amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCANLON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 480. A bill for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli; without amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2121. A bill relating to the computation of retirement pay of personnel of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2122. A bill to provide for a uniform method of payments to the several States on account of certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2123. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to provide for certain aid to Indians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2124. A bill to further expedite the national defense by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, to diminish the causes of labor disputes affecting the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2125. A bill to provide for the refund of all penalties paid with respect to the 1941 and 1942 crops of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the importance of farmers to the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 2126. A bill for the relief of David Cowan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 2127. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Womble, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2128. A bill for the relief of J. Aron & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2129. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2130. A bill for the relief of Christine Lund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Henry Angell; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2132. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2133. A bill for the relief of William Taft (deceased); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 2134. A bill for the relief of Paul Szeliga; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 2135. A bill for the relief of Albert D. Castleberry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 2136. A bill granting an increase of pension to Margaret C. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN:

H. R. 2137. A bill for the relief of William A. Roberts, father of David Ernest Roberts, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

236. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the President and Congress to revise the Federal laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

237. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing Congress to relieve persons in active military service of the United States from payment of income taxes or gross income taxes on their compensation received from the Government for such service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

238. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to the safeguarding of livestock sanitary welfare and the livestock industry of the Nation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

239. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any modification of sanitary pacts against the importation of meats from countries known to be infected by hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

240. By Mr. SCHWABE: Memorial of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri to the Congress of the United States, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act to the effect that any citizen in any county in any State thus organized under the Federal Social Security Act may be informed upon request made to his local social security board of the names of any recipients in any branch of the Social Security Department and the respective amounts of money each is receiving, or has received during the past year, and to liberalize the Social Security Act so as to remove the many limitations and conditions placed upon the States before they may obtain Federal funds, also to allow the States and local boards to exercise greater authority in the administration and payment of assistance to the needy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

241. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the general secretary of the Anti-Saloon League of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the sale of intoxicants to men and women in service uniforms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

242. By Mr. ANGELL: House Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Oregon State Legislature, asking the Congress to defeat Senate bill 246 and House bills 1012 and 1115; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 9, 1943)

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

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

Our Father God, on this holy day in the Christian year we fain would join the vast company of pilgrims around the world who reverently pass through the portals of Lent. Whate'er our name or sign, we, too, would follow the wounded feet of that Master of men who has invaded more realms, conquered more lives, taken possession of more hearts, swayed more wills than has any other figure across the long centuries. We, too, would gaze at that one Face set steadfastly against cushioned ease and cowardly compromise and which has become forever the living symbol of the might and majesty of meekness and of ideals and principles worth dying for.

For these weeks ahead leading to the gloom of Calvary and the glow of Easter, in the midst of our crowded and complex modern life, may we find some quiet cloister of the spirit, may we still the tumult a little, so that, opening long shut doors to the Unseen and Eternal, we may hear His voice. Coming to these days of the Passion with the sackcloth and ashes of penitence, may we enter with sincerity that we may come out with strength and joy. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 9, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

REPORT OF PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON DEFERMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON, *March 10, 1943.*

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: On December 15, 1942, I appointed a committee consisting of Mr. Paul Bellamy, chairman, Mr. Ordway Tead, and Mr. Eric Johnston for the purpose of making an independent study and recommendations to me on the question of deferments of Federal employees from induction in the military service.

This committee, after applying itself industriously to its task for more than 2 months, has now presented its report. For the information of the Senate, I am transmitting herewith a copy of this report and of the Executive order which I have signed giving effect to the committee's recommendations.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

TABLES OF BANKRUPTCY STATISTICS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, submitting, pursuant to law, tables of bankruptcy statistics with reference to bankruptcy cases commenced and terminated in the United States district courts during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE (S. Doc. No. 19)

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of Los Angeles Parlor, No. 45, Native Sons of the Golden West, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing Congress to investigate the alcohol production plant of the Yankton Industrial Alcohol Corporation, of Yankton, S. Dak., with a view of determining the possibility of the establishment of a synthetic rubber plant at Yankton, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BUSHFIELD, on the 9th instant, p. 1689, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 12

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 38, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products

"Whereas with the increasing demand on the farmers of the United States to meet the food requirements of our fighting men and lend-lease commitments, at the same time assuring the people of the United States of the proper amount of foodstuffs, it is essential for the war effort and the well-being of our people that a study be made of the complicated problems of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products; and

"Whereas farm products should be properly graded and distributed when and where needed, at fair prices both to the producer and the consumer, and immediate steps should be taken for a coordination of efforts and the adopting of a comprehensive and workable plan in betterment of the interests of the producing farmer and the consumer; and

"Whereas House Resolution 38 has been introduced into Congress providing for the Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products, which study and investigation are imperative at this time: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Michigan Legislature urge the Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 38; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress."

By Mr. McNARY:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully request and petition as follows, to wit:

"Whereas there are now pending in the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States of America, three bills identified as S. 246, H. R. 1012, and H. R. 1115, each of which provides amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; and

"Whereas the amendments provided in such bills, if enacted into law, will have the effect of completely nullifying every State right to regulate, control, and tax the ownership and operation of aircraft owned and operated exclusively within the State of Oregon; and

"Whereas such amendments will deprive the State of Oregon of every opportunity and means of fostering, promoting, and regulating the local development of aircraft and the rapidly expanding air-transportation industry; and

"Whereas such proposed enactments will stifle the development of aircraft and air transportation by individual citizens by bringing under Federal planning and control 'all civil aeronautics both for commerce and pleasure'; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon insists upon maintaining its reserved right to legislate independent of Federal Government interference, on all matters of local concern, including intrastate development of aeronautics; and

"Whereas this legislative assembly is opposed to the principle of usurpation of all State rights by the Central Government and believes the above identified pending congressional bills are based upon that principle: Now therefore

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring):

"1. That we, your memorialists, the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby most respectfully request and petition the Congress of the United States of America, and the Members of Congress from the State of Oregon, to give unfavorable consideration to and to defeat the enactment of S. 246, H. R. 1012, and H. R. 1115.

"2. That a copy of this memorial be sent to the Honorable United States Senators CHARLES L. MCNARY and RUFUS HOLMAN, and to Congressmen JAMES W. MOTT, HOMER D. ANGELL, LOWELL STOCKMAN, and HARRIS ELLSWORTH, and that they be and they hereby are urged to use their best efforts and influence to make this memorial effective and the secretary of state hereby is instructed to transmit the same to them.

"3. The secretary of state be and he hereby is instructed to send a certified copy of this memorial to the President of the United States of America, the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, and the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States of America."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to extend full statehood to the Territory of Alaska

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska has an area of 586,400 square miles, one-fifth as large as the United States, has a population of 72,524 according to the 1940 census, was approved by Congress as a territory on August 24, 1912, and now, due to war, has an estimated population as large as Nevada; and

"Whereas the area was purchased on March 30, 1867, for the sum of $7,200,000, since which time it has produced in gold and copper alone $722,222,000; is rich in the strategic metals tin, tungsten, platinum, mercury, nickel, and palladium; has an estimated timber stand of over 85,000,000,000,000 board feet; and

"Whereas the Territory produces a salmon fishery output of $40,000,000 yearly; and

"Whereas due to the present war emergency and to the further demand by the people of the Western Hemisphere that the countries of North America be joined by motor roads, and the Government of the United States is pledged to spend many millions of dollars on the Alcan Highway; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska has no congressional representative and is limited to 1 delegate; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Nevada believes that full representation of this Territory should be granted by establishing a State of the Territory now within the boundaries of Alaska: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to extend to the Territory of Alaska full status of a State of the United States, thus assuring full representation in Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, and to each of our Senators and Congressmen in Washington, D. C., requesting their support in this matter."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF INDIANA LEGISLATURE—ARMY PHARMACY CORPS

Mr. WILLIS. I present and ask to have appropriately referred a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana memorializing Congress to enact legislation to establish a pharmacy corps in the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, H. R. 997 and S. 216 to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; and

Whereas the experience of every civilized country in the world as exemplified by the laws on their statute books governing the practice of pharmacy, including those on the statute books of all of the States of our own country, requires that a pharmacist shall have at least 4 years of professional training in a college of pharmacy to make him a safe person to be entrusted with the responsibility of handling the many dangerous drugs and medicines prescribed by physicians, such as strychnine, morphine, sulfanilamide, bichloride of mercury, serums and vaccines, etc.; and

Whereas correspondingly competent pharmaceutical service is not now afforded the men serving in the Army and is not compara-

ble to that received by our civilian population, such services being performed in the Army in many cases by men with only 90 days of emergency training and in other cases by those who have had no pharmaceutical training whatsoever, thus jeopardizing the health and welfare of our soldiers; and

Whereas the men in the Army should be afforded pharmaceutical service of at least the same competency and efficiency as that afforded the civilian population; and

Whereas this can only be accomplished by creating a pharmacy corps in the Army, which will have the authority required, and the personnel of which will be adequately educated and trained for the purchase, selection, manufacture, standardization, storage, and dispensing of medicines and for such other pharmaceutical and administrative duties as their education and training qualifies them to perform: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, That the Indiana General Assembly now in session, goes on record as urgently requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation without delay to establish a pharmacy corps within the Army; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army, and to the Indiana Members of Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

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

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 784. A bill to amend that part of the act of June 24, 1910 (36 Stat. 619), relating to disposition of profits from sales of ships' stores; without amendment (Rept. No. 100);

S. 800. A bill to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter; without amendment (Rept. No. 101); and

S. 853. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable; without amendment (Rept. No. 102).

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE AGREEMENTS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report back without amendment the bill (S. 813) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, the extension of the so-called lend-lease agreements for an additional year, and I submit a report (No. 99) thereon.

The report advocates the extension of the so-called lend-lease agreements for an additional year. Let me say to the Senate that the committee gave the matter very careful and meticulous attention. We had before us the extensive hearings held before the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs. In addition, there appeared before us the Lend-Lease Administrator and the Secretary of the Navy. Also we had the benefit of other information which was available. After the most deliberate consideration, the committee voted unanimously to report the bill favorably.

Furthermore, the committee very carefully considered the wording of the report which I herewith submit, and in all respects it approves the terms and the language of the report. Such an occurrence is so unusual in the Senate that I want to call the attention of Members of the Senate to it.

So I ask that the report be received and that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 857. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Arthur Dewitt Janes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 858. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 859. A bill providing for cancelation of penalties for farm marketing excess of wheat for the years 1941 and 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 860. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 861. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INCOME TAXATION—THE RUML PLAN

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. Stuart C. Rand, an eminent attorney of Boston, an exceedingly illuminating letter on the subject of taxation, and, because I believe its contents will be helpful to Members of the Senate, I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART,
Boston, Mass., February 16, 1943.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I hope you will feel that this letter is not merely a personal squawk about taxes, although there is probably something of that element in it.

I am writing to urge that you give your support to the Ruml plan. For years I have made a comfortable living income, and I have no objection whatever to paying heavy taxes. I am glad to do it, and I take pride in doing it. The Federal taxes, however, have risen so rapidly that I have not been able to keep pace with them in any annual program of savings. I know that many others have gone through the same experience. I start the year 1943 with a simply staggering tax debt. As in the case of other lawyers, my annual income is apt to fluctuate greatly. My income for 1943 might easily be no more than my tax debt to the Government, and possibly less than my tax debt to the Government. If I earn enough this year to pay my ordinary living expenses, carry my modest insurance program, and pay my taxes to the Federal Government, I will start the year 1944 with an equally staggering tax debt. This is a perpetual treadmill from which thousands of people see no escape even by the most rigid program of savings. May it not be a mistake to put a large group, particularly of professional people, into this perpetual treadmill? Personally, I believe that it is.

If it is not possible now to say that taxes paid during the year 1943 shall be taxes on the 1943 income, I urgently suggest that the law be so changed that taxes payable during 1944 shall be considered taxes on 1944 income, so that at least by January 1, 1944, taxpayers may realize that they will not be starting that year with a staggering load of debt which they may or may not be able to meet. I firmly believe that if Congress can accomplish this they will have general approval throughout the country. Please understand that this is not any kick against paying high taxes. It is a protest against what seems to me the tragic unwisdom of forcing a large percentage of the population to start each year with an inescapable load of debt which they may or may not be able to discharge and which, in the event of death during the year, would leave their estates either insolvent or severely crippled.

Very sincerely yours,

STUART C. RAND.

AWARD OF AGRICULTURAL A FOR FARM PRODUCTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 4, 1943, the Milwaukee Farmers Club wrote a letter to Hon. Claude Wickard in relation to the subject of an agricultural A award for those doing an outstanding job in the production of food. I ask, Mr. President, that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MARCH 4, 1943.

Subject: Agricultural A award.

Hon. CLAUDE WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The members of the Milwaukee Farmers Club unanimously petition you to arrange for the awarding of suitable recognition to those farmers who are wholeheartedly cooperating with the Government's agricultural program, and who are doing an outstanding job in producing food for victory.

It is our suggestion that this recognition be in the form of an agricultural A on the same general lines that war industrial plants and workers have been awarded the Army-Navy E, Maritime M, and similar awards.

It is our belief that too few farm men and boys are appreciative of the fact that their work on the farm is just as important a war job as the neighbor boy's who is working in a war plant in town.

There is a feeling of inferiority on the part of the farm boy who is still just working on the farm, when the factory worker proudly exhibits his importance in the war effort by wearing his Army-Navy E pin.

The publicity that would follow the awarding of agricultural A awards would do much to add a little glory to the tedious farm job,

and help put the farmer on an equal patriotic base with his brother in the city war plant.

We urge your taking steps to get such a program under way as quickly as possible.

If you wish, we would be happy to submit a suggested plan more in detail, and we are sure members of our club and other similar organizations will be happy to work with you in formulating the plans for carrying out this program.

Yours for victory,

MILWAUKEE FARMERS CLUB,
VAN B. HOOPER, *President*.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I may say that months ago I suggested that an agricultural E instead of an A be awarded to those who are doing an outstanding job in agriculture.

In some of our States there is State recognition of the importance of the outstanding producing farmers.

This gives me an opportunity to say something about the farm problem. At long last some of our mistaken columnists and editorial writers are waking up to the plight of the farmers and the food shortage menace to the Nation. Many of the columnists and editorial writers have had something to do with this situation. Do we not remember how in the past they have lambasted the farmers and the so-called farm group? They could not comprehend that the farmer was entitled to the cost of production. All they could do was fill their columns with the worst kind of sabotage material.

On March 4, 1943, Mr. McNutt issued an order deferring farmers from the draft. In most instances it was a case of deferment after the farmers were already in the service. At long last Washington is beginning to realize that now the prospect of getting production even equal to last year's does not look very good.

The county agents of the country finally were canvassed. I made the suggestion months ago on the floor of the Senate that the county agents be canvassed to ascertain the situation in relation to (a) manpower on the farm, (b) farm machinery. Instead of that, the matter was delayed, and in February a survey was made of the 3,000 county agents, and they predicted an alarming reduction in spring planting. Why? Because of the lack of workers on the farm and in many instances inadequate machinery.

If we are going to get production, we will have to get workers back onto the land. America will have to go into victory gardening.

Yes, Mr. President; I am in favor of the idea contained in the letter written to Secretary Wickard to give the boys who produce an agricultural A.

ADDRESS BY HON. THURMAN W. ARNOLD AT BANQUET GIVEN IN HIS HONOR

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the program and the address delivered by Justice Thurman W. Arnold at the dinner given in his honor on March 9, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF VOLUNTEER WOMEN WORKERS TO TRAVEL COMFORT OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Mrs. Lionel Atwill, chairman of a committee of 500 women engaged in contributing to the travel comfort of members of the armed forces, on the occasion of the presentation of a cup to Mrs. Mason Gulick, on March 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRADE AGREEMENTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Trade Agreements," published in the Washington Star of January 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD SHORTAGE—EDITORIAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bureaucratic Rule Brings Food Shortage," published in the San Francisco Examiner of March 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SMALL BUSINESS—ADDRESS BY NAT BASS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of small business, delivered by Mr. Nat Bass at the American Business Congress, New York City, February 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM—STATEMENT BY JAY FRANKLIN

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Jay Franklin relating to the free enterprise system, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for the committee amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Connally	Kilgore
Austin	Danaher	La Follette
Bailey	Davis	Lodge
Ball	Downey	McCarran
Bankhead	Eastland	McClellan
Barkley	Ellender	McNary
Bilbo	Ferguson	Maloney
Bone	George	Maybank
Brewster	Gerry	Mead
Bridges	Gillette	Millikin
Brooks	Green	Moore
Buck	Guffey	Murdock
Burton	Gurney	Nye
Bushfield	Hatch	O'Daniel
Byrd	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Capper	Hayden	Overton
Caraway	Hill	Pepper
Chavez	Holman	Radcliffe
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Reed
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Reynolds	Tobey	Wherry
Scrugham	Tunnell	White
Shipstead	Tydings	Wiley
Smith	Vandenberg	Willis
Stewart	Wagner	Wilson
Taft	Walsh	
Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it is my desire to discuss the question now before the Senate, namely, the deferment of farm workers from military service under the Selective Service Act. I ask the indulgence of Senators not to interrupt for questions or requests for me to yield until I shall have finished my statement. I believe that in this manner my statement may be more clearly placed before the Senate than if it were broken up with arguments. When I shall have concluded presenting my side of the case, I shall be glad to answer questions which Senators may propound.

In stating the issue which was so ably debated and discussed yesterday, I may say that the purpose of both proposals before the Senate is the amendment of section 5 (k) of the Selective Service Act, dealing with the deferment of farm workers. There are two bills on this subject before us, and we are asked to pass one of them. One we will call the Bankhead substitute, which is offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. The other bill, in the form of an amendment, may be called the O'Mahoney amendment, offered by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

I speak at this time in favor of the Bankhead substitute, because I believe it will give the needed relief. I am against the O'Mahoney amendment, because in effect it does not change the present law, and under the present law the food problem of the country has grown serious and dangerous.

The deferment at this time of farm workers would be in direct aid of the war effort of this country. From the facts which have been placed before us, both from the statements of the Government

departments, dealing with agriculture, and the statements of individuals interested in that work, I am convinced that such a step is essential to strengthen this country at war.

Whatever may be said of the Bankhead substitute whatever attacks may be made upon it by its critics, it will attain its prime purpose, which is the keeping of American men on the farms, there to raise crops for all our people, both those in our armed services and those in civilian employment.

From discussions outside this Chamber it seems some are not impressed with the serious farm question which this Nation faces.

Only a few citations of facts and opinions are necessary, and the opinions which are considered should come from sources that know the subject of food production. They should know about the production of other necessary agricultural crops, but, in particular, they should know about the production of food.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, addressed a question to the county farm agents of this country, the question being as follows:

Has farm labor in your county been appreciably reduced by farm workers joining the armed forces of every kind, either as volunteers or as selectees under the draft law, and by leaving the farm to work on industrial or war production?

The Secretary received 2,780 replies to that question and 99 percent of those reporting indicated that farm labor had been appreciably reduced by being absorbed by the military forces or by industry.

Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the Washington Times-Herald of yesterday containing an article to which I wish to refer. The title of the article is "United States Must Eat Animal Feed, Says Wickard." I wish to read a portion of the article, written by John Fisher:

The public will have to eat animal feed as substitutes for meat, according to Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard.

That's what he told a Senate appropriations subcommittee recently, according to testimony at the secret hearing disclosed yesterday.

Under questioning by Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Democrat of Rhode Island, ardent New Dealer, who contended that solution to the food problem lay largely in getting the people to eat less, Wickard replied that rationing will take care of that and substitutes are under consideration.

MORALE CITED AS FACTOR

"We have about reached the place now where we cannot expand our meat production any more, because we are not going to have enough of the basic element, feed, to support much more increase," said Wickard.

"And we are going to have to start with some of these grains (as substitutes), eating them ourselves, rather than feeding them to animals and eating the animals. That is a change in the diet of this country, and our people cannot change diets suddenly I think, without affecting their morale, and increasing the amount of food they consume. We are getting people to do it gradually, and we are doing all we can in that direction."

NEARING BRITISH LEVEL

"It may be that it will, if you don't want to keep up the feeding of the Russians and the English," replied Wickard.

He said we are approaching "pretty rapidly" the level of nutrition in Britain, and experts have been sent to England to study their use of the short rations available.

"They have cut down their consumption and have found out better ways of feeding people," Wickard asserted. "But here in this country we have to produce not only for our own people and our Army, but foods for these other nations. * * * If we had more food, we would give it to the Russians and not cut down on the British. And even though we cut down the consumption for our civilians, there would still be an unlimited demand from our allies."

Mr. President, I read this article particularly in view of the statement made yesterday by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the majority leader, that he had been informed that there were 500,000 more beef cattle in this country than there were before the war. It strikes me as quite strange that a statement should come from the Secretary of Agriculture that the people must eat feed appropriate for cattle rather than that it be fed to cattle because there are not enough cattle to feed the people.

I have before me letters written by persons directly interested in farm production, and upon the point of the need of the proposed legislation I wish to read short excerpts from them. They come from various sections of the country.

The first letter is one from the Coolidge-Florence Farm Bureau, Coolidge, Ariz., and the letter contains this statement:

Our difficulties in obtaining farm help during the past season have been doubly discouraging. A considerable shortage existed during the production season, but this paled to insignificance when the time came for harvest. During the earlier months we had lost portions of our feed and seed crops for want of the necessary labor for gathering them.

From another letter written by Hon. J. B. McLaughlin, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of West Virginia, under date of February 13, 1943, addressed to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Economic Stabilization Director, I read the following excerpt:

The partial black-outs in the showcases and shelves, and grocerymen closing their doors every day is an indication of an appalling food shortage that may be expected before the year is out, and if not remedied immediately may be disastrous.

Reading from the same letter I quote this sound statement:

The farmer is not insistent upon making profits, but he does want to be allowed to make ends meet and stay in business so that he may do his part in the production of food to win this war, because he knows as no other group knows that men cannot be trained to be farmers in 2 or 3 months as the case may be in training skilled laborers in factories.

Under date of January 7, 1943, I have this letter from the C. A. Hawkins ranch, Fresno, Calif. This is a copy of a letter that was addressed to the Honorable SHERIDAN DOWNEY, a Member of the Senate:

In compliance with your request at the Fresno farm meeting that I put my arguments about our debts and food supply in writing:

The simple fact is that already too many farm laborers have been removed from farms for it to be possible to maintain the food supply for men drawn into highly paid munition-factory jobs, our 10,000,000 men under arms, the army of Government bureaucrats, our civilian population, and meet our lend-lease commitments for food.

From the Louisiana Department of Agriculture, in a letter dated February 17, 1943, addressed to Hon. J. B. McLaughlin, commissioner of agriculture, Charleston, W. Va., I read:

I have just returned from a trip to north Louisiana and I find less farm work being done at present than at any time as far as I can remember. The help is just not available and farms will not work themselves.

From the Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture, a letter dated February 16, 1943, I read as follows:

First, I would like to say that the farmers of America are willing and anxious to fulfill production goals 100-percent plus. In Arizona and the entire Southwest it is possible that 1943 agricultural production will exceed that of 1942.

I regret to state, however, that, in my opinion, our probable production will not exceed 80 percent of last year's, unless we have assurance within the next 60 days of sufficient labor, materials, and supplies, and repair parts for machinery and equipment.

I read further from the same letter:

Labor manpower: Manpower is the key to 1943 goals. Since Mr. McNutt's order of January 26, giving Secretary Wickard control of farm labor, we have hopes of prompt solution. Immediate action on following matters should eliminate our labor shortage:

(a) Draft deferment to all essential farm workers. Definite orders should be issued as most local and State selective-service boards ignore Director Hershey's suggestions in release No. 175, which was issued January 16. Essential men are still being called.

Here is a letter from the State of Idaho Department of Agriculture, addressed to Hon. J. H. BANKHEAD, United States Senate, Washington, dated February 6, 1943:

I have been in constant contact with the farmers in this State. I'm very familiar with their problems. The information I give you has been gained by actual experience.

I read further:

I know that the last few years, and especially last year, the farmers have not received an even break with other industries. I also know that if food is to be produced to feed our armed forces, our allies, and ourselves some drastic changes must be made and made immediately. Action must be taken.

Another paragraph from that letter reads:

Labor: Labor was an important factor in 1942, and is going to be more serious this year. Statistics show 400,000 farm laborers left the farm in 1942, many of them since harvest was completed. To produce more foodstuffs with less labor, when we were very short last year, is out of the question. We must get this help back. We haven't anything yet to offer to induce them to come back. We cannot compete with war industries, with wages. If these men are even drafted back on the farm, I don't believe they will be much help because of the high wages and short hours they have been working, they will be unwilling to work farmer hours. The only chance I see of getting them back is if food gets short and too hard to get in some of these crowded centers. Then they may come back on the farm to get something to eat.

This is from the National Grange:

Winning the war is our supreme task and to this accomplishment the Grange pledges

its maximum resources, both as an organization and through the individual efforts of its entire membership.

The attainment of this goal requires immediate action to assure farmers manpower, machinery, and supplies, with prices for food produced that will give farmers a reasonable financial return for their toil, compared with like effort in other essential industries.

Now I quote from a resolution adopted at the forty-sixth annual convention of the American National Live Stock Association held at Denver, Colo., January 15–16, 1943:

Whereas agricultural workers are being pirated by industry; and

Whereas some local draft boards do not give enough consideration to directions from selective service; and

Whereas the shortage of manpower for agriculture is curtailing the food production program: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American National Live Stock Association in annual convention in Denver, Colo., January 15–16, 1943, That we urge the War Manpower Commission to provide more effective control of pirating of agricultural workers by industry, and that selective service provide mandatory deferment of agricultural workers.

I should like to read an excerpt from an address by Albert S. Goss before the seventy-sixth annual session of the National Grange at Wenatchee, Wash., November 11, 1942:

As a result of this drain—

Speaking of the drain of manpower—

farm production has suffered severely in some areas, and there is a great deal of evidence that plantings for next year will be shortly curtailed.

When he spoke of next year he meant this year, 1943, for he was speaking in November of last year.

Dairy cows have gone to the slaughter block in alarming numbers, while farm sell-outs have been breaking all records. Although the grange has been warning the administration and Congress of this for many months, until recently our warnings have been ignored and we have been blindly plunging into a situation which can result in no other way than a food shortage.

This morning I clipped from the Washington Times-Herald an article appearing on the front page headed—

The auction block—costs, labor shortage, force another dairyman to sell out.

The article proceeds to relate that a dairy close to Washington has been placed upon the block for sale, and says that it is one of three which in the last few months have been sold and closed out in the milk shed of this area.

Mr. President, I submit to the Senate that there is going to be less planted and less harvested in 1943 than was harvested in 1942. That fact is undeniable, based upon all the evidence that has been produced thus far on the question of manpower and production.

I deem it unnecessary further to quote authority and opinions upon this subject. Today every man and every woman in this country knows that there is a scarcity of food. If this were not true then why were we placed upon a rationing basis? Why are our people required to purchase food in limited quantities? Why the limitation upon the supplies which our people may have for subsistence? Why the empty shelves and showcases of the food merchants?

I have no opposition to necessary rationing designed to insure a lasting supply of food to all our people, but I say that the very fact that we have resorted to rationing is proof sufficient of either an existing food shortage or an apprehension that there will be such a shortage. In either event, the situation is too serious for palliation on the part of Congress.

Facing a food shortage, on the other hand, our need for food supplies in this year will greatly exceed the demands of 1941.

Our armed forces are increasing in number. More and more of them are being sent across the seas to be maintained thousands of miles from home. Naturally this requires a greater outlay of food for those men, who, above all others, must have first call upon the food and agricultural products of this country.

In the report of Mr. Stettinius on the lend-lease program under which we sent these products to the other countries fighting this war with us, we are told that lend-lease shipments of foodstuffs must be increased over the shipments of 1942. That is a definite program requiring greater supplies of agriculture products, a program which even now is in process of performance.

We cannot ignore our own people here at home. We are not going to permit them to go hungry if we can prevent it; yet we must realize that the boys whom we have placed under arms and sent out upon the waters and to lands on other continents must receive food and supplies in sufficient quantities to maintain them first above all others.

The need, the crisis, is immediate. When we deal with the raising of crops we cannot await the convenience of Congress to pass a general manpower act, because crops grow in season. The time for planting is at hand now. Action must be taken at once on this subject or it must be forgotten for 1943. I for one am not willing that it shall be forgotten, and I for one realize the necessity for immediate action, even drastic action, if you please, in order to assure the raising of crops and the furnishing, as best we can, of the men necessary for that purpose. A crop shortage in 1943, with the immense feeding program we have undertaken, would place us in a dangerous position. It might bring disaster. Men with empty stomachs cannot fight; and a hungry people cannot be a strong people.

It is true that the measure before us will not reach out and bring back to the farms those who have left them, but at least it will prevent further depletion of the farm workers. I believe it will prevent their going to the manufacturing plants; if they leave the farm they will be subject to the Selective Service Act, as not necessarily being engaged in some essential industry; and it will stop them from entering the armed forces. Certainly, it is no answer to the existing shortage of farm labor that the military should continue to take men from the farms.

We cannot wait for a general and complicated manpower plan if we are to have sufficient crops in 1943. The seasons of the year—the seasons of planting and growth and harvesting—do not await the deliberations of Congress. Nature will not await congressional action. This is so even though, as I am told, one of our bureaucrats suggested that lambing time be postponed although the lambs were on the way. Even the genius of the bureaus cannot bring about so great a miracle. But, nevertheless, the boys of the bureaus directed it be done.

It is my hope that the Bankhead substitute will be adopted by the Senate because it will attain the prime objective desired, regardless of what its critics may consider to be faults. It will keep on the farm the men who are now there.

The amendment which has been offered by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] does no more in effect than to reenact the existing law on this subject. It does no more than to reenact section 5, subsection K, of the present Selective Service Act. I invite attention to the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming. He would exempt those engaged in any agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort. That sounds good when we read it. It is the same as, or quite similar to, the language of the present section of the Selective Service Act dealing with this subject and under which there has been complete failure. The present act on the subject is called the Tydings amendment. I do not doubt for one moment the earnestness and sincerity of purpose of the distinguished author of that amendment, or of the Congress in passing it, when it said that necessary farm workers who were essential were to be deferred. But what, in fact, has been the result? The administrators of the Selective Service Act seized upon the words "necessary" and "essential" and have set up their own definition as to who are necessary. In so doing they have defeated the very purpose of the act.

I point out that in the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Wyoming he has followed virtually that same language. It is attractive language. The words "necessary" and "essential" catch the eye at once; but when we look at the existing law we find the same words there. When we consider the situation throughout the country we find that in the interpretation of those words there has been a complete failure in the matter of keeping men on the farms.

The administrators of the act set up the so-called unit system now in use. First, they required that a farmer produce 16 units before there could be deferment, and the men from the farms continued to be taken into the service. The Selective Service department recognized its mistake and then set up an 8-unit basis, and that rule is in effect today as a basis for deferring essential farm workers. Mr. President, you and I know, as does everyone else who comes from a farming section, that today workers are still being taken from the farms. So it becomes necessary in this situation for the Congress in acting to be very definite and direct in order to accomplish the purpose of keeping men on the farms if food is to be produced. To do that we cannot use adjectives or quali-

fying terms, however appealing they may sound, because a trial has proved that they will not be interpreted as it was intended they should be interpreted by those who enacted the law.

The present section 5 (K) and the results under it represent another instance of the Congress enacting a law with the intent that it should accomplish a definite purpose and leaving words in the act to be defined by an administrative department which was not in sympathy with its provisions, with the result that methods of enforcement were set up which destroyed the very purpose of the law.

I submit that the time has come when the Congress, in enacting laws, must be definite when it gives to the administrative departments a duty to be performed. The O'Mahoney amendment contains in essence the same language as that of the present law, which has been a failure. To enact it would be purposeless. The O'Mahoney amendment goes a little further. The existing law does not recognize the creation of any unit system for determining who is a necessary worker, but the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming would put a proviso into the law recognizing and placing in effect a unit system, and affirming and declaring that what is going on is right. For that reason I take issue with the distinguished Senator upon his amendment.

Mr. President, we are told that some 350,000 men have been deferred under the Tydings amendment to the present act. Yet, in the face of that, we have the statements of farmers and farm agents that needed farm workers continue to be taken. In fact, we know that even today they are being taken by local draft boards. Consequently it becomes necessary for us to be definite and say that in this perilous situation no farm worker who will stay on the farm and perform his work shall be taken into the military service.

At this time let me briefly address myself to the objections which have been made in the minority views to the bill as reported, and to certain questions which were raised on the floor of the Senate yesterday.

First. It is said that this is a blanket deferment of all persons working on the farm. That is correct. That has become necessary in order to preserve farm labor. The Selective Service Administrators, when given power to define such words as "essential" and "necessary" as they appear in the present law, and as they appear in the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, set up for themselves their own definitions and proceeded to take needed workers from the farm. I have already dwelt upon this subject.

Second. Objection is made, also, that the enactment of the bill would be an invitation to anyone who might desire to evade service to go to the farms and work. It is my view that this objection has very little practical soundness in it, because when we use the words "worker on a farm" we mean a bona fide worker; that is, a farm hand or a farmer. We know that he goes there to work. We do not have to write in the words "bona fide," "earnest," or "real" worker. There is not a draft board, and certainly there is not a community in this country, that would permit anyone to use such a law as a shield to avoid military service. His pretense would be revealed so quickly that no farm could hide him or keep him. When I say "farm worker" I mean just what that language implies—one who is truthfully a worker on a farm, or one who in truth operates a farm. I submit that it is only to beg the question, and that it is not a serious objection, to say that such a law would be a shield for a man to evade military service. If he goes to the farm and works and is a real farm worker, he is needed there; and we must boldly face the question and solve it as best we can.

It has been said that the so-called Tydings amendment, which is now in the law as section 5, subsection (k) of the Selective Service Act, is all that is necessary to keep the farm worker on the farm. We have discussed that question. I think it answers itself, by reason of the very fact that while that law has been in existence the farms have been denuded of their labor, until a food shortage is now upon us.

The argument is made that to exempt farm labor would be to undermine military morale. A Senator spoke of that yesterday. In support of this complaint there is cited the opposition to the bill of Mr. Patterson, Acting Secretary of War, General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, who is the one who set up the plan for enforcing the Tydings amendment in such a way as to destroy its effect, and Mr. Byrnes, of the Office of Economic Stabilization. I invite particular attention to the letter of Director of Economic Stabilization Byrnes, which is addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]. It reads as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1943.

Hon. R. R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: This is in reply to your two letters of February 19, 1943, with reference to S. 729 and S. 730.

The production of foods and fibers necessary for the war requires that some plan be worked out to secure the deferment of qualified laborers who are engaged in the production of essential war products until such time as adequate replacements can be provided. The necessary details, however, must be recommended by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, who is primarily responsible for dealing with this problem, and who is in a position to estimate adequately the requirements of the armed forces and to industry, as well as agriculture.

I also agree that it will be necessary in certain cases of critical emergency, to furlough members of the armed forces for the harvesting of critical agricultural crops. The details of the plan, however, must be worked out in close cooperation with the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and the Secretary of War, in order that no steps shall be taken which will disrupt the efficiency of our armed forces.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES F. BYRNES, *Director.*

Mr. President, there is nothing in the bill which would call for any soldier coming back out of the ranks, or any sailor coming back from the Navy to the farm, so there would be no disruption on that score. The whole purport of the letter is that the plan must be worked out with the Manpower Commissioner and the Secretary of War. But the trouble is that we cannot work out any plan of this kind because no plan has been given the Manpower Commissioner, and none has yet been brought forth from any source under which the Commissioner was to operate. We cannot wait for that if we are to have sufficient crops in 1943.

With respect to these objections offered from persons in the War Department and the Selective Service Administration let me say, as a Member of this body, that no one will more wholeheartedly support the military in time of war than will I. That I intend to do. But I realize, as all other Senators must, that the military is principally interested in raising and equipping a sound army. That is, of course, essential. The Congress has the over-all duty not only to aid in raising such an armed force but to see to it that it is fed, and, furthermore, to see that the people of our country, the families from whom the men are taken, are fed and clothed. We have that duty as well as the duty of raising an army to fight the battles of this country.

If in its great work—which has been magnificent to this day—the military in the opinion of Congress has overlooked or is overlooking some necessary phase of this great war effort, such as the producing of food and other necessary farm crops, then it is the duty of Congress as the direct representative of the people, and under its over-all duty of supervision of government in time of war as well as in time of peace, to see to it that the threatened danger of lack of food is met and removed. That, of course, means keeping men on the farms. That means, in the present instance, that all men there at present must be kept there for the 1943 crop, because their ranks have now been thinned to the danger point.

Certainly it is no answer, referring to a point which was raised yesterday, to say that it is too late to pass this proposed law. It is never too late to save what we have left. If in order to help produce the food required by our country it is necessary that we take definite, even drastic, action to freeze men on the farms, to induce them to stay there, to provide under the edict of law that they shall stay there, then we must be courageous enough to take action sufficiently definite to meet the needs of the situation.

On the question of morale, I heard it said that the boys in the armed service would resent the deferment of men back here at home. I do not agree with that conclusion when the men under arms realize that such deferment is made for the purpose of raising food, not only for them but for the loved ones they left back home and whom they expect the Government of this country to protect while they are away. The man in the fighting forces is a sensible man. We

hear talk about morale. I can think of nothing that would destroy a soldier's morale so quickly or place him in greater distress than to know, or even believe, that his Government had failed him in not providing the essentials of life—such as food and clothing—for his family that he left back in America. I can take no stock in the argument of the opposition on that point.

On the same point let me read a short letter which I received under date of March 3—only last week—from a man serving in our armed forces. The letter reads as follows:

UNITED STATES NAVAL FLIGHT PREPARATORY SCHOOL,
Murray, Ky., March 3, 1943.

Congratulations upon your vote, noted in the press today in favor of the bill granting deferment to farm workers. This should have been done systematically long ago. It would have obviated the serious shortage of skilled farm labor and the dislocation in the farm communities, and would make unnecessary the absurd suggestions now heard to have doctors, lawyers, and bankers harvest the crops and to sprinkle interned Japanese around through the farms to help with the work. I have asked a number of my farmer friends what they think of these solutions. You know the answer. It's unanimous.

The sailor who wrote that letter is not a farmer. He came from city life. He knows the necessity for adequate farm labor. I believe that in his letter he expresses the feeling which all our soldiers will have when they realize that the action taken in that direction is for their benefit and for the benefit of their families.

So far as the fighting man is concerned, I give second place to no one in my determination to stand by him in seeing to it that he receives the first consideration of his country. But it is one thing to make declarations of devotion and to rest supinely upon such declarations, and yet another thing to back them up with positive, practical action that will assure our fighting men genuine support and sustenance.

Finally, Mr. President, if the farms shall continue to be denuded of their labor, who will work the land? Are we going to bring in foreign labor through the gates of immigration? Is the Federal Government going to help create in this land a situation whereby the boys of America will be upon the high seas and foreign shores fighting this World War, while the fields and farms back home will be cultivated by foreign men?

We hear talk about the question of morale. How is the soldier or the sailor going to feel about a situation of that kind, Mr. President?

I am not referring to something that is remote. If there shall be taken from the producing farms of this country the American men who live upon them and know the work, necessarily there will be created a dearth of workers there, and there will ensue a situation that will permit those who want the bars of immigration let down to say that it has become necessary to bring in foreign workers. I am opposed to having that done, and I am against creating any situation which might give any basis to the claim of need by those who would let down the bars of immigration. I want to have the farms of this country maintained by American people.

Mr. President, the danger to which I have referred is not so remote. Let me remind the Senate that no later than December the Chief Executive asked the Congress to give him authority to control immigration into this country. It was not stated why that power was wanted, so far as I know. Could it have been that there was a desire to let in refugees under a plea that their labor was needed? Can it be that we shall create so difficult a situation on the farms of this country that such a request can be given the semblance of justification?

For my part, I shall oppose with all the power that I have the opening of the gates of this country to the foreign worker. When the millions of young men whom we have taken from the farms, from the shops, and from their homes are out fighting their country's battles, to my mind nothing that could happen to our national life could be more horrible than to have those of us who have undertaken to guide this country's course and to protect those we have sent to war allow the places of work to be filled by people from other lands, while our own sons are away fighting for our country's existence as a Nation. To them—to those boys of ours—we owe the first duty to see to it that the places of work are open to them when they come marching home, that this country is kept for them, and that our farms are maintained by Americans.

The danger is not so remote. Let me point out a question and an answer of a date no later than March 2, 1943, at one of the hearings on manpower. The answer was given by a military officer during the manpower inquiries now going. The question is as follows:

Colonel, if there is a shortage of labor on the farms, do you favor the importation of persons from other countries to work on the farms?

Here is the answer:

As a temporary expedient, yes, sir; until we get our agriculture properly organized.

"Until we get our agriculture properly organized!" What would we do with the foreign workers when it was organized? I want agriculture organized, and kept organized, with our American people. All of us know as a practical matter that we cannot ship foreign workers out of this country, once we bring them here.

I realize that the statement of one officer, giving his own opinion—and a very fair and candid opinion—does not necessarily reflect the views of others in the military service or on the administrative side of the Government; but summing up all of these things, I submit that it is the duty of Congress—and to no other body may we turn for the performance of that duty—to see to it that no one creates in this country such a situation as will give anyone any basis for stating that we need people from other countries in order to operate our farms.

To the proposal that farm workers be deferred from service in the armed forces, the objection has been raised that legislation to accomplish that result would be class legislation. Even if that be so, I am willing to legislate with respect to a class in time of war, as a temporary measure, if such action be necessary to the winning of the war and to sustaining this country in its strength. If it be necessary to legislate with respect to one group of persons in order to assure to this country the needed food and other agricultural products, and to assure that the farms of this country are operated by our own people, then such legislation should be enacted.

But the measure is not class legislation in the sense in which that term is usually applied. What we seek to do would not be done for the benefit of the farmer or the farm worker. I rather suspect that many farmers will resent this measure. They may do so when the time comes for them to respond to the call of the Nation.

No doubt, in many instances, they may resent this law. What we do is done for all of America. It is done for the fighting forces of this country in order that they may be sustained in food and clothing. It is done so that all people living under our Government and looking to it for protection, as they have a right to do, shall be able to obtain the necessities of life.

The argument has been advanced that if we provide for deferment of the farm worker, we may be asked to do the same thing for workers in other lines of endeavor. That, of course, is but an argument of convenience. We have not been asked to defer any other class of workers, and, so far as I know, there is no need for such legislation. There is now in process of evolvement an over-all organization of the workers of the country. I do not know what will come out of it; but at the present time no one has greater need for such an organization than does the farm worker. As I say, the question before us involves consideration of seasons and of planting times. A shortage of crops in 1943 may be a disaster.

There is another fact which bears on the situation. The man who is needed in the plant usually gets his deferment through the application of his employer; the man on the railroad and in the mine, when needed in that work, has the voice of his employer saying that he is needed there. But the farm worker, has in many instances, no employer to make such a request for him. Under the present law deferment for the farmer must usually come through the request of his father or from the worker on his own farm unsustained by other requests. The application for deferment, in the first place, is not very strong when a father asks for his own boy's deferment, and, in the second place, if it is granted under such circumstances, the odium of a slacker is placed upon the boy and he lives in his community shunned by his neighbors around him. The law now proposed requires that he be kept on the farm to perform agricultural work in the service of his country and that a certificate be issued showing that fact. In other words, the law would say to him, "You stay on the farm, you are not asking for deferment, but your Government wants you to stay there, and when you do you will be given a certificate, which you may show to the world, that you are deferred under the order of your Government and not at your own request."

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the Bankhead substitute. I urge it for the men who are fighting the war of their country. I urge it in the name of those they have left at home in our hands for protection, for the whole general populace that must be fed and clothed. I urge it for a secure America which must continue to have Americans operate its farms and plants, which must be safeguarded against the floods of immigration. We must never create such a situation that while our own blood, our own boys, will be fighting the battles of the world on foreign shores men of other countries, aliens, will be operating the farms within our own country. May such a thing never happen in America.

Mr. President, I submit that the Bankhead amendment would more nearly achieve the desired purpose than would the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I further submit that the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming would simply be the reenactment of the present law which has been a failure. It would, indeed, go further than that, for it would write into the law the plan brought forth by the Selective Service Board which has failed to keep men on the farm.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in its practical effect, the Bankhead amendment is an amendment to increase the number of and to hasten the drafting of married men with children. That proposition is intermingled with the Bankhead amendment as it will be applied by the Government.

The debate on this question has been very interesting. I think one of the most logical deductions was that drawn by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], that the whole philosophy of the drafting of citizens in time of war was started wrong and needs to be revised in the light of the failures and inequalities which have followed in its wake.

There are two proposals before the Senate. The first is to blanket in and exempt from military service all persons working on farms. The other proposal, in essence, is to make the question of deferment an individual question predicated upon the character of the work, the irreplaceability of the worker, and the necessity of the Nation.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I prefer not to yield until I can develop the argument a little further.

Mr. President, I shall not dwell long on the two amendments, because I am advised that the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] intends to discuss them in their details. So I will pass them over for the moment.

I inquire now, Where are we going to get the Army which we are told by the military experts is essential in order to fight this war? If Congress wants to cut down the size of the Army, the way to cut it down is by law. If Congress does not want to cut down the size of the Army, then it should be drawn from all walks of life. Insofar as the Nation's needs will permit, there ought to be an equality in sacrifice in the raising of the Army, because no one in this country is going to perform any service whatsoever which will reasonably compare with the service of the men in the armed forces.

We already know what service in the armed forces means. It means, in many cases, the giving up of life itself and in other cases the bearing of wounds by the young men of our Nation. So, if we cut anywhere and exempt in a blanket fashion a great group of American citizens, we have to go elsewhere, into the ranks of the married men with children, in order to get the men to replace those who have been excluded. It cannot successfully be denied that that will be the case if the Bankhead amendment shall be adopted.

First of all, what is the trouble? Is it that the military forces are depleting the farms of workers? No; that is not the trouble, for the testimony before various committees shows that 70 percent of the farm depletion went into industry. I do not blame the farm workers for going into industry, for the following very proper reasons: Mr. President, what do you suppose the average farm weekly wage is in this country? I have before me the figures for every State in the Union, with board and without board, for 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942. Listen. For the Nation, as a whole, in 1939 the average was $27.39 a month with board, and $35.82 without board.

In 1940 the average was $28.08 a month with board, and $36.68 without board a month.

In 1941, the average was $34.85 a month with board, and $43.64 a month without board.

In 1942 the average was $46.64 a month with board, and $56.07 a month without board.

In other words, the average wage, even in 1942, was less than $2 a day. There is the problem, Senators.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. The figures stated by the Senator, as I understand, constitute the average for the United States as a whole?

Mr. TYDINGS. The figures given represent the average for the whole country, but I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point a table showing the wages, with and without board, for each State in the Union. I believe the wages are highest in California, where a shortage of labor has been occasioned by the transfer to camps of large numbers of Japanese, who formerly worked on the farms, and lowest in some of the Southern States where in some instances wages are but half as much as the average which I read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). Without objection, the table may be printed in the RECORD.

The table is as follows:

Annual average wage rates, 1939–42, per month, by States, and United States

[Straight average of 4 quarters—not official estimates of annual averages]

State	1939		1940		1941		1942	
	With board	Without board	With board	Without board	With board	Without board	With board	Without board
Maine	$30.10	$45.70	$30.60	$48.60	$38.20	$58.30	$51.60	$74.80
New Hampshire	31.70	54.80	31.90	55.30	35.80	61.40	49.20	77.70
Vermont	30.20	47.60	31.30	48.10	38.50	58.10	50.00	72.10
Massachusetts	32.30	61.50	33.60	62.80	39.40	70.80	53.60	89.10
Rhode Island	38.10	65.40	36.60	64.50	45.80	73.10	55.60	89.60
Connecticut	34.80	63.60	35.70	63.10	45.20	73.60	56.80	89.00
New York	29.30	45.50	30.70	46.80	38.40	56.20	50.30	72.00
New Jersey	32.00	53.60	33.10	54.60	39.10	62.50	51.10	77.60
Pennsylvania	26.40	41.70	27.10	42.20	31.40	47.80	38.50	60.80
Ohio	26.20	38.80	26.30	39.00	31.60	44.60	39.30	55.40
Indiana	27.10	37.60	27.70	38.60	32.80	44.30	40.90	54.60
Illinois	31.80	42.60	32.20	42.90	38.30	49.10	48.10	61.40
Michigan	27.40	41.90	28.20	42.10	35.40	51.10	44.30	63.20
Wisconsin	28.10	41.10	28.60	41.90	36.70	51.30	48.90	67.40
Minnesota	28.60	40.80	28.60	40.70	34.90	47.90	48.50	63.90
Iowa	31.70	41.40	32.10	42.10	38.30	48.10	52.10	63.80
Missouri	22.90	31.10	23.20	31.80	26.70	36.40	34.90	46.40
North Dakota	25.80	39.10	26.40	39.60	34.00	48.80	50.50	68.70
South Dakota	26.70	38.90	27.10	39.60	33.20	46.50	48.20	64.00
Nebraska	24.80	34.90	25.80	36.10	31.00	41.90	45.30	58.60
Kansas	24.00	35.30	24.50	35.90	29.60	41.80	41.20	57.40
Delaware	24.40	37.40	26.10	39.20	31.40	45.10	39.10	56.60
Maryland	26.50	38.50	27.10	39.60	31.60	45.20	38.30	54.70
Virginia	21.30	30.40	21.80	30.90	24.90	35.10	30.60	44.40
West Virginia	21.60	31.90	22.00	32.40	24.50	35.30	30.20	43.90
North Carolina	17.00	24.90	17.40	25.40	19.80	28.20	25.80	35.50
South Carolina	12.30	18.10	12.90	18.70	14.20	20.70	18.70	25.90
Georgia	12.20	17.90	12.80	18.60	14.80	20.90	18.80	26.00
Florida	15.60	26.80	15.90	27.80	18.40	31.20	25.10	41.90
Kentucky	20.40	28.90	20.20	28.60	23.10	31.80	29.10	39.90
Tennessee	16.50	23.90	16.90	24.20	19.60	27.60	24.30	34.00
Alabama	13.60	19.40	13.60	19.50	15.80	22.00	21.60	29.80
Mississippi	14.20	20.50	14.20	20.70	15.90	22.80	20.40	28.50
Arkansas	15.90	23.50	16.20	23.90	19.00	27.00	25.40	36.20
Louisiana	15.10	22.80	15.50	23.00	16.90	24.50	21.90	30.50
Oklahoma	20.20	29.60	20.80	30.30	24.30	34.40	33.00	45.60
Texas	20.60	29.50	21.10	30.10	25.10	34.40	34.70	46.30
Montana	37.10	53.20	38.80	54.80	44.70	63.90	63.30	84.20
Idaho	37.40	52.20	38.60	53.70	45.70	60.80	63.40	83.30
Wyoming	35.70	52.10	36.30	52.30	43.70	59.30	58.10	77.30
Colorado	29.50	45.40	30.30	45.90	35.60	51.40	48.10	68.70
New Mexico	27.60	42.20	27.90	40.20	32.10	45.70	42.40	57.70
Arizona	38.20	54.60	36.40	55.30	42.20	59.30	60.80	80.60
Utah	42.10	55.90	44.40	58.60	48.60	66.20	68.60	87.80
Nevada	40.60	60.30	42.40	58.70	46.60	69.30	59.00	82.10
Washington	35.80	53.20	37.00	56.90	45.10	67.20	69.00	97.80
Oregon	35.30	52.20	35.80	53.80	44.90	63.30	68.80	92.90
California	45.90	69.30	45.60	72.10	55.60	81.20	76.60	105.70
United States [1]	27.39	35.82	28.05	36.68	34.85	43.64	46.64	56.07

[1] United States rates are official annual averages: Weighted by hired farm labor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, by the Bankhead amendment we are not going to keep workers on the farms unless we propose to compel them to work for $56.07 a month, when men are getting an average of $158 a month in the war industries of the Nation for working 8 hours a day, are getting time and a half for overtime, and double time if they work 7 days in a week and the seventh day is on Sunday, and are also receiving social-security benefits, unemployment pay, and retirement pay thrown in.

Mr. President, there is the issue. Why not face it? The adoption of the Bankhead amendment will not cure that situation unless it says to farm workers, "Go to work on the farm for this wage even though your neighbor is making three times as much and working shorter hours in the war plants of the Nation."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Maryland the date of the figures he has given.

Mr. TYDINGS. I obtained them 4 or 5 days ago.

Mr. BYRD. What was the date when they were effective in the industries and on the farms?

Mr. TYDINGS. I gave the dates, 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, the wages have been somewhat increased.

Mr. TYDINGS. They have been going up each year, but even with the increase the average in 1942 was $56.07 a month, out of which a man must provide food, clothing, and shelter for himself and his family.

Some may think men will be held on the farms in the face of such a disparity between industrial and agricultural wages. If they are, I do not know human nature. The only people left on the farms are those who have remained because the farmers have raised the pay in order to hold them, those who love to farm, those who find that farming is what they like to do best.

Mr. President, who is the farmer about whom I am talking? We are looking to that farmer in our own homes today and tomorrow for breakfast, for dinner and for supper. We are looking to him for the clothes on our backs, whether they be cotton or wool, for the hides which make the shoes on our feet, and for the lumber in all our homes. He is the one who furnishes all these things. He is creating all the wealth on which all war industries and all industrial wages depend, and in the midst of the highest wages in all history he is getting $56.07 a month for contributing the things without which we could not run the Nation's plants, or even an Army, or fight a war.

I know that for a long time farmers were blinded by the fact that they received a yearly check, paid to them from money borrowed by the Government in an effort to even up things. Now the chickens are coming home to roost. That is why the farms have been depleted. The military services have gotten only 30 percent of the men who have left the farms. The industrial plants have gotten 70 percent.

Then think of what will happen if we freeze men on the farms, as the Bankhead amendment would do, since under it they could not leave the farms until they went to some civilian tribunal and said, "I do not want to work for $33 a month, or for $40 a month, or $56.07 a month"—which is the average for the whole country. "I can go down the road and get $158 a month." "Ah, but you cannot do that. You must stay on your farm."

That is what the Bankhead amendment would accomplish. Of course, that would be nothing more nor less than bringing about a condition of enforced labor; it would result in nothing more nor less than slavery. If we are going to enter upon such a movement, let us make a law for the entire country, and require everyone to share the sacrifices, and not condemn to slavery the poorest paid workers in the whole economic scale, while all the others in the economic picture do pretty much as they please.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I hope that before he concludes the Senator will give us his solution. I am not asking for the activities he would suggest in carrying it out, but I should like to have his program for increasing wages on the farms and earnings on the farms to a point which would be sufficiently attractive to make farmers desire to stay on the farms.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's question is a good one, and I shall come to it in due time.

Mr. President, the farmer of this Nation, and particularly the farm worker, has been the real forgotten man during the last 20 years. The whole economic system has been set up with no consideration whatever for the farmer. The farmer pays, in direct and indirect taxes, his share of the social-security program, of unemployment insurance, and old-age taxes, but he gets none of it for himself.

The farmer, through his taxes, will pay off the huge debt which this Government is going to drive up perhaps to the $250,000,000,000 mark, to pay all the high wages now being drawn, and to pay all the manufacturers the billions of dollars they receive under contracts. The farmer gets none of it.

Every time the prices of manufactured articles increase, either because of wage increases or through social-security payments which are added to the cost of the articles, the farmer's income is correspondingly depressed.

We cannot raise wages on the farm without increasing the cost of food and clothing and shelter. It is not possible. But why should it not be done?

When we increase the cost of manufactured articles, we depress the income of every farmer and farm worker in this country; and that has been taking place for a long time. Politicians travel about the country and tell what stanch friends they are to a particular group, and the great gains which have been made, but they fail to tell the remaining groups that the gains were made quite often at their expense. People have been falling for that boloney, one group being put up on stilts at the expense of another group which is already away down, right on the bottom.

It is not possible to increase the cost of manufactured articles, as a result of increased wages, without passing the increase on to the farmer and to the other consumers of the country. It is not possible to increase the cost of food because of the necessity of raising wages without increasing the cost of living.

Let us put ourselves in the farm worker's position. There he is on the farm, working 10 hours a day, 7 days a week, without any overtime pay, with no social security benefits, without the benefit of retirement pay, and he is working for less than $2 a day, when he can go right down the road and get $158 a month, which is the average, work 8 hours a day, get time and a half for overtime on Saturday, if the industry operates under the 48-hour week system, and get unemployment insurance and old-age pensions thrown in.

Does anyone think we are going to hold workers on the farm unless we compel them to serve there through the medium of the Bankhead amendment? If we do that, if we force men to work on the farm and to stay on the farm, then justice has left this Chamber, and reason has departed from the meditations of those in it.

Mr. President, I stated at the beginning of my remarks that the Bankhead amendment, in its ramifications, though not so intended, I know, in practical effect is an amendment to compel, to increase the number of, and to hasten the drafting of married men with children, and I shall give the proof.

Mr. McNutt, General McNarney, Mr. Wickard, Mr. Donald Nelson, and 30 other witnesses testifying before the Bankhead subcommittee have all told of the need for labor. What is that need, in a paragraph?

Outside of the figures 4,300,000 needed for the Army and Navy this year, 6,400,000 entirely new workers must be found for service here at home. It is hoped to get 2,700,000 of these from the ranks of women, 500,000 from the physically handicapped, whose disabilities are so slight that they can be overcome. The remaining 3,200,000 can be obtained only by a reduction of employees in less essential industries. Let us stop there and call it by its right name. It means by putting out of business less essential industries, by not allowing them to stagger along, because when we take 3,200,000 from a nonessential industry we might as well put up a sign "Closed for the duration of the war." The figures I have given present the manpower picture and problem, and superimposed on all that is the need for 3,100,000 seasonal agricultural workers at harvest time, not regularly employed, not working on the farm steadily, but for a month, or 2 months, or 3 months at the outside.

What the Bankhead amendment would do would be to shove back into agriculture every one who lives on a farm, whether he milks one cow, two cows, three cows, or four cows; whether he works 6 hours a day, or 5 hours a day, or 3 hours a day, or 2 hours a day. Under the Bankhead amendment, a worker

would not have to be regularly employed; he would not have to be irreplaceable; he would only have to be there. Go over the Nation and tell the married men with one child, two children, three children, four, five, or six children, that because of this, though they would not have been called without it, perhaps, they must go and leave their families, to take the places of some other persons in the armed services of this country.

Let me say, Senators, this war is not yet over. Regardless of how much we may be advancing on any front, regardless of how great the drives, this war will be a long war, and the casualty lists are going to be large, just so surely as that we sit in the Senate Chamber. I should rather have almost anything else lying as a bar on my conscience than to know I had favored a piece of legislation which substituted some man who should not go, under the laws of right and reason, in the place of one who should have gone, in the place where we need him in this crucial time.

We are going to need men for the armed forces. We may not like the size of the Army or the Navy or the other armed forces, we may think it is not necessary to have such a number; but who knows? Even as I am speaking, a new situation may develop in some theater of war which will disabuse our minds of our preconceived ideas of what size the United States Army should be. The time to have thought of those things was before we got into the war. A country can get into a war very quickly. The only way I know of to get out of a war is to fight our way out of it, and win it.

When the time comes that the Nation is at war there is only one thing to do, and that is win it quickly.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment, for whatever it may be worth, there could be no greater mistake made by us than not to give the Army and the Navy, within human reason, what they want in manpower; otherwise, in the long run, probably more lives will be lost, greater treasure squandered, and graver troubles and trials encountered than by making everything available which we humanly can make available to shorten this war, and to save life, and to get it over.

Therefore, I say that the Bankhead amendment, in its practical application, is a measure for the draft of married men with children. It means that, for everyone it excludes from the draft, if he is not needed, if he is not regularly employed, if he is not irreplaceable, someone else must take his place; and the figures show there are not enough single men now left to man the ramparts. So, if the Senators feel that they would rather eat bacon every day and send a married man with children to the slaughter, well and good. For my part, I would rather not eat bacon at all and keep that man in his home with his wife and children.

Mr. President, we hear talk about a food famine. There is not going to be any famine. You know it and I know it. There will not be as much food as we have been used to, not so many varieties as we have been accustomed to have. We shall have a great deal more rationing than we have had up to now, but no one is going to starve. There will be enough to keep us going, and if not, we will have to cease some of our shipments abroad, for first we are going to live without starving, and we can be assured that our boys overseas are going to live, too. We will give away only what we can spare by sacrificing greatly. We are not going to give away food to the point where we starve to death. So do not be frightened. Of course, there will be a shortage of food.

Mr. President, I do not like comparisons with other countries, for I am not one of those who thought the problems of England or Russia or China were like the problems of the United States. But, by way of comparison in this instance, how many Senators know that the British people get two eggs apiece a month? They get very little meat. They have to eat food they can plant, such as cabbage and sprouts, and so on. We will not have to do that. We will eat more than two eggs a month, and we will eat a good bit of meat. That is far from starving.

Mr. President, I should rather eat less than the British eat, and do everything humanly within my power to shorten the war, to save the life of just one other boy, than I would to live well, and have life as usual, at the expense of the tears and the grief and the worry of some poor woman, or some poor children of some poor father, or some poor brother.

Mr. President, that is the question we are voting on here. We cannot put sacrifice on the basis of the belly while men die in filth in the South Pacific, suffer all kinds of tropical diseases, are killed in action on the battlefield, or suffer from wounds, with torn bodies in the hospitals.

In God's name, having raised this large Army, this Marine Corps, and this Navy, and set them into action by our formal edict, let us keep on sending enough to give them the fullest measure of support and devotion we humanly can. If we are not going to do that, then let us have a declaration of peace right here and now, and bring all the men back. Do not let us leave them over there with too few weapons and too few men to end the war as quickly as we can.

Briefly, Mr. President, the O'Mahoney amendment is realistic, humane, and just. What does it say in essence? I will not discuss it in detail, because the Senator from Wyoming will do so, but in essence it says that we need to consider food as a weapon; that we need to consider the raw materials produced on the farm for clothing and shelter and so forth as a weapon, and, just as in industry, where a man is regularly employed and irreplaceable, we cannot afford to have that line of supply stopped, and therefore the man on the farm should be exempt from military service because he is contributing the thing he can best contribute, and which he is working very long hours under difficult conditions to contribute.

Mr. President, I wish to go back for a moment to a discussion of what I think is the real effect of the amendment drawn by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. We all know that if 11,000,000 men are taken for the armed forces it means the service of a representative from one out of every three families in America. Think of that; one out of every three families will have a man in the armed services, because there are roughly 33,000,000 or 34,000,000 families in this country. There will hardly be a street, or a country road, on which there is not a blue star in the window of every third house. If we cut down the availability of the men who are going into that army by saying that 5,000,000 families, for example, have no part in it, then we would correspondingly increase the number of homes on certain streets and roads from which substitutes must come to take the place of those who have been excluded. So what would we be doing if we adopted the amendment drawn by the Senator from Alabama? In a blanket fashion, without any reasonable yardstick of measurement, without any regard to the intrinsic merit of the effort made by a particular farmer, we would be shutting off behind the fence of safety those men as a group, and telling the rest of the Nation "Come forth to take their places in the battle line."

Let us consider the number of those who remain of the available single men in the country. There are not enough single men, Senators, to fill the ranks. Every time a single man is excluded in industry, or every time a single man is excluded on the farm, or in Government work, or in any other place, a married man is taken bodily away from his wife and children and substituted in the place of the man who is excluded. Is not that what the Bankhead amendment would do? Will that not be the effect of it, and do Senators want to have on their conscience the fact that they have excused a part-time worker, and to fill his place, have taken from another group a full-time worker who is constantly employed, and quite often he will be a man with children?

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator please explain to us how the O'Mahoney amendment would save the married men?

Mr. TYDINGS. The O'Mahoney amendment confessedly, by the words out of my able friend's own mouth, purports to keep not all the men on the farm; it purports to keep only those, if it keeps any, who are regularly employed and who are irreplaceable. To the extent that it keeps them on the farm it makes the draft of married men inevitable to supplant that very number. But the amendment of the Senator from Alabama would add vastly to that number, without any regard to the Nation's need, and would make the draft of married men continually greater.

Mr. President, before I conclude answering the Senator's question, let me say that, while I hope it is not a prophecy, yet I have a feeling, if the Bankhead amendment shall be adopted, the very Senators who are sponsoring it will, in time, repudiate it on the floor of the Senate. Its injustice is so apparent, the lack of logic to support it is so evident,

and there is about it such a lack of what I call the commonness of sacrifice, that sooner or later events are going to catch up with it, when the married men learn that, because of blanket deferments on the farm, they are going to be summoned to the colors.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then my understanding of the Senator's reply is, boiled down to a very few words, that the reason the O'Mahoney amendment protects married men is that it is less effective and less potent than the Bankhead amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no. Let me say to the Senator——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The O'Mahoney amendment does not say anything about married men, does it?

Mr. TYDINGS. There has been a good deal of loose talk with no facts to support it. For example, it is said that the Tydings amendment did not do any good. I got in touch with General Hershey several days ago and again yesterday. He said that the first 2 months the so-called Tydings amendment was on the books, 364,000 regularly employed and irreplaceable farm workers who were called for the draft were deferred. That was in just 2 months. I was informed only yesterday that more than 1,000,000 regularly employed and irreplaceable farm workers will be deferred under my amendment during 1943.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. WILLIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator referring to all men, or only to single men?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am referring to all men who were exempted because of the Tydings amendment, and not to the greater number who were exempted because of physical disabilities or dependents.

Mr. AIKEN. About 400,000 men will eventually be classified as II-C, and the rest will be classified as III-C. That means that they will be deferred for family as well as occupational reasons.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know what the difficulty has been. It has not been with the Tydings amendment, but with the Selective Service Act. A communication is forwarded to the draft officials of the State of Mississippi, for example, which is an agricultural State, or to the State of New Mexico, Arkansas, or Alabama, and the officials are told that, based upon population, their next quota will be so many men—we will say, for example, 30,000 men. In turn quotas are assigned to the various counties. In an agricultural county the draft board is bedeviled to obtain from the particular county the number of men it must have without taking some from the farms.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Tydings amendment has done a great deal of good.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate the statement of the Senator. He was very helpful in having it adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. However, I am not sure that it goes far enough. It certainly does not go so far as the Bankhead amendment goes; but it has done much good.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sure of that. The amendment offered by my good friend the able Senator from Wyoming would write into the law the regulations which the Selective Service System has adopted to interpret and carry into effect the Tydings amendment so that they would become law and not merely regulations with which the draft boards are now confronted.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator has said that the principal difficulty in administering the act has been in the competition of industry.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIS. Has the Senator from Maryland any information concerning the number of men who went into the Army, and the number who went into industry after they were deferred under the Tydings amendment? Did they leave the farms?

Mr. TYDINGS. They cannot be deferred unless they remain on the farm. When they accept employment from industry they can be drafted into military service unless they are irreplaceable in their then employment.

Mr. WILLIS. Would not that situation support the belief that under the new provision the men would remain on the farms?

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand that since the amendment of November 13 of last year—commonly referred to by the author's name—was adopted, the whole tendency has been to arrest the trend from the farm to industry, and that the trend is now the other way. Why, I will not attempt to explain. Senators must draw their own conclusions. However, the fact is that the trend from the farms to industry has been stopped. Unfortunately, it was not stopped soon enough. The draft law considered all occupations on an equal footing.

This year, in round numbers, 400,000 men a month are being taken. General Hershey has told us that this year the draft will provide 4,300,000 men for the armed services. The men who went in this January will not be fully trained and equipped until next January. The men who go in next June—400,000 during that month—will not be fully trained and equipped until a year later. Those who go in next December will not be fully trained and equipped until December 1944. What does it add up to? It means that we shall not have 11,000,000 men in the armed forces, trained, equipped, and ready to fight until December 1944.

This morning I asked for figures pertaining to the Army as of December 31, 1942. According to the figures we had at that time 366,869 officers and 4,989,053 enlisted men, which, with eight-thousand-odd warrant officers, gives a total in the Army of 5,364,521 officers and enlisted men. That is roughly five and a third million. Of those five and a third million a great many had not been in the Army longer than 6 months. Some had not been in the Army longer than 3 months. Some had been in the Army only 1 month, the month of December.

This war is not over by any means. Perhaps more men should have been isolationists than there were. Perhaps we should have had a different policy. I do not know. I am not questioning or arguing the philosophy of anyone. The point is that that day is past. We are in the war. We are not one-half in it, three-quarters, five-sixteenths, or ninety-nine one-hundredths in it. We are all the way in. Our boys are out on the firing line.

I do not know whether we are serving them by shoving certain groups into the cloakroom out of sight and throwing a greater burden upon those who remain, for the more who are shoved into the cloakroom out of sight, without regard to their morality, character, worthiness, or education, the lower the physical quality becomes. The greater the number is, the better the physical, moral, and mental stature of the individual soldier will be.

Let me mention another point: The Axis nations have 17,000,000 men under arms. When we bring our Army to full strength, and Britain does likewise, we shall not be quite up to the Axis strength in numbers, because we shall have fewer than 17,000,000 men. However, we shall supply the lack of men with tanks, planes, equipment, and other means which should—and I believe will—make us superior to our enemies and bring about their defeat.

Keep in mind that even when all these things take place our Army will not be so large as that of our combined foes. Our boys are over there. If we had three times as many in Africa as we have now Rommel would not last one-third the time; and even though we might have more men, we should not lose as many as we shall lose with fewer men. We could wind up the African campaign quickly and get busy somewhere else. The point is that by dragging it on and keeping a small army hamstrung, taking the conduct of the war out of the hands of the generals and admirals, we may unnecessarily waste human life, prolong the war, deplete the Treasury, and bring on chaos.

Mr. President, I have talked at great length. I think I have covered the essential things in my mind. I shall conclude with one or two observations.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I agree with much of what the distinguished Senator from Maryland has said. I believe that his philosophy in relation to the Army is correct. However, it seems to me that the two amendments which have been proposed would probably arrive at the same result.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then why is the Senator in favor of the original proposal?

Mr. WILEY. Let me continue. Yesterday it was stated as authentic that practically all the available farm labor

has already gone "out of the stable," so to speak.

Mr. TYDINGS. In many places, that is true.

Mr. WILEY. And only 250,000 remain.

Mr. TYDINGS. Two hundred and fifty thousand what?

Mr. WILEY. Available single men on the farms. I should like to have the very fine mind of the Senator directed to this question: He said, for instance, that there was no danger of famine. I agree with him.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. But there is danger that we will not get all the food we wish.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can say to the Senator that we will not get it.

Mr. WILEY. There must be a way to get labor back to the farms. In Great Britain farms are operated almost exclusively by women, and they are doing a good job. We are talking about an issue which involves only 250,000 single men, a large proportion of whom the Senator agrees are essential.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the ramifications of the bill the Senator would draft 250,000 married men to take their places.

Mr. WILEY. Oh, no; the Senator does not understand my position.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator cannot escape the logic of it. Somewhere along the line, in obtaining an armed force of 11,000,000, 250,000 married men must furnish the quota which would otherwise be furnished by the single men. I am not saying that the single men should not be excluded for the purpose of the Senator's question.

Mr. WILEY. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Maryland; but I understand that under the O'Mahoney amendment, whether men are married or single, if they meet the test they remain on the farm.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILEY. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] asked how many men would be affected. If they are needed on the farms, they are essential, whether they are married or single. It is conceded that practically all men on the farm are essential.

Mr. TYDINGS. No one has the answer to that question. However, it may be said that if a man is regularly employed and is irreplaceable, he will stay on the farm.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming would, in effect, write into the law all the liberalizing regulations and policies which have been discussed, to give further emphasis to the protection which should be afforded the man who is regularly employed and irreplaceable.

The Bankhead amendment, in effect, would blanket out the farm group because they live on farms and are substantially employed there. The two things are entirely different. The original proposal would allow men to stay on the farms only when they could not be replaced. The Bankhead amendment would allow them to stay on the farms even though they be part-time workers.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; but the result would be the same if the men are all essential.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, it would be the same. I did not follow the Senator's original question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin confuses the argument. He says "if they are essential."

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The distinction is so plain that I wonder why anybody should hesitate for 3 seconds over it. The substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], which is the third or fourth substitute, is acknowledged by its proponents to be a blanket deferment. Under that amendment, men on the farms would be deferred whether they were individually contributing in sufficient quantity or not.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment which was suggested by the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs avoids that great difficulty, and provides that no one shall be deferred unless he individually is making at least the minimum contribution to the production of an essential food.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, in essence the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Wyoming takes the regulations, which have been greatly liberalized, even down to eight cows a day, and writes them into the law. It does not change the Tydings amendment. It leaves it on the statute books, but explains how it shall be safeguarded by having interpretations thrown around it.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator just said that the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado did not cover the point that the worker had to be essential on the farm and had to do work resulting in a certain amount of production needed for the war effort. It is my interpretation—and I believe it to be correct—that in order to obtain deferment a man must be essential on a farm. Under the O'Mahoney amendment, I am quite sure the man must remain essential.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. GURNEY. The point I want to make is that the men must remain essential.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Mr. President, yesterday I asked General Hershey what he thought about the two amendments. I hold in my hand a letter from General Hershey stating what he thinks about them. Before I read his letter let me say that there never was a fairer group of men to deal with, in my opinion, on essential vocational problems than the group made up of General Hershey and the staff which he has about him. They have been willing to meet with us at any time. On several days we met in the office of the Senator from Alabama, and largely through the leadership of the Senator from Alabama we obtained many liberalizing interpretations of the Tydings amendment, and General Hershey has been fully cooperating with us in endeavoring to keep irreplaceable and regularly employed laborers on the farms.

I read General Hershey's letter:

MARCH 10, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I am submitting this statement in answer to your inquiry as to my views on the amendment by way of a substitute presented to the Senate yesterday by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado.

As you know, I have already submitted a statement of my views on S. 729 as originally introduced and on a substitute therefor which was considered in committee and agreed to by the committee with some modifications. That statement is set forth following the minority report.

Although the Johnson substitute requires as a condition precedent to deferment that a registrant be engaged substantially full time in producing agricultural commodities, certified by the Secretary of Agriculture as essential, there is no requirement for any minimum quantity of production for each commodity, nor is there any requirement that the registrant must be irreplaceable, and by irreplaceable I mean that there is no satisfactory replacement ready and able to replace the registrant.

Without those two requirements, namely, irreplaceability and quantity of production, the Johnson substitute constitutes blanket deferment, and hence class legislation. It will in my opinion tend to remove the incentive for maximum production and will not be acceptable either to the public generally, to the registrants in other occupations, to the men already in the armed services and their families, or to the bona fide farmers themselves. I don't think real farmers want to be classified along with those whom the Johnson substitute would in my opinion place with them

I trust this statement will satisfactorily answer your inquiry.

There you have it. The Senator from Alabama asked me what was to be done concerning the disparity which is occasioned by the low pay received by farm workers and the high pay received by industrial workers. Well, who sets the high wage scales of the industrial workers? Our Government is now setting most of them. It is causing their employment, and everything that the higher standard of wages finally reaches must in turn bring about similar high wages in other manufacturing enterprises. Otherwise, their labor would leave and would go where the highest wages were paid.

There is one way we can get at the problem, but we cannot get at it by passing a law. We must get at it by administration. That may not be advisable; I am not advocating it. I am answering the question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask the Senator what is his position?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will state it. My way would be to pay the men who work on the farms more money, and let the ceilings go up correspondingly, just as we have paid the men in the manufacturing plants more money, and the prices of all manufactured products have gone up and have been increased to the farmers and to all other consumers. I would give equality of justice to men who are producing equally. That is my solution.

I would go down to the O. P. A., if I could do so, and have it explain to the country that the farmers are entitled to every bit of consideration that the industrial workers are entitled to. We are not going to hold farm workers on the farms—I care not how many laws may be passed—until we rearrange the work and until we pay agricultural skill in line with what is paid to industrial skill. Seventy percent of the men who have left the farms have gone to industry. The Army has not raided the farms; it has taken only 30 percent of those who have left. No one will begrudge the farm workers all the wages and all the short hours and other benefits the farms will stand.

However, while industrial workers have gone up in their economic scale, farm workers have remained on the lowest scale. In many cases, the increases received by industrial workers have to some extent decreased the income of the farmers and of the farm workers. Therefore, my solution would be to pay the farm worker a decent wage, to add that wage to the cost of production of agricultural commodities, and to give justice to the farmer whose son is in the armed forces, just as we give justice to others in America whose sons are in the armed forces.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Gillette	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barkley	Gurney	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Hawkes	Scrugham
Brewster	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Hill	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Kilgore	Tobey
Byrd	La Follette	Tunnell
Capper	Lodge	Tydings
Caraway	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Maybank	Wherry
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Downey	Moore	Willis
Eastland	Murdock	Wilson
Ellender	Nye	
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has made such an excellent analysis of some of the fundamental reasons why the so-called Johnson amendment should not be adopted, that I shall endeavor to content myself with a brief effort to analyze the various proposals which are before the Senate. I should like to make clear just what the issue is. In order to do that, I think it will be necessary, first, that there should appear in the RECORD, at the beginning of my remarks, the so-called Tydings amendment as it now reads in the Selective Service and Training Act as section 5 (k) of that act.

There being no objection, the so-called Tydings amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(k) Every registrant found by a selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work:

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Following that, I should like to have appear in the RECORD the bill as reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, Senate bill 729, which contains the text of the original Bankhead proposal stricken through and then the first alternative which was submitted by the majority.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 729) as introduced and as reported from the Committee on Military Affairs was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., [That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

["(k) Every registrant who is regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor or whose principal occupation consists of employment in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States; and no such registrant shall leave such occupation or endeavor or cease to be employed in connection with such production or harvesting unless, prior thereto, he requests his selective service local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage in some other occupation or endeavor, to be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces."]

That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) Until January 1, 1944, every registrant who is regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor on a farm, or whose principal occupation consists of employment on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States; and until January 1, 1944, no such registrant shall leave such occupation or endeavor or cease to be employed in connection with such production or harvesting unless, prior thereto, he requests his selective service local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 18 (a) (2), determines that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage in some other occupation or endeavor, to be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces: Provided, That each man who is deferred pursuant to this subsection shall receive from his selective service local board at the time of such deferment a certificate stating that such deferment has been found by such board to be in the best interests of the war effort.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Following that, Mr. President, I should like to have appear in the RECORD a copy of the proposed substitute which I received yesterday morning from the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] in a letter addressed to me, which is different both from the original bill which he introduced and from the bill which was reported by the majority of the Military Affairs Committee.

There being no objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(k) Every registrant who is found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in Local Board Release No. 164 of the Selective Service System as being essential to the war effort shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States: *Provided*, That should any such deferred registrant cease to be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with such production or harvesting, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving his work on the farm he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage or be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces: *Provided further*, That each man who is deferred pursuant to this subsection shall receive from his selective service local board at the time of such deferment a certificate stating that such deferment has been found by such board to be in the best interests of the war effort: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort.'"

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Following that I should like to have appear in the RECORD the substitute as it is now offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

There being no objection, the substitute proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado to the

bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations, viz: In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee, to insert the following: That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) Every registrant who is engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in Local Board Release No. 164 of the Selective Service System as being a commodity essential to the war effort shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred by his selective-service local board from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States: *Provided*, That should any such deferred registrant cease to be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with such production or harvesting, his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving his work on the farm he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage or be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces: *Provided further*, That each man who is deferred pursuant to this subsection shall receive from his selective-service local board at the time of such deferment a certificate stating that such deferment has been found by such board to be in the best interests of the war effort: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to have in the RECORD the substitute which was offered by the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs, and from which there has been no deviation since it was originally proposed.

There being no objection, the substitute proposed by the minority of the committee was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by Mr. O'MAHONEY to the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended be amended by adding the following proviso: '*Provided further*, That for the purposes of this subsection, a registrant shall be found by his selective service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort (1) if he is engaged substantially full time in the production of agricultural commodities certified to the Selective Service System by the Secretary of Agriculture as being essential to the war effort and set forth in Local Board Release No. 164, effective January 16, 1943, and (2) if the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant is at least equal to the minimum standard of production per person as set forth in such release No. 164: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort, together with the minimum standard of production per person which he determines to be applicable to such additional agricultural commodities.'"

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it will be observed from what I have said that all this controversy revolves around the modification of the so-called Tydings amendment. It is important, therefore, to know what the Tydings amendment is. It was adopted late last year—I think in October—and was intended to provide for the deferment of essential farm workers who were necessarily employed in the production of essential crops. It provided further that deferment should be granted only so long as a satisfactory replacement was not obtainable.

The important thing to remember is that the Tydings amendment was based upon the theory and principle of the Selective Service and Training Act. It required individual judgment on individual cases. The vice of the proposal which was first offered and sent to the committee, which was then modified and reported to the Senate, and which has since been changed twice, is that in every form in which it appears it remains a blanket deferment, and takes no account whatsoever of the individual status of the registrant who is to be deferred.

The Selective Service and Training Act makes clear the principle upon which compulsory military service in a republic should be based, namely, upon the circumstances and conditions which surround the individual worker. This is the language which appears in the act. It is part of section 5 (e) of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940:

No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution.

Mr. President, that provision in the Selective Service and Training Act was the result of experience in the last World War. It was the result of a realization that the only just basis upon which any individual could be deferred was upon the basis of the circumstances and conditions which surrounded him. The provision was written into the law because it was recognized that unless deferment were based upon individual circumstances and conditions, the door would be open to draft evasion and to those who would seek to avoid the obligation of military service.

The proposal which is before the Senate in any one of its four different texts from beginning to end remains an open door to the evasion of military service, and there is no possible way of answering that indictment. Those who sponsor the amendment answer it only by saying it is necessary to do this in order to keep workers upon the farms, but, as the Senator from Maryland so clearly and forcefully stated earlier today, when we defer, in addition to those who are engaged in producing essential crops, those whose individual activities are not sufficient to make it appear that they are making a substantial contribution to the war effort, we create the opportunity for evasion of military service, and for one, Mr. President, I say that that is a condition which no farmer in this country has appeared before the Military Affairs Committee to ask; I say it is an utterly unjust and unfair burden to place upon the backs of the individuals in the agricultural regions who are to be deferred by a blanket law passed by Congress.

Yesterday I received a letter from a lady in my State which is so brief and so clear that I think it deserves a place in the RECORD. It was written on March 3, 1943, from Buffalo, Wyo., and reads:

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Austin-Wadsworth bill seems best to me. To defer farm workers is to make a very weak minority group after the war. The returning soldiers, sailors, or marines will have a strong bloc behind them, they will have pensions, bonus, etc. The farm worker will have nothing, not even the big wages of the war worker in defense plants. If a person chooses to be with a minority, that is all right and their affair, but no one has the right to make any one join a minority.

I am a Quaker, proud of my minority, but understanding minorities makes me know none should be created.

I suggest a land Army with basic Army training then returned with honors to the fields.

Sincerely,

EMILY LOTT,
(Mrs. Howard Bryant Locke).

The author of this letter, of course, was urging another measure, not the one now before the Senate, and when she wrote the letter she did not know that the authors of the bill as it was reported by the majority of the committee proposed to give something to the farmer who should be deferred. They made this provision by amendment in the Committee on Military Affairs, and have retained it in each of the variations which have since been proposed. It reads:

Provided further, That each man who is deferred pursuant to this subsection shall receive from his selective-service local board at the time of such deferment a certificate stating that such deferment has been found by such board to be in the best interests of the war effort.

Mr. President, shall we pin a certificate of war merit upon the breast of every person who is deferred under this proposal, even though we know that his individual contribution is not sufficient under the present law?

The one great objection to the amendment which was offered by the minority in the committee was that it provided for an individual minimum contribution. Those of us who drafted the amendment said that no man should be included in a blanket deferment, and that no man should be deferred at all, unless in his individual case it was clear that he was making a contribution which met the standard set down by those who are endeavoring, to the best of their ability, to handle the agricultural problem of this Nation. That was written in by the minority. It was the one provision to which the majority has taken exception from the beginning, because, they say, "We do not want deferment to be governed by a minimum contribution," and the minute they say that, Mr. President,

they draw a criticism across the breast of every farmer who is deferred because the measurement has been avoided.

Now let us understand what the Tydings amendment was. It was very simple. No one had any difficulty in understanding it, I am sure. It provided:

Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work.

Mr. President, it is clear that to qualify for deferment under the Tydings amendment it was necessary, first, for each registrant to be found by the local board "to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation," and his deferment was to exist "so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement" is found. So here we have three standards: That the individual is necessary, that the crop is essential, and there must be no possibility of replacement.

The proposal which comes from the Military Affairs Committee, which is covered by the amendment now offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and called in this debate the Bankhead amendment, drops all those provisions save one, the provision that the registrant must be engaged in producing an essential commodity. No account is taken of whether or not that registrant is necessary to the production of the commodity, nor of whether or not a replacement is available. So, Mr. President, it becomes quite clear that the door is open to evasion of military service.

It will next be observed that the language of this amendment vests in the local board the discretionary authority to determine whether or not a registrant should be deferred. There never was any other thought about it. The theory of the Selective Service Act was that the local boards were the ones who would know best who should be deferred and who should not be deferred. So it was provided that the local boards could exercise their authority.

In my State I have heard no complaint whatsoever, except in a few minor cases, against the action of its local boards. There have, of course, been appeals, but so far as agriculture is concerned the local boards and the State appeal board have endeavored to carry out the intendment of the Tydings amendment, an amendment which up to February 18 had already brought about the deferment of 364,000 men who had been found essentially engaged in the production of essential crops, and without available replacements.

In the face of that record is it possible to say that the Tydings amendment was a failure? Adopted only last October, it has already operated successfully. But while, as I say, I have received no complaint from Wyoming with respect to the operation of the Tydings amendment, complaint has been made from other States. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who has sponsored a pending amendment, told the Committee on Military Affairs that the local boards in Colorado were disregarding that law; that they were not deferring essential workers, necessary workers, workers without replacement. And so in the committee I said—and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], who is present, will bear me out—that the way to cure that defect is to provide by law that the local boards shall defer a man if he meets the standards provided in the Tydings amendment, and such a provision is precisely what was prepared and drafted in the minority amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The question which has arisen in my State is, Who shall initiate the proposal for deferment? In order to be deferred, let us say, under the substitute amendment proposed by the minority, on whom does the initiation of deferment devolve?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it would devolve upon the registrant, but there is no difference between the proposals before us, because in the Johnson amendment we find, on page 2, the provision—

That should any such deferred registrant cease to be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with such production or harvesting, his selective-service local board, * * * shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving his work on the farm he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines—

And so forth. So there is still left in the local boards, under the Johnson amendment, an amount of discretion with respect to the registrant. But in the amendment which the minority has offered I think the Senator will find, if he will bear with me, that his difficulty is cleared up.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have recently returned from my State. The complaint I found there concerning the Tydings amendment—and the complaint comes from farmers and their sons—was that the claim for deferment rests upon them, and they do not like it. I talked to several farmers, each of whom said, in effect, "I need my son just as badly as I can need him on my farm, but in order to have him deferred I must initiate the deferment. I must ask for it. That is the one thing I object to, and that is the thing my son objects to."

I think the arguments in favor of the minority amendment are excellent, but, in my opinion, there will still be left on the shoulders of the farmer whatever onus there is—and I think there is plenty—in asking for deferment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to say to the Senator from Utah that all these amendments constitute an effort to direct the discretion of the local board with respect to certain classes of registrants. I believe that the amendment proposed by the minority imposes a clear obligation on the local board to make the deferment regardless of whether or not the farmer or the farmer's son makes the application.

Let me say that discussion with respect to this very serious problem has been going on for several weeks. I think it may be properly said that the Senator from Alabama made a very notable and desirable contribution to the solution of the problem by the investigation of manpower which he initiated and which was so ably carried on in the Appropriations Committee under his direction. I believe he made a very valuable contribution when he called attention to the character of the problem which confronts the country. Let me say in passing that the amendment which is proposed by the majority does not meet the problem.

As the result of the discussions which were launched by the Senator from Alabama, as the result of hearings which were held by the Military Affairs Committee, by the Appropriations Committee, and by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, hearings at which representatives of the Department of Agriculture and of the Selective Service System were present, the Department of Agriculture and the Selective Service System have been at work upon some steps to take care of the very situation suggested by the question of the Senator from Utah.

As a matter of fact, during the hearings, when my proposal was first discussed, I brought to the committee a representative of the Department of Agriculture, who told us that that step was in process. It has now eventuated into fact. The Department of Agriculture and the Selective Service System jointly have issued instructions to the local boards by which the county war boards in each county will have the authority to ask for the deferment of any worker. That has been done upon the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture who, under an Executive order issued as recently as December 5, 1942, was made Food Administrator. As soon as he had the authority he began to act. Word has gone forth, through amendments to Local Board Release No. 164, to make certain that the burden of asking for deferment may be transferred from the individual to the county war board.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Following the inquiry made by the Senator from Utah, it has occurred to me that if the registrant is released from responsibility in the first place of initiating an inquiry into his individual status, transferring to the local board the responsibility to initiate the inquiry as to whether an individual should be deferred might result in mass deferment for a class. It seems to me that we run the very great risk of deferring men who either do not want to be deferred, or who ought not to be deferred. I do not see how we can avoid putting the responsibility on the registrant first to bring the situation to the attention of the local board and let the board pass on it. We should not pass on to the local board the responsibility of initiating the inquiry, on the assumption that everyone ought to have his status inquired into. It seems to me that mass deferment is bound to include many who ought not to be deferred for any reason. If the burden is on them to show that they ought not to be deferred, they probably would not do so, and there would be greater confusion in the administration of the Selective Service Act than now exists.

For that reason I feel strongly inclined to vote for the Senator's substitute for the minority substitute, in behalf of which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is speaking. I find difficulty in voting for any mass deferment by class, because obviously all persons in a particular class are not situated alike. Each individual situation must be considered. If we get away from that principle, I fear that the confusion will be worse confounded than it is at the present time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is correct in his conclusions. An amendment which would make possible deferment by class would result in the creation of a haven for those who could somehow or other gain initial entrance into that class and thereby secure deferment.

Are Senators unaware of the fact that in many industries men are now employed who sought employment in such industries primarily for the purpose of avoiding military service? If we enact legislation of this character we shall run the extreme danger of another rush to the farms to escape military service. It should not be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator permit a further observation and inquiry?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Another condition has been called to my attention, which I am sure exists in many industrial centers. Men who have registered in their local communities have gone to industrial centers and have become employed in some capacity in industrial plants. When they receive notice of a call from their local boards they write back, or have the company write, that they are employed in a war industry. The local boards are inclined to exempt them, not knowing whether the particular employment in which they are engaged is essential or whether their service could be dispensed with. None of the pending bills deals with the situation, but it seems to me that in many cases the draft boards in the communities or cities where the registrants are residing and working should have some jurisdiction to pass upon whether the work which a registrant is doing is essential, instead of having the question passed upon by the local board where the registrant was registered a year or 18 months previously. The local board is inclined to take the word of the registrant himself that he is engaged in an essential industry elsewhere, perhaps a thousand miles away.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Kentucky has put his finger upon one of the defects in the proposed legislation, including even the minority amendment, because it is an effort to deal with a specific problem, which is only one aspect of the whole broad problem of manpower.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has introduced a considered bill, the purpose of which is to treat this problem as a whole, including every part of it—not agricultural labor alone, not aircraft labor alone, not manufacturing labor alone, not labor in the manufacture of guns or tanks alone, not labor in cutting logs or mining metals alone. The bill is intended to cover the whole broad scope of the problem which lies at the very basis of this discussion.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understood the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] to ask whether the move for the deferment of a particular person must originate with such person, or whether he might be deferred upon the initiative of the board itself. I understood the Senator from Wyoming to reply in the first instance that it must be by the initial act of the registrant. I thought the Senator subsequently changed the answer and said that the responsibility was on the board. Will the Senator from Wyoming clear up for me the question of where he thinks the original responsibility rests?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from Maine misunderstood me. I will try to clear up that question immediately.

Mr. WHITE. May I add a further word?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Maine that I was referring to the county War Labor Board, which is not the local Selective Service Board. Instructions which have been issued by the Selective Service System and the Department of Agriculture authorize the county boards which have been appointed by the Department of Agriculture in every county to make requests for the deferment of any worker in order to stimulate the production of agricultural commodities.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Wyoming advise me whether in his view the amendment which he has offered would deny to the registrant the right to make request for deferment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would not.

Mr. WHITE. He would retain that right. Also the board would have authority to make the deferment if it saw fit to do so, even without a request from the registrant.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly.

Mr. WHITE. I believe that principle to be perfectly sound. I think there should be a right in the board to make the deferment without regard to the desires of the registrant, if the board believes the man ought to be deferred. I have had brought to my attention a great many instances of farm boys being unwilling to take the responsibility of bearing what they consider to be the odium attached to a request for deferment. So it seems to me that there should be in the board authority to grant deferment as well as the right in the registrant to request it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me to make a statement in reply to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish first to answer the question raised by the Senator from Maine. I believe that what I will say will tend to make the situation clear.

I have before me local board release No. 164, effective January 16, 1943, from the national headquarters of the Selective Service System, on the subject of classification of registrants in agriculture.

I also have local board memorandum No. 164–A, supplementing local board release No. 164. The subject is, Classification of registrants in agriculture—supplemental information.

These releases and others like them are messages from the national headquarters of the Selective Service System to each local board in the United States, saying in effect, "The problem of agricultural production is serious and important. We want you to know how we are operating and how we feel the Selective Service System should operate."

That amendment offered by the minority says to the local board that every person who comes within the classification mentioned in these releases shall be deferred. Therefore, in my opinion it is a mandatory direction to the local boards to defer the classes of persons mentioned. In the additional memorandum there is a direction from the Secretary of Agriculture to the county war boards, which operate through the Department of Agriculture, to make sure that this is done.

Mr. WHITE. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming would not deny to the registrant the right to initiate a request for deferment if he saw fit to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It certainly would not.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Not being a member of the committee, I may not be quite as familiar as are other Senators with the

effects which it is thought the bill would have.

I understand that the purpose in introducing the bill is to meet a possible food shortage. That being the purpose, I should like to know if it is the thought of the Senator who is now occupying the floor that there will be a food shortage if the present force of farm laborers remains on the farms of the country. Will there be a shortage of food in the opinion of the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot speak for the committee on that point. Of course, that is largely a question for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I do know that on the whole the production of agricultural commodities in 1942 was much greater than ever before. The farmers of the country did a perfectly marvelous job in spite of many handicaps; and as I stand here now answering the question of the Senator from Delaware, I am reminded of the fact that in January 1942 the Senate by an overwhelming vote adopted an amendment to the Price Control Act which, if it had been enacted into law, would have tied agricultural labor to industrial labor and would have prevented the migration of workers from the farms to industry—which migration is the cause of the farm-labor shortage.

The purpose at that time was not to tie agricultural labor to industrial labor. As a matter of fact, every recourse was adopted to prevent the action of the Senate from being enacted into law.

Mr. TUNNELL. It is my understanding that even if no more farm laborers were taken off the farms by the Selective Service Boards, there still would be a shortage of food.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that it still depends on what is meant by "shortage"; and that question again raises one of the curious inconsistencies of the legislation as I see it. As of the present moment, the shortage of food is occasioned not so much by a decrease in production, as it is by an increase of use. Today we have more need for food than we ever have had before. For example, persons who have gone into war industries, and who previously were unemployed, and previously had very little upon which to support themselves, now are working harder at physical labor, are getting good wages, and are able to buy more food. That is one factor.

Another factor is that under lend-lease we are shipping food products to such an extent as to constitute a substantial drain upon the agricultural supplies of our country.

The third factor is that we are supplying great quantities of food to the Army and Navy. I think the hearings held by the Committee on Military Affairs will justify the conclusion that at least in some instances shortages of some kinds of food—tinned and canned foods, I believe—have been occasioned by the fact that some of the Army and Navy purchasing authorities have purchased far beyond their present requirements. One canner stated, as I recall, that the Army Procurement Office was buying canned food as though there never were to be another tin or can of food prepared, instead of letting the supplies come in regular contributions over the period of production.

So, finally answering the question of the Senator from Delaware, let me say that the question of a food shortage is largely relative. I think there has been a great reduction in the production of milk, for example—a very dangerous situation—and there is likely to be further reduction of food production; but I doubt very much whether the reduction will be so great as to justify the alarm which has been expressed upon the floor of the Senate by some Senators who have said that we are facing a famine.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have understood that the purpose of Senators who favor this particular amendment is to prevent the further depletion of the supply of farm labor. Does the Senator from Wyoming believe that the amendment if adopted would bring about an increase in the supply of farm labor?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not think it would cause an increase in the amount of effective farm labor. I think it would cause an increase in the number of persons who are on the farms, by bringing to the farms many persons who seek deferment from military service.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then the increase would be, not an increase in farmers, but an increase of people who would call themselves farm workers in order to secure deferment; is that the Senator's view?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is my judgment.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I assure the Senator that I shall not interrupt again, but I should like to propound a question. As I have understood the Senator's position, in my opinion he is faced on the one hand with what he calls creating a haven for men who might want to evade the operation of the Selective Service Act, and on the other hand with a realization that if we place the responsibility of initiation of deferment on the shoulders of the registrant himself an unwarranted stigma is created.

If I correctly understand the Senator's explanation to the Senator from Maine, it seems to me that if the minority amendment will do what he says it will do, he certainly has answered my question, which is this: If the minority amendment is adopted, then in connection with the rules and regulations which have been put out by the Administrator of the Selective Service Act, the Department of Agriculture, and the Commissioner of War Manpower, the county boards not only are given the right to initiate the deferment on the part of the registrant but the boards have imposed upon them the duty of initiating deferment; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Upon the local boards.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. If that is what the amendment would do in connection with the supplemental regulations, then, to me, that answers the question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. That is exactly my understanding of the intent and purport of the minority amendment and the effect of the rules and regulations.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I merely seek some information which thus far has not been supplied by any of the debate which I have heard.

A great many men have been induced to leave the farms and to go into industry because of the better wages paid in industry. None of the formulas thus far suggested would require or even invite those men to return to the farms; so no compulsion exists in that direction, and obviously the men are not going to return to the farms.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. Not only is what he says true, but the fact is that at least 60 per cent of all the men who have left the farms have gone into industry, not into the Army. I have seen some figures which indicate that the percentage is 70 percent, rather than 60 percent. In other words, 7 out of every 10 men who have left the farms have gone, not into the Army, but into industry; and the remedy which is proposed here is that we take them away from the Army.

Mr. BONE. All my queries and statements to the Senator are made merely because I seek information.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, my remark was not directed to the Senator.

Mr. BONE. Yes; I understand that.

I do not know, and it has not been revealed, what percentage of men who were on the farms when the war started are now on the farms. I do not suppose anyone is prepared to break down the figures. Out of every hundred men who were on farms when we entered the war, I should like to know, if some one can inform me, approximately how many workers who are active still remain on the farms.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should be very glad to supply the figures.

Mr. BONE. I should be pleased to have the Senator do so, if the Senator from Wyoming will permit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Alabama supply the figures as a release, but I do not want to yield the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not want the Senator to yield the floor.

Mr. BONE. I am trying to find out how much of a drain there has been on the farms.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The record supplied by the Department of Agriculture to the Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Manpower shows that on February 1 there were on the farms 8,369,000 men over 14 years of age.

Mr. BONE. Over 14 years of age?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Down to 14 years of age—8,369,000.

Mr. BONE. How many workers were on the farms before we entered the war?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Twelve millions, at times. Of regular workers, usually about 9,000,000.

Mr. BONE. What interests me first, let me say to the Senator from Wyoming, is the fact that when in the latter part of last year—I think it was in October or

November—the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] suggested the desirability of adopting an amendment which went to the very heart of this problem; we adopted the amendment proposed by him, I believe. It provides that—

> Every registrant found by a selective-service local board * * * to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred. * * *

That is too plain for cavil or dispute; and, frankly, I am at a loss to know why we have to keep implementing the law all the time when we have a plain mandate and directive from the Congress of the United States to defer those men.

My present remarks are not made by way of criticism of anyone, because I realize that the situation is in a very fluid state and has many facets, and I am not out of sympathy with the Senator's suggestions in the views of the minority.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand.

Mr. BONE. All we would be doing in following the minority suggestion would be to further clarify the situation, but we would not change the manifest purpose of the Tydings amendment, which was to bring about the deferment of those men. I cannot understand why public officials have not sense enough to know what Congress meant, and to implement the will of Congress by proper regulations.

We have said in a law, which is as formal a declaration as we can emit, that essential farm workers should be deferred; and I never have had it explained to me why we have to keep passing one law after another in order to try to implement our own will as expressed in the statute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The explanation—and I made it before the Senator came on the floor—is that under the Tydings amendment, as the Senator has just read it, the discretion lay in the local or county boards, and each board would decide for itself what was an essential farm commodity and what registrant was necessary to the production of such farm commodity. So we had the result, according to the testimony given to the committee, that in one State one standard was being followed, while in another a very different standard was being followed. There was no uniformity of standards. It was even stated that in some States there was a divergence of standards among the counties in the same State. We seek now to overcome that by declaring to each county board what the standard is, so that under the minority amendment, there will no longer be any justification for a variety of decisions. In other words it is proposed to make it uniform by saying that if the commodity is listed in release No. 164 and if the registrant is making the minimum contribution set forth there, he shall be deferred, and there need be no more doubt about it.

Mr. BONE. Does release No. 164 define the various types of activities bringing men within the deferable class?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It defines exactly first, what the essential commodities are, and, secondly, what the individual contribution should be.

Mr. BONE. Then why do not the local boards follow that directive and definition? Since the national organization has become definitive and has created the boundaries, why is not the matter reached by regulation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is being done. I think the regulations were issued on January 16. Now it is the 10th of March, and already up to February 18 364,000 workers have been deferred under the Tydings amendment. So, actually the record would indicate that the Tydings amendment and the local boards were performing the function originally contemplated.

Mr. BONE. I can see the purpose of the Senator's proposal in the language that is in italics, which does more clearly define those who shall be brought within the deferred class.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Human nature is universally the same, and the members of the local board are not an exception. We can imagine a board, consisting of doctors and lawyers and businessmen in a community, seeing the boys from the town going into the Army, and noting that some boys on the farm are not going into the Army, and then coming to the conclusion, "Well, farm work is no more necessary than the work of the shop, and we are not going to grant farm deferments." In any event there was that divergence of judgment, and now, by regulation upon the one hand and by this amendment, we are trying to direct that judgment.

I may say to the Senator that the minority amendment was presented to the Senate last week, and it was on Sunday or Monday of this week that the additional statements were issued by the Selective Service national headquarters.

Mr. BONE. I wish to say to the Senator—and I hope I am not taking too much of his time——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator cannot take too much of my time. I am always glad to try to answer his questions. He can ask more questions than almost any other Member of the Senate, but that is because of his very alert mind.

Mr. BONE. It is probably because I am more ignorant than some other Members of the Senate about things concerning which I should know more than I do, but I try to find out as much as I can, so that my vote may be as enlightened as possible.

I see the shortening line in the American diet, and I cannot conceive of any more ominous picture being presented to the American people than one of fear generated by a growing lack of food. I care not from what cause it may arise, it would probably precipitate greater panic in this country than almost any other manifestation of this war. Whether or not one has sympathy with the men working on the farm is beside the point, for wars are fought on men's bellies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator, and I have said that over and over again, but I think if the problem is created because we are making a greater demand upon our facilities of production than such facilities are capable of meeting, then the answer is not to create class deferment; the answer is to cut down production.

Mr. BONE. We are deferring a great many men working in factories, and that, of necessity, because they are producing airplanes, guns, and tanks without which we could not fight this war. But I do not know to what extent younger men are being deferred for factory work; I take it that is in the sound discretion of the local boards, and they are exercising such discretion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know from the records of the War Production Board that there has been a tremendous achievement by American industry. We are now producing more tanks and guns and more airplanes and more ammunition than were produced throughout the whole of the First World War. As a matter of fact, we are now producing more airplanes than the Axis nations combined are producing. In December 1942 the output of airplanes reached the figure 5,449, if I remember correctly, and in February it exceeded 5,500. In other words, at this very moment we are producing airplanes at a rate in excess of 60,000 a year.

When we view the whole scope of the industrial output, when we realize that many of the munition-producing facilities do not need to be expanded, then we reach the conclusion that there is likely to be soon—not tomorrow, but soon—a decrease in the demand for labor for industry. We shall not need to expand certain plants. Already the building of certain new facilities has been abandoned. There remains to be accomplished an adequate production of high-octane gasoline, and of rubber, and an increased output of airplanes, for those who are directing our war effort realize that the airplane is going to perform the greatest function in this war; indeed, that it will bring victory. The record of MacArthur a week or 10 days ago in the Bismarck Sea is a demonstration of what can be accomplished by air, and already we are producing airplanes, as I say, at a rate of over 60,000 a year.

The time may come when we shall have to shift employment. Certainly we have stopped building military camps, and the labor that was heretofore involved in constructing such camps is no longer working at that task, but is engaged in other enterprises. The whole problem of necessary manpower, necessary labor, is being studied by the Military Affairs Committee in connection with the Austin-Wadsworth bill; and one of the vices of the suggestion here is that it proposes to deal with this all-over problem piecemeal, in a manner which will create more and greater difficulties than if we do not provide blanket deferment.

Mr. BONE. The thing which I believe should concern all of us is the fact that we are going to have to produce more and more food if our program is to be implemented as has been suggested by those in official life. I am wondering

how we are going to get greater production on farms, because that is one avenue of production the necessity for which will not diminish with the lapse of time, for we will have to have more and more food.

I agree with the Senator that we can reach the point of sufficient production of arms, ammunition, and matériel to meet war needs. The odd thing is that that is being achieved, and the stuff is being turned out to the accompaniment of a great deal of very bitter abuse of labor, although the record is a magnificent one, even considering absenteeism, which, in no small degree, is due to sickness, the lack of transportation, and other factors which are being casually overlooked by critics who are not very charitable. I am wondering what the Senator's view is as to what effect the adoption of the proposal might have on farm production? Is it thought it may stimulate the return of men to the farm, and, if so, how? Will a man who is engaged in the building of airplanes undertake to perform farm labor even for a few months?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The minority amendment will not stimulate the return of workers from industry to the farm.

Mr. BONE. I know of no way to do that except by making farm labor more attractive, by higher prices; and we may have to come to such a formula. I am sorry to have troubled the Senator so much.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to try to answer the Senator's questions.

Now, Mr. President, I desire briefly to analyze the minority amendment. It will be recalled that I discussed and tried to analyze the so-called Tydings amendment. The minority proposal retains the Tydings language and merely adds another proviso intended to direct the discretion of the local boards, but it bases the standard of direction upon the two fundamental factors, (a) the essential character of the commodity, and (b) the individual contribution of each registrant. This is the way it reads:

Provided further, That for the purposes of this subsection, the registrant shall be found by his selective-service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort (1) if he is engaged substantially full time in the production of agricultural commodities certified to the Selective Service System by the Secretary of Agriculture as being essential to the war effort and set forth in Local Board Release No. 164, effective January 16, 1943.

That clause clearly sets forth what the essential agricultural commodities are.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I will yield.

Mr. BONE. I merely wish to suggest that is writing into law a series of legislative directives for local boards.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. I continue the reading:

And (2) if the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant is at least equal to the minimum standard of production per person as set forth in said release No. 164.

So here we retain the three factors of the original Tydings amendment, namely, essential commodity, necessary labor, irreplaceability; and we control the discretion of the local board with respect to the essential commodity and the individual contribution.

It was the provision with respect to the individual contribution to which the majority of the committee objected. I was asked to remove that, but I could not remove it, the minority would not remove it, because to do so would be to bring about the situation which I criticized in connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, in that it would offer the opportunity for evasion by saying that in the mind of Congress it makes no matter whether or not the individual contribution is large or small.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have heard several references made to blanket deferment in regard to one or the other of the proposed amendments. I fail to see any general blanket deferment in either of them, because anyone to be deferred must be producing, either substantially full time or a certain number of units, the crops deemed absolutely essential by the Federal authorities. But in reading the two amendments, it appears to me that one of the main differences is that it would be more difficult, under the Bankhead amendment, for men working on farms to leave and enter industry, for they must get the consent of their draft boards before leaving farms to go into industry, whereas the O'Mahoney amendment does not contain any such restriction. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether it is not his understanding that the Bankhead amendment would make it really more difficult for men to leave the farm and go into industry?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; but as the Senator from Maryland so clearly said this morning, the Bankhead amendment freezes these workers absolutely to the farm, and takes no account of wages at all.

Mr. AIKEN. It is industry which has taken the workers from the farm, but, as a matter of fact, the tide seems to have been stopped, and has turned somewhat, and the principal sources of new farm labor today are among men who are leaving industry. Perhaps they have earned enough money to get out of debt and are going back to the farm, perhaps they are going back in accordance with the request which was made about a month ago, either by Mr. Byrnes or the President, I forget which. The principal source today of new farm labor is those who are going back from industry. It still appears to me that the difference between the two amendments is that the Bankhead amendment would make it difficult for industry to solicit farm labor any longer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the essential difference between the two amendments is that clause No. 2 of the minority amendment was stricken out. It was stricken out because the sponsors of the other substitute do not want to have any minimum standard of contribution, and to me that is its fundamental vice.

The provision of the Bankhead amendment to which the Senator refers was taken substantially from the Tydings amendment and since the minority proposal retains the whole Tydings amendment, it retains the provision the Senator has in mind. There is no difference between the Bankhead or Johnson amendment and the minority substitute in this respect.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield a moment further, if a man is engaged substantially or full time in producing crops classified by the Department of Agriculture or the Selective Service as being absolutely essential, is he not going to produce eight units anyway?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That does not follow at all.

Mr. AIKEN. It is to be presumed he would.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator knows farmers and I know farmers of whom that could not be said, just as in industry there are workers who produce and workers who malinger. It does not follow at all.

Why should there be an objection to the minimum standard? The objection to the minimum standard is solely on the ground that those who object do not want any minimum standard; they want to defer everyone who is included.

Now I should like to conclude by saying that in order to cover this situation the minority added another proviso:

Provided further, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort, together with the minimum standard of production per person which he determines to be applicable to such additional agricultural commodities.

Mr. President, that makes it possible for the Secretary to list additional commodities, and it also makes it possible for each local service board to go below the minimum standards, if necessary, in any individual case. That this is the interpretation by the Selective Service System is indicated by a letter which I have received from General Hershey, and I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1943.

The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I am writing in answer to your inquiry concerning the interpretation of your proposed substitute to S. 729, the so-called Bankhead bill.

It is my opinion that in addition to deferring registrants meeting the eight and a fraction units-of-production requirement and the other requirements of the provisions of your proposed substitute, local boards may also defer persons who produce eight or less units if the boards find that the individual registrant is necessary to and regularly en-

gaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort.

I trust that this will satisfactorily comply with your request and serve your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

SIZE OF THE ARMY—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the able Senator from Wyoming an address entitled "The Size of the Army," delivered in Washington last night by the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War.

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

Tonight I wish to speak to you about the subtle danger which, unless guarded against, may destroy our present bright hopes for a decisive victory. It arises out of a mental attitude which is quite prevalent among our people, including many of the best of them, and has danger of which most of them are quite conscious.

We are raising and training a magnificent army. We are constructing and manning a superb navy. The fine young men of both these forces are now just beginning to meet the enemy and have already shown their mettle. They are equal to their tasks. Man for man they have proved themselves superior in skill, initiative, and resourcefulness to the men of the Axis Nations which we are fighting. There is no trouble with that section of the American people who are in uniform either on the land, on the sea, or in the air.

Nor does the trouble exist among millions of patriotic citizens at home, who have given up their dearest to the dangers of this war and who are cheerfully devoting themselves to patriotic tasks and sacrifices here and are thus trying in every way to hasten and push forward the war effort.

It is hard to analyze the attitude to which I refer. It doubtless arises from various causes and it manifests itself in many ways. Some call it the spirit of "business as usual," but that definition is not broad enough. Very often it appears in patriotic people who do not realize what we are up against and who honestly do not understand the purpose and necessity of some of the war measures which their Government is taking. But the attitude is just as dangerous even when it is innocent. I think it can accurately be called the attitude of trying to win the war—the most fierce and dangerous war which has ever confronted the United States—in some easy manner and without too much trouble and sacrifice.

Abraham Lincoln met it in the Civil War even after that war had been going on for over a year and many bloody battles had been fought. He said to a caller at the White House in September 1862: "The fact is the people have not made up their minds that we are at war with the South. They have not buckled down to the determination to fight this war through, or they have got the idea into their heads that we are going to get out of this fix somehow by strategy. They have no idea that this war is to be carried on and put through by hard, tough fighting; that it will hurt somebody, and no headway is going to be made while this delusion lasts."

Today this attitude which Lincoln described manifests itself when we say:

The Russians have destroyed so many Germans that Germany will not be able to carry on any more offensives.

Or when we say:

The German people are cracking.

Or when we say:

The best way to win the war is to give our allies plenty of weapons to fight for us.

Or when we say:

If we make too big a military effort we shall so dislocate our economy that we shall never recover; we shall create a permanent dictatorship and lose our historic freedom.

Or when we say other things which at bottom represent merely wishful thinking or the dread of personal sacrifices and the desire to find a better way out.

I believe that this attitude toward hard fighting on our part really underlies much of the criticism which is being directed today against the proposed size of our Army. On the other hand, I also realize that the Army plans involve many factors of great complexity, and that the doubt in many minds is perfectly honest and patriotic. Such minds are entitled to all the light which we can give them. It is my purpose tonight to try to explain to you how the size of the Army was fixed, the kind of Army we are training, and the purposes for which it is designed, and why it is impossible to reduce its size or interrupt its training without the gravest danger to our ultimate victory.

I. THE NUMERICAL SIZE OF THE ARMY

We are planning to have raised by the end of this year, 1943, an Army of 8,200,000 men composed of 7,500,000 enlisted men and 700,000 officers. This number will include an air force of about 2,500,000. It also will include the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps of upward of 150,000.

These figures were not arrived at by guesswork; they were the product of months of study by the General Staff and the War College. They were also the product of joint planning with the Navy over the future work of both these services. The proposed size of the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps were all determined at the same time, and all of these forces were balanced within themselves and against each other, and also in connection with the available manpower, the estimated capacity of production of equipment, and the estimated availability of shipping for their transport. These figures have received the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Army and the Navy and finally of the President. They have thus had the benefit of all the brains, accumulated research, and judgment which our governmental machinery provides for that purpose. They have not been worked out in disregard of but in full reference to our program of shipbuilding and production of equipment.

When we look at the estimated size of the forces of our enemies which are in the field against us, our numbers certainly do not look relatively too large. I realize that the figures of the hostile forces are estimates only but they are based upon the best information available to those whose business it is to make such estimates. In Europe the estimated forces of the Germans and their allies show about 14,000,000 men under arms. Russia and Britain together have a much smaller number. In Asia the Japanese have more than 3,000,000 men. These figures represent the aggregate of individuals in the various forces.

When we compare the combat units of the various forces the disparity between us is even greater. Our plans are to produce about 100 American divisions of ground forces, together with their auxiliary troops. Germany is estimated to have approximately 300 divisions, Italy 80 divisions, Germany's European satellites another 80 divisions, and Japan about 86 more. This makes an aggregate of about 546. Making all allowances for error these figures certainly make our ground forces seem of very modest size in comparison.

II. THE CHARACTER AND OBJECTIVE OF THE ARMY

It is not the purpose of our military leaders to create a huge defensive army, awaiting in the United States such unknown and uncertain opportunities for its use as may hereafter occur. Their plans are much more wise than that. The Army is being raised on the fundamental and correct theory that we shall at once take the offensive and seize a number of priceless opportunities which are already opening up for us to end the war as quickly as possible.

III. THE NATURE OF THE TRAINING NECESSARY TO MEET THESE OBJECTIVES OF THE ARMY

To successfully meet these priceless opportunities we have put into effect the most carefully planned and coordinated program of military training which has ever existed in the United States.

The training contemplated by this program for the individuals is a process covering a long time. The Germans think 2 years necessary for such training of their men. We believe that our men can do it in 1 year but that is a minimum. Furthermore, the recruits are not all taken into the Army at the same time and all graduated at the same time. Such a method would be impossible for any country, even one as rich and powerful as the United States. And, furthermore, it would not meet the changing requirements of war. It would be too rigid and inflexible. Each of the reception centers and training schools takes in a succession of new classes and these groups are passed along the steps of the course until the final product in the shape of Army divisions is produced at the end. During each group's training the men are first instructed in the schooling of the individual soldier, are then crystallized into small and later large units for training in cooperative team action in modern warfare, and finally large divisional combat forces emerge from the other end of the system, each highly trained for its specific task. Every month the requisite number of men to form a certain number of divisions is taken into the reception centers at the entrance to the machine and every month at the other end that number of divisions is emerging highly trained for the various objectives to which they are to be assigned.

Anyone who studies this system as it is now running will be astounded at the careful planning which has been required as well as at the smooth continuity of the process of training which it has produced. It is now proceeding under the highest pressure of perfected action. Nothing like it has ever existed in this country before. It represents a great stream of training toward a carefully thought out goal. It has taken over 2 years to develop and construct this system; to train the instructors of its schools and to develop the immense overhead necessary for its smooth operation; and to construct the cantonments and other buildings for its use. Almost every unit in it has been devised and fitted into its place in accordance with the program of the size of the Army to be completed by December 1943, which I described a few minutes ago.

The first point to be borne in mind about this system of training is that the whole structure is complex and interrelated. Men are taught in a large number of different kinds of schools for different purposes of warfare. For example, in the ground forces there are special schools for infantry, artillery, tank warfare, antiaircraft gunnery, antitank gunnery, Signal Corps work with all its ramifications of scientific specialties, mechanics' schools, Quartermasters' schools and many more. In the Air Corps exists a similar large group of different schools for different purposes and specialties. The number of the graduates of these several schools must conform to the number required in the final product of combat forces and all must be taught to work with each other in carrying out the war task of the final division or combat force to which each belongs.

The second point to be remembered is that the whole process takes at least a year. If you interrupt the steady flow of entrants to

the schools in March 1943, the effect of this break will be produced a year later and then, if it proves a mistake, cannot be corrected for at least another year.

IV. THE DISASTROUS RESULTS OF INTERRUPTING THIS PROCESS

In the light of the foregoing description of the purpose and process of our Army's training, I think one can see more easily the danger of meddling with that process. Plan and process are tied together. The plan contemplates a succession of carefully directed blows at our enemies. The size and character of these blows and the aggregate forces which are necessary have been carefully thought out. Just as our present offensives are being carried out by men who have been through a year's training, the men now being brought into the Army are to be trained for campaigns a year ahead. Our main object is to continuously build up a force which will strike without interruption and with cumulative effect. That purpose can be thwarted by a mistake made now.

The various critics who today are asking that we should slow up or interrupt our work fail to realize the far-reaching effect of interruption. Furthermore they do not understand the psychology of combat. They do not realize that battles are won by continuous rapid blows upon an enemy and that when an enemy begins to show signs of demoralization these blows must be continued and, if possible, redoubled in order that he may not have time to reform his forces. Once the enemy is checked or shaken on the field of battle, he must be constantly pursued and hammered until he is completely beaten or surrenders. The very fact that it is known that we have trained forces ready to do this tends toward his demoralization.

On the other hand, the commander who, after an initial success, stops and gives his broken opponent time to reform and reorganize only finds that he must fight his battle over again. If, after the battle of Gettysburg, the Federal commander had been able to pursue and destroy his defeated enemy, the length of the Civil War might have been shortened by more than a year. On the other hand, the fact that in 1918 Foch was ready to remorselessly follow up and shatter the German enemy who had been shaken at Soissons on July 18 and again at St. Quentin on August 8, permitted the last great war to be finished in November 1918 instead of lasting over into 1919 as had been expected.

I speak with careful consideration when I say that if we should halt this great training establishment which we have now built and timed according to the present timetable of the war, we should deal a heavier blow to our hopes of a complete final victory than by any loss which we are likely to sustain on the field of battle.

V

Another argument of our critics is that by constructing too large an army we are making undue inroads into our limited manpower; that we are taking necessary workers from the factories which are providing Army equipment and machines; and that we are similarly slowing down the construction of merchant shipping, which is necessary to carry the Army and its supplies across the ocean. As I have already said, this argument ignores the careful study which has been given to this subject by our President and his military advisers. As between them and their critics I think it is the safer bet to trust the former. But there is this further answer to this argument which I think is conclusive. The argument depends upon the assumption that there is no elasticity in the efficiency of the civilian industries which are producing weapons and ships; that every man-hour taken away from industry and put into the Army must result in exactly the same ultimate loss in rapidity of production.

Every thoughtful citizen who will give any real consideration to the problem will know that such an assumption is not true. Only those who believe that our industry and our farming and our general civilian activity are really keyed to an all-out war are entitled to make this argument. It is the duty of every citizen to examine into his own life and his own community and see whether production in industry and on the farm cannot be increased enormously in efficiency; whether absenteeism, threatened strikes, general complacency, insistence of "business as usual," or even insistence on hoped-for standards of living, are not going a long way to prevent what could be accomplished by an all-out war effort. If you are content with the present situation and with the present results in industry, in agriculture, and in our civilian life, then I suggest that you go to one of our great camps and see our boys in uniform working. I suggest that you read the detailed dispatches from Tunisia and the southwest Pacific about the fighting efforts of our soldiers. I suggest that you compare your comforts of life with theirs, and then ask yourself again—are you content? I hope and pray that it will not require tragic disaster to bring our people to a realization of the facts. The great wave of patriotic ardor which was shown so dramatically in the weeks after Pearl Harbor must not fall away into arguments of rights, wages, profits, and relative advantage of one man over another.

The armed forces, the men who are going into actual combat, have placed their house in order. Their spirit and their program are all that patriotism and careful planning can effect. I now ask whether industry and agriculture should not likewise be put on a more efficient wartime basis. When you are driving a team of horses and one of them goes lame, you do not lame the other horse to equalize the team. You try to get two sound horses.

I fully understand that we must have essential food and necessary goods for civilian consumption. I am well aware of the difficulties in getting machinery and employees which our farmers and manufacturers are now experiencing, but I am convinced that with the initiative, resourcefulness, and willingness to sacrifice of the American people, these problems can be solved without crippling their armed forces.

For myself I have reached the conclusion that one of the reasons why industry and agriculture and the whole civilian population have not moved more rapidly toward an all-out effort is that we have relied almost entirely on voluntary cooperation. This voluntary cooperation would work with a large part of our population as soon as they clearly understood the need for it. But the effect of the recalcitrant or thoughtless few is so great upon the minds and efforts of others that I am convinced that the only way to accomplish the result which we must all reach, is through a general service act. This has proved true in England, and I believe it is now true here.

The issue between the proponents of the Army program and its critics in my opinion largely narrows down to this difference: The leaders of the Army are trying, by shortening the war, to save the lives of thousands of young Americans—lives vital to the future of this country. The opponents of the Army program are trying to avoid present trouble, the inconveniences and relatively minor sacrifices which would be involved in a more thorough and drastic reorganization of our industrial and civilian life for the remaining period of this war. I firmly believe that when the true situation is understood by the American people, there will be no doubt as to their decision. Even if, as Lincoln said in 1862, they have not yet truly realized what it means to be at war, they will soon do so. And when they have done so, they will be ready to make any sacrifice for victory.

REPORTS OF THE NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD (H. DOC. NO. 128)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA-FOLLETTE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

To assist the Congress in the development and consideration of appropriate legislation to achieve normal employment, to give assurance for all our people against common economic hazards, and to provide for the development of our national resources, I am transmitting herewith two reports of the National Resources Planning Board.

The first, "National Resources Development—Report for 1943," presents the results to date of the Board's work on post-war plans and a record of wartime planning activities. The Board proposes measures to meet the problems of the transition period from war to peace and for the longer range development of an expanding economy. It is appropriate that each year the immediate programs contained in the Budget of the United States should be considered by the Congress in the light of much longer range plans and programs. To facilitate such use of this report, I recommend that the report be printed, in accordance with past custom.

We can all agree on our objectives and in our common determination that work, fair pay, and social security after the war is won must be firmly established for the people of the United States of America.

Men in the armed forces and all those engaged in the war effort rightly expect us to be considering their future welfare.

We fight today for security for our Nation and at the same time we can endeavor to give our citizens and their families security against attacks from without and against fear of economic distress in old age, in poverty, sickness, involuntary unemployment, and accidental injuries. We need to look forward to the accomplishment of these objectives—world peace, democratic society, and a dynamic economy.

The second report transmitted herewith, on Security, Work, and Relief Policies has been developed over the last 3 years by the National Resources Planning Board, at my request, with the cooperation of the Federal agencies concerned and with the help of citizens with special knowledge and competence in this field. It reviews the accomplishments and experience of the last 10 years, pointing out some of the weaknesses of our security system, and suggesting ways of improving and strengthening the whole program.

Because of their basic importance to our national welfare during the war and after the war, it is my earnest hope that the Congress will give these matters full consideration during this session. We must not return to the inequities, insecurity, and fears of the past, but ought to move forward toward the promise of the future. When the Congress has agreed on procedures for the considera-

tion of these problems, the executive agencies responsible for the administration of programs in these fields are prepared to provide the Congress with all assistance within their power in devising appropriate ways and means to accomplish these high purposes.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 10, 1943.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is informed that it has been customary to refer matters of this kind to the Committee on Education and Labor. Should the committee provided for in the resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] be established, it is the opinion of the present occupant of the chair that the message and accompanying papers should be rereferred to that committee, but under the circumstances the message and accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was about to make the suggestion that in view of the very likely early adoption of the resolution now on the calendar, but which is for the moment before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, it might be feasible not to make any reference of the message until the resolution shall have been adopted and the committee appointed. It would save the difficulty of a rereference. I am not, however, particular about the procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair conferred with the Senator from Georgia and this procedure was satisfactory to him, and it would be rather unusual to leave the message on the desk. Therefore it will be referred as suggested by the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE AGREEMENTS

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1501) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 1501) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House has just messaged to the Senate the lend-lease bill, which it has passed. The Committee on Foreign Relations today unanimously reported an identical bill, Senate bill 813. If it is possible to dispose of the pending bill today, I hope that tomorrow the Senate may consider the bill providing for the extension for 1 year of the Lend-Lease Act.

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Gillette	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barkley	Gurney	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Hawkes	Scrugham
Brewster	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Hill	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Kilgore	Tobey
Byrd	La Follette	Tunnell
Capper	Lodge	Tydings
Caraway	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Maybank	Wherry
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Downey	Moore	Willis
Eastland	Murdock	Wilson
Ellender	Nye	
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in approaching this question one is reminded of the old Indian fable about the blind men and the elephant. One blind man put his hand on the elephant's leg and thought he was touching a tree. Another blind man grabbed the elephant by the tail and thought he had hold of a rope. Another blind man touched the elephant's trunk and thought it was a spear. None of them could see the problem in its entirety.

The questions raised in the pending bill, of course, make it a farm bill, make it a military bill, make it an industrial bill—in fact they lead one irresistibly into the whole question of manpower.

One of the interesting things brought out in this debate is the fact that every Senator on both sides of the question has shown clearly his realization of the importance of having an adequate supply of food for ourselves and for others, the importance of having industrial production that will produce the weapons which are necessary, and the absolutely vital importance of maintaining a sound home front.

History has repeatedly shown that armies which were well led and were well supplied have laid down their arms when they were not satisfied that everything was well at home. I am the last person to minimize the importance of the Senate discharging its duty toward the home front, because the home front is the mainspring upon which the success of our military efforts depends. But, Mr. President, I do not think the bill before us will achieve the objective which it seeks. It is well known, I think, that a majority of the men who have left the farms have gone into industry, and a minority have gone into the armed service, and it is rather like finding a man with a headache and putting a splint on his leg to enact legislation of this kind in the belief that it will really solve the problem.

In addition, as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has brought out, the bill, if it shall become law, will create a great many poisonous discriminations between various elements in our population, and will be unfair, not only to those who are not exempted under it from the military service, but especially to those who are.

Of course, I recognize that it is much more convenient and it is easier and it is more direct, when one faces a shortage on the farm, as indeed we do, to limit something that the Government can arbitrarily control, and that is the size of the armed forces. That is a direct approach, and when it is stated that there are 11,000,000 men in the Army, as is often said—the figure looks pretty large—it seems as though it could be shaved down without doing any harm.

When the figures are broken down and we see what goes into them, they do not seem excessive at all. The figure of 11,000,000, I need not say, includes all our armed forces—the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Marine Corps, and the merchant marine. The largest category in that total is 7,500,000 for enlisted men in the Army. The total number for the Army is 8,200,000, of which 700,000 are commissioned officers, leaving an enlisted personnel of 7,500,000.

I do not wish to burden the Senate with too much detail, but I should like to break down that figure of 7,500,000 into its component parts. Two million two hundred thousand is for the Air Force, which has the first priority on men, matériel, and ships.

One million is for the Services of Supply, which, in a war being fought at the end of lines of communication as long as ours, are bound to involve tremendous problems. Take, for example, the lines of communication between here and Africa, as well as between here and the southern Pacific. The mere mention of the delivery of supplies over such distances suggests tremendous difficulties.

To recapitulate: 2,200,000 men for the Air Forces and 1,000,000 for the Services of Supply makes a total of 3,200,000. To this must be added 1,000,000 for our defense commands, one on the Atlantic coast, under General Drum, and one on the Pacific coast under General DeWitt, which include antiaircraft artillery protection for the industrial centers, which are a vital factor in a war in which science has increased the range of weapons as much as in the present war, that is, 3,700,000 for the ground forces, artillery, tanks, and so forth. It is not quite as large as the objective for our ground forces in the First World War.

If we were to remove the ground forces from the picture and have only an air force, we should still have to have our defense commands and our Services of Supply. Therefore we should still have to have 4,200,000 men under arms.

Whether or not we are prepared to accept the figures in total when we break them down and examine them in detail I believe we will find some reason behind them, and they will not seem quite so excessive and quite so fantastic as they do when they are studied in the bulk.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's breakdown of the Army is very interesting and informative and, of course, is accurate. There has been a great deal of confusion in the public mind—and I believe also in the congressional mind—as a result of the constant reiteration of the figure of 11,000,000 men in the Army. The figure of 11,000,000 men includes not only those in the Army but those in the Navy, those in the Marine Corps, and those in the Coast Guard, as well as those in the women's auxiliary organizations of both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. LODGE. It also includes the merchant marine.

Mr. BARKLEY. It also includes the merchant marine. So when we speak of 11,000,000 men in the Army we are speaking not only of the Army but all branches of the service.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is correct. Of the figure of 11,000,000, only 8,200,000 is attributable to the Army, and of that number, 7,500,000 represents enlisted strength.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As we have heard in meetings of our committee—usually in executive session—that number does not include the women in the Army and the Navy.

Mr. LODGE. It does not include women in any of the various branches of the Service.

Mr. AIKEN. And it does not include the merchant marine.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was going by the statement of the Secretary of the Navy when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations a few days ago.

Mr. AIKEN. I was going by the testimony of Army officials.

Mr. LODGE. The figure of 8,200,000 pertaining to the Army does include the WAAC's.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In addition to the 11,000,000 men referred to by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, 1,000,000 more would be needed for replacements, making a total of 12,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. That goal is not expected to be attained until the end of this year.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not a reality at the present time.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

One of the untrue concepts expressed in regard to the Army is that it is a mass Army. A picture is created of a mass of soldiers marching along the road with packs and rifles, in the style prevalent at the time of the Spanish-American War. That is definitely not the case, Mr. President. We have a mechanized Army. The choice is not between a large mass Army on the one hand and a small mechanized Army on the other. That might be a good choice in time of peace; but when we are at war it is desirable to have as large a mechanized Army as possible. That is what the present program really contemplates.

The suggestion has been made that we should reduce this contemplated size and, as a Nation which is so preeminently industrial, and such a large agricultural Nation, we should do what we can do best, namely, produce food and weapons, allow the nations with the larger number of men the use of our food and material production, and let them do the fighting. I believe every Senator in this Chamber has heard that suggestion. I shall not comment on it from the standpoint of gallantry or honor, because everyone can judge that for himself, and my views on that subject are of no interest.

From the standpoint of policy, however, I very much doubt the wisdom of taking such a step. We have already seen in this war nations which started out on one side and are now on the other side. We know that history shows that there is nothing permanent or sacred about the alliances which certain kinds of war create. In his farewell address George Washington said:

> That it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

We are very fortunate to have allies. When a nation is at war the more allies it has the better. However, we must always be able to look out for ourselves if the wheel of fortune should take a turn which makes it inevitable for us to do so.

At the beginning of my remarks, Mr. President, I said there was substantial agreement in the Senate on the necessity for complete victory. Everyone wants to do everything possible to bring about complete victory. The differences which occur between us here are differences as to method, and not as to objective. I believe it can be said that there are two schools of thought. There are those who want the country to make its major effort as rapidly as possible and win a victory in the shortest possible time. There is another group which wants to win a victory with as slight derangement and dislocation of the ordinary amenities of life as possible. There is a group which believes that time is on our side and that we should make the smallest effort consistent with winning the war.

There can be a great deal of argument as to which of these two methods is the best way to proceed. I happen to belong to the first group. I happen to believe that time is a commodity of which a poor nation has just as much as a rich nation. I happen to believe that the sooner we get the war over the better, and that it is worth making a major effort and a major dislocation, if necessary, to attain victory. I happen to believe that we can do it, and I base that belief on what some other countries have done.

In preparing for armed forces totaling 11,000,000, we are preparing for a percentage of about 7.9 of our population in the service.

The testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs indicates that the percentage of approximately 7.9, which is our objective, compares with a percentage of 8.2 for the United Kingdom, and 8.8 for Russia.

Going to the other side and looking at the figures regarding the armed forces of our enemies, we find a percentage of 12.4 for Germany. I should say that the other countries, such as Canada, India, China, and Italy, do not make such a percentage contribution as is contemplated in our figures. However, these figures show that the United Kingdom, Russia, and Germany are making a larger contribution on the basis of the percentage of population than we are.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not possible for those countries to make such large contributions to the army because they are fighting near home and are not confronted with such long lines of communication as confront our country? Is not that the reason that Canada has not so large a percentage as Germany, Russia, or the United Kingdom? I think we must consider that factor.

Mr. LODGE. The percentage does not apply merely to the Army The figure which I have cited includes the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the merchant marine.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator from Massachusetts taken into account that this country, in addition to producing necessities for our own Army, Navy, and civilian requirements at home, must produce food and supplies for the armies and navies of many other nations under lend-lease, and that those nations are correspondingly relieved from producing the same amounts, which they would otherwise have to produce? So far as the size of the Army is concerned, I do not think I differ with the Senator from Massachusetts; but in making comparisons it seems to me that we must take into account the fact that we have a much heavier call placed on our productive facilities and manpower than do other nations.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is a factor which must be taken into account.

Mr. President, I said at the beginning that no matter how we start to consider this subject, whether we start from the viewpoint of the farmer or from the viewpoint of the airplane manufacturer or from the viewpoint of the Army or the Navy, or from whatever viewpoint we start, we always come to the question of manpower. That big question and the decision which we make regarding it flow directly from the opinion which the

American people have about the importance and the essentiality of winning the war. The decision as to the manpower question depends on the state of mind on the home front. So it is particularly necessary to look at the home front very carefully.

If one talks to soldiers who are returning from the war zone or if one happens to have had the privilege of having been in a combat zone, and can supplement that experience with conversations with others who have been there, he finds an astonishing unanimity of opinion as to the emotions which are aroused in returning soldiers when they reach this country once more. One who has been in the Middle East, for instance, and who has seen not only the sufferings caused by war itself but who has seen the refugee French, the refugee Yugoslavs, the refugee Greeks, the refugee Jews, and all the other miserable people who have been hounded from pillar to post, who have had their near and dear ones killed, who have been utterly impoverished and ravaged—if one has seen the hatreds that exist over there, and then returns to this country—if, for instance, he returns by airplane, and looks down from the window of the plane and sees below him the coast of Florida, and, after he lands, sees once again American young men and American young women and gets the first glass of milk that he has dared drink in a long while—I mention those incidental things—above all he has the feeling of hope, the feeling of the worth of the individual man, the feeling of the promise which the future holds for this country; and he says to himself, "Yes, there is a civilization worth saving, and it is right here in the United States of America."

Those of us at home can profit by the emotions of the returning soldier.

Another thing which naturally occurs to one who has been on the other side of the ocean and who, for instance, has tried to move tanks from one place to another, who has been up all night and all day, has not had much to eat, has not had any sleep, and whose sole preoccupation has been to get the tanks moved from one place to another—I mention that as an illustration; I could have mentioned one of a hundred other things—is the idea that the winning of the war is the biggest thing that there is. Then he comes back to this country; and the prominent utterances and speeches which come to his attention are those in which concern is expressed about the third world war, in which concern is expressed about how are we to play a game of chess, although the pieces are not yet on the chessboard. Is it any wonder that constituents of mine write to me—and I am sure other Senators have had similar experiences—that they feel that from Washington there emanates the belief that everything is really going fine. If the winning of the war is taking care of itself, they say, what is the point of putting up with all these inconveniences and all these dislocations, and why should people meekly put up with administrative incompetence?

When I observe the number of prominent men who never lose an opportunity, not to discuss the war, but on every occasion to discuss what will occur after the war, it seems to me we can hardly blame the people for having the feeling I have just described. And when we observe the way in which the voluntary system of organizing manpower is not being used, we cannot blame the people for having such feelings.

Mention has been made this afternoon of the Austin-Wadsworth bill which would seek by compulsory means to take a man from a place where he is not needed and move him to some place where he will be useful. I do not believe that today the appropriate agencies in Washington know where such people are to be found. For instance, I do not think the agencies in Washington know where men who are trained in certain types of metalwork are located—men who have nothing to do in the places where they are, and who are needed elsewhere.

I shall not shrink from voting for legislation to effect appropriate transfers if I am convinced that such legislation must be enacted in order to save the country; but to pass such legislation is a harsh and sharp thing to do at best, and certainly it would be a terrible thing to do if such a law were not well administered. Many of our laws have not been well administered. We have had a great deal of bungling; a great deal of needless harm has been done. To take a man from his home in Boston and send him to some place far away from his home, all because of administrative incompetence, would be a terrible thing to do. It would be bad enough to do it for a good reason.

Yet I believe that our people have unlimited good will toward the purposes we seek to achieve. Can anyone doubt that if the names and addresses of the people who have skills, and whose services now are surplus, were known, and if an appeal were made to their patriotism by the President, who is concerned with the home front, a great many of them would respond on a voluntary basis? However, the voluntary system has not been given a trial. The voluntary system has not been organized. We can organize a voluntary system just as well as we can organize a compulsory one; but I cannot see that a voluntary system has been organized.

Mr. President, there are two schools of thought relative to the winning of the war. One school of thought is that of those who want to make a major effort at once and get the war over with quickly. The other school of thought is that of those who want to make the least effort consistent with victory.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. In my mind I do not divide the issue in that way. I want to keep the strongest and largest possible combat force hitting the enemy, and hitting him every hour of every day of the combat, but I want to be sure that the men we put into combat can be maintained on their feet and in fighting trim by not being neglected because of any failure on our part to supply them with the absolutely necessary foods, fibers, and minerals and to provide for the production and fabrication of those supplies and their transportation to the battle areas.

Mr. LODGE. I appreciate the force of the Senator's remark. Of course, those who have confidence in the accuracy of the figures of the General Staff believe that what the Senator wants done can be done. I heartily agree with the Senator that of course that must be done. I believe it can be done and can be done under the system which was very well described by Woodrow Wilson in language which is printed at the head of the introduction of the Industrial Mobilization Plan, a plan which I wish had been more closely followed when the present war began.

Woodrow Wilson used the following words:

> The highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people.

I think there is still a great deal of truth in that statement. In making our decision about the pace at which we want to prosecute the war and about the intensity of sacrifice and dislocation that we want to impose upon ourselves, I think we should always remember the young men who are in Trinidad, Paramaribo, Belem, and Natal, and then, across the ocean, those who are stationed all through the Sahara and tropical Africa, and those who are serving in places all the way across the Pacific to Australia, and who are working under very unpleasant conditions—young men who probably will not have the excitement and adventure of combat. They will have to endure the long, slow, boring grind of service in out-of-the-way corners of the world, where the climate is disagreeable and unhealthy, and where, even with the best efforts on our part, they will have monotonous diets. The thought those young men have—and it is the thought that sustains them—is that at home everyone is working himself up to the highest pitch to give the enemy both barrels just as fast as possible. That is what they think. The young men who are in the actual combat positions in Africa, in the Solomon Islands, or wherever the fighting may be, are sustained by the thought that no effort is being spared here to get this thing over with as soon as possible. That is the phrase one hears.

So, Mr. President, in concluding, I hope that we will keep faith with those particular aspirations. I think we can do it; I think we can do it without harm to America; I think we can do it by spontaneous cooperation; but there has got to be a real effort made by the leadership of this country to create such conditions that that kind of spontaneous cooperation is possible.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am pleased to have an opportunity to say a few words on the pending amendment and on the pending bill this afternoon. First, I wish to say that I think the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama has done a valuable service by bringing to the attention of the country the serious trouble which faces it. I do not believe that either the amendment or the

bill will afford a solution for the great problem which confronts our people. The only solution will be in the eventual passage of a carefully drafted law somewhat along the lines of the one introduced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and by Representative WADSWORTH in the House of Representatives. But, Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be kept clear, insofar as my vote is concerned, I desire to speak on the pending amendment.

Let me say that I have spent many sleepless hours thinking about the situation with which we are confronted and thinking even more about the 105,000 boys from the small State of South Carolina, the majority of whom have volunteered and others of whom have been selected to carry on the battle. Some of them are fighting on foreign soil; some, sad to say, Mr. President, are now sleeping below the soil; and others are preparing themselves to go forward and carry our flag on to victory. It is of them I think and worry.

Mr. President, I was not a Member of the United States Senate when the selective-service laws were passed. After the passage of the original law, in which certain deferments were granted, there were also authorizations issued by the Director of Selective Service to grant other deferments. As the Governor of South Carolina, I protested to General Hershey many times against deferments, and I shall vote against any deferments and against any bill that may be introduced that sets up by law deferment for any group including married men. Of course, I believe that single men should be first selected. I believe that married men, without children, should be selected next, but I also believe, if it is necessary to select married men with children, it most certainly should be done. Married men with children certainly have as much at stake in the welfare of America as has anyone else.

As a Member of this body, I voted to select 18-year-old boys and take them from school, and from the farms and from the factories. I voted under no condition to give them exemption because they went to college and were sons of well-to-do people, and I sincerely hope that the law will be enforced in its letter and in its spirit. Selective Service is the fairest way to obtain the necessary armed fighting forces. It is my opinion that the selective law should also be used to obtain merchant crews when and if the voluntary system fails to produce a sufficient number of men. The brave and heroic merchant crews are, in reality, a part of the fighting forces of our Navy.

I am well aware that the farmer has not received the treatment accorded others, because when ceilings were placed on farm prices and wages, industrial wages had already far exceeded, in proportion, farm incomes. Naturally, large numbers of farm helpers, because of such financial conditions, left the farms.

There was also provided under Executive order deferment for certain war workers. This may have been necessary temporarily until others could be trained, and, of course, to some extent it may be necessary today; but such matters should be handled by the local boards, as in the case of deferment for farmers under the Tydings amendment for which I voted. There should be, in my opinion, no interference with the Selective Service by laws creating for any group blanket deferments throughout the United States. Each individual case should be handled on its merits by the local boards.

If I am any judge of those who have always been so kind to me at the ballot box, the people of South Carolina, whom I in part have the honor to represent, wish no preferential deferments for anyone or any group.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that this is the most important vote I shall cast since my reelection by the people of my State last summer, I wish to express myself further on some matters. Since the meeting of the Seventy-eighth Congress reference has been made by other Senators to what the people expect of them, and, therefore, I want to take this opportunity to state what the people of South Carolina expect of me. I know in expressing this opinion I voice the wishes of the majority of the people of South Carolina. Their wishes and desires, Mr. President, are for me, as their United States Senator, to support 100 percent the war program of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces. They do not expect any preferential deferments; they do not expect any preferential treatment; they wish all to be treated alike.

As to the size of the Army, it is their opinion and my opinion that that is a matter for the Commander in Chief, together with the generals and admirals, to determine. If I should be called upon to vote as to the size of the Army or any matter connected with military objectives, I shall vote to support to the end those in command of the fighting forces.

On the other hand, so far as the domestic home front is concerned, the people of South Carolina, as they have expressed themselves on every occasion, are desirous of streamlining the Government and cutting out all activities which can at this time be deferred, so that all our interests, resources, and work wherever and whenever possible may be used to speed our cause to victory. I propose, on every occasion, to vote their convictions on these matters.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that I am here in the United States Senate because of the generosity of the people of South Carolina. I made a contract with them to support the President in the war effort, and I made a contract with them to support their convictions as best I could interpret them on matters not pertaining to the war. Here let me say, Mr. President, that some matters have been brought up in the Senate recently which have been opposed by those who voted for me and made possible my service as a Senator. I propose to do what I can to stop such measures. I have been, as have most of my colleagues, disturbed because of deferments which have been given to Government employees. The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] called attention to these matters last fall. The people want fair and just treatment of all citizens whether they are in the employ of the Government or in private employment, whether they are working on farms or in factories.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the "negligible" subject of farming. We, as the Representatives of the several States, must decide whether or not farming is essential to our war effort. If it be true that agricultural production is not only necessary to support the Army of this Nation in the matter of food, but also, as well mentioned by the Senator from Ohio, if we are to feed the men of other countries, agriculture is certainly an essential industry.

We must decide, not flippantly, but as serious men, whether we consider production of food essential to winning the war. That having been determined the question is, Who is to produce the food? From listening to the debate here one would think that any man could go out and produce the food necessary to feed the country. It is not such a technical matter, so far as small grain is concerned. One can sow it by machinery, reap it by machinery, and thresh it by machinery. But that is only a small part of food production.

Not only is the harvesting and preservation of the food essential but one has to be trained in its cultivation. We hear much talk about the relation of the selective service to food production. The question of production can be made very practical if we will define what is the duty of the selective service. I am not frightened by the statement that we are separating a certain class to be deferred. The fundamental question underlying the proposal is, Is this class essential? We are taking men into the Army through an arbitrary method, and are fixing their wages. The bill before us does not propose to do anything of that kind. It merely says, "Let us take the men who are qualified to produce the crops."

I should like to go into some of the particulars of what it takes to make farming an essential occupation, but before I leave the draft board question, let me say that the draft boards are as confused as we are. To give an illustration of the confusion, I may cite the case of a certain physician in my city who had quite a hospital, known as the Saunders Memorial Hospital. The Army authorities came to my town, and he thought perhaps they might need his hospital. He entered into negotiations with them, and understood that they would lease the hospital. They agreed upon a lease, or he felt they had done so. Then the question arose as to the purchase of the hospital. He came to Washington, and thought perhaps he had negotiated a sale of the property. It now turns out that they have not leased it and have not bought it. He had dismissed his organization, and was getting ready to move out, but now he is without a hospital and without a job.

The physician appealed to me, and I called in the general who was said to be the head of the organization with

which he had dealt. The general said, "This man listened to those who had no authority." Some of us have had experiences along that line. We do not know whether we are coming or going. The physician, thinking he was acting with a man who had the authority of the Government behind him, agreed to lease his property, and then to sell it. He had dismissed his organization, had broken up his nurses' training school, but he was left high and dry, and now it is said the only thing he can do is to go into the court of claims and sue for redress.

Mr. President, that illustrates the manner in which our war efforts are being organized. As to the Selective Service, the theory is fine. The Selective Service board in my county is more or less acquainted with the farmers of the county, and when a farmer tells the board that it has taken a man who is essential, the members of the board know the man with whom they are dealing, and have reason to be in a position to know whether he is stating facts.

Let me give a personal illustration. I had a hand on my place who was competent to run machinery. Those who have dealt with the Negro race and their ability to operate machinery know what usually happens when they are placed in charge of it; but this man understood machinery. He was drafted, and I wrote the board a letter telling them that the man was essential to the proper cultivation of my farm and the proper utilization of my tractors and trucks. I thought they had, under the Tydings amendment, made arrangements for him to stay on the farm, but the day before I left home, just after I came out of the hospital, he was notified of his induction, and was ordered to prepare for service in the Army. I came to Washington and took the matter up with General Hershey and certain of the manpower organization. The result was that the man was allowed to remain on my farm.

The draft board in this case were acting under their interpretation of the law, and they thought this man should be taken away. Had he been taken away, the production of my whole farm, and the use of my tractors, would have been reduced by one-half.

Reading the modified Bankhead amendment we find that it provides:

> A registrant who is regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor on a farm, or whose principal occupation consists of employment on the farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity, shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred from training.

We must decide whether we believe that production of food or agriculture is essential to winning the war. We hear learned talk about men who produce a pumpkin or a bushel of potatoes. What in the name of heaven has that to do with a man who is running a farm and knows all about it? I do not know where in the world the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] got his idea that before one can be qualified as a farmer he has to produce two bushels of potatoes, a quart of sirup, and certain other things, and prove it. One would have to take the Army suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to enforce such a law as that. It is absolutely absurd. Josh Billings said a thing which I think applies perfectly to this body. He said, "My son, come to the Senate and see how great an amount of conjecture they can get out of so little fact." That is applicable to us all.

As to the matter of cultivation, how many of us here are familiar with the difficult details connected with cultivating food crops? How many Senators know how much fertilizer should be used in production, and the character of the fertilizer, to get maximum production of a given plant? During the last war I busied myself in going from Maine to Florida in order to get soda, which is one of the essentials in the production of all food crops. How much does a farmer need, when shall he put it on, has the rain nothing to do with it, has the season nothing to do with it? Before we get through with this matter I think we will all have to ask God to come down and make his laws accord with our wishes. We may talk about production until doomsday, but unless the seasons are good, a farmer cannot make a crop.

Not only is the application of fertilizer on the Atlantic seaboard essential, but a farmer must know what kind he needs, and he must know about the soil upon which it is to be applied. That cannot be learned in a day. Farming demands a certain bucolic skill, comparable to the skill which characterizes the mechanic. The seasons determine when the cultivation must be made, and a farmer has to have men who understand the situation.

There has been talk about getting school children and the urban population to help. God knows I do not want them to come to my farm. To cite an example of what happens when one unfamiliar with farming is employed: A brother of mine was very philanthropic, entertaining theories much like many we hear of now, and he got a man off a vessel whom he employed to go to the field and thin some corn. Some grass had grown up in the corn, and my brother tried to show the man the difference between the blade of the corn and the blade of the grass. At noon he went down to see how the worker had gotten along, and found that he had chopped up all the corn and left the grass. [Laughter.] The worker did not know the difference between grass and corn, and had not correctly understood my brother's instructions.

Another element involved is that of insects. I lost a whole corn crop last year because of a little insect known as the webworm. I had not placed on the fallow ground a sufficient amount of lime to destroy the worm, and planted my corn, and the worm destroyed the whole crop.

Some persons in authority may think it does not take experience to do farm work. They think men can be sent out and told to go ahead and plant, regardless of the preparation which is necessary, or the character of the soil, whether it is suited or not to certain crops.

Mr. President, I could consume several hours explaining not only the absolute need of experience in growing a given crop, but the need for knowing the character of the soil upon which the crop is grown. If we can raise an army of 11,000,000 men, and feed such an army, and feed the people of America, as well as a great part of the population of the world, all with depleted manpower, very well. But Secretary Wickard appeared before our committee and told us that not only are we going to have a scarcity of manpower, but that we now have a scarcity of farm implements. We have, as well, a scarcity of fertilizer. It is proposed that we shall set out to feed ourselves as well as the rest of the world, without sufficient farm implements, without fertilizer, and without enough manpower. We must face the problem as sensible men.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, it is my thought that there is a great difference between the conclusions reached by the statisticians, data gatherers, and the hordes of others in the departments, and those who are actually engaged in operations in the fields. I know from my own personal experience that I have until April 1 to find some more help to do the work on my farm in connection with the maintenance of my dairy herd. If I do not obtain this farm help I must offer my stock for sale. Then one more of the many dairy farms of my State goes out of production.

The problem of vanishing farm help is the vital production problem faced by many persons with whom I am acquainted—farmers who are actually engaged in production of those farm products which are required to feed our combat forces, meet our lend-lease obligations, and supply our industrial workers, and, last, to maintain our civilian populations. If we fail to feed all these people, how can we achieve our military objectives? How can we win the war?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Oregon has learned that old adage that figures do not lie, but that liars can figure. That is what is the matter. The figures may not lie, but those who figure do lie.

Mr. President, the fundamental question which is worrying me is, Are we going to attempt to preserve the agricultural production of America, or are we going to turn farm workers loose and take our chances? Everyone knows that there is an element of skill in farming. It is said we must have an army of so many million men. On what is such an army going to be fed? If we are to have so large an army, we must provide a sufficient amount of food. The fundamental question is, What is essential to the winning of the war? The sine qua non is food. Without it an army cannot fight.

Another element which confuses the situation is rationing. I say without fear of contradiction that regimentation and rationing have done more to decrease production than any other one

thing. The farmers themselves do not know what to do.

Let me illustrate: Last year there was an abundant pear crop in my section, and also an abundant fig crop. The housewives wanted to preserve these crops, but found they could not get sugar. So, the figs and pears laid on the ground and rotted, simply because rationing had gone into effect, and the housewives could not get sufficient sugar to preserve those crops.

Mr. President, all this messing with natural law has brought us to the situation we are now in. I say that the American people are just as patriotic as those who are rationing them, and if we say to the American people, "We must have food," and give the people a chance, and not have priorities on machinery, and priorities on fertilizer, but see to it that the farmers get the wherewithal, and turn them loose to produce, they will produce.

A few years ago we had, under the so-called ever-normal granary, a surplus of wheat and a surplus of corn, and took a few million hogs and dumped them in the Mississippi River. We were overproducing then. Now all that has been changed, and we are underproducing. I hope this body will vote to provide that every farmer working on a farm and producing will be permitted to remain unless he himself elects to get up and go elsewhere.

Mr. President, the main reason for depletion of the farms and the bringing about of this terrible condition is the determination on the part of those controlling the administration that the farmer shall not get a just price for his products. Earlier today the Senator from Maryland read some figures showing the wages the farmer receives as compared with the wages received by the industrial employees. The whole question depends upon whether groups are organized to vote or are not. If I could organize the farmers as completely as the industrial workers are organized, and get them to say "We are not going to vote for this or that candidate," a different condition would prevail.

I do not know whether we are going to say that there shall be a deferment for the farmer. We digress; we sail, in our minds, over to Africa and to Australia, but forget the necessity for encouraging the man at home.

Mr. President, I hope the Bankhead amendment, which seems to me to be the only reasonable proposal before us, will be adopted. I do not think it requires that a farmer shall produce a certain amount of pumpkins, or a certain number of bushels of wheat, or sacks of potatoes, but it provides that if he is working on the farm and producing he shall stay there and not be disturbed. That is all there is to the Bankhead proposal.

Talk about class legislation! We will surely have class legislation in the fall of 1944 if some practical relief is not given to the farmer. Columnists and public writers were referring a short time ago to the "farm bloc" and the "greedy farmer." Why should he not be greedy? God knows he has been starving from the days of Adam until now. He has never been given a chance.

This morning I received a report from the market to the effect that an order had gone out that a certain amount of cotton was to be released at a price below the market price. Cotton dropped another dollar a bale. That meant that the farmer who had cotton to sell had to take a dollar a bale less.

Congress has passed many laws. In passing laws let us make them so clear that a fool can understand them. Fools do not understand many of the laws we have passed. We pass laws, but the administrator of the laws reads into them anything he wants to. We have degenerated to such a point that we are nothing more than an appropriating committee. We appropriate and the other man spends.

I want to talk on the subject from the standpoint of an impoverished practical farmer. The element of cultivation has not been mentioned at all in this debate. The element of the experienced hands necessary to do the work has not entered into it. I saw a neighbor of mine ruin a whole cotton crop by plowing it too soon after a rain. Yet it is proposed that the city man go into the fields and cultivate and gather our crops.

The discussion has gone far afield. The fundamental question is, Shall we have an adequate food supply, and if so, how will we get it? The farmer should be permitted to farm wherever he can farm. If he is on a farm and producing he should be deferred.

Someone has said that country is best governed which is least governed. God knows if that is so, we are gone, we are helpless.

A ceiling has now been placed on pulpwood. If a ceiling could be placed on those who lack intelligence along certain lines I would vote for such a ceiling.

I want it understood that I believe the Congress of the United States should pass the laws which govern the people. They should not be governed by fiat and Executive order. One day I was making a speech and I was asked if I did not want to cooperate. I do. However, under the present situation the bureaucrats "operate" at the other end of the Avenue, and we "co." They have it nicely divided. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not know whether we can retain enough really practical farmers to support the world. To quote Mrs. LUCE, we are now in the midst of "globaloney," and God only knows when we will get out of it. [Laughter.] However, the question before us is, Shall we assume the responsibility of providing enough labor to produce the required quantity of food? We cannot do so unless we pay attention to those who are qualified farmers. Except for those who come from the farms, there is not a Member of the Senate present who knows how to operate a farm, or work on one. Not only is seed necessary, but the preparation of the soil is also necessary. When the seed has been planted the cultivation of the growing crop is essential. I recall that someone once said that the boll weevil could become a grandmother over night. What Senator present knows anything about protecting even a turnip crop? I once had turnips planted, and they suddenly started to die. I sent to Washington for aid in saving my crop and a man came down to my farm. He examined the turnips. I had been dusting them with calcium arsenate and other poisons. He said, "The web worm is attacking your crop and unless you secure a certain kind of poison for it your whole crop will be destroyed." I secured the poison and saved the crop. If I had come to the Senate for information as to what was destroying the crop I would have been told just to plant turnips. "Just sow them and let them grow."

Mr. BARKLEY. Was it a bureaucrat in Washington who saved the crop?

Mr. SMITH. No; it was not a bureaucrat. It was a man with some sense. He had escaped the odious faults of this damnable bureaucracy. He was in Washington before the bureaucrats gained control.

Mr. President, I hope we will take a sensible view of this problem and vote to preserve the men who are on the farm raising crops with such aid as they may be able to obtain and supervise.

Mr. President, I have not said all I wanted to say, but I must conclude.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot obtain a vote on the pending amendment this afternoon. I have consulted with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the author of the pending substitute, as well as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], and other Senators. As a result of those conferences I now ask unanimous consent that not later than 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon the Senate proceed to vote on the O'Mahoney substitute without further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I had prepared and desired to offer a substitute for the pending bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's substitute would not be in order.

Mr. PEPPER. I am aware of that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The O'Mahoney amendment, or substitute, is the last degree in which an amendment can be offered. It cannot even be amended.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that; but availing myself of the right of discussion and debate before a vote is had, I desire to submit a proposal which is a closer approach to the problem under discussion than is either of the pending substitutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Florida can offer his amendment after the O'Mahoney substitute shall have been disposed of. It cannot be voted upon before the O'Mahoney substitute is voted upon, and it cannot be offered as an amendment to the O'Mahoney substitute.

Mr. PEPPER. I am aware of that; but I should like the Senate to have the benefit of the proposal.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator can offer it and have it printed as another amendment to the proposed bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I desire to offer it as an amendment this afternoon so that it will be in the RECORD, and be subject to debate tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no objection to that. However, that has nothing to do with my request for an agreement as to voting.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, has any agreement been proposed relative to the allocation of time tomorrow which would deny me even 10 or 15 minutes for debate on the pending substitute?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; there has been no agreement as to allocation of time. I suggested 2 o'clock as the time to vote. I believe the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] are among those who desire further to discuss the pending amendment. Two hours would seem to provide ample time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish also to speak on the pending amendment if there will be sufficient time. Otherwise, I shall have to object to the request. I should like a little time to discuss the pending amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied that the time will be ample without allocation.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show the figures which I have just received from the Selective Service officials. The so-called Tydings amendment was adopted on November 13, 1942. Between November 13 and November 30, 1942, 24,278 farm workers who otherwise would have been inducted into military service were deferred under the amendment. The number during that month was not great because the act was new, and it took some time to send regulations to the various draft boards throughout the country. Subsequently the regulations were greatly liberalized.

During the month of December 1942, 168,066 additional farm workers were deferred under the Tydings amendment.

In the month of January 1943, when the Selective Service officials were calling for about 400,000 men a month, 171,638 farm workers who would otherwise have been inducted, were deferred under the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does that mean that about half of all the registrants who were called up were deferred?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. The practice is to continue calling until they get the 400,000. They may have to call 600,000 before they get the desired number.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They may not call more than 400,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the month of February 1943, when another 400,000 men were called up, 130,460 were deferred under the amendment, making a total for the period between November 13, 1942, and March 1, 1943, of 494,462 regularly employed and irreplaceable farm laborers, who were deferred under the law on the statute books at that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was done by the local boards.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. These figures have been furnished by General Hershey's office. They have been checked and rechecked. They contain 1 month's additional figures to those referred to today by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and myself. The final figure for the 3½ months is 494,462 which represents the regularly employed and irreplaceable farm workers who have been deferred under the so-called Tydings amendment.

I wish the RECORD to show that while the so-called Tydings amendment may have its imperfections, and while it may be violated in certain communities, it is contributing no small part in retaining workers upon the farm even without the addition of the liberalizing amendment offered by the minority of the committee and sponsored by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maryland has not given vital information concerning how many of the number to which he has referred were deferred under the so-called Tydings amendment, and how many were deferred for other reasons.

Mr. TYDINGS. The figures which I have given represent deferments under the Tydings amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to know how many were eligible for military service?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is estimated by General Hershey's office that by December 31, 1943, at the present rate of deferment for all reasons, 3,032,000 men on the farms will be deferred for physical handicaps, dependencies, and preferences under the Tydings amendment.

The figures which I have read—and they have been checked and double-checked—apply to those who have been deferred under the Tydings amendment and in accordance with its provisions.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The figures presented by the Senator from Maryland indicate that considerably more than one-third of all the farmers will be deferred. It is absurd to think that it would be reasonable to have two-thirds of the farmers inducted into the service. There are only 8,500,000 on the farms, and yet he is talking about deferring 3,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 38 who are eligible for military service.

Mr. TYDINGS. It will be found that of the men who will be drafted this year, with the cream already pretty well taken off by men having gone into war plants or into the Army, the deferments for general reasons will run much higher than they have run heretofore. That applies not only to those who come from the country, but those who come from the city as well. Men who were deferred a year or a year and a half ago on the ground of being physically unfit are now being reexamined, and in many instances are being put on the eligible list in order to make up the required quota. So the figures which I have received from General Hershey's office are as accurate and as nearly primary evidence as any which can be adduced from any source in the country.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to be recognized to discuss the pending bill, but I understand the majority leader wishes to move at this time that the Senate adjourn or recess until tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood that the Senator did not want to proceed with his discussion this afternoon, but desired to obtain recognition for that purpose tomorrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to having that done.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Alabama. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I simply want to insert a word of explanation about certain amendments which I propose to offer tomorrow before requesting consent that the amendments be printed and placed on the desks of Senators.

Mr. President, what my amendments propose to do is to set up an over-all authority consisting of what is called a committee on requirements and program, to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization, and to make them an over-all committee which, subject to the jurisdiction of the President, would have the duty of allocating the manpower of the Nation among the armed forces and essential civilian production activities, including agriculture, and giving to the chairman of the War Manpower Commission the power to defer those who might be found to be essential civilian workers in industry and in agriculture. The amendments would achieve the essential purpose of the pending bill, but at the same time would set up an over-all agency to deal with the question of allocation of the war manpower resources of the country.

With that word of explanation, I send the amendments to the desk, request that they be printed, be printed in the RECORD, and that copies of them be placed on the desks of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will lie on the table, be printed, and be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments submitted by Mr. PEPPER are as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. PEPPER to the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations, viz: strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"This act may be cited as the Manpower Mobilization Act.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program (referred to in this act as the Committee) under the chairmanship of a Director of War Mobilization to be appointed by the President (referred to in this act as the Director) and consisting of the Secretaries of War and the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization. This Committee shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military and essential civilian production (referred to in this act as the program). The program shall take the form of a detailed schedule of military and essential civilian production and specific quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces and to particular categories of military and civilian production. In preparing the program the committee shall take into account schedules of military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator, according to appropriate jurisdiction, statements of manpower requirements for the military forces furnished by the War and Navy Departments, and statements of manpower requirements for military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and determined by him in cooperation with the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator. The quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces as determined under the program shall supersede present quotas employed under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The schedules of military and essential civilian production and the manpower quotas relating thereto determined under the program shall be binding upon the War Production Board, the Food Administration, the War Manpower Commission, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and other war agencies in their determination and operations relating to production and manpower.

"SEC. 3. The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'Any provision of this act to the contrary notwithstanding—

"'(1) whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission deems it necessary in order to meet the program determined in accordance with section 2 of the Manpower Mobilization Act that occupational deferments be granted to persons engaged in military or essential civilian production or in essential activity related thereto, he shall make a finding to this effect and such findings shall be conclusive upon all civilian local boards and any other civilian agencies functioning under this act. No other occupational deferments shall be granted under this act except upon such a finding by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission;

"'(2) for purposes of making an individual finding as to occupational deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is empowered, subject to direction by the President, to employ the officers or employees of the War Manpower Commission or of any other Federal agency and to establish such additional organization and procedure as he shall deem necessary and proper.'

"SEC. 4. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is authorized to provide equipment, transportation, housing, medical facilities, and training to workers being placed in or transferred to war or essential civilian activity, including production of food and other agricultural products whenever he deems such assistance necessary in order to meet the program.

"SEC. 5. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is hereby authorized to recruit and organize a National Emergency Workers Corps, and to employ the members of such National Emergency Workers Corps for such length of time as he may deem their services necessary in order to meet the program. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, with the advice and consent of the Director of Economic Stabilization, is authorized to fix and pay such compensation to the members of the National Emergency Workers Corps as he deems necessary and proper after adequate public hearings; such compensation shall be fixed with due regard to the availability of such labor, the compensation to labor in alternative employment, the policies of the Director of Economic Stabilization and such other circumstances as may be deemed necessary and proper by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and the Director of Economic Stabilization. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall make the members of such National Emergency Workers Corps available to agricultural producers and other employers engaged in essential activity whenever he deems such action necessary in order to meet the program: *Provided*, That such employers shall reimburse the War Manpower Commission for such labor at amounts to be determined by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission with the advice and consent of the Director of Economic Stabilization which are determined by them to be reasonable and proper in relation to previous and present costs of labor and to the necessity of achieving the essential production involved.

"SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 to the War Manpower Commission to carry out the purposes of section 4 of this act.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $200,000,000 to the War Manpower Commission to be used as a revolving fund to carry out the activities authorized under section 5 of this act. The compensation to be paid by employers accepting the services of the members of the National Emergency Workers Corps shall be paid to the War Manpower Commission for use in this revolving fund.

"SEC. 7. There is hereby created a Board of War Mobilization under the chairmanship of the Director and consisting of four representatives of agriculture, four representatives of industry, four representatives of labor, and four public members at large appointed by the President. The Board shall hold regular meetings at least once a month. The Board shall make to the Director and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Director of Economic Stabilization, and the Food Administrator all of whom shall advise and consult with the Board on all major policies of manpower mobilization, such recommendations relating to policy and operation as it may deem will improve production and manpower mobilization."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide maximum mobilization of manpower for the war effort, including manpower for the military forces and for essential military and civilian production."

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I have received from Mr. George O. Rafert, of Fortville, Ind., a letter which bears so pointedly upon the topic under discussion that I request that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, so that it may be available to the Senators who are studying the problem.

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

FORTVILLE, IND., *March 8, 1943.*

Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: * * * My interest is not in politics but in my 350-acre farm and in the problem of farm labor. Incidentally I am the Indiana farmer who wrote the article A Farmer and His Troubles, which was published in the United States News in their issue of December 25, 1942, and which was subsequently read to the House on January 8, 1943, by Representative CLARE HOFFMAN of Michigan, and is in full in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A54. This article gives our exact experiences on this farm during the past year and the reasons for the impending food shortage just as I can see them developing right here on the farm.

Here on my farm our normal crew was five men, two hired men, my two sons, and myself. Now there are just two of us including myself, age 59. The factories took our two hired men and the draft took one of my sons. Where we formerly put 350,000 to 400,000 pounds of corn-fed beef on the Indianapolis yards in a year we can now feed no cattle at all due to lack of labor. To feed that many cattle required the daily handling of from 14 to 16 tons of material every day and two of us cannot do this as only one of the jobs of a large farm. Last year we produced 260 tons of tomatoes for canning. This year we cannot do half of that unless we get help. Last year we produced a crop of canning peas. This year we cannot even plant them. We expected to produce upward of 1,000 head of hogs this year but will not run much over 500 head. Last year we had 70 acres of soybeans and 65 acres of corn. What we can do this year remains to be seen. The reason in each case is the same—lack of labor.

In our situation, located as we are about midway between the industrial centers of Indianapolis and Anderson, we simply cannot hire labor for we cannot compete with the 8-hour day and over a dollar an hour and overtime. We are fully mechanized and equipped but our equipment will not run itself. There is no longer any question but what the situation is very serious and that something will have to be done to place labor on our farms. The question is what to do.

In such a large country as this and with such a variety of crops and climate and agricultural methods, it is evident that the solution of the farm-labor problem is not to be found in any one answer. In picking cotton in the South, a battery of soldiers acting as such might be of use but we cannot feed cattle or raise hogs with a battery of soldiers.

In some areas it is conceivable that boys of from 14 to 17 might be of some use but we cannot trust high-priced and complicated equipment with inexperienced boys, especially when we cannot replace the equipment and in fact can hardly get repairs. Besides, any boys of that age who have been raised on the farm and have some experience are already working there. The same is already true of our womenfolk. If it had not been for my wife and my daughters we would not have had a tomato crop even last year.

In our area we must plan our program ahead as definitely as a production line is planned and this planning must be based on the knowledge that we will have dependable skilled and experienced labor 7 days a week. In our situation there is only one answer and I write to you in the hope that you may implement legislation to make this one answer possible.

I have a son in the Army. As a matter of plain horse sense I know that he would be worth many times as much to the Nation if he were here on this farm. He knows

every foot of this land for he was raised on it. He knows our machinery and our methods and would need no training. He was part of a productive team which was broken down when the draft took him away. He has not produced a single thing in the 17 months he has been in the Army. Here at home with the equipment available to his use he could this year produce enough food to feed the entire regiment of which he is now a part, for the entire year. Now, the only answer and the only solution which will meet the labor problem on this and thousands of farms like this, is to furlough experienced individual farmers back to the land from which they came.

The draft stripped our farms and the only way to correct the mistake is to back-track on the draft and put these individual experienced farmers who are now in the Army, back on the land from which they came and with which they are already familiar and acquainted.

It should not be difficult to implement legislation to accomplish this purpose.

I ask that you present this idea to the Senate or to such committee as in your judgment will give this solution the recognition that I know you will agree it should have. I send this to you because I do not know where else to send it to be assured that it will be effectively used. Regardless of what solutions may be presented to meet the needs of farmers in other sections of the country, this is the only real solution which will meet our need here in the Corn Belt and in the area devoted to the feeding of cattle and the raising of hogs. The Army took our experienced farmers and we will have to go to the Army to get them back. Lack of labor on our farms could lose this war a whole lot quicker than lack of soldiers in the Army. This is just plain sense. Something has to be done now or it will be too late for planting time is at hand.

I am sure that you will find Representative SPRINGER and many others in both the House and the Senate fully ready to cooperate. I thank God that we have a Congress again.

I would appreciate your personal reply.

Yours very truly,

GEO. O. RAFERT.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that the figures which the Senator has given would be much more impressive to me and to other Senators if he were to state in terms of percentage the number of persons who have been deferred for farm labor, as compared with the number of those who have been sent into the armed forces. Can the Senator obtain such figures?

Mr. TYDINGS. Between now and tomorrow I shall endeavor to obtain the figures showing the number of persons who have gone from the farms into the armed forces and the number of those who have been deferred.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to have the Senator obtain for us the figures showing the total number of those who have entered the armed services during the period covered by the figures which the Senator has given us, and also the figures showing the number of those who have been deferred. Then we shall know what percentage of the persons selected for service have been deferred to work on the farms, as compared with the total number of persons entering the military service. I think such information would be quite helpful.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it would be; and in order to make the picture complete, I think we should obtain information as to the number of persons who have been deferred to work in industry; because the point of the proposition is that a man working on a farm is working in a war industry, and I do not think we want to defer those in one group and not defer those in another.

My State is an industrial State, not a farm State; so I cannot be accused of having any bias in the matter.

Mr. WALSH. The point I desire to make is that we should have sufficient information to give us the entire picture. Information as to the total number deferred does not present such a picture. We want to have information as to the number deferred to go into industrial work, as compared to the number deferred to go into farm work.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, when General Hershey was before our committee he said that 804,000 agricultural workers had been inducted into the armed services.

Now, Mr. President, with the understanding, as previously stated, that I shall have the privilege of having the floor when the Senate meets tomorrow, I yield to the majority leader so that we may conclude the session this afternoon.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Harold E. Montamat, of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, also to be a consul; and

Several persons now Foreign Service officers of class 7 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, also to be consuls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years from August 27, 1938.

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

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, nominations under the War Manpower Commission are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

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

That completes the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTER AT LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is on the desk from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads a favorable report on the nomination of Mr. Frank F. Garside to be postmaster at Las Vegas, Nev. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be taken up and considered out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the able senior Senator from Nevada has spoken to me today about the matter, and has made out a very strong case for immediate consideration of the nomination. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank F. Garside to be postmaster at Las Vegas, Nev.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 10 (legislative day of March 9), 1943:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years from August 27, 1938.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

Charlotte E. Carr to be assistant to the Deputy Chairman at $6,500 per annum.

Wallace P. Studencki to be field supervisor at $5,600 per annum, Chicago regional office.

Stephen R. MacRae to be field supervisor at $5,600 per annum, Washington regional office.

Bernard L. Gorfinkle to be field supervisor at $5,600 per annum, Boston regional office.

Russell C. McCarthy to be area director at $5,600 per annum, Rochester area office.

Olaf K. Fjetland to be area director at $4,600 per annum, Saginaw area office.

Wilberforce D. Simmons to be senior manpower utilization consultant at $4,600 per annum, New York regional office.

Luke White to be senior attorney at $4,600 per annum in the office of the General Counsel.

Paul N. Devine to be area director at $4,600 per annum, New Bedford-Fall River area office.

James K. Johnson to be field supervisor at $5,600 per annum, Cleveland regional office.

Grafton L. Brown to be field supervisor at $4,600 per annum, Washington regional office.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Nannie L. Connevey, Bauxite.
S. Tillman Tipton, Biggers.
Harmon T. Griffin, Lake City.
Sue M. Brown, Luxora.
Maud Jackson, Sherrill.
Fred W. Knickerbocker, Sparkman.

NEVADA

Frank F. Garside, Las Vegas.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clarence H. Rosebro, Cleveland.
French W. Graham, Elkin.
William D. Coble, Guilford College.
Frederick R. Jones, Hayesville.
John V. Highfill, Mayodan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal God, Thou who at the creation looked on all Thy works as good, give us an expanding experience in the school of our Saviour. Breathe Thy valiant spirit into our quiet breasts that we may wait and not be weary. Pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of compassion, the very bond of peace and of all virtues.

In a world which nourishes in its bewildered brain that unquenched, deep-sunken sin of hate, quicken us with the spirit of the Christ, for spiritual communion, and it shall be well with us when the rain descends and the wind blows. As we behold and glorify Thee as infinite goodness, help us to live in the spirit of entire consecration. As servants of our great land, inspire us to spread the mantle of the crescent hope of promise near and far, lifting man to the high levels of our historic freedom. In the approaching days of humility, repentance, and meditation, do Thou arm us with the conviction that there is nothing better in all the universe than building a sacrificial civilization. It shall tower above the wrecks of time, declaring that its riches, honor, and glory cannot die. In the name of Him who spake as never man spake. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution condemning outrages inflicted upon civilians in the Nazi occupied countries and favoring punishment of persons responsible therefor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1749. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 133) entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BAILEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, and Mr. MCNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therewith a statement made on a bill pending before the Rivers and Harbors Committee by Mr. Roy Miller, of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Boston Globe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HENDRICKS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COOPERATION PLEDGED TO PRICE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an article written by Mr. Stettinius, appearing in the April issue of the American magazine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a memorial passed by the Indiana State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WHAT CONSTITUTES SEDITION?

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. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] from the Well of the House said:

Whatever else may be said of Premier Stalin, he is for Russia first, and he does not hesitate to say so. Whatever may be said of Prime Minister Churchill, he is for Great Britain first, and has said frankly that he "was not chosen Prime Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." I admire them for their frankness, for I can truthfully say that my first interest is the welfare of the United States of America.

Every true American should, in my opinion, agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that our first interest is the welfare of the United States of America.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me issue a warning to the gentleman from Mississippi. He had better watch his step because one William Power Maloney, recently promoted by the Attorney General to the office of chief of staff in charge of Federal prosecutions, last summer caused an indictment to be returned in which an organization known as America First was named as one of the agencies used by individuals who were indicted as seditionists.

I call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the danger he is in from this man Maloney, who has indicted people who have, in Maloney's opinion, voiced too loudly their faith in America, their belief that America should come first.

LEND-LEASE

Mr. JONES. 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. JONES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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