whose milk went into the production of American cheese. No subsidy was provided for the manufacturers and producers of foreign types of cheese. What will be the result of this subsidy order in its effect on the manufacturers and producers of foreign types of cheese? It is perfectly obvious that this industry, which has taken many years to develop, will be forced out of business. The manufacturers and producers of these foreign types of cheese will not be able to pay to the farmers who produce the milk a sufficient amount to permit the continued flow of milk into the factories producing foreign types of cheese. The explanation given is that our lease-lend requirements do not include foreign types of cheese and that therefore the subsidy must be paid to encourage the production of American cheese. It is the latter type of cheese which is wanted for shipment to our allies. Unless this subsidy program is abandoned or unless it is applied equally to the producers of foreign types of cheese, the latter group will be completely put out of business. Perhaps such a result may be thought to be necessary as one of the incidents of war. I want

to assure you, however, that it is difficult for those who have devoted their lives to the upbuilding of this business to see it wiped out overnight by Government regulation and bureaucratic order.

Let us look one step further into this picture. The Secretary of Agriculture, who is now Food Administrator, has demanded a tremendously stepped up and increased production of American cheese to meet our lease-lend commitments. As previously indicated, Wisconsin today is producing over 60 percent of all the American cheese produced in this country. We have the facilities to produce American cheese, which is the type wanted by the Government. We have the experienced cheese makers, who have spent years in making and upgrading their cheese. It would seem only common sense, therefore, to believe that the increased production of American cheese should be stimulated in the area that has the milk and is equipped to produce the cheese.

Let us see what the bureaucrats have done. There has been created what is known as a dairy industry advisory committee. These are the men who offer suggestions and advice to the W. P. B. and the O. P. A. in connection with the dairy industry. The cheese section of the advisory committee is composed of four men as I am advised: First, Mr. Charles Eckburg, president of the Borden Cheese Co., of New York; second, Mr. Fred Kraft, of the National Dairy & Kraft Cheese Co., of New York; third, Mr. Roy D. Smith, of Jerome, Idaho, and fourth, Mr. Ernest Henegar, Lewisburg, Tenn. The gentleman from Idaho I understand is a small cheesemaker and the gentleman from Tennessee falls in the same category. Thus it will be seen that this committee is dominated by the representatives of the two great cheese processing organizations of this country; namely, Borden and National Dairy with the Kraft Cheese Co. as a subsidiary. It will be noted that the State which produces 60 to 70 percent of the American cheese of the Nation is not represented on this advisory committee. It is to be assumed that the orders of the O. P. A. and the W. P. B. must to some degree at least reflect the attitude of this advisory committee which is clearly dominated by the big cheese processors of this country. I make no charge that they have dominated either the W. P. B. or the O. P. A. in the matter of orders affecting the cheese industry. The Nation may judge from the facts. The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

It is well known that the production of American cheese in Wisconsin is largely in the hands of small factories scattered throughout the State, which operate as farmer-controlled plants or farm cooperatives. The big interests are located in areas principally outside the State of Wisconsin in their direct manufacture of American cheese. In order to understand this picture thoroughly it must be borne in mind that American cheese for years has been made in certain styles. Generally speaking, these styles may be designated as large and small. The large styles are known as Cheddar and twins. The twins and Cheddars weigh approxi-

mately 70 pounds each. The small styles are known as flats, double daisies, triple daisies, single daisies, longhorns, young Americas, square prints, natural loaf, and picnics and midgets, ranging in weights from the smallest style, natural loaf, 5 pounds, to triple daisies, weighing a total of 66 pounds.

In an order made by the O. P. A. on December 24, 1942, the Administrator set the maximum price for American cheese. These maximum prices ranged from 23 1/4 cents per pound for the large styles, Cheddars and twins, up to 24 1/4 cents a pound for square prints, natural loaf, picnics, and midgets. The price for double daisies and triple daisies was fixed for 23 3/4 cents per pound, and for single daisies, longhorns, and young Americas 24 cents per pound. It will be observed at the outset that under this maximum price order the differential between the price of the small styles of cheese and the large styles is not sufficient to take care of the necessary increased costs necessary to manufacture and package the small styles of cheese.

The price of these two large styles of cheese is fixed at 23 1/4 cents. They have fixed a little higher price for the small type of cheese. I am told by the cheese makers' organizations of my State that the differential between the two is not sufficient to absorb the extra labor necessary to make the small types weighing from 5 to 33 pounds and to pay the extra cost necessary for the additional packaging of that cheese. I want you to bear that in mind because it is very important in what I am going to say to you in just a moment in tracing these orders through for you.

I am advised by those in the cheese industry who should know that the effect of this order will be to stop the production of the small styles of cheese and force the producers of American cheese to manufacture only the large styles—namely, cheddars and twins. I want you to bear this fact in mind at this point as it will assume a commanding importance later on in this discussion.

The prices which I have hereinbefore enumerated are the maximum prices for American cheese, delivered at all places in the State of Wisconsin regardless of the point of origin. What about the manufacturers of American cheese outside of Wisconsin? Here is where the inequity and discrimination begins to manifest itself clearly. The order provides that the maximum prices for American cheese delivered at all places outside the State of Wisconsin shall be the Wisconsin prices which I have heretofore listed, plus transportation charges. The order provides that the transportation charges shall be the lowest published railroad carlot, freight rate per pound, gross weight from Plymouth, Wis., to that place, times 1.15. It further provides that the calculation on the per pound basis shall be carried to the second decimal point.

Now let us see how this order works and how it encourages the Wisconsin farmers to produce more American cheese. In simple terms the order means this: A factory producing cheddar or twin styles of American cheese at any

point in Wisconsin is under a maximum price ceiling of 23 1/4 cents. The same type of cheese manufactured any place outside of Wisconsin can be sold for 23 3/4 cents per pound plus 115 percent of the lowest published railroad carlot freight rate per pound, gross weight, from Plymouth, Wis., to the place of manufacture. For example, cheese manufactured within the areas of the following points will receive the following price advantages:

| City and State | 115 percent of freight rate from Plymouth, Wis. | Maximum price freight plus 23 1/4 cents |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Freeport, Ill. | \$0.22x1.15=\$0.25 | \$23.50 |
| Dixon, Ill. | .25x1.15=.28 | 23.53 |
| Escanaba, Mich. | .51x1.15=.58 | 23.83 |
| Kansas City, Mo. | .88x1.15=.66 | 23.91 |
| Pine Island, Minn. | .68x1.15=.78 | 24.03 |
| Memphis, Tenn. | .84x1.15=.96 | 24.21 |
| Springfield, Mo. | 1.07x1.15=1.23 | 24.48 |
| Birmingham, Ala. | 1.11x1.15=1.27 | 24.52 |
| Dallas, Tex. | 1.17x1.15=1.34 | 24.59 |
| Any place in Wisconsin | | 23.25 |

What will this mean to Wisconsin that now produces from 60 to 70 percent of the American cheese requirements of the Nation? It means that a factory located at Escanaba, Mich., will receive 23.83 cents per pound as against 23 1/4 cents per pound paid the Wisconsin factory just across the State line. The factory at Freeport, Ill., will receive 23 1/2 cents a pound; the factory at Dixon, Ill., 23.53 cents per pound; a factory in Dallas, Tex., will receive 24.59 cents per pound. Is it not clear, therefore, that the farmer who produces the milk and upon whom the factory is dependent for its successful operation will deliver his milk to the factory that will afford him the best price advantage? We are, therefore, threatened with this situation: The milk which now goes into Wisconsin factories that are equipped and set up to make American cheese will flow across State lines into the factories in other States that enjoy the price advantage heretofore indicated. Is it not clear also that the milk which used to flow into the factories making foreign types of cheese will be attracted from southwestern Wisconsin into Illinois, Iowa, and Minnesota where advantage can be taken of the increased price afforded the producers in those States under this Plymouth-plus order?

I have talked with many men connected with the cheese industry, and no one has been able to indicate any reason for this destructive blow to the American cheese industry of Wisconsin. I point out these facts as evidence of what is transpiring in government that is causing the revolt among the farm people of this country. Why should a government that seeks increased production of American cheese break up an industry in the State that produces 60 to 70 percent of that cheese and destroy the incentive to the trained cheesemakers and operators to produce more American cheese? I am wondering if you can see in this picture the skillful hand of the big operators who have plants located outside the State of Wisconsin who will

reap a rich harvest by reason of this price differential. I am advised that these same big operators are constructing milk-drying plants in the State of Wisconsin to produce powdered milk at a price ceiling fixed by O. P. A. which will enable them to drive more cheese factories to the wall. The whole picture should be the subject of a congressional investigation, and I propose at the proper time to introduce a resolution to that effect. As a Representative from a great dairy State, I cannot sit idly by and see a whole industry ruined by reason of the orders of a small bureaucratic group who have failed to even ask the advice and opinion of those who today are making 60 to 70 percent of the production which the Government so badly needs.

A moment ago I indicated to you that the manufacture of small styles of cheese would no doubt cease due to the inadequate price differentials between the large and small styles. Let us examine this order further. It provides that whenever twin and Cheddar styles of cheese are sold for processing to the United States Government or any agency thereof and the moisture content of such cheese is 37½ percent or less, the maximum price shall be as set forth in table B contained in said order. An examination of this table indicates that the maximum price for twins and Cheddars when sold to the United States Government or to a processor shall be a price ranging of from 23.82 cents per pound for cheese with a moisture content not over 37½ percent to 25.54 cents per pound for cheese where the moisture content is 33 percent or less. Thus it will be seen that when sold to the United States Government or to a processor, the price ceilings on twins or Cheddars is very much above the general price ceilings on the same styles of cheese. The result of this price advantage again is that the producer of twins and Cheddar styles of American cheese in order to obtain the maximum price must sell the same either to the United States Government or to a processor. Thus we find that in accordance with the price ceiling fixed for all styles of American cheese the cheese maker will be forced to discontinue the make of small types of cheese because he can make more money by making the large styles; namely, twins and Cheddars. Having converted to the manufacture of twins and Cheddars, he must either sell to the Government or to a processor in order to get the maximum price provided for in this order. This means, in simple language, then that so far as the American public are concerned, they will be required to eat processed cheese. They will not be able to buy that which is purchased by the Government because that will be shipped under lease-lend to our allies abroad. They will not be able to buy the small styles of American natural cheese because the cheese makers will discontinue the making of those styles as hereinbefore indicated. I do not know whether the processors had this in mind or not, but I am stating the facts as they are, and I am reliably informed that natural cheese will soon

be entirely off the domestic market as a result of these orders.

Another indication is to be found in the general order providing for maximum mark-up for retailers who sell all types of cheese. I am advised that the mark-up that a retailer doing an annual business of \$250,000 or more dollars per year on natural cheese is 22 percent. I am further advised that this mark-up is all out of proportion to the mark-up permitted on packaged processed cheese, thus forcing the large retailer to sell only processed cheese. One of the large retail distributors in my district recently wired me in part as follows:

Office of Price Administration is restricting the mark-up to 22 percent on Wisconsin cheese, an item that we have promoted and developed for years in every State in the Union. This mark-up might be satisfactory for a store handling a few varieties of prepackaged processed cheese. We handle every conceivable kind of cheese and must absorb the cutting, shrinking, and packaging cost. This order puts us out of the natural cheese business and takes away all incentive of future promoting Wisconsin cheese.

Again this order appears on its face to discriminate against natural cheese in favor of the processed variety. Wisconsin has spent millions of dollars in this country to cultivate a taste for natural cheese. These successive orders with one sweep of the Henderson pen threaten to destroy these efforts.

They have worded this order so that it even has the effect that a retailer who used to take a twin and cut it up and sell a pound or a pound and a half or two pounds, and wrap it up, cannot do so at a price high enough so that he is able to pay for the cutting and the shrinkage and packaging. They have imposed on him a mark-up that will not permit him to absorb those items any longer in the retail store. By a further differential in favor of processed cheese, he will be confined in his sales of cheese to the cheese made by the processor. The processor is the one we will have to sell twins and cheddars to, in order to get the price advantage to the farmer stipulated in this order.

Is not the picture suddenly beginning to clear up a little?

My friends who are on this Dairy Advisory Committee, in charge of cheese, will very vigorously deny that they had anything to do with the writing of these orders. Then who did write these orders? I should like to have somebody who is always apologetic for the actions of the bureaucrats in this administration make some study and be prepared to answer that question.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it any wonder, therefore, that the farmer, who will ultimately be most affected by these orders, views the situation with alarm? He may be getting a fair price for his milk

today, but when he sees this natural cheese industry destroyed, which he himself has spent millions of dollars to build up throughout this Nation, cultivating a taste in the people of American for natural cheese, he is ultimately going to be the sufferer.

Is it any wonder therefore that the farmer who will ultimately be most affected by these orders views the stranglehold that great dairy monopolies are acquiring on his business with alarm? I say to you, my colleagues in this Congress, that honeyed words and soft praise is not what the American farmer wants today. He demands security. He demands protection. He demands his right to be heard before these far-reaching orders that so vitally affect him are entered. He has no desire to accept charity at the hands of his Government. He wants no dole. He wants no subsidy. He wants to be assured of a fair wage for himself and his wife and his children.

In short, he wants and demands the same security that is afforded to other segments of our society, and this Congress owes him the responsibility and the duty of investigating this bureaucratic action to the end that he may receive simple justice.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman has stated about the cheese industry of Wisconsin is similar to the experience we have had in Minnesota with reference to butter. Wisconsin is conceded to be the largest cheese-producing State in the Union, and Minnesota is conceded to be the largest butter-producing State. They started out with a program in Minnesota where they diverted the milk from butter into evaporated milk and paid a higher price for evaporated milk, but scores of small creameries closed down all over the State, dislocating the butter-production program. Then they went into powdered milk from evaporated milk. The result has been that we are having a famine in butter. The creameries producing butter have gone out of business just the same as the cheese factories in Wisconsin will go out of business under the program.

Mr. KEEFE. May I thank the gentleman and say that due to the limitation of time I have attempted to confine myself to the over-all picture today and the situation as it affects cheese. I hope I shall be able to discuss the general situation as it affects butter and powdered skim milk and powdered whole milk and the evaporated-milk problem that is facing the farmers of the gentleman's State and mine. It will not be possible to do it within the limitations of one address in one afternoon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman pointed out in the beginning that labor knows what it is going to get for its hire.

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The industrialist knows what he is going to get, whether his contract is on the cost-plus basis or any other basis. The President has asked \$100,000,000,000 for the coming fiscal year to meet war and other expenses. Nowhere along the line, however, does the farmer know what he is actually going to receive as his price for his products. It seems to me the solution to give him security for the things he is going to produce which are a vital war element, namely, foods, and to encourage him to increase production, would be to fix a floor under those prices as well as fixing a maximum beyond which the prices cannot go. Nowhere is the farmer guaranteed even the cost of production for his products.

Industrial plants costing millions of dollars have been built with the taxpayers' money for the purpose of producing war materials. No adequate attempt has been made to financially assist agriculture, one of the largest industries to meet the requirements of war needs. Our small farmers are going out of business every day and selling their few remaining units of livestock and so forth because of the drain on their help and because of lack of financial ability to keep upon their farms their dairy and livestock herds. Some provision should be made to assist the remaining small farmers in purchasing some of the dairy herds and so forth that are being sold because of the draft law and the way it has been administered. That is one of the reasons for our shortage and it is going to increase in intensity as we go along. We are going to have to face and meet the issue.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that I think he is quite familiar with the attitude on this general question of the gentleman from Wisconsin who is speaking. The responsibility of legislating on this subject, however, rests with the gentleman's party. You still have control. You still have not met this issue. You prattle about the increased prices the farmers have received from the time they received nothing until today, but you have not fundamentally solved this problem. I congratulate the gentleman upon the diligent fight he has made, as I well know, to encourage his party in this Congress to deal adequately with this problem. After all, we of the minority can make suggestions, but we cannot legislate until the majority is willing that legislation come before this House. I hope the gentleman will have some influence upon the leadership to begin to legislate to stop the sort of thing I have described this afternoon.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I appreciate what the gentleman has said regarding myself. I have done my best to make my party see this very situation, but I may say the responsibility rests upon the

shoulders of every Member of this Congress, whether he be Republican, Democratic, or Progressive. The responsibility rests upon the gentleman just the same as it does upon me, to introduce legislation which will bring about security for the American farmer as well as insure an adequate supply of food to meet war needs. Maybe our shortage is due to some extent to our commitments under lend-lease.

Mr. KEEFE. If it does rest upon me and upon the minority, I would like to know why some of the measures that we have advocated are not enacted into law. You cannot get them out of the committee, you cannot get them on the floor of the House until the administration permits it. Your party is charged with the primary duty in matters of legislation and it is because you have failed to properly meet the issue that the whole country is aroused.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] for 10 minutes.

MANPOWER

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I quote now a phrase from the President's Budget message delivered on Monday last:

Private thought and public discussion of this subject are very necessary.

The President said that when he delivered his Budget message to Congress here the other day. He was referring to the procurement of munitions and used this particular language:

Total mobilization of all our men and women, of all equipment, and all our materials in a balanced proportion program will enable us to accomplish the production goals underlying this war Budget.

Following that general statement was his subhead of manpower, and I wish to touch on that for a few moments, for the purpose of public discussion. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we are making rather poor progress in the mobilization and use of the man and woman power in this country, and if you will permit me to read a few lines from a book just published by the Brookings Institution, prepared by Harold W. Metz, I call the following excerpt to your attention:

Much public confusion has resulted from conflicting statements issued by Government officials, both with respect to the ultimate size of the armed forces and the possibility of a labor shortage. Brigadier General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, stated in September 1942, that we can look forward ultimately to a total of 13,000,000 men in the armed forces, and that he contemplated 10,000,000 men at the end of 1943. Secretary of War Stimson testified before the Senate Military Affairs Committee on October 15 that the number in the Army at the end of 1943 would be 7.5 million; and according to Navy officials, the naval force will be approaching 2,000,000 by the end of 1943.

With reference to the available manpower, Secretary of Labor Perkins stated in September that she did not believe there would be any real labor shortage making it necessary for Congress to enact legislation regulating the use of manpower. At practically the

same time, Chairman McNutt of the War Manpower Commission asserted that a manpower shortage is imminent, and that legislation to control the allocation of the labor supply is imperative.

Some of those statements you will notice go back to last fall, and yet in the President's Budget message he in my mind still raises the question, to the effect that these munitions can be obtained only provided we properly balance the manpower and the womanpower forces of this country. The Industrial Conference Board, together with other studies which have been submitted, indicate that we have a total labor force in this country of approximately sixty-two to sixty-five million people, but in order to obtain that high figure, you have to take in many of the able-bodied youngsters between the ages of 14 and 19, who are now in school, and you have to take in a great army of the women in this country under 45 years of age, who have reached maturity, married or single, and with children over 16 years of age. Studies have been made in connection with maintaining a 9,500,000-man army, and a 12,000,000-man army. If you will permit a personal reference, based upon these studies, I wrote my own family this very week and told my wife to prepare herself mentally to be brought into this question of securing munitions, and by munitions I mean total war supplies, on a basis of a ten to twelve million man army. With the food supplies that we have, and which have been so very well referred to by our friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] this afternoon, I think we will have to scrape the bottom of the meal barrel in order to get out this production of war material and I think these men and women, boys and girls, will have to move into the production lines at just as rapid a rate as possible, and with all the work of these people, unless we get ships far beyond anything in sight at the present time, I do not think you will have the bottoms in which to move the men and goods, after you prepare for a ten to twelve million man army.

Mr. Metz in his study gives us these interesting figures. On the basis of a nine and one-half million man army, in 1944, you will need a total labor force of 65,000,000 people, consisting of an agricultural force of nine and one-half million, an unemployed force of 1,000,000, agricultural workers nine and six-tenths million, and nonagricultural, 45,000,000, and he points out that—

The magnitude of the draft upon the youth and the aged is indicated by the fact that we would be recruiting for full-time employment over 15 percent of the 11,000,000 persons in the over 65 and between 14- and 19-year groups, both boys and girls who are not now employed, and that in the case of homemakers we should have to take at least 60 percent of the nonfarm women who are under 45 and who have no young dependent children. It is obvious that such a program would involve enormous social as well as economic consequences.

I think these are some of the things that the President was referring to when he said that this subject needs to be discussed and thought out by our people.

Going on in connection with this study, and dealing with an army of 12,000,000 men, if the armed force could be increased to 12,000,000 by the end of 1944, with no increase thereafter, then in 1945 you will need 69,000,000 people in the labor forces. This would require an increase in the labor force of ten and four-tenths million people from 1942 to 1945. This means the using of 250,000 Mexican workers and two and four-tenths million retired workers, five and six-tenths million homemakers, and 2,000,000 as a result of the natural increase in the population. At least 20 percent of those between 14 and 19 years of age normally in school and of the workers who would normally retire would have to be brought into the labor force, and at the same time all nonfarm homemakers under 45 without small children would also be required.

I think it is well for the country, for the women of this country, particularly the homemakers, our wives, to consider these studies which are now before those who are dealing with this manpower problem. Now, going on to one or two other points.

FINANCING THE EXPENDITURES

In his Budget message the President pointed out that before Pearl Harbor our monthly expenditures for war were running around two billions, that now they have reached six billions, and that during this current fiscal year we shall top seventy-seven billions, and in the following fiscal year we are to disburse \$100,000,000,000 for war purposes. He gives some figures which I have projected along with the chart made by the Industrial Conference Board. Taking the appropriations as of July 31, 1942, at two hundred and fourteen billions and adding to that the one hundred billions called for by the message the other day, makes a total of three hundred and fourteen and two-tenths billions; and when you take the amount spent against this before Pearl Harbor of thirteen and one-tenth billions, the amount spent up to June 30, 1942, of thirty-two and four-tenths billions, and the amount to be spent during the current fiscal year, we have a total of one hundred and nine billions, and deduct that from the three hundred and fourteen and two-tenths billions it leaves two hundred and four and eight-tenths billions of dollars to be spent on war subsequent to July 1, 1943, having in mind only the appropriations and authorizations heretofore made plus those called for in this Budget. We can well raise this question: To whom are the securities to finance these activities to be sold? Let us look at that for just a moment. Taking into consideration the \$12,000,000,000 of securities placed by the Treasury last month, the month of December, we find that nonbanking sources purchased \$7,230,000,000, and the banking sources purchased \$5,070,000,000; in other words, about 41 percent of this last issue was placed in the commercial banks of this country and thereby became highly inflationary material. Now, let us consider this thought for a moment: I believe it is reasonable to assume that the business institutions and insurance companies and corporations other than

commercial banks skimmed the cream from their cash positions this last month in their purchase of the large volume of securities which they purchased. They undoubtedly exerted themselves in their response to the Treasury to make the selling campaign a success. But let me ask this question: Will those corporations, estates, and trusts repeat with such a liberal response say in the month of April 1943, when another great issue must be sold? And again every 3 months or more often, will they so respond? It is reasonable, I submit, they will not be able to do so. In that event the Treasury will then have to resort more specifically to two other sources: First, the savings and income of individual citizens; and, second, the commercial banks. Let us examine into this question further: During the 13 months December 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942, Savings bonds amounting to about \$10,000,000,000 were sold to our people; just a fraction of their income during that period and only a small percent of the total disbursements for war purposes during those months. Monthly redemptions of Savings bonds have jumped from about \$16,000,000 in December 1941, to around \$50,000,000 in December 1942. That is a rather small item at present as related to the total amount of Savings bonds outstanding. Taking the amount of disbursements given by the President for the remainder of the current fiscal year plus the more than \$100,000,000,000 to be spent during the coming fiscal year makes it very clear to everyone who listens that the individual citizen must probably double or treble his purchases unless we are to resort to the wildest inflationary process and place these Treasury issues in the commercial banks, taking whatever economic consequences that may follow.

It should be clear to all that if we are to avoid inflation the deficit after such increase in taxation as Congress sees fit to provide must be financed out of the savings of individuals and the savings and uninvested accumulations of corporations. And I submit this question: If the Congress adopts the Carlson-Ruml plan as advocated by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] this week, will that assist in preventing inflation or in promoting inflation? More about this later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted for this time to the gentleman from Michigan who preceded me. He told me that he was to talk about the Budget message and wished I would add a little to his remarks. I have usually studied recent budgets, listened to the reading of the present one, then taken the floor at once, commented and made comparisons. This message you heard on Monday was so general in character that there was little to comment on, since there was no chance to compare, there being not many detailed figures or statements in it. Message that the non-military appropriations amounted to lit-

tle because they more or less tied into the war effort, and might be generally included as military expenses. Like the first message, we were given a generalization and patriotic talk. The President paid tribute to all of our citizens who were doing most yeoman service in the war effort. The real trouble that I have had for years, or had years ago, was a fear that the Budget would raise the debt to the point of real danger. I have had to change my mind however. When asked if our debt would be paid, I have always said that that depended upon the willingness of Congress to tax our people sufficiently to pay it. We were then talking about some four to ten billions! Now, of course, we are talking about a debt of \$210,000,000,000. I have had to change my views and fix my eyes upon the stars and infinity.

The President has asked us for some \$35,000,000,000 to be taken out of the people's pockets in 1 year. We never dreamed that the time would, or could ever come when our people would pay willingly, even in war time, \$35,000,000,000 almost all of which would be in direct taxes; and now it is suggested that we ought to have a \$16,000,000,000 tax in addition to the \$35,000,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The \$35,000,000,000 the gentleman mentions does not take into consideration the twenty or more billions that the people of this country pay to the States and the subdivisions of the States.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Our States and State subdivisions have been very careful about paying their debts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is correct. I have found, as I have observed, read, and listened to discussions on taxation by those in power within the Administration, that they have not too carefully refrained from giving the probable reason for desiring that our people become used to paying very heavy taxes to the Federal Government each year. If we are to be taxed 50 percent of our war effort each year, we can pay our debt in a few short years.

What is their real object? It apparently is that they want about the same amount of money each year after the war. Some now in authority are telling you that it is probably going to cost as much or more to keep the peace after the war is over. They apparently hope to extract from our people forty to fifty billions of dollars in taxes each year for some time to come, so that they can proceed to make the world over by acting as Santa Claus for all backward nations.

Little did I dream, a few short years ago, that a Congress would ever dare to impose such huge amounts of taxes on our citizens. What marvelous things we will do when patriotism is the issue. However, when the war is over, will our patriotism extend to such enormous exactions to keep the nations at peace through largesses? The idea to continue lend-lease methods is the vehicle for continuance of the huge spendings contemplated.

Do you not think that I have reason for these assumptions?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Jesse Jones tells us that we can expect on the basis of today's price level a national income of \$135,000,000,000 for the calendar year 1943. I think this is the problem that the Congress faces and I feel it very deeply. We have had a 35-percent increase in the price level since the outbreak of the war. Assuming that is correct, I want to ask the gentleman, what in your opinion would have been the increase in the price level had our people not tended to practically hoard many of their liquid savings after income instead of letting them flow into the competitive retail market bidding against each other? Where does the gentleman think the price level would have gone to?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not know. I know what the gentleman thinks. He probably thinks that the price level in 2 years from now will be 75 percent higher than it is at the present time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. GIFFORD. I will let the gentleman answer his own question. I cannot challenge that statement. I have said I did not think it was possible that our people would give up \$40,000,000,000 for any purpose during one particular year. Are we not afraid of what our credit may be after the war? Certainly, such a huge amount of taxes each year ought to preserve our credit if applied to the debt. But will it?

The new scheme is to take the money from any source they can get it. They desire to seize your savings, or much of your salary, that it may be returned to you after the war. They suggest that you buy listed articles on installments, but such articles could only be delivered after the war is over. That argument must be challenged at once. The Secretary of the Treasury is right. He says that this can better be accomplished by buying savings bonds. What about this great demand debt of ours? We are selling bonds and stamps in great quantities, making a highly dangerous debt on demand. This must now amount to some thirty billions.

But this administration has been shrewdly planning after all. It has learned a lot about currency. I will place an interesting reassurance in the RECORD. Do not worry about not getting back dollars that you paid for your bonds. But you may still worry about what those dollars will buy. I will read this into the RECORD:

Dollars are not a problem. Cash for bonds turned in can come from other bonds sold to other investors or to banks. After the war all the holders will not sell their War bonds at once. Furthermore, the Government can create more deposits as fast as bonds are offered for sale, and, if buyers for new bonds can't possibly be found, the Federal Reserve System can step in and buy. The Government has guaranteed to supply dollars in exchange for its bonds, and there is nothing that can interfere with that guarantee.

You will get your dollars. The new Members have not yet heard me bewail

our financial conditions. I must confess that the public have proven themselves apparently willing to be taxed some \$40,000,000,000, therefore I must withdraw some former lamentations. I will close with a quotation I have often used, but now repeat for the possible enjoyment of the new Members:

Hush, little deficit;
Don't you cry,
You'll be a crisis
By and by.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter addressed by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JOE MANSFIELD, to Mr. Roy Miller with reference to a matter involving considerable foresight on the part of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which, had it been acted upon would have largely reduced the present shortage of fuel in the Eastern States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not object, the gentleman refers to that barge canal across the Florida Peninsula?

Mr. KLEBERG. I do refer to that. It is a rather full set-up for any reference of the House to the facts in connection with that matter.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, if that had been developed, the people on the Atlantic seaboard would have plenty of oil today. They would not be freezing and shivering?

Mr. KLEBERG. That is right.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what has been done regarding the Florida ship canal thus far?

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Donald Nelson recently made some recommendations which are set out in this letter. It will take less time if the gentleman will read this than for me to explain it.

Mr. RANKIN. This is the barge canal, not the ship canal.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all special orders on the calendar for today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]?

There was no objection.

PROBLEMS OF THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the small businessman today is suffering very much, especially in the city of New York, and probably in all other communities, because of the red tape in the regulations heaped upon him by the various Govern-

ment agencies. The act which Congress passed to relieve the burdens of the small businessman has not done very much for him.

We talk about the little fellow who is the backbone of the country, the small retailer, the butcher, the grocer, and the others who are the backbone of our way of life, yet although I have heard much said on the floor of this House and of the other body and seen much in the newspapers about it, I have not as yet seen one constructive measure that would in some form or another bail out the small businessman who is in trouble because of the sudden changes in our economic life.

I refer as an illustration to my own city, a city of close to 7,000,000 people, the greatest center in the world for industry, science, culture, and almost everything you can name. As the war progresses and as the problems of our industrial development become more acute, it is of tremendous importance that Congress lend its effort to find a solution to these problems in the best interest of industry and labor. In New York City, for instance, the garment industry, which used to employ say half a million people and indirectly affected the welfare of an additional three-quarters of a million of the population, has been hit very hard by war conditions, and the complicated and arbitrary orders and regulations heaped upon it by the O. P. A. and the Labor Department do not help industry in its desperate struggle to adjust itself to a war economy.

I am not blaming the administration; I am not blaming the leadership of this present Government, but something is radically wrong. Either Congress pays no attention when it is passing laws, or it throws the whole burden of issuing rules and regulations and orders on the departments or commissions or other agencies, and as a result a lot of dollar-a-year men who, in my opinion, ought to be removed from all Government agencies, get a great deal of power they should not have. If we need experienced men in certain industries, we ought to employ experts, pay them a regular wage, and make sure they work for the interest of the whole country and not for the exclusive interest of their respective companies.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman believe those businessmen are experts?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They are experts when it comes to their own business, but I believe some of them are more interested in their former business associations than in the job they hold. I say some of them. I believe the dollar-a-year men are all right in their own factories, but not working for the Government. I think we ought to employ capable men at a definite wage and know that they are administering for the benefit of all the people the laws that Congress passes, and not administering them for a special group or a special individual.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is making a very constructive statement.

Would he go further and suggest the class from which these experts should be drawn? Will the gentleman make a constructive suggestion as to where they could be gotten?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think they can get plenty of capable men if they pay them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Where?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There are plenty of them in this country today, big men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know the gentleman is trying to help, but will he name some of them or tell us the societies or the class from which they can be drawn?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I could go into that very thoroughly and most likely completely, and I am going to make every effort I can to see what I can do to satisfy the gentleman.

It is true that Congress has approved the laws under which the Labor Department and the O. P. A. are functioning, but I feel sure that we never intended to set up agencies which would complicate matters by bureaucratic methods and a lot of red tape. It is true that consumers must be protected against speculative prices. It is true that it is necessary to ration certain materials to insure equal distribution. It is true that steps must be taken to guard against inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I am not attacking the basic law enacted by Congress to take care of certain emergencies, but I certainly disagree with the way these laws are being administered. Judging by the various orders and regulations with which the country has been swamped in the last few months, it would seem that a lot of people who know nothing about the various industries are allowed to draw the orders in which the prices are fixed. The harassed small businessman cannot possibly understand the complicated legal terms. He has to employ attorneys and additional clerks to comply with all the new rules and regulations. He has to fill out so many forms that his own business almost becomes a side line.

Take for example M. P. R. 287, which is supposed to regulate the manufacturing of women's, girls', and children's outerwear garments.

This, by the way, is only 1 part of several other circulars dealing with other branches of the garment industry. In order to establish a maximum price, the order goes along for 20 columns, closely printed regulations, and winds up with a table which divides the articles in question into 31 different groups, each of which is subdivided into 16 more groups. There are, therefore, 496 distinct items which must be borne in mind by the manufacturer of such garments in that industry; otherwise he simply could not manufacture. Now, Mr. Speaker, 496 items are a large number to consider if a person wishes to engage in this type of business. Out of the 496 types, there must be at least 75 percent which necessarily affect the wages to be paid by the employer in such establishments. We, therefore, come to the question as to how it would be possible for a businessman to continue his activity and pay a

reasonable wage to employees, with such a tremendous amount of detailed regulations which he must follow; otherwise the regulations provide for detailed penalties and all kind of unpleasant reprisals. When I say 496 I am really somewhat inaccurate. We have to multiply this by 496 more, since in addition to the regulations established in 1 part of the order there are different figures established in another portion of the same regulations covering 496 other items. So that the total number is really twice 496, or almost a thousand detailed figures which have to be borne in mind if the manufacturer is not to become enmeshed in these regulations to the extent which will mean his complete extinction or bankruptcy. I did not say a word as yet about the 20 columns of the text which tell the manufacturer what to do and what not to do, and which prescribe for him and all kind of methods of determining the wages and determining the styles, and all of the other manifold regulations, with which he is pressed under this circular known as M. P. R. 287. I am afraid that most of the regulators, who so plentifully supply the Government Printing Office with printing matter for the regulation of industry, do not in most cases know the first thing about the problems of the industry, or the necessities of either the manufacturer or the worker. The administration in my opinion is opposed to all this, but we have some people in these various branches of Government, who apparently sit up night and day thinking up new orders to keep busy without realizing what these complicated orders will do to business.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. As a new Member seeking information, it is quite surprising to me the number of men making these regulations. Can the gentleman tell me who voted these agencies into being?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, Congress does not adopt the regulations.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Did you vote for the bill originally?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Then, may I ask this: Do you feel that we should make some changes?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I shall come to that in a moment. I want to answer the gentleman's question. The gentleman is a new Member. We pass a law, and then we say that the administrator, or the person who is to carry out the intent of the law, shall make such rules and regulations. Congress cannot do that. All we can do is to tell the administrator to make regulations and put them into effect.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman agree with me that if we have the remotest hope of preserving government by the people that the time has arrived for us to cease talking and begin acting?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman. I think that is a fair statement. We should act.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman agree with me that we are living under a government of dictatorship by bureaucrats?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I would not put it that way. That is a rather strong statement to make. We are just living under a government, a pretty good government, that is trying its best to protect the interests of all the people. There are some people in some of the Government agencies, however, that are misfits. We ought to study these problems carefully, remove the incompetents, and put better men in office.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me in the further statement that the way to stop these bureaucrats is to starve them out by not giving them money to carry on that practice.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, that is rather a large order.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I understand the gentleman to say that the administration is opposed to this, and that the gentleman is condemning these unnecessary regulations?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think so. I do not think, for example, that the administration is in favor of all the time-consuming orders and regulations which are practically ruining a whole industry in my city. It is simply a matter of having too many people trying to show their authority in drawing up orders on subjects they know very little about.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman point out just one instance where the administration has indicated that it is against this regimentation and this bureaucratic interference?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have not gone into that particular phase except that I have talked to a few people. Some of them did not themselves know what the regulations were, because some of their understudies drafted them. If the situation is the same in other industries, as it seems to be in the shoe industry and the clothing industry, the gentleman will find that before long nobody will know where we are or where we are going. We ought to turn around and clean house.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman, then, cannot point out any single instance where the administration has indicated that it is against this regimentation and this bureaucracy. The statement which the gentleman made that the administration is opposed to these things is not therefore backed up by any proof.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think it is the great responsibility of the Congress in passing laws fixing prices, or laws for the general welfare and the benefit of the people, to make doubly sure who is going to administer the law and what kind of regulations are going to be made to take care of the administration of the law rather than to pass a law so general

in term that it in effect says: "Mr. Administrator, you can issue any regulations you want," and then pay no more attention to it until our constituents commence to squawk.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield, but my time is going fast, and I have many more things to call to the attention of the House.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been furnished figures to the effect that during the year 1942 some 33,000 small food stores in the United States had to close their doors, and I have been told that to a general extent this was due to the multitudinous regulations that are smothering them out of business. Has the gentleman got those figures too?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman made a fair statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me? I will give the gentleman 2 minutes of my time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not want to take the gentleman's time; I want to use my own.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Two minutes of mine for half a minute of the gentleman's?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield.

At the present time we have over 400,000 people unemployed in the needle industry of New York. We have no defense work, we have no other method of taking care of these families, and this means 100,000 families.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman should call that to the attention of the people who are saddling inefficiencies on the Government, because today we find washerwomen and bricklayers holding jobs as stenographers in every department of the Government here in Washington.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is another serious problem the manufacturers in the garment industry have to face and that is the interpretation of certain phases of the Walsh-Healey Act. The Secretary of Labor, as well as her inspectors, have shown very bad judgment in the interpretation and enforcement of this act and have created a great deal of unnecessary confusion and uncalled for hardships. In order to remedy this situation, I saw fit to introduce the other day a bill—H. R. 690—which deals with a certain phase of the so-called Walsh-Healey Act, affecting public contracts. It provides that the determination of the Secretary of Labor shall be subject to review by the circuit court of the United States and confers jurisdiction on the circuit court to hear an appeal taken from the decision of the Secretary of Labor.

Due to the administration of prices and the various regulations dealing with the production of New York City's needle industry as well as the curtailment of civilian needs, a good many business concerns could keep their heads above water only by securing Government contracts from the Army and the Navy Departments. The Walsh-Healey

Act gives the Secretary of Labor certain rights in approving or disapproving concerns bidding for Government contracts and the Secretary of Labor has not been very wise in using this authority. The rules and regulations set up by her Department are very complicated and as has been proven in a number of cases were even too complicated for her own investigators to interpret. How, then, can one expect the average businessman to be able to obey all these rules and regulations? It is almost impossible to escape technical infractions of these regulations, and the average small businessman harassed by regulations coming from the various Government agencies, must, whether he wants to or not technically violate some of them at some time or another. When that happens, there is another section of the Public Contracts Act which says that when a businessman violates any of the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary can bar him from bidding on any public contract for 3 years. Invariably where such an event has happened, the Secretary of Labor, in spite of the fact that the power to bar a businessman from future contracts is discretionary, has exercised her right to the nth degree, and has always barred a business manufacturer from future contracts, so that in addition to paying a fine and being beset with all these rules and regulations the slightest infraction of any of them means being put out of business. In this way, more thousands of employees lose their jobs and again the roll of unemployed increases.

To bring partial relief in this situation, the bill I introduced, H. R. 690, will vest in the circuit court of appeals the right to overrule the Secretary of Labor whenever the facts in a case may warrant such action. At least some way will be provided for, by which the courts will be able to determine whether or not the infraction of some minor rule by a manufacturer shall bar him from future contracts and throw his employees out of work.

This becomes so much more necessary, since the Supreme Court, on January 11, 1943, sustained the scope of the Walsh-Healey Act, and strengthened the powers of the Secretary of Labor, making her a virtual czar in the enforcement of this act. There should be some check on the powers of this executive official and the place for such a check should lie in the courts.

I hope and expect that Congress will enact this proposed legislation without delay so as to give much needed relief to a great number of people who through no fault of their own are losing the means to make a livelihood for themselves and their families.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair calls attention to the fact there are several other special orders pending.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I withdraw the request.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress will receive within the next few days a personal message from the Apartment House Association of San Francisco. I have a copy of it here. It is a letter dated December 31, 1942, signed by Douglas Dorn as president. I urge my colleagues to read not only Mr. Dorn's letter, but also the interesting data and information contained in the brochure attached. The title of the brochure is "Rent Control—as Congress Intended it—as O. P. A. Runs it."

Many citizens of San Francisco feel they have been unfairly treated. On October 14, 1942, Justice James F. Byrnes appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency seeking an amendment to the Price Control Act to cover Nation-wide rent control. I quote a portion of the colloquy between Justice Byrnes and myself appearing on page 18 of the committee hearings:

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Justice, I come from San Francisco and I was out there recently and a number of these people who have modern apartment houses have asked me if some machinery could not be set up whereby they could make applications to have their rents increased. For instance, during the depression they reduced their rents very drastically and now they are unable to get any increases because of the Rent Control Act and a good many tenants have had their incomes very greatly increased through the war situation. I was wondering if you could not arrange to have some simple machinery set up so these people could be heard without great delay.

Justice BYRNES. There is no reason why it should not be done. I will be glad if you will get in touch with me to ask those in charge to provide machinery to give them a hearing on it. I will be delighted to assist you in that.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that I did not have any opportunity of going over these remarks before they were printed. The words "modern apartment" as printed in the hearings is a mistake, for I am sure I said "moderate apartment."

About 10 days after the October meeting of the committee I went home to San Francisco for the November election, returning to Washington some time about the middle of December. While home, many people broached their rent troubles to me. On January 2, 1943, I wrote Justice Byrnes a letter under the caption "Rent Control":

WASHINGTON, January 2, 1943.

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES,
National Economic Stabilizer,
Board of Economic Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

RENT CONTROL

DEAR JUSTICE BYRNES: You remember when you appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee in connection with rent control I asked if it were not possible for some simple machinery to be set up in order that cases in which the landlords felt they were being unjustly treated, could be heard.

You were very kind and expressed your sympathy in connection with this problem.

I am enclosing herewith letter addressed to me as well as to Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, and Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH, written by Joseph A. Brown, attorney for Apartment House Industry of San Francisco, under date of December 28.

I would greatly appreciate your earnest consideration to this matter.

With every good wish for the new year, I am,

Cordially,

THOMAS ROLPH.

Mr. Speaker, I received the following reply, dated January 4:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 4, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of January 2 with reference to the rent-control program.

Of course, you know I have nothing to do with determining the manner in which this office should be administered, but I am forwarding your letter to Mr. Paul Porter with the request that he give consideration to the letter from Mr. Joseph A. Brown.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

To date I have had no word from Mr. Paul Porter.

Mr. Speaker, I also submit a letter dated San Francisco, January 6, 1943, from Mr. and Mrs. Pessarra, of 811 Forty-second Avenue, reading as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, January 6, 1943.

To Congressman T. ROLPH,

Fourth District.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: We never did ask any favors. But now we feel we are, with many others, being treated very unjust. We have been decent citizens. Could we please get some kind of closer information about that Office of Price Administration renting business—as it is, it is a most unfair one-sided proposition only for the tenants. Our case is miserable, not only unjust. In 1941 we rented to one particular tenant very reasonable as he kept chewing down on Mr. Pessarra until he finally gave in to said tenant's terms; said tenant faithfully promised they both where never home thereby using very little or barely any gas and elect. Same tenant is using both by far too much, thereby breaking his word. Agreements have just been mutual, not in writing, as no one would ever come, thought then that such laws could ever come, where the property owner had absolutely nothing to say any more except take all mischief whatever a tenant might do. The Office of Price Administration tells us there is nothing we can do, no matter how much said tenants are using or wasting it is up to the landlord to write to his Congressman so the present laws may be changed. In our other apart. is the same thing improved conditions under 1940 unimproved conditions (rentals). The tenant can do as he pleases, waste hot water and break all his other agreement to any extent even using terrible language if you ask them in a nice way to be a little more careful. Why does that Office of Price Administration renting law just condemn the landlords and step all over them? While wages and food prices have gone sky high are we not even to exist any more? This is one of the most unfair and class discriminating laws ever been put in effect yet. Please try your utmost to do something for us and help better just a little on that law as now it's very unfair. We both have been loyal voters with friends in your both terms and want to be in the future. Sorry to bother you with our trouble in this times as you must be a very busy man but the Office of Price Administration says to write your Congressman to change the laws; as it is now they can't do nothing. I will not go

into details about my other problems in my aparts, as it would be too much for you to read.

Thanking you sincerely.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. PESSARRA.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. What is the date fixed for the fixing of rents?

Mr. ROLPH. San Francisco was one of the first areas declared a defense area. I cannot remember the date. It was away back in the early part of 1942.

Mr. ROWE. April 1, 1941.

Mr. ROLPH. Whatever date it was. I cannot remember the exact date, but I know that San Francisco was among the first areas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the gentleman agree with me that 90 percent of the difficulties that are emanating out of the rent-control situation is due to the regulatory concept of the law instead of the law itself?

Mr. ROLPH. Exactly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I have filed a bill today to correct the situation, and I hope the gentleman will support it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is a most encouraging thing to note that our friend from California is trying to correct some of these errors. Is it not a fact that the minority side protested against this broad grant of power when those bills were put through, but in spite of that they were jammed down our throats?

Mr. ROLPH. I voted for the price-control bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And now what have you got?

Mr. ROLPH. Well, I am trying to correct certain objectionable inequities.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The trouble with that bill, as well as others, is that it delegated the power down at the other end. They could not do a thing except through what we have given them the power to do. The minority side objected to those broad grants of power to those individuals, and I am glad the gentleman is trying to correct them.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman doing penance today?

Mr. ROLPH. No. I am trying to correct a wrong.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman can agree with me in the statement that the practice of the Congress in the adoption of legislation carrying broad grants of power permitting an almost unfettered use of discretion is the thing that has made the Congress ridiculous throughout the country and put it in a bad situation?

Mr. ROLPH. I agree with the gentleman; we should correct it.

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

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman agree with me that one of the greatest errors that has been made by O. P. A., the Rent Control Division thereof in particular, is that they have set up rules and regulations which take them into the most intimate activities of the homes of our people and the owners of those homes and apartment buildings and business institutions, to a point where there is such great interference that the people themselves resent the activity by reason of the fact that they personalize these interferences. In other words, our people are not objecting to rationing as such, they are not objecting to the scarcity of materials due to the war needs, they are not objecting to the personal sacrifices they make on that basis, but they are objecting to the type of administration by which the O. P. A. sticks its nose into everything that we try to do in order to promote our welfare and carry on the war.

Mr. ROLPH. May I say that it has been my experience in my trips home that it is perfectly amazing and perfectly wonderful the way the people have accepted every request and every regulation that has come out of Washington? This method of trying to have these things changed is an orderly and proper way for them to do it. I think the people should have credit for doing it the way they do. I think it is a wonderful demonstration of the loyalty and patriotism of the American people the way they have cooperated with this Government 100 percent. I thank the gentleman very much for his observation.

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

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Does the gentleman know that in Summit County, Ohio, the rent control board is now employing snoopers to go out and inquire of renters whether or not they are satisfied with their agreements with the rentees, and where there are perfectly amicable arrangements in existence they foment trouble in order that they may have control?

Mr. ROLPH. I think that is very unfortunate.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield further, may I call his attention to the enormous form, tabulation after tabulation, that has just come out. I have a copy on my desk. The owner of a house or an apartment must fill out this form. Then, as I understand, the O. P. A. takes that form and hands it to the tenant, thus stimulating a dog fight between the tenant and the owner of the place.

Mr. ROLPH. I am not familiar with that condition, but it should be corrected at once.

Mr. Speaker, if municipalities and other political subdivisions are to be saved from long lists of delinquent taxpayers, it is necessary that relief be granted at once to those who are suffering gross inequities. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution

setting forth that to successfully further the war effort the House Committee on Banking and Currency should make a complete national survey of rent control.

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

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

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman find in the administration of the price-control regulations strong evidence of a violent and hostile attitude toward private ownership?

Mr. ROLPH. That is what my people at home tell me.

Mr. COX. In other words, an intent to outlaw the institution of private property in this country?

Mr. ROLPH. I would not say that, but I think they are overzealous, and I believe the conditions should be corrected.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I say not only to the gentleman who has the floor but to the other Members of the House that the present speaker has in his hands a letter addressed to him from the brother of a boy who is on Guadalcanal doing that job for \$55 a month. He has a 6-room modern home in the city of Akron, Ohio, in which seven people are living. Their total income from work in war industries exceeds \$700 a month. The Rent Control Board compels that man to rent that property for \$22 a month.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 7 minutes.

BUREAUCRACY RUNS WILD

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, again a committee controlled by the party of the administration has had to conclude from the evidence before it that faulty management of the armament procurement program, the manpower program, and a general condition of confusion in the bureaucracy at Washington are interfering with the highest efficiency in our war effort.

This report is not made by "obstructionists," "isolationists," or "partisan Republicans." It is made by a special committee of the House of Representatives headed by a Congressman noted for his astuteness and fairness, and who last November was highly praised by the Democratic floor leader of the House as a man who had always supported the administration as far as possible. Under these circumstances, the report of the Tolan committee is very disquieting and merits the grave consideration of the American people. The people must not be discouraged by such reports as these. On the contrary, they should be encouraged that faults can be discovered and corrected. The most dangerous situation which could arise would be one in which a congressional committee could not find out and make public such facts as those secured by the Tolan committee.

There will be those, it is to be presumed, who will assert that the report of the Tolan committee may give aid and comfort to the enemy. Such a view is foolish and unwarranted. The very fact that

the Tolan committee has uncovered the practices and derelictions which it describes in its report is the guaranty that the Congress will see to it that these weaknesses in the war effort are remedied. That will give no aid and comfort to the enemy.

The committee, in its report, is sharply critical of the way the armed services are handling armament procurement. The report expresses general concern over the manner in which Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt is shaping up that program. The committee declares that we cannot win the war merely with our surplus energies, and makes a recommendation for the establishment of an over-all civilian war mobilization agency. This proposal should be scrutinized very carefully, because piling agency on agency has not heretofore achieved efficiency. On the contrary, the practice has resulted in conflicting authority, contradictions of policy, seething internal jealousies and general confusion. It is not too much to say that our greatest danger in this war comes from an enemy led by General Confusion.

The criticisms of the larger business corporations voiced by the committee arise largely because those larger corporations have been pulled and hauled, have operated under conflicting instructions, and cross lines of jurisdiction which have made it very difficult for business to operate efficiently at all. In spite of these obstacles, American free enterprise has already accomplished a marvelous job and will continue to do so. The committee took special pains to deplore the custom among Washington bureaucrats of substituting words for deeds. The committee said, in part:

There has been a widespread attempt to persuade the American public that many of the steps previously urged by this and other congressional committees have been carried out when even a brief investigation by well-informed persons will reveal the contrary.

This is a very disquieting condition of affairs—this empty pretention of following congressional directions and advice—especially when considered in connection with a most recent defiance of a direct congressional expression of will. There was an open and flagrant breaking of a specific promise made by administration spokesmen in both Houses of the Congress.

The essential point is that these dangers and derelictions pointed out in the Tolan Committee report must be remedied. Since it is apparent the executive department seems not intent to remedy its own mistake, the Congress, on behalf of the American people, will have to take a firm stand. These criticisms must be given serious attention, because they are of grave import and merit serious consideration.

We must immediately move to eliminate as far as possible all the objectionable features which now characterize the war effort, both in the civilian and military divisions as pointed out in the Tolan report. This special committee has done the Nation a great service and there is no question but that the Congress will give careful attention to the committee's report.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 10 minutes.

BUREAUCRACY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not see our friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] around. He is the gentleman who spoke to us earlier today and complained so bitterly about the bureaucrats, who are raising hob with his people up in New York. It was certainly refreshing, but it was at the same time somewhat ridiculous, if one can experience all three in so short a period, to hear the gentleman complain about those bureaucrats, because I recall very distinctly, that when those acts which gave those bureaucrats authority were under consideration here in the House, every time a Republican got up and called attention, as we did many, many times, to what would happen, to the misuse that would be made of the power granted—every single time someone on the majority side, usually the majority leader—and I am sorry that he is not present at the moment—would get up and, figuratively speaking, just damn the Republicans from hell to breakfast for playing politics, when they pointed out the absurdity of making those grants of arbitrary power and the abuse of power which would be made if we gave it to them. Now, when they cannot deny the misuse and abuse of that power, they come in as has my friend, who has now, I see, come into the Chamber, and themselves complain about these very bureaucrats. I say to my friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] that he was one of the principal advocates of that legislation. I am glad that he has repented. I hope his repentance is deep-seated, and sincere. I hope it will stick. I hope he will not backslide.

The gentleman said that we have not offered one constructive suggestion. If he will go through the list of bills he will find that Republicans every time they criticized have offered a bill which, if adopted and adequately enforced, would have remedied the situation. Let the gentleman offer a constructive suggestion, and he will find every Republican here doing all he can to get the thing through.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The trouble is that some of the Republicans, instead of trying to honestly criticize and suggest a remedy, have criticized to such a degree that they have made it appear that there is somebody in the administration who is trying to bring about this complicated O. P. A. complication. I was not talking about the bureaucrats. I was talking about the bureaucracy in the regulation that was made in the particular needle industry, which requires almost 1,000 forms to fill out for that business. I was addressing myself to a specific question and the gentleman is trying to get me on another phase.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; I am not. I am sticking to what the gentleman said. The gentleman was complaining because of regulations which the bureaucrats had

made. They made those regulations under legislation which the gentleman advocated and supported.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And for some of which the gentleman voted also.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, wait a minute. I did not vote for your general grant of power. Because I did not vote for every blanket arbitrary grant of power; because I would not become a rubber stamp, I was accused during the campaign of obstructing the war effort. Now we know, and many a Member on the majority side admits, the absurdity of the regulations the bureaucrats are putting out under the power we gave them.

I knew that the doggone thing would not work, and so did almost everybody else in the country. It was only the professors and those New Dealers who thought that they could make it go. Now the argument is that the boss, the big boss, the administration, is not responsible for what his hired men do. Why does not he fire them? Was the gentleman in favor of Mr. Henderson resigning? He was one of those bureaucrats, or does the gentleman think he was one of the good ones?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not know whether he was good or bad. I know what is happening today with certain regulations and I do not believe the administration would sanction it if the matter was called to the attention of the public.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, the gentleman means that the administration will not stand for it if the people make it too hot for the administration.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, I did not say that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The President is responsible. He has the power. He delegates it to somebody, to some bureaucrat, and then that bureaucrat comes along and squeezes the people so that they cannot support the men that we have sent abroad, and yet the gentleman says that the administration is not responsible. You tell me, in God's name, if the administration, which has the power and the money, is not responsible, who is?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the Republican platform and the Republican minority approve of everything that the gentleman from Michigan says on this floor?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, heavens, no. We do our own thinking over on the Republican side. Each individual man over here thinks for himself, and if you would do a little thinking on some of these bills that I have introduced here, we would get a little further toward solving some of our problems. Although there are symptoms over here of following the leader, yet as a rule, if I understand it correctly, the Republicans have always done their own thinking and voting as their conscience and judgment have indicated they should vote.

Over there—and this is a secret, too—for the last 6 or 8 years those gentlemen on the majority side, patriotic as they are, have always played this little game

of follow the leader. You all remember back when you were boys you played that game, and the leader would run around on top of this picket fence, over that ridge pole, and then the first thing you knew everyone was off in the ditch somewhere. Now, that is the situation we are in at the present time. And I am glad, I am happy, to know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], who has been an ardent, an all-out, shut-eyes-and-swallow-everything supporter of the New Deal—now at last has discovered when his people in New York are being pinched that that medicine which he has been ramming down the necks of the people out in the country is not good medicine. It has proved to be castor oil instead of paregoric.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was going on to talk about something—

Mr. DICKSTEIN. When the gentleman remembers, as he must, that time after time the Republican minority voted in a solid block, why does he criticize the Democratic Party? Why should we not vote in a solid block when we knew the proposed legislation was wrong?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I never criticized the Democrats; no, no, just the New Dealers.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Just a moment ago the gentleman condemned the whole Democratic Party.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, my, no; there it is! That is the way it goes! The gentleman gets excited. I did not criticize the Democrats at all, because the Democrats are honest, conscientious, zealous Americans, though sometimes mistaken. It is just the New Dealers here who want to sell us out, who want to do away with our system of government, and are ruining our country; that is the only group I am criticizing. But wait a second—there is that other group, the Communists—I forgot them, but they work so close together that they come under one head.

But what I wanted to talk about is this: We have heard a lot today about the gentleman's people being cold. I rather fancy some of the constituents of the gentleman from New York are getting cold up there because they are not getting coal. I cannot sympathize too much with him about that. I cannot sympathize with him about the lack of beef, either, because I remember that he backed a policy under which, when our farmers wanted to take milk or meat into the city of New York before they could get into the city, our teamsters, our farmers, had to dig down in their socks and pay \$8.41 if they were driving a small truck and \$9.42 if it were a big truck, just to take farm produce into the city for the gentleman's constituents to eat to keep them from being hungry. You charged us—you robbed us, let me put it—while we were taking in food for them to eat—do not talk about selling it, even if we gave it to them, if we took a truckload of beef to feed the hungry people the gentleman says there are in New York and drove up to the city limits, we could not get into New York City until

we dug up \$8.41 tribute money to permit us to drive on the streets. Paid to the city? Oh, no; paid to the union racketeers. Now, what do you think of that? Do you think that was right? I wish they would get hungry and stay hungry just a little while, say, 5 minutes, until they changed their minds and decided to help themselves by being fair and breaking the grip of the racketeers. We can bring food and fuel to your city limits, but you will not let us bring it into the city markets and stores until we have paid for the privilege of bringing it in. It does not strike me that that is a situation that calls for sympathy for the people of the gentleman's district.

END THE COAL STRIKE

Now, as to this coal strike. Why was this strike brought on? It was caused by John L. Lewis and the racketeers in his organization sticking another 50 cents on the miners every month before they could work. The miners say: "We are patriotic; we will dig the coal if you let us." And John says: "No; you cannot dig any more coal until you pay that 50 cents." And the administration backs the policy of giving a closed shop and check-off, so that if the miner works that \$1.50 will come out of his pay check. He never gets the money in his hand until that \$1.50 is taken out. This coal strike is the fault of the administration.

Why does not the administration and the press turn their guns on the politicians in control of the labor union who are insisting upon the payment of this extra 50 cents? These miners never agreed to this additional 50-cent assessment. That was just put over on them by the organization to which they are compelled, by this administration, to belong. Let the administration quit playing a crooked political game with labor politicians and the miners will work.

The administration pretends to be a friend of labor. But what is it trying to do to the employees of Montgomery Ward & Co.? President Roosevelt in effect orders Montgomery Ward & Co. to refuse to continue giving jobs to the men and women employed by it unless those men and women pay the sums demanded by union officials.

In Germany, men and women work where Hitler's agents tell them to work. Here in America, men and women cannot work, even in defense of their country, unless they join and pay tribute to unions backed by the President.

Not long ago, in Jackson, Mich., 175 employees, who did not want to submit to the demands of 30 fellow employees who were members of a C. I. O. union, were told by the administration to get back to work. Why did not the administration tell the 30 C. I. O. employees to stop trying to force the 175 into the C. I. O. union?

Does this administration think it is creating confidence in our Government by demanding that everyone who wants to work in the highly paid jobs must open his pocket to the hand of the union racketeer, organizer, or politician?

It is all very well to talk about carrying the "four freedoms" to the uttermost parts of the world. What about having

a little of the freedom to work right here at home?

Today I have introduced a bill which, if enacted, will help to end the un-American practice of sabotaging our war effort by insisting that everyone who wants to contribute to that effort kick in to the funds of an organization which contributed to the President's campaign fund.

Let us have a little more Americanism, a little more constitutional government, a little more regard for the freedom and liberty of our citizens; not quite so much solicitude toward building up organizations which may be able to exert political power in the 1944 campaign.

Two statements from Montgomery Ward shed light on the situation. I quote:

MONTGOMERY WARD'S SECOND STATEMENT TO NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

The following statement was submitted to the National War Labor Board at its meeting in Washington on December 8, 1942:

The War Labor Board, on November 5, 1942, issued an order that Wards "incorporate" in a contract with a Congress of Industrial Organizations union at Chicago:

1. A clause establishing a form of the closed shop, called maintenance of membership, together with a check-off of union dues from wages.

2. A clause providing for compulsory arbitration on any questions the union wishes to raise.

3. A clause guaranteeing in these uncertain times present wage and working conditions for a year.

Wards rejected this order of the Board for these reasons:

1. The Board was without authority. Congress, the only lawmaking authority under the Constitution, has not empowered the Board to order any employer to do any of the things which the Board demanded of Wards.

2. The order violated the fundamental principles of liberty. Liberty requires that an employee be free to join or to resign from a union without jeopardizing his livelihood. Liberty requires that an employer be free to employ the person best suited for the work.

3. The order was in itself illegal. The order required Wards, first, to interfere with the free choice of its employees to resign from the union; second, to give support to the union by a check-off of union dues; and third, to discriminate against employees if they resigned their membership in the union, all in direct violation of the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Wards operates in a highly competitive field composed of 1,750,000 retail establishments. It is unfair to impose burdens upon Wards and not upon those with whom it is in competition.

The imposition of the closed shop against Wards cannot be justified by reference to the so-called no-strike agreement. Wards was not a party to this agreement. Wards had no voice in the selection of those who, as representatives of industry, attended the conference in December 1941, which formulated this agreement. Wards has never ratified the results of that conference.

Furthermore, the conference itself did not agree that the War Labor Board might impose the closed-shop principle. Those acting as representatives of industry expressly recommended to the President that this issue not be considered by the Board. The Board, in ordering a form of closed shop at Wards, has acted contrary to these expressed recommendations of the industry representatives.

If Wards had had the right to test the legality of the Board's demands in a court, Wards would have done so, but Wards was

deprived of a remedy in the courts by the Board's complete lack of legal authority to compel obedience of its order. The court will only act when legal rights have been violated. The courts have declared that the mere making of demands which do not have to be obeyed does not, in the eyes of the law, violate any legal right. The Board's very lack of authority thus resulted in a denial to Wards, as it has to other employers, of a right to relief in the courts.

The President of the United States, as well as the Board, is wholly without constitutional authority to order any employer to do the things demanded of Wards. Nevertheless, in deep respect for the President and his great responsibility in time of war, Wards said, in rejecting the Board's order:

"If Congress imposes closed shops, compulsory arbitration, or contracts for a year's duration on employers, or if the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief in time of war, directs that Wards accept the Board's ruling, which we earnestly believe are illegal and uneconomic, we will respectfully obey."

The President, on November 18, wrote the company, saying:

"As Commander in Chief in time of war, * * * I * * * direct Montgomery Ward & Co. to comply, without further delay, with the National War Labor Board's directive order of November 5, 1942."

Wards immediately answered:

"Your order of November 18 has been received and will be promptly obeyed."

Wards thereupon altered the general form of its contracts with unions and incorporated, word for word, the clauses ordered by the War Labor Board. This document was offered to the union. The company has fully complied with the President's direction and will continue to do so.

The document which the President has directed Wards to sign is not a contract. The requisite of a contract is that there be a meeting of the minds or agreement between the parties. There has been no agreement between Wards and the union. The document which the President has ordered Wards to sign affects the rights and liberties of Wards and of its employees. Therefore, in order that the document itself may be clear and state the facts, Wards informatively included these three sentences:

"The following provisions are not voluntarily agreed to by the company. In the company's opinion they are illegal and unsound. These provisions are copied verbatim from the War Labor Board's order of November 5, 1942 and are incorporated herein, on the company's part, under duress and only because the President of the United States as Commander in Chief in time of war has expressly ordered that they be included."

These three sentences are in all respects true. They do not alter the effect of the provisions ordered by the Board—provisions which Wards will carry out. Nevertheless, the union has refused to sign the offered document.

Wards will be happy to accept any improvement in the wording of this statement, but Wards will resist any attempt to hide the truth by a change in its substance.

On January 9, 1941, the President said:

"In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world."

Wards feels that it is bound by the rules of good citizenship to make sure that the simple truth about these provisions and Wards' acceptance of them be not hidden from or misrepresented to its hundred thousand employees, its 60,000 shareholders, and its many millions of customers. The elimination of this statement would serve no purpose but to conceal the truth from readers of the document.

Wards has cheerfully met with the union and with this Board whenever requested. Wards has promptly obeyed the direction of the President. Wards insists that its right to tell the truth not be destroyed.

MONTGOMERY WARD & Co.,
SEWELL AVERY, President.

JANUARY 11, 1943.

To All Montgomery Ward People:

1. You are free to join or not to join a union, as you wish. The company fully respects this privilege. Your opportunity with the company will be the same whether you are a union member or not.

2. You do not have to join a union to work at Ward's.

3. Ward's is opposed to all forms of the closed shop. Liberty requires that an employee be free to join, to refuse to join, or to resign from a union without losing his job. Liberty requires that an employer be free to employ the person best suited for the work.

4. The President of the United States has commanded Ward's to accept for its Chicago plant a form of closed shop called "maintenance of membership." Under this form of closed shop, employees are not free to resign from the union without losing their jobs. Ward's is compelled to discharge every union member who fails to maintain his union membership in good standing (nonpayment of dues, etc.). This making of membership in a union a condition of holding a job is the closed shop.

5. Ward's did not voluntarily agree to this requirement. Ward's believes it to be illegal and uneconomic. Ward's has accepted it under duress and only because the President of the United States expressly so ordered.

6. Ward's is the only retailer in the United States upon whom the President has imposed any form of the closed shop. It is unfair to impose burdens upon Ward's and not upon those with whom it is in competition. If the retail industry is to be subjected to the closed shop requirement, it should be legislated by Congress and applied uniformly against all retail establishments.

7. The National War Labor Board has now called a hearing to determine whether the employees at Ward's six large stores in Denver, Detroit, and New York City must belong to the union in order to hold their jobs. Ward's will continue to oppose this illegal and uneconomic requirement. Ward's will reject any demand of the Board that employees be discharged because they fail to maintain their union membership.

8. The President of the United States has no authority to order Ward's employees to remain union members in order to hold their jobs. Congress is the only lawmaking authority. Congress has passed no law requiring the closed shop.

MONTGOMERY WARD & Co.,
SEWELL AVERY, President.

SMEAR-PURGE ARTISTS STILL WORKING

Mr. Speaker, there is something else that I wish to speak about today.

One of the most vindictive and most unreliable of those engaged in the campaign to smear-purge Members of Congress and destroy the confidence of the people in Congress, notwithstanding the rebuke administered the group by the people at the November election, still continues his dirty work. As an illustration, in the Sunday, January 10, edition of the Washington Post, that paper and Dillard Stokes, alias Jefferson Bream, alias Quigley Adams, continued their campaign of misrepresentation and falsehood by falsely writing that I charged that the prosecution of certain individuals alleged to be seditionists was "just an effort to smear" isolationists.

I certainly did tell the House, and I propose to repeat that charge as often as may be necessary, that Maloney, an assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, and Stokes and the Washington Post have been using the grand-jury investigation to smear Congressmen, but I never have claimed—I do not claim now—that the investigation by the grand jury and the subsequent prosecution of the persons indicted was solely for the purpose of smearing Congressmen. Those instrumentalities were diverted from their legitimate purpose by Maloney and Stokes and were improperly used to smear Congress.

Either Dillard Stokes willfully, in reporting proceedings of the grand jury, lied, or he violated the rules governing grand-jury proceedings, when on the 22d of January 1942, in the Washington Post, he wrote, "the prosecutors declared Hill told the grand jury he recently received \$12,000, but would not reveal the source." Did the prosecutors, including Maloney, reveal to Stokes the secrets of the grand-jury room? Either they did, or the truth is not in Stokes. If they did tell him what Hill said in the grand-jury room, they as officers of the court should be haled before the court to answer a contempt charge.

Now note, please, that charge does not rest upon any statement made by me; I merely quote what Dillard Stokes said.

On December 8 I called the attention of this House to another instance where a columnist writing for the Washington Post quoted the testimony of a grand-jury witness, Mrs. Goode, and a statement made in the jury room, according to the columnist, by a grand juror. It would seem that Washington is the only place in the United States where the rule as to the secrecy of the grand-jury proceedings is violated.

Certainly I do not complain because a grand jury is investigating alleged criminal acts. I do complain when that body and an assistant to the Attorney General of the United States proceeds in violation of all fairness, decency, and legality to carry on a subversive activity.

Stokes then sought to create the impression by his Sunday article that I had either failed or refused to answer three Members of the House who spoke in defense of Maloney—two on the 10th and the other on the 14th day of December last, and that I was upon the floor.

Each of those gentlemen spoke when I was not upon the floor, without notifying me that they intended to refer to me and I answered them earlier this week.

Stokes further stated and I quote:

The Speaker flung these questions at the dour Michigan isolationist.

He capitalized the word "Speaker," evidently intending the readers to believe that the Speaker of the House had asked me certain questions. The Speaker did not ask me any questions. The questions repeated in the Post were asked by the Member from Pennsylvania, Mr. Holland. Stokes but asked them again and why did he repeat them? Why did Holland ask them—because they wanted

the information? Oh, no; they just wanted to again—once more—link my name with the names of those who have been indicted. That was their sole purpose.

During the grand jury investigation Stokes tried to make it appear that I was concealing something. He knows better. As long ago as November 17, 1941—more than 13 months ago—on the floor of this House when one of the assistants to the Attorney General was sitting in the gallery, referring to him I said, "If he is hard up for witnesses, he can call me. I will be glad to go down and talk to him. Thirty thousand copies of my speeches went out under my frank that were antiwar speeches." Those were the speeches entitled "We Burned Our Fingers Once—Will History Repeat Itself?" Now Stokes, more than a year later, squawks and asks whether I sent out those speeches.

Why, on January 2, 1942, under his own signature in the Washington Post was the same fact published?

On April 13, 1942, I nailed the lie that in the speech, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, I called the President a Judas and pointed out those to whom I referred as betraying our Nation. On that same occasion I disclosed the fact that I had furnished thousands of copies of that speech to others.

What a silly donkey Dillard Stokes, alias Jefferson Breem, alias Quigley Adams, shows himself to be when in writing about what I had to say on the floor yesterday he captioned his report, "HOFFMAN admits circulating speech." Members of the press gallery, Members of the House, and those of the public who paid any attention at all to the matter know that I never denied circulating the speech, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes. Stokes knows it but he is so crooked, his mind is so twisted, he is so lacking in political morality that he just cannot tell the truth. He must in writing an article, disseminate falsehood.

Those familiar with the circumstances know that time and again on the floor of this House I have stated that I circulated that speech, that anyone who wanted a copy could have it for the asking.

The first question asked by the smear-purger, Dillard Stokes, in his Sunday article was this:

1. Will the gentleman from Michigan deny that two mail sackfuls of a speech delivered by him on the floor of this House, in which he called the President a Judas, were delivered to Mrs. Bethune in Washington and that the speeches in those mail sacks were enclosed in franked envelopes bearing the frank of the gentleman from Michigan?

Answer to question 1: I have pointed out the falsity of Stokes' statement that in that speech I called the President a Judas. For further answer to that question let me here quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 28, 1942, page 4728. Those speeches went out in franked envelopes. What of it?

March 30: Copies went to Mrs. N. N. Bethune, the LaSalle Apartments, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington D. C., upon the understanding had with her and with Mrs. Goode, who was in the office with her asking for reprints, that they were to be

addressed and mailed to the members of the organization known as the Dames of the Loyal Legion and others mentioned by Mrs. Goode when she first came to my office asking for reprints.

I will answer the other seven questions categorically.

2. Will the gentleman from Michigan deny that he sent, or caused to be sent, 2,000 copies of this same speech to Charles B. Hudson of Omaha, Nebr., who is now under indictment, charged with conspiring to break down the morale of the armed forces?

Answer to question 2: He received 2,000 copies of Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes in the flat—not in franked envelopes. What of it?

3. Will the gentleman from Michigan deny that he sent 1,000 copies of this same speech to Gerald B. Winrod of Wichita, Kans., another of the defendants in the same indictment?

The same answer as made to the second question will serve as an answer to questions 3 and 4, except that Winrod received 1,000 and Baxter 500 copies of Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes. Again I ask, What of it?

Let me add all three were indicted on the 28th day of July 1942 for a violation of section 9 of title 18 of the United States Code. All three were arrested and with other defendants indicted at the same time for the same offense and were brought before the court in the District of Columbia. The validity of the indictment was challenged on the 8th day of August 1942. Though Maloney had used 71 days, according to Attorney General Biddle, in taking testimony against these gentlemen, on August 12 he asked for an additional 30 days to answer the challenge to the validity of the indictment. If my understanding is correct, from that day to this Maloney has never accepted that challenge nor has he brought the defendants to trial.

Maloney evidently has forgotten that provision of our Constitution which guarantees to every person accused, a speedy and impartial trial. We all recall the Scottsboro case where the conviction of the Negroes from the South of the most heinous crimes known to our law, was reversed by the United States Supreme Court because they had been denied a fair trial; that is, men of their race on the jury.

A speedy trial was not Maloney's objective. When it seemed no longer possible to delay the challenge to the validity of the indictment, Maloney, on January 4, handed in a new indictment charging a violation of the same section by practically the same acts and shaming, absurdity of absurdities, that the defendants conspired to violate that section 7 years before the act became a law.

Where is Maloney's pal, Walter Winchell, who was suddenly assigned to active service? For months Winchell, a lieutenant commander in the Navy, violated the articles of war by falsely charging Members of Congress with disloyalty. He was much in evidence, but when it appeared that those charged with sedition were about to be brought for trial and that Winchell, the courageous Winchell, who peddled salacious

gossip or, as Pegler described him, "the gent of the men's room," might be called as a witness, forced upon the stand, and compelled to submit to a cross-examination which would disclose some of his falsehoods, his back-door connections with brothels and gambling joints, his pipe lines into Maloney's office, he was suddenly sent on active duty. If he was detailed to the job for which he is best suited, he will be found. It may be, too, that he has been sent to Australia to prepare a garden for "Paving-Block" Flynn, former chairman of the National Democratic Committee.

Questions 5, 6, and 7:

5. What use did the gentleman from Michigan intend that these conspirators should make of his speech?

6. Was it to be used in furtherance of their conspiracy to break down the morale of the armed forces of the United States at a time when we are at war and our boys are giving up their lives for the defense of our country?

7. Let him explain to this body what his interest was in sending his speech to these people.

The answer to all three questions is the same. The use which I expected to be made of my speeches, the purpose of the speech, and the circulation of it was set forth by me when I spoke in this House on the 28th day of May 1942. It was explained again on the 11th day of January 1943 and on many, many occasions in between those dates.

To, once for all, enlighten Dillard Stokes, if that can be accomplished, let me say to him that that speech was made and it was distributed in the hope that some of those who lack confidence in the United States of America and in her institutions, in the determination of her people to preserve this, a Nation, would finally be convinced that the people of America believe in America, believe in the Constitution, and believe that, under God and with his help, we will be able, in spite of the enemies from without and the traitors from within, to carry on as have our forefathers since the day of Washington.

To convince Stokes and Maloney and some of the others who were engaged in the now admitted conspiracy, to slander and vilify the Congress and to destroy it as a coordinate branch of the Government, that there was no secrecy about the distribution of that talk, I here refer to remarks made by me on the 28th day of May from the Well of the House and which will be found on pages 4728 and 4729 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I do not quote from those remarks at length but I here repeat that many, many individuals received copies of that talk; that copies went to residents of 34 of the 48 States of the Union who asked for them.

Question 8:

Let him explain to this body his unusual interest in the prosecution of an indictment which does not name him either as a defendant or a conspirator.

Answer to 8: I have no interest whatever in the prosecution of either of the indictments returned against the defendants therein named. I have no knowledge as to whether those defendants or

any of them are guilty or not guilty. As a lawyer practicing for something like 40 years, I have been deeply interested in the misuse and the abuse made of judicial processes by the man Maloney.

I have been astounded by his unfair methods, by his complete disregard of professional ethics, by the rank injustice of his procedure. Over and above all that, I have been interested in the proceedings of the grand jury and of Maloney prior to the rendition of the indictment, and by his effrontery in violating all constitutional guarantees thrown around the people's Representatives. Though I did not choose to avail myself of any protection afforded by the Constitution, but volunteered to give the prosecuting representative of the Department of Justice any information at my command.

I was interested in the proceedings of the grand jury because the Washington Post and its reporter, Dillard Stokes, alias Jefferson Broom, alias Quigley Adams, used those proceedings in their effort to smear and purge Members of Congress. I had never realized that an official connected with the Department of Justice would so prostitute his office, that he would engage in such a foul conspiracy, and I determined that I would do all in my power to give to the public a true and accurate picture of the disreputable, morale-destroying methods of Maloney and Stokes.

Just to prove that Stokes cannot tell the truth about even immaterial matters, permit me to call attention to the fact that he wrote, and I quote, referring to the talk made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Houston:

Congress did not adjourn for several days and HOFFMAN was often on the floor, free with carping and with questions, but not with answers.

That statement is absolutely false. I was not on the floor when any of the gentlemen made the remarks to which Stokes refers; had no knowledge that they intended to speak and at 5:10 on that day I left for my home to bid my son, who was going into the Navy, good-bye. I did not return until after Congress adjourned. Again Stokes wrote a plain lie—a lie which he knew to be a lie.

I have had no acquaintance with Hudson, Baxter, or Kullgren. I have no knowledge of what they did with the copies of the speech, "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes." If any of the men named, or all of them, sent out the talk "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," with seditious material, he or they made a mistake for if you will pardon my egotism, I am quite sure that the patriotic sentiments contained in that speech of mine would tend to overcome any seditious sentiments expressed in the other literature.

Having now answered several questions, permit me to ask one—the people having answered at the November election, the vilifying propaganda of Stokes, the convict Browder, Birkhead, Maloney, Winchell, and others of that ilk and of the Union for Democratic Action, the New Republic, the Masses, PM, the Chicago Sun, and the Communists, just how

much further does Stokes, Browder, Winchell and company intend to go to create disunity? Just when will they end their conspiracy to destroy the morale of the American people?

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to use my time this afternoon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to use my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. McCORD, for Tuesday and Wednesday of next week, on account of an important engagement at West Point, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to include a statement in my remarks, and to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock) the House adjourned to meet, pursuant to its special order, on Monday, January 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

59. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to permit eviction proceedings brought thereunder to be instituted in the Federal courts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

60. A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the

year ended December 31, 1941; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

61. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States 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.

62. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of various ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

63. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of various laws passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

64. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of various laws passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

65. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a detailed report of the receipts and expenditures made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, from the working capital fund established for the operation of the industrial activities at the United States Public Health Service hospitals, Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

66. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

67. A letter from the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 4. Report on the disposition of records in departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 5. Report on the disposition of certain records by departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 6. Report on the disposition of records by departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 1163. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1164. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1165. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 1166. A bill to permit civil officers whose compensation amounts to \$2,500 or more per annum who were commissioned in the armed forces of the United States since September 16, 1940, serving on active duty during the war, to resume the duties of their civil offices after honorable discharge or relief from active duty; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1167 (by request). A bill to amend section 1 of the act of July 30, 1942, Public Law 690, Seventy-seventh Congress, to provide increase of pension payable to dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 1168. A bill making Members of Congress ineligible to hold appointive office in the executive or judicial branch of the Government within 2 years after the termination of their service in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPOZZOLI:

H. R. 1169. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1170. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1171. A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeiture of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 1172. A bill to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1173. A bill to aid in the preservation of constitutional government in the United States of America; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 1174. A bill to repeal all limitations as to the amounts of compensation or pension otherwise payable to the dependents of a deceased veteran; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1175. A bill creating the Office of Photographic Imports and providing for the admission into the United States duty-free of certain historical, educational, documentary, or religious photographic dry plates and films; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 1176. A bill to make available copies of the daily editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to certain libraries and schools; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 1177. A bill authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1178. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1179. A bill providing for the payment of mileage for certain employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue when traveling on official business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1180. A bill to increase up to \$50 per month the amount of pensions otherwise payable to the widows of those deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1181. A bill granting equipment allowance to postmasters of the third class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1182. A bill to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1183. A bill to provide for deportation of certain aliens who do not make declaration of intention to become citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1184. A bill to provide for the creation of the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, in the States of West Virginia, Maryland, and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1185. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1186. A bill to provide that the feeding of wheat to poultry or livestock shall not constitute marketing of such wheat for the purpose of marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1187. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which provide for national marketing quotas with respect to wheat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1188. A bill to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1189. A bill to authorize and to direct the Veterans' Administration to provide vocational rehabilitation, and assistance in securing suitable employment, for service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof, and feasible therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 1190. A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section thereto, designated as section 266a, to provide for intervention by States in certain cases involving the validity of the exercise of any power by the United States, or any agency thereof, or any officer or employee thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1191. A bill to provide for the hearing of certain criminal cases by United States commissioners, to fix compensation of United States commissioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1192. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, with respect to regulations and orders establishing maximum rents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1193. A bill making applicable to all lands or premises subject to the partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, the law of the State within

the exterior boundaries of which such land or premises is situated, pertaining to the recovery of damages for injury or death by wrongful act or omission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1194. A bill to provide for the orderly payment of conflicting claims and demands against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1195. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1896, as amended, relating to the appointment of assistant United States attorneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1196. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress (pocket vetoed); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1197. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1198. A bill to change the time of the appointment of Presidential electors and the election of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

H. R. 1199. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting and certain other laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1200. A bill to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1201. A bill to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1202. A bill to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1203. A bill to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of fraud against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1204. A bill to amend the Criminal Code so as to punish anyone injuring a party, witness, or juror on account of his having acted as such; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1205. A bill to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1206. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1207. A bill providing for waiver of prosecution by indictment in certain criminal proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1208. A bill authorizing the judicial council of a circuit to direct that a term of court be not held where the public convenience does not require the holding of such term and there is insufficient business to warrant the holding of such term, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1209. A bill prohibiting the soliciting or accepting of fees for referring persons for employment by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1210. 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. WELCH:

H. R. 1211. A bill providing for a survey of South Basin, San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 1212. A bill to provide for the installation of pipe lines sufficient to provide oil requirements for the eastern seaboard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1213. A bill to regulate in the United States Court of Claims and in the United States district courts suits for payment for the infringement of patents infringed by or for the Government and for the use of inventions used by or for the Government, and for the better protection of the rights of inventors and owners of patents, and to stimulate the making of inventions useful to the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1214. A bill to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1935 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, sec. 251); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution protesting against the attempts of the Nazis to exterminate racial and religious minorities in occupied territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of "The American's Creed"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee of the Senate and House to formulate social-security legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to aid and expedite the prosecution of the war effort by raising revenue through the sale of war participation tickets, to be conducted under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Res. 49. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the enforcement of regulations and orders issued by the Price Administrator; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 50. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules to employ a clerk-stenographer; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. Res. 51. Resolution to expedite the war effort by authorizing an investigation of the activities and practices of the Office of Price Administration with respect to the stabilization of rents; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER:

Memorial of the Legislature of the Dominican Republic, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the teaching of Portuguese language; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 1215. A bill granting an increase of pension to Bertha M. Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1216. A bill for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 1217. A bill granting a pension to Elsie Israel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1218. A bill for the relief of F. L. Riddle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 1219. A bill for the relief of Fred Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1220. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, father of Paul M. Campbell, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1221. A bill for the relief of Capt. Edward J. L. Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1222. A bill for the relief of Jacob Wolozin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 1223. A bill granting a pension to Ed Arnel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1224. A bill to restore John Gilbert DeMuth, formerly a captain of Motor Supply Train No. 428, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, who rendered military service as a commissioned officer during the World War, to the emergency officers' retired list with pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 1225. A bill for the relief of Joseph Nathaniel Gownder; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TIBBOTT:

H. R. 1226. A bill granting a pension to Ella Howarth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1227. A bill granting a pension to Mary Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1228. A bill for the relief of Marshall A. Dequeant; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1229. A bill for the relief of Elmer T. Johns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1230. A bill for the relief of Ivan Rightmour; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1231. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kochinich; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 1232. A bill for the relief of Roscoe McKinley Meadows; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1233. A bill for the relief of Frank Kelley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1234. A bill for the relief of the General Exchange Insurance Corporation, Richmond, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1235. A bill for the relief of Walter Ormes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 1236. A bill granting a pension to Zack Pool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1237. A bill granting a pension to Roy Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 1238. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1239. A bill for the relief of John V. Saul; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1240. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of Carl G. Allgrunn against the United States for the use of his invention in rifling guns during the war and thereafter by the Symington-Anderson Co. at Rochester, N. Y., said invention being shown and described in his Letters Patent No. 1,311,107, issued by the Patent Office of the United States on or about July 22, 1919, and conferring jurisdiction upon said Court of

Claims to reopen and further adjudicate the claim of said Carl G. Allgrunn for the use of his invention by companies or in shops other than the Symington-Anderson Co. in 1918 and 1919, which claim has heretofore been settled on the basis of the judgment of the Court of Claims of February 8, 1937; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

12. By Mr. ANDREWS: Statement from the Buffalo Master Bakers Association having to do with raise in the ceiling price of flour, and protesting against no action having been taken to permit bakers to raise the price of bread; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

13. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Long Island Association, New York City, urging support of the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

14. Also, petition of the Triangle Ink & Color Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging support of the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

15. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Edward F. McKee, president; Hal T. Kain and Thomas F. Gavin, members of the board of commissioners of the county of Ohio, Wheeling, W. Va., urging that the county of Ohio and other counties similarly situated may be freed from the discriminatory restriction heretofore imposed upon them as the result of gasoline rationing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

16. Also, petition of W. P. Liller, president, Kiwanis Club of Wheeling, W. Va., urging that the dividing line of gasoline rationing be placed where it was before Nation-wide rationing went into effect, and that the Wheeling area be excluded from the 17 Eastern States, for the reason that the Kiwanis Club of Wheeling feels that there is not a shortage of gasoline in their section of the State and that an injustice has been done by drawing a rationing line directly through the center of an intensely populated, industrial section; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

17. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Third National Congress of the Confederation of Workers of Cuba, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, whose kingdom is forever and against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, we would rest our weary and needy souls in Thee. At the wicket gate of another day with all its waiting tasks, we bow our heads and our hearts in reverence and devotion.

Into Thy hands we commit the mystery and the mastery of the godlike power of choice—the royal right to say "I will. Our wills are ours, we know not how; our wills are ours to make them Thine."

May the altar lights of faith, undimmed, burn brightly in spite of the winds of adversity and unbelief. In the

confusions of these troubled days, help us to keep inviolate in our souls a little shrine of quietness; a chapel of peace within, an altar of contrition, a sanctuary of sure and swift retreat, where the world's angry voices die, where Thou alone art real. So, in turmoils without and within, may we find day by day,

"A little place of mystic grace,
Of self and sin swept bare,
Where we may look upon Thy face
And talk to Thee in prayer."

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 14, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

OATH OF THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the oath of office of the Honorable CARTER GLASS, Senator from the State of Virginia, as the President pro tempore of the Senate, duly subscribed and sworn to by him on the 14th instant, which will be read.

The oath was read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

I, CARTER GLASS, President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States of America, do solemnly swear that I will truly and faithfully discharge the duties of my said office, to the best of my knowledge and abilities.

CARTER GLASS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of January A. D. 1943.

A. D. BARKSDALE,
United States District Judge for
the Western District of Virginia.
LYNCHBURG, VA.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in this connection I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 62) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Hon. CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY. I send forward another resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 63) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that at the earliest opportunity following the convening of the Senate on Thursday next I shall address the Senate on the subject of how our manpower should be divided for the conduct of the war, with reference to the Army, the Navy, shipping, production

for war purposes, agriculture, and the civilian economy.

CONFIRMATION OF PRENTISS M. BROWN TO BE PRICE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency I report favorably the nomination of Hon. Prentiss M. Brown to be Price Administrator, and I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be at once confirmed.

Mr. McNARY. Was the committee unanimous in its approval of the nomination?

Mr. WAGNER. The committee was unanimous.

Mr. McNARY. I am advised, and I think authentically, that the present Administrator desires to leave his position at once. I conferred this morning with former Senator Byrnes, the Director of Economic Stabilization, and he is anxious that Mr. Brown be inducted into office at once. I have high regard for both these gentlemen, having served with them in the Senate.

Of course, it is contrary to the rule to permit confirmation of a nomination without its going to the Executive Calendar, and it is not done unless unanimous consent is given; and request is made for unanimous consent on this occasion.

I have discussed the matter with the able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and I can say that he has no desire to oppose the confirmation.

In view of the circumstances, and always keeping in mind my desire to conform with the rules of the Senate, I am willing in this instance to waive the rule, and, so far as I am personally concerned, consent to action at this time upon the nomination of former Senator Brown.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination as in executive session? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Prentiss M. Brown to be Price Administrator, Office of Price Administration.

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

Mr. WAGNER. I ask that the President be at once notified of the confirmation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

QUORUM RULE ADOPTED BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, at the first regular meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary, held in executive session today, the 18th instant, the following proposed rule of committee procedure respecting a quorum of the committee was submitted by the chairman:

PROPOSED COMMITTEE RULE NO. 4

Resolved, That a quorum of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall consist of six members present in person at any regular or special meeting of the committee.

The rule proposed was unanimously adopted by the committee.