

upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges and benefits accruing to those serving in the armed forces, and on H. R. 1853, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 1, 1943, at 10 a. m., on S. 163 (H. R. 498) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship-construction reserve funds, and for other purposes.

Congressman GEORGE J. BATES, of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on Thursday, April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee, duties of which will compel him to be absent from Washington on Thursday, April 8, 1943. Accordingly the hearing scheduled for that date has been changed to Thursday, April 15, 1943, at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

248. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1944, involving an increase of \$345,000, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 131); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

249. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to amend the act known as the Insecticide Act of 1910 (36 Stat. 331), approved April 26, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

250. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to aid in obtaining for Indians the services of doctors and dentists during the present war; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

251. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy," approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2194) granting a pension to Evangeline R. Butler, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2195 (by request). A bill to amend section 8 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2196. A bill to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fishing or related industries and now owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2197. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2198. 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; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2199. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER:

H. R. 2200. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. Res. 166. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the conditions of the American Indian in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. Res. 167. Resolution authorizing rationing privileges to men and women in the armed services on leave; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. Res. 168. Resolution recognition of honorably discharged servicemen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. Res. 169. Resolution providing for the expenses of the select committee authorized by House Resolution 166; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

271. By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Senate joint memorial of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico to the President and the Congress of the United States of America, pertaining to the continued operation of this State's unemployment compensation program, under State law and administration, as opposed to nationalization of the system under Federal law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

272. By Mr. CARTER: Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 of the California Legislature, petitioning the Honorable Claude E. Wickard to alleviate the food shortage resulting from increased population in the State; to the Committee on Agriculture.

273. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 22, urging amendments to the Federal Social Security Act in respect to earnings and other income of recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

274. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 14, relative to small business enterprises; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

275. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of Elk-W. Scott Farm Bureau members of Buena Vista County, Iowa, urging that standard time be restored; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

276. By Mr. LECOMPT: Petition of representatives of American youth, passed by

the Council of the Osceola Christian Youth Fellowship, emphatically opposing the resolution passed by the Iowa Legislature, as printed in the Des Moines Register of March 7, which urges discrimination against American-born citizens of Japanese ancestry to the extent that none should be allowed to attend colleges, even under Government surveillance, and that those already doing so should be returned to concentration centers; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

277. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the Hancock County Federal Savings and Loan Association of Chester, Chester, W. Va., urging the discontinuance of the Government's deed of trust and mortgage loan business as early as practicable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

278. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Wisconsin Legislature Assembly, Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

279. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the clerk, House of Representatives of the Arkansas State Legislature, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to income tax of those in the armed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

280. By Mr. KING: Petition requesting the creating of a military and naval academy on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 9, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father God, in the abundance of Thy loving kindness we come unto Thy presence. We bless Thee for the inspired souls of all the ages who saw afar the shining city of God and by faith faced peril, toil, and pain to follow the gleam. We rejoice with joy unspeakable that today the hope of these lonely hearts is becoming the confident faith of millions as the salvation of the exploited and of the enslaved draweth near.

Save us from garnishing the tombs of yesterday's prophets and yet standing today with those who stone their successors. Suffer us not by thoughtless condemnation or selfish opposition to weaken the arm and chill the spirit of those who strive for the redemption of mankind. As citizens of this land of the free and as servants of the commonwealth make us solemnly conscious that—

"We are watchers of a beacon whose light must never die,
We are guardians of an altar that shows Thee ever nigh,
We are children of Thy freemen who sleep beneath the sod:
For the might of Thy arm, we bless Thee, our God—Our fathers' God."
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 12, 1943,

was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 786) to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 303) to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 133) to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal year, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal year, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 12, and 19 to the bill and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 131. An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 324. An act to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof;

H. R. 1366. An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 1671. An act to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 1780. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1936. An act to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1940. An act prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings;

H. R. 2023. An act to 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; and

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

SUPPORT AT HOME OF MEN AT THE FRONT—EXPUNGING OF LETTER FROM RECORD

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, some weeks ago Mr. Forrestal, the Under Secretary of the Navy, gave me a letter which he thought was authentic, and on January 21, last, I put it in the daily RECORD, where it appears on page 278. Subsequent investigations show that the letter was not authentic. Mr. Forrestal has written me concerning this matter. I ask that Mr. Forrestal's letter may be published in the RECORD at this point, and that the unauthentic letter may be expunged from the permanent RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter referred to will be expunged from the permanent RECORD, and the letter from Mr. Forrestal will be published in the RECORD.

Mr. Forrestal's letter is as follows:

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, March 9, 1943.
The Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: My attention has been directed to an article appearing in the Sunday, March 7, edition of PM with respect to a letter presumably written by a United States marine at Guadalcanal to a former co-worker of his at Brewster Aeronautical Corporation.

The letter in question came to my attention when it appeared in the January 1 issue of the Brewster Builder, a publication of Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, and, at that time, I assumed the letter to be authentic and displayed a copy to you. Sufficient doubt has now been cast on the authenticity of the letter to make further use thereof unwarranted.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

DOCTORS AND DENTISTS FOR SERVICE TO INDIANS DURING THE WAR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to aid in obtaining for Indians the services of doctors and dentists during the present war (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR GRAZING PURPOSES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADJUSTMENT OF INDIAN DEBTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust debts of individual Indians, associations of Indians, or Indian tribes, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

CONSERVATION OF ASSETS OF THE GOVERNMENT DERIVED FROM RELIEF EXPENDITURES IN PUERTO RICO—REHABILITATION, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, according to law, the annual report of the Governor of Puerto Rico for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF INSECTICIDE ACT

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act known as the Insecticide Act of 1910 (36 Stat. 331), approved April 26, 1910 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations under sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PAYEE UNDER CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL ACTS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, as to the names and addresses of payees who received \$1,000 or more and showing the amount of payment to each for participation in the 1941 programs administered under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1938, as amended; also a supplemental list of payees who received \$1,000 or more under such programs for 1940; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF DEFENSE WORKERS

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the Education and Training of Defense Workers, covering the period beginning October 1, 1942, and ended December 31, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES (S. Doc. No. 21)

A letter from the president of the National Academy of Sciences, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that academy for the year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Library.

REPORT OF AMERICAN NATIONAL THEATER AND ACADEMY

A letter from the second vice president of the American National Theater and Academy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the American National Theater and Academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Farmers at its annual meeting at St. Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the total suspension of Agricultural Adjustment Agency activities for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 65

"Resolution relating to the growing of guayule for rubber production

"Whereas Congress has authorized the Emergency Rubber Project of the United States Forest Service to secure 500,000 acres of land for the growing of guayule for the production of rubber; and

"Whereas the guayule plant is still in an experimental stage insofar as the production of rubber is concerned and is adapted to and will grow upon arid or nonirrigable land; and

"Whereas the emergency-rubber project of the United States Forest Service, pursuant to the authority vested in it, has secured thousands of acres of the best irrigable lands, adapted to the cultivation of necessary food products, and is now endeavoring to secure 7,500 acres of irrigable vegetable lands in Santa Barbara County, and in excess of 15,000 acres in the county of Kern and is threatening to condemn these lands in event the owners refuse to lease them for the guayule project; and

"Whereas the entire country is faced with an acute food shortage, and Santa Barbara County is furnishing an immense amount of vegetables to various military encampments and a great portion of the vegetables to the Los Angeles market; and

"Whereas 1 acre of irrigable land planted to guayule will produce only 800 pounds of rubber, if any, within 3 years, and the same acre if planted to vegetables under the multiple-crop system will produce in the same period of time 240,000 pounds of essential foodstuffs; and

"Whereas the farmers throughout California have the machinery and necessary equipment for the production of essential foodstuffs, which will be rendered valueless for the production of food, if irrigable land is taken for the development of the guayule plant; and

"Whereas there are many acres of irrigable land within the boundaries of the State, particularly in Imperial and San Bernardino Counties, suitable for the production of guayule and not now used for the production of vegetables and essential foodstuffs and cotton, which could be utilized by the Guayule Emergency Rubber Project without endangering the food supply: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and William Jeffers, United States Rubber Administrator, be memorialized to take these factors into consideration and to restrict the development of guayule-rubber projects to such

areas as will not interfere with the production of essential foodstuffs; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to William Jeffers, United States Rubber Administrator, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from California.

"Very truly yours,

"JOSEPH A. BECK,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of an act incorporating the principles of the Townsend national recovery plan substantially as set forth in a bill entitled 'H. R. 1649' introduced in the House of Representatives in the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States on February 2, 1943, by Representative PAT CANNON of Florida providing substantially as follows: To provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled in the Seventy-eighth session:

"Whereas with full recognition that as first in importance to America, is the winning of the war, we also recognize that second in importance is the winning of a lasting and satisfactory peace; and

"Whereas after the soldier boys in all the branches of the armed forces have won the military victory, we who have stayed at home, should not have it said of us that we have made a mess of the home front by neglecting to provide full employment and the means for them to make a living when they come home; and

"Whereas when the war is over America will have, through her marvelous machines, more production capacity, with less manpower than ever before known in history; and

"Whereas with appropriate action taken we will be able to produce enough for all, assuming that our industrial and agricultural plants remain intact; and

"Whereas this bill, H. R. 1649, provides for buying power in a continuous stream round and round in the market by its forced spending clause and the money will never be lost; and

"Whereas benefits are provided for those permanently disabled either through accident or illness which will care for the disabled soldier boys as well as all other citizens who are disabled and also widows with children, thus making them an asset to the community rather than a liability since they will help to sustain a constant and dependable market; and

"Whereas the old folks and those incapacitated for work and widows with small children to support, have not been able to participate in the prosperity brought about by the war effort and are now and will be in a worse financial condition after the war than before; and

"Whereas it is the purpose of this bill, H. R. 1649 first, to provide voluntary retirement for some 5,000,000 persons over 60 years of age, and provide jobs for several million persons under 60 years of age; second, to decrease if not eliminate expenditures for relief; third, to stimulate trade and industry by increasing the purchasing power of persons of advanced age, those incapacitated and widows having the care of children, producing employment for younger people, thus keeping the wheels of industry going: Now, therefore, it be

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America for the consideration at this Seventy-eighth session of Congress of said Townsend national recovery plan bill H. R. 1649 into law so it will be in operation when the war is over to provide full employment in post-war times and to care for the crippled and maimed soldier boys and the aged citizens. The said plan being deemed just and equitable to all persons of the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of South Dakota transmit a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of South Dakota, and that they and each of them be requested to use all honorable means within their power to bring about the enactment of said H. R. 1649 into law at the earliest possible moment."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 38

"Whereas the persecution and attempted extermination by Nazi Germany of the Jews in occupied Europe have outraged the conscience of the civilized world and have manifested the necessity of continued maintenance and development of a Jewish national homeland; and

"Whereas pursuant to the treaties of peace terminating the first World War, a mandate was issued, approved by 52 nations including the United States, to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine; and

"Whereas this policy was concurred in by a joint resolution unanimously adopted by both Houses of the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, and approved by the President on September 21, 1922: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That we of the State of New York express our most profound sympathy toward the victims of Nazi religious persecution and racial hatred; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That we urge the fullest cooperation of the United Nations in punishing those responsible for this horrible crime against humanity and in alleviating suffering through an international rescue agency; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That we favor the continued development of a Jewish national home in Palestine, for the absorption of as many Jews as may be required by the urgent needs of the Jewish people, as an integral part of the new democratic world order in accordance with the principles for which the United Nations are now fighting; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President and to the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Joint Resolution 16-A

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to change war time back to regular standard time

"Whereas food is the one weapon of most fundamental and vital importance in the present war; and

"Whereas those in the best position to know predict an imminent critical food shortage in this country and throughout the world, so that famine and pestilence among large populations as well as suffering in our own land can be prevented only by a large increase in food production in the season now commencing; and

"Whereas dairy products hold a high rank among the foods of greatest value to our civil population, and especially our armed forces; and

"Whereas Wisconsin farmers, who are among the Nation's leaders in production of dairy products, are anxious to continue the increase of that production achieved in 1942; and

"Whereas such increased production now is particularly difficult by reason of shortages of farm machinery and particularly of manpower; and

"Whereas the substitution of war time for standard time hampers not only increase but even maintenance of production by Wisconsin dairy farmers by lengthening their working day, already too long for efficiency of farm workers, while at the same time shortening the time available for productive farm tasks, such as haying, harvesting, threshing, and shredding; and

"Whereas the change in time has very little effect on factories engaged in defense production and none on those operating 24 hours a day, and many offices can change their working hours regardless of standard time, and consequently the change in time has resulted in very little, if any, saving in electricity for lighting: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to restore standard time as it existed immediately before enactment of Public Law 403, approved January 20, 1942, and urges upon the Wisconsin Members of Congress to do all in their power to secure the enactment of legislation needed to bring back the regular standard time: be it further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this joint resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Director of Economic Stabilization, to the Director of the Manpower Commission, and to both Houses of Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial declaring the policy of the State of Idaho to maintain jurisdiction and control over the use of the waters within the State; to protect and preserve rights to the use of water established under the laws of this State or the United States; to promote harmonious relations between the State of Idaho, the United States, and other States; and authorizing the Governor to direct the State reclamation engineer to take such action as may be necessary in carrying out these policies

"Whereas the State of Idaho has approximately 53,000,000 acres of land, of which approximately 21,000,000 acres are classified as agricultural land, a large portion of which is situated in the southern portion of the State; and

"Whereas the value of the lands in the southern portion of Idaho is wholly dependent upon irrigation for the production of valuable agricultural crops; and

"Whereas approximately 2,300,000 acres of these lands are now under irrigation, and ultimately by developing storage reservoirs and conserving the available water supply, approximately 2,000,000 acres additional may be irrigated in southern Idaho; and

"Whereas the topography of this State is such that many of our streams are interstate in nature, which fact has heretofore given rise to problems of administration regarding such streams, involving other States and the Federal Government, and other problems of administration will doubtless arise with the further agricultural development of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho now in session, That it is the declared policy of this State to maintain its jurisdiction over, and control of, the use of waters in this State for all beneficial purposes, as provided in the Constitution of Idaho and the admission bill by Congress admitting Idaho into the Union of States; also to protect and preserve rights to the use of water established under the laws of this State or of the United States; to protect and preserve such rights against threatened uses outside of the State to the detriment of our citizens within the State; to promote harmonious relations between the State of Idaho, the United States, and other States with respect to the beneficial use of such waters and to encourage compacts between Idaho and other States in regard to interstate streams; be it further

"Resolved, That in furtherance of these policies the Governor is authorized to direct the State reclamation engineer to take such action and perform such duties as may be necessary in carrying these policies into effect; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each presiding officer of all State legislative bodies now in session and to each member of the Idaho delegation in Congress."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"To the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate from Alaska:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas vast areas of Alaska, patented under the mining and land laws, are held for speculative purposes or lie idle for other reasons, and their present ownership is in many cases unascertainable because such property is not taxed; and

"Whereas this condition retards the development and settlement of Alaska, delays and impedes the construction of roads and trails, and other projects, as well as explorations for strategic minerals, and can be remedied only by taxation and foreclosure; and

"Whereas a general property tax cannot be imposed upon nonproducing, patented mining claims, nor a nominal tax upon other patented lands outside of incorporated towns because of the requirement of the Organic Act that all assessments shall be according to actual value, and such taxation is necessary to free such lands from the hands of speculators and others,

"Now, therefore, we, your memorialists, do respectfully pray that section 9 of the

organic act be amended so as to read as follows:

"Provided, That all authorized indebtedness shall be paid in the order of its creation; all taxes shall be uniform upon the same class of subjects and shall be levied and collected under general laws, and the assessments shall be according to the actual value thereof, except that nonproducing, patented mining claims, which are also unimproved, may be valued at the price paid the United States therefor, or at a flat rate fixed by the legislature, but if the surface ground is used for other than mining purposes, and has a separate and independent value for such other purposes, or if there are improvements or machinery or other property thereon of such a character as to be deemed a part of the realty, then the same shall be taxed according to actual value.

"Provided further, That a nominal tax not exceeding \$1 per annum for each trade and manufacturing site, nor 1 cent per acre or fraction thereof per annum for all other nonmineral land outside of incorporated towns, may be levied, in the discretion of the legislature."

"And your memorialists will ever pray."

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 23

"Whereas members of the armed forces of the United States are subject to payment of income tax upon their service pay; and

"Whereas the sums paid them are small compared to the risk they carry while defending our country against its enemies, and

"Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas has enacted legislation at the present session relieving persons, male and female, from paying State income tax on that portion of their income received as service pay from the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas (the senate concurring therein), That we do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to adopt such legislation as will relieve all members of the armed forces from payment of income tax upon the pay received by them from the United States for their services as members of such armed services, together with any allowances granted them by the Government in connection with their services.

"Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of this house and the secretary of the senate, to the United States Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress, and copies be forwarded to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

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

By Mr. McCARRAN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Whereas the war economy of the United States has made many metals, heretofore of little value, of great and vital importance in the wartime activities of the Nation; and

"Whereas no State in the Union holds such potential wealth of the vital and strategic metals of copper, lead, tungsten, zinc, as does the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas many hundreds of prospectors, miners, and mine operators throughout Nevada have spent many years of labor and have expended an unknown amount of money in prospecting, locating, testing, developing, and mapping these deposits of strategic and rare metals upon which the Nation's war industry so much depends; and

"Whereas in times of peace the commercial demand for these metals was not sufficient to make the operation and development of these properties economically sound and by reason thereof such properties, though discovered, and developed in an exploratory way, have not been opened to the point of efficient and sustained production; and

"Whereas the so-called ceiling prices established by Presidential order are greatly in excess of peacetime levels, such ceiling prices, by reason of the vastly increased cost of labor, material, and mining supplies, are yet much too low to encourage the investment of capital and labor into immediate large scale development and production of countless properties situate throughout Nevada; and

"Whereas in the present war effort the cost, in money, of needed material and supplies has long since ceased to be considered as a valid reason for not encouraging wartime industry, and millions upon millions of dollars have been poured into favored industries upon the theory that the war needs of the Nation cannot be measured in dollars and cents with which principal we are in accord; and

"Whereas a proper increase in the ceiling prices of strategic metals would immediately encourage men, industry, and capital to develop these metals in numerous localities throughout the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas we sincerely believe that the metal output of the State of Nevada in strategic metals alone, could be doubled within the year if the mining thereof was accorded the same favored consideration now being received by certain other industries, all of which would remove many industrial bottlenecks impairing and endangering the war effort of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the President and Congress of the United States take immediate steps to fix ceiling prices on all strategic metals, not an increase of price based on peacetime standards, but upon the standard that a nation at war must have, whatever be the cost, those metals necessary to the ever-increasing production of the implements of war; and be it further

"Resolved, That if such prices are so fixed to the end that the men of Nevada may open and operate her many deposits of strategic and rare metals, not at a profit—but at least without loss to themselves—then we pledge the faith of the State of Nevada that in every desert and mountain outpost, men and machines will immediately begin to pour these now priceless metals into the mills and smelters and furnaces of the Nation's industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada forward duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President, as Presiding Officer of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to our Representatives in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 12

"Whereas the movement of strategic materials to war industries is being greatly impeded by the lack of transportation facilities; and

"Whereas Congress has appropriated in excess of \$10,000,000 for the building of raw materials access roads; and

"Whereas the many bureaus through which the approval of access roads has to pass have

become so involved with red tape as to cause great delay in getting the money from the Federal Government to the sponsor actually building the access roads in the field: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the Congress be memorialized to demand that the bureaus having to do with access roads to strategic mines shorten their procedure for approval, eliminate the red tape, and help move the strategic ores to places of use; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, duly certified, be forwarded to our Representatives in the Congress of the United States for proper presentation."

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 16

"Whereas the Farm Credit Administration, and its various subsidiaries, such as the Production Credit Corporation, the Production Credit Association, the Farm Security Administration, and the Regional Agriculture Credit Corporation, were all organized and activated to supplement the facilities of the private lending institutions in the financing of agricultural operations; and such agencies and organizations have ably performed such duties as were assigned to them and accomplished their respective objectives; and

"Whereas, in time of economic stress, direct relief to agriculture on the part of the Government undoubtedly involves loans of the public funds; and

"Whereas the abnormal war conditions now existent in this country have imposed upon the farmers demands for greater production than were ever made before, and in meeting such demands additional credit will undoubtedly be needed; and

"Whereas, there are, in the State of Colorado, 140 banks situated, equipped, and with resources in excess of \$300,000,000, to meet any credit demands which may thus be made by virtue of increased agriculture production; and

"Whereas, the banks of the State of Colorado have clearly demonstrated their energetic and whole-hearted support of the war effort by successfully promoting the "food for freedom" program in their respective communities, and by assisting the Treasury Department in raising the enormous sums of money necessary to finance the war effort; and

"Whereas the banking system of the United States has proven its rightful place in a democratic Nation, and is now proving its place in the war effort; and

"Whereas the various Government agencies established under the Farm Credit Administration have long since abandoned their practice of supplementing the facilities and credit of private financial institutions, and have now embarked upon a course of subsidized farm credit in destructive competition with the banks of this country; and

"Whereas the control of agricultural credit should not be subject to the play of political forces, nor should it be subsidized with public money; and

"Whereas the banks of the State of Colorado have invested more than \$225,000,000 in Government securities, which funds are now proposed to be used in competition with them in that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation has been revived, and granted \$225,000,000 to carry out its work: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly (the house of representatives concurring herein), That this assembly go on record as recognizing the right of farmers to establish, operate, and maintain cooperative enterprises, but as vig-

orously opposing the subsidization of agricultural credit by the various agencies of the Farm Credit Administration; and be it further

"Resolved, That this assembly go on record as favoring the restriction of the activities of the Farm Credit Administration to those of serving agricultural credit needs which for reasons of safety, advisability, or legal restriction cannot be adequately served by private lending agencies; and that the future activities of the Farm Credit Administration be restricted to these supplementary aids to agriculture for which it was originally created, and as vigorously opposing the further extension of socialized credit; and be it further

"Resolved, That this assembly go on record as strenuously objecting to the present attack on private lending institutions and recommending the recall of the directive of the Secretary of Agriculture reactivating the Regional Agriculture Credit Corporation, and denying the use of the public funds to the same; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States; to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States; to all members of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives; to the members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank; to the Comptroller of the Currency; to the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and to the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"Whereas the narrow-gage lines of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co. serve approximately 85,000 inhabitants of southwestern Colorado as their only railroad outlet from such district;

"Whereas said narrow-gage lines of railroad are vitally necessary for the transportation of agricultural crops and livestock, and strategic war metals, such as zinc, lead, copper, and vanadium;

"Whereas other forms of transportation are inadequate to supplant said narrow-gage lines;

"Whereas the United States Government has heretofore requisitioned and taken 7 of the largest and newest type of narrow-gage locomotives from said railroad lines, which then left only 41 narrow-gage engines in the possession of said the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co.;

"Whereas the United States Government through its Army is now endeavoring to requisition three more of the largest and newest type of the narrow-gage locomotives used in said lines of railroad; and

"Whereas if said three locomotives now under consideration by the Army of the United States Government are taken from said narrow-gage system the Denver & Rio Grande Western will be unable adequately to transport such vital war necessities as crops, livestock, and strategic metals: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the house of representatives concurring herein), That protest is made hereby to any present, future, and further requisitioning of narrow-gage locomotives and other railroad equipment in the State of Colorado which would have an adverse effect upon the transportation facilities of this State, with a resultant unfavorable deterrent upon this State's war effort; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to Franklin D. Roosevelt, Presi-

dent of the United States of America, to the Office of Defense Transportation, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado so as to urge their vigorous support in accomplishing the purpose of this memorial."

MEMORIAL OF THE NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask consent to present and ask to have appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD a joint memorial by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, to the President and the Congress of the United States of America, pertaining to the continued operation of the State's unemployment compensation program, under State law and administration, as opposed to nationalization of the system under Federal law.

There being no objection, the memorial was received, referred to the Committee on Finance and, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 4

Joint memorial of the State of New Mexico and the sixteenth legislature thereof to the President and the Congress of the United States of America, pertaining to the continued operation of this State's unemployment compensation program, under State law and administration, as opposed to nationalization of the system under Federal law

Whereas the State of New Mexico, through its legislature and appointed officials, has established and maintained under its laws since December 1936, a system of unemployment compensation by which cash benefits have been paid to its unemployed wage earners from a fund made up of contributions by New Mexico employers, which system has been characterized by the just and prompt payment of benefits and the exaction of the minimum sustaining contribution from employers; and

Whereas, although the President and the Congress of the United States, in 1935, after studies by the President's own committee on economic security, not only recommended but urged the adoption of such programs by the several States as the best instruments for the administration of such a local function, there nevertheless has now developed a campaign in certain other quarters hostile to State and local government, to centralize the entire program of unemployment compensation, including the appropriation of the present State funds, into a national system administered from the Nation's Capital under Federal laws; and

Whereas the present system of unemployment compensation as a State program has permitted administration by local officials in close personal touch with the employers and wage earners affected, free from the evils of rigid Nation-wide uniformity in disregard of local needs and conditions, and the evils of delay and confusion in the payment of benefits whose promptness and fairness are vital, which evils might characterize the administration of a centralized program under Federal laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House and the Senate of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico join in making known their concern that the principle of the division of powers inherent in our dual system of government, under which the States through their people have happily retained the management of their local affairs and concerns, is imperiled; be it further,

Resolved, That the President and the Congress of the United States of America be and they are petitioned and memorialized to recognize,

as they did in 1935, the proposition that the payment of unemployment compensation to wage earners in New Mexico out of funds contributed by its employers is a local concern and a function most economically, efficiently, and fairly administered by local officials under State laws; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution, under the great seal of the State of New Mexico, in order that the same may be appropriately brought to the attention of the President and the Congress of the United States, be forwarded to the Honorable CARL A. HATCH and the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, Senators from the State of New Mexico, and to the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON and the Honorable ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, Members of the House of Representatives from the State of New Mexico.

RESOLUTIONS OF TOWN OF RANDOLPH, VT.—FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the town of Randolph, Vt., at its annual town meeting held on March 2. Similar resolutions relating to food production were adopted at their respective annual meetings by 36 other Vermont towns, as follows: Andover, Benson, Bethel, Brandon, Bridgewater, Calais, Cambridge, Canaan, Cavendish, Chester, Concord, Dummerston, Enosburg, Guildhall, Hartland, Hyde Park, Ira, Middlebury, Morristown, Norwich, Pittsford, Plymouth, Pomfret, Reading, Richford, Rupert, Springfield, Stockbridge, Stowe, Vernon, Waterbury, Weston, West Windsor, Weybridge, Williamstown, and Woodstock.

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

Whereas Vermonters are called upon to break all previous farm-production records in 1943 to provide much needed wartime food supplies for our armed forces, our allies, and our civilian population; and

Whereas Vermont farmers are faced with serious wartime obstacles including the scarcity of farm labor, farm machinery, livestock feeds, fertilizers, and other production factors, together with uncertainty as to whether farm returns will keep pace with rising production costs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the citizens of the town of Randolph pledge their unstinting efforts to further the production of food for freedom during 1943.

Resolved, That the citizens of the town of Randolph pledge their willingness to do everything possible to help local farmers produce and harvest food.

Resolved, That the citizens of the town of Randolph hereby petition the Federal Government to take all essential steps to the end that farmers may be assured of sufficient labor, machinery, and equipment, livestock feeds, fertilizers, gasoline, and other production factors, together with fair returns for the work, investments, and risks involved in increasing production.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, United States Secretary of Agriculture and to the Members of Vermont's delegation in the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF TOWN OF TOWNSHEND, VT.—WINNING OF VICTORY AND PEACE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I also present for appropriate reference and ask

unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a different resolution adopted by the town of Townshend, Vt., at its meeting, which was likewise held on March 2. Similar resolutions relating to the winning of the victory and to the peace that will follow were adopted at their meetings by six other Vermont towns, as follows: Benson, Middlesex, Richford, Sherburne, Stowe, Waterbury.

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

Whereas the Axis governments in their folly and madness and crime conceive that they are wise enough and strong enough to destroy and annihilate other nations and to rule the world;

Resolved, That the town of Townshend pledges to help win, at whatever personal cost, the victory which will erase forever from the minds of all men ideas of "master races" and of people who have the destiny and the power to dominate and enslave other peoples.

Resolved, That the town of Townshend pledges to help work for a peace in which the United States recognizes to the full and fulfills her responsibilities in a world of free peoples; and

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to Members of Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of the Committee on Claims were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 257. A bill for the relief of Christine Lund; with an amendment (Rept. No. 115);

S. 839. A bill for the relief of Etta Houser Freeman; with amendment (Rept. No. 116); and

S. 854. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex., without amendment (Rept. No. 117).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 877. A bill to reduce the rate of interest on loans secured by United States Government Life Insurance to 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 878. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 879. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy," approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate bill 880, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 881. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938; and

S. 882. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to prescribe the method of capital punishment in the District of Columbia," approved January 30, 1925 (43 Stat. 798, ch.

115, Public Law 348, 68th Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia. (Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 883, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 884. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. MALONEY (on behalf of the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of American Small Business Enterprises) introduced Senate bill 885, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK) introduced Senate bill 886, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 42 Joint resolution to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, approved May 7, 1942; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution establishing a Division for the Physically Handicapped in the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fishing or related industries and now owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

JUNIOR VOLUNTEER ARMY OF AMERICAN YOUTH

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "An act to establish a junior army of the United States for the purpose of organizing the youth of the Nation on a volunteer basis, in order that they may contribute more effectively to the war effort, and for other purposes." The main object of the bill is to provide 3,100,000 seasonal farm workers at harvest time. I request that a statement which I have prepared in connection with the bill be printed in the RECORD and also that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 880) to establish a junior army of the United States for the purpose of organizing the youth of the Nation on a voluntary basis in order that they may contribute more effectively to the war effort, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture (herein referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to establish, under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, an organization to be known as the Junior Army of the United States and to consist of boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 18 years who volunteer for service in the junior army. The purpose of the junior army shall be to provide an effective method through which the services of such boys and girls may be made available and utilized, on a purely voluntary basis, for aid in the production, harvesting, and distribution of agricultural commodities and in the

performance of other useful work or activities in which they are qualified to render services which will contribute to the effective prosecution of the war.

Sec. 2. (a) Boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 18 years who meet such requirements of eligibility as may be established by the Secretary may, with the written consent of their parents or guardians, be enlisted in the junior army. Enlistments shall be for a period of 3 months and may be renewed. Members of the junior army shall be known as junior soldiers, and shall be divided into grades corresponding to grades in the Army of the United States from colonel to private. Assignment to such grades shall be in accordance with, and the qualifications for and duties of the several grades shall be determined under, regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) The Secretary shall provide suitable caps or hats and buttons or pins or other insignia of appropriate design for junior soldiers, for the purpose of indicating their membership and their rank or grade in the junior army.

(c) Upon the completion of any period of satisfactory service of 3 months or more in the junior army, any junior soldier shall be entitled to a certificate of honorable discharge and shall be entitled to retain the cap or hat and insignia issued to him. Any junior soldier may withdraw from the junior army at any time, but no certificate of honorable discharge shall be issued upon withdrawal prior to the completion of 3 months of service unless such withdrawal is determined to be for good cause.

Sec. 3. (a) The activities of the junior army shall, so far as practicable, be conducted in a manner which will not interfere with the education or attendance at school or normal home life of junior soldiers; and no junior soldier shall be assigned to any service which necessitates his absence from school or from his place of residence, unless he volunteers for such service with the consent of his parent or guardian.

(b) Junior soldiers shall not be paid compensation by the United States. In cases where they perform services for other persons, organizations, or agencies, the terms and conditions upon which such services are performed, and the compensation to be paid therefor, shall be determined and fixed in accordance with regulations of the Secretary.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary—

(a) May enter into agreements with public and private agencies and, pursuant to such agreements, may utilize the facilities and services of such agencies, may reimburse them on a cost basis for the use of such facilities and services, and may delegate to them the performance of functions under this act.

(b) May accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services.

(c) May utilize such personnel and facilities of the Department of Agriculture, employ such additional personnel, and make such expenditures as may be necessary.

(d) Shall make such rules and regulations as are necessary for the establishment and operation of the Junior Army in order to accomplish the purposes of this act, including rules and regulations relating to the establishment, composition, organization, and operation of units thereof.

Sec. 5. The heads of the several departments and agencies of the Government are authorized, upon request of the Secretary, to detail civilian or military personnel of their respective departments or agencies to assist the Secretary in the administration of this act and in the establishment and supervision of the Junior Army, and such detail shall be considered part of the official duties of such personnel.

Sec. 6. The Junior Army shall not be considered, for the purposes of any other law, to be a part of the military or naval forces of the United States.

Sec. 7. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Sec. 8. The provisions of this act shall cease to be in effect at the end of 6 months after the termination of the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or at such earlier time as the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate.

Sec. 9. This act may be cited as the "Junior Army Act."

The statement presented by Mr. TYDINGS in connection with the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are told by the Secretary of Agriculture that 3,100,000 extra farm workers will be needed to harvest the crops at harvesttime. It is plain to everybody that these 3,100,000 persons needed to save the food supply which the farmers are now planting cannot be found in the accustomed channels and places. I have, therefore, introduced a bill to meet this great need at harvesttime by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to form a junior army of persons between 14 and 18 years of age on a purely voluntary basis.

If such a force is now organized, when the harvesttime comes there will be no need for the crops to be lost in the field. Available extra labor through this medium can be ready in each community. We will not have crops rotting in the field for lack of harvesting personnel as we have had heretofore. It is important that this movement get under way at once. I shall ask the committee considering the bill to report it to the Senate so that it may become law at the earliest opportunity.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WILEY. I ask consent to introduce a bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business, and I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and that in connection therewith there may be printed a statement I had expected to deliver on the floor of the Senate today.

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

The bill (S. 883) providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby finds that (1) the existence of American small business as an integral part of the American economic system is essential for the preservation of the system of free competitive enterprise in the Nation, (2) that the continued existence of American small business as a potent factor in the American economy is now challenged and threatened with extinction, and (3) that destruction of American small business burdens and obstructs the free flow of goods in commerce and interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of goods in commerce.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act, through the exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce between the several States and to create executive offices, to preserve American small business

as an integral and essential part of the American economic system, and to preserve the system of free private competitive enterprise in the Nation.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Sec. 2. There shall be in the Department of Commerce an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business. It shall be the province and duty of said Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business to foster, promote, and develop the conduct of commerce, manufacturing, transportation, distribution, and other business facilities and activities in the United States by small business with the end in view of the preservation of small business as an integral component part of the American system of free private competitive enterprise of the Nation. He shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall be charged with the supervision and coordination of governmental activities dealing with the small business and small-business problems, and such other duties as shall be assigned to him by the Secretary of Commerce and as may be required by law. There shall be detailed to his office such number of employees of the Department of Commerce as may be authorized by the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce shall make a report to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each 6 months of the operation of the office of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business including such other information and such comments and recommendations with respect to American small business and small-business problems as he may deem appropriate.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY in connection with the bill is as follows:

The last census taken of business concerns indicates there were over 3,100,000 in this country. Of course, since that time, because of the impact of the war, large numbers have fallen by the wayside. In 1939 small business produced 70 percent of all manufactured goods and employed about 60 percent of the wage earners in this country. These small business concerns were owned by about 6,500,000 men and women.

Approximately only 40 percent of the small business manufacturers can possibly be harnessed into war production. The remaining 60 percent must be kept alive by civilian production. It is plain that if the manufacturer cannot produce, then the wholesaler, the jobber, and finally the retailer will go out of business for lack of merchandise to sell, and that is what is happening throughout the country. It has been said that last year there were fatalities of about 25 percent.

This resolution I have introduced has something more in mind than simply protecting a group. Small business in this war has been the neglected and the forgotten man—the farmer, the misunderstood and maligned man. If we include many farmers who should be classified as small businessmen, with this group of 3,100,000, then we will probably have a group of 4,500,000. These two segments of our society, small business and the farmers, constitute the backbone of America. We must maintain their economic health. Why? Because if we permit a great percentage of this segment to become paralyzed—remember it affects probably 10,000,000 adults—we will seriously damage the morale of this country.

The war has brought out this fact, that small business must have a voice in the councils of the Nation. Therefore we are suggesting by this resolution that an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business be constituted.

This Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business could take hold of this problem right now and do a great job now and in the post-war period in rehabilitating and integrating small business with the life of the Nation. He should have been appointed years ago, but this is like many other things that should have been attended to but haven't.

But let us delay no longer. Small business, with its millions of the finest Americans, must have a pilot in Washington, one who knows the channels and who will look after its interests.

The Assistant Secretary of Commerce in the post-war period can see to it that there is the right kind of cooperation between small business, big business, the farmer, and labor. Without this cooperation among these four segments of our society, the post-war period will bring only tragedy in the national and international economic field.

We must demonstrate the "four freedoms" at home before we can effectively become a "world preacher" of the "four freedoms." I refer especially to "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear." The small businessmen by the tens of thousands have become acquainted with these two "wants."

DEFERMENT ON OCCUPATIONAL GROUNDS OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill which I desire to describe briefly. I am introducing the bill on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and myself.

The bill relates to selective-service deferment on occupational grounds of persons employed by the Federal Government. It reaffirms the provisions of the Executive order issued by the President with regard to employees of executive departments. It extends a similar policy to employees of the legislative and judicial departments, and provides that the names of all persons deferred because they work for the Federal Government shall be sent to Congress.

In connection with my statement I ask that section 5 (c) (2) and section 5 (e) of the Selective Service Act be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, because a section of the bill I introduce relates to them.

There being no objection, the sections of the law were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 5 (c) (2):

The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any person holding an office (other than an office described in paragraph (1) of this subsection) under the United States or any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, whose continued service in such office is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the public health, safety, or interest.

Section 5 (e):

The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment

from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States (1) of those men in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of those men found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. 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. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say that I am very much pleased to join with the Senator from Massachusetts in endorsing the bill, and I hope that the committee will be able to act on it quickly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 836) relating to the selective-service deferment on occupational grounds of persons employed by the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CIVILIAN SUPPLY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, not intimately related to war production but closely related to the war effort is the situation concerning civilian supply. The greatest number of American small business concerns operates mainly in the field of civilian supply rather than in the direct production of goods for the armed forces.

Here we find hundreds of thousands of smaller wholesalers and retailers who provide our citizens with food, clothing, fuel, drugs, and other necessities. Here we find thousands of service establishments, hotels, places of amusement, and other types of nonwar establishments. Here also are the majority of small manufacturers. In all, about 95 percent of American small business concerns are engaged in civilian supply.

Although much has been said about the necessity of bringing small business more fully into war production—and the committee has taken the lead in this respect—the wartime problem facing most small businessmen is the imminent crisis in civilian supply.

Since the beginning of the war, civilian supply enterprises have been orphans of the storm. These enterprises have been repeatedly treated as though completely nonessential. Materials, manpower, and other resources are being haphazardly drained away from them by an ill-planned and chaotically administered war production program. They have operated under price regulations that have been promulgated and administered entirely apart from any program of civilian supply. Under such circumstances the smaller firms in the civilian field have been unable to stand up against the competition of big business firms which, because of their greater financial resources, have been able to build up large supplies of waning stocks, outbid them on the labor market, and

continue to operate under rigid price ceilings.

In the earlier days of the war, while war production was still at modest levels, the neglect of civilian supply presented no immediate danger. But today, now it has been decided to build up a huge army and now that war production has reached tremendous proportions, we have just begun to feel the results of the insufficient attention given to civilian supply. Entire sections of the country have suffered from acute and unpredicted shortages of meat, fuel, and other necessities.

By the end of 1943, unless drastic measures are promptly taken, we face a break-down on the home front. Although the dollar volume of goods and services available for the civilian population may look reassuring on the statistical charts of Washington economists, over-all figures are misleading. While our factories will produce more than enough of some goods, they will turn out far less than enough of others. Goods produced in sufficient quantity will be distributed unevenly. Small stores and stores in farming and rural areas, remote regions and certain new communities will lose out in the struggle for a share of available supplies. Because of an overloaded transportation system, there may be hours, days, weeks, or months when civilian goods cannot be moved in adequate quantities to or from certain areas. This is a particular danger in crowded industrial communities where too complete a diversion of facilities and manpower to war production may destroy local sources of civilian supply and create an overdependence on goods transported from other areas.

By the end of 1943, moreover, small business in the civilian field will find its stocks depleted. The profit reserves that may have been built up during the earlier days of the defense boom will have melted away. The specter of the black market operator may again arise to threaten the legitimate distributor. Thousands upon thousands of small manufacturers, retailers and wholesalers, including the essential as well as the nonessential, the established operator as well as the fly-by-night, may be wiped out of existence.

Accordingly the subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business of the Senate has come to the conclusion that the first step to be taken in approaching the problems of small business in the field of civilian supply is the establishing of a clear-cut national policy and program on civilian supply. We must once and for all do away with the theory that after military needs are met, the civilian population should scramble for the crumbs that are left over. We must do away with the theory that a total war can be waged by planning the production of airplanes and ships and neglecting the production and distribution of the food, clothing, fuel, medical supplies, repair parts, and other necessities used by those who make the airplanes and ships. To paraphrase Abraham Lincoln's statement that we cannot survive half slave and half free, we cannot fight a total war half planned and half hit-or-miss. It may seem a far cry from the fighting privates in the

jungles of Guadalcanal to the grocer in Middletown, but they are both essential parts of our total war effort for the safety of our country.

The heart of our military strategy lies in having the right amount of the necessary equipment and manpower available at the right moment at the right place. The heart of our wartime strategy on the home front lies in having the right amount of the necessary goods, services, and manpower at the right moment at the right place. All Federal regulations and control programs affecting the civilian economy—whether they be price ceilings, rationing programs, inventory controls, wage controls, manpower allocations or any other—must be subordinated to, and integrated with, this basic strategy.

The committee has heard extensive testimony from businessmen on this very question. On January 19, 20, and 21, especially, representatives of many retailing and wholesaling trade associations presented their views in considerable detail. The National Retail Dry Goods Association pointed out that no one now knows where the balance is between the materials needed by the armed forces and civilian requirements. The Voluntary Chain Institute pointed out the need for carefully weighing the respective requirements of the armed forces and specifically called for greater production of foods. The National Retail Furniture Association suggested the need for greater production of bedsprings and baby carriages. The National Electronics Distribution Association presented figures to indicate the importance of relatively small amounts of material for the maintenance of electrical equipment. The National Leather and Shoe Finders' Association pointed out the necessity of allocating steel and leather for shoe repairing. The National Automobile Dealers' Association, the National Restaurant Association, and the Associated Retail Bakers of America stressed the necessity of maintaining adequate manpower for civilian activities. The Wholesale Dry Goods Institute and the National Association of Retail Druggists pointed out the importance of having the limited supply of goods equitably distributed. The National Association of Retail Meat Dealers called attention to the inequitable distribution of existing meat supplies. At least three associations, the National Retail Dry Goods Association, the National Leather and Shoe Finders' Association, and the National Association of Retail Grocers, suggested the appointment of a civilian supply administrator. The National Association of Retail Grocers laid special emphasis upon the need for statutory action as follows:

We do need a statutory reorganization of existing agencies or set-ups . . . that would establish a civilian supply administrator, with complete power to determine essential civilian requirements for goods and services and for the material, labor, and facilities needed to produce and distribute such goods and services . . .

Your committee and the Congress should also give the civilian supply administrator the authority to issue regulations governing concentration, inventory control, allocations, rationing, and simplification. Above all, irre-

spective of what detailed responsibilities and powers are established, such legislation should clearly define our national policy on civilian supply. It should state in no unmistakable terms that the guaranteeing of essential civilian supply is an integral part of our war economy.

In June 1942, upon recommendation of the Senate Committee on Small Business, the Congress enacted the Smaller War Plants Act, which set up the Smaller War Plants Corporation and provided it and the War Production Board with ample power to bring thousands of small business concerns into war production. The committee has now arrived at the conclusion that the Smaller War Plants Act must now be supplemented by legislation establishing a national policy on civilian supply, administered by a Civilian Supply Administrator. Through well-conceived legislation of this type the Congress can provide the way to prevent a serious break-down on the home front that might disrupt the entire war effort. It can also complete its legislative foundation for the wartime utilization of small business concerns in all phases of our national economy and for the preservation of a healthy small-business structure throughout the war period.

Mr. President, as we read the terrifying daily news stories directing our attention to the many war fronts on which our soldiers are fighting, the question of civilian supply is not exactly light reading, but all of us by this time know that it is among the most serious of our problems; that certainly next to what confronts our combat troops this is our paramount problem. If we are to afford a proper protection to them and to those whom they left behind, we must, and must now, deal with this seriously important problem.

And so, Mr. President, on behalf of the subcommittee on civilian supply of the Committee on Small Business of the Senate, composed of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and myself, as well as on behalf of other members of the Small Business Committee of the Senate, I ask consent to introduce a bill to establish a civilian supply administration, and for other purposes, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 885) to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONEY (on behalf of the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of American Small Business Enterprises), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 131. An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 1671. An act to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1780. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 324. An act to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof; and

H. R. 1940. An act prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 1366. An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 1936. An act to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2023. An act to 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; to the calendar.

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COMPENSATION OF CIVILIAN AIR CORPS TRAINEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have had brought to my attention in a rather forceful way, by correspondence from those who are taking the Civilian Aeronautics Administration war training program, a condition which merits attention. The plight of these men is really serious. As a result of this correspondence, I have prepared an amendment, which would provide that these men while undergoing training, or while they are awaiting assignment to a more advanced training course, or awaiting assignment to active duty in the armed forces, or such employment as the Army Air Force may direct, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$50 a month.

I am submitting this amendment to the bill (H. R. 1670) to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended. I ask that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Commerce, which has under consideration the bill to which the amendment is intended to be offered, in the hope that the committee will take cognizance of the plight of these men, that the amendment may afford some opportunity for consideration of the subject, and that perhaps the full committee, or a subcommittee, may go into the whole subject matter, to the end that some relief may be afforded to these men and their families.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION TO CREATE A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. LUCAS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 115), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That section 2 of Senate Resolution 102, to create a special committee on post-war economic policy and planning, agreed to on March 12, 1943, be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, during the Seventy-eighth

Congress, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of said committee, and shall be served by any person designated by him. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman."

Resolved further, That said resolution be further amended by striking out on page 2, line 13, the word "Appropriations" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Funds."

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF MASSACHUSETTS SOCIETY FOR PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate, and I think it is appropriate that I do so, the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

Mr. George T. Angell, of Massachusetts, in 1868 conceived and founded this society. Over a period of 40 years he worked unceasingly and gave unstintingly of his time and money in order that dumb animals may be better understood and more kindly treated by mankind. Since 1910 Dr. Francis H. Rowley has carried on as president of the organization with equal enthusiasm the good work inaugurated by his predecessor. In his efforts to teach people a higher regard for animals he has created a kindlier feeling and better understanding, a closer fraternity and greater concept of citizenship, among all peoples regardless of race, denomination or creed.

At this time the principles on which the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and its many auxiliaries was founded, has spread and expanded and gone on and on until now education along the line of kindness and gentleness in the treatment of animals reaches all the States of our Nation and extends to every civilized country.

THE ROADS TO LASTING PEACE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Roads to Lasting Peace," published in the current number of the Republican Magazine of Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

WINNING THE WAR AND PLANNING FOR THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR HAROLD E. STASSEN

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Hon. Harold E. Stassen, Governor of Minnesota, at the United Nations Forum, Philadelphia, March 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR POST-WAR AMERICA—ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. ALTMAYER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address dealing with social security for post-war America, delivered by Arthur J. Altmeyer, chairman of the Social Security Board, at

the National Conference of Social Work in New York City, March 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLANNING IN REVERSE—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Planning in Reverse," from the Boston Post of March 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF WAR AND POST-WAR PROGRAMS—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Taking In Too Much Territory With One Arm" by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times, March 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DELAY IN TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL TO ARMED FORCES—EDITORIAL FROM SHREVEPORT TIMES

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Shreveport Times of March 10, 1943, entitled "Let's Have Action on This," relating to the transmission of mail between the United States and our armed forces, which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASE OF COMMERCE ON THE MISSISSIPPI AND ITS TRIBUTARIES—ARTICLE BY PAUL WOOTON

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article by Paul Wooton, from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, regarding the increase of waterborne commerce on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM CONDITIONS

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Farm Crisis," from the New Orleans States of February 3, 1943, and an editorial entitled "The Farmer's Side," from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans of February 3, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE TRUTH ABOUT MACARTHUR—ARTICLE BY IRVING BRANT

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "The Truth About MacArthur," written by Irving Brant, and published in the New Republic of December 28, and another article from the New Republic of March 1 containing a letter from Joseph C. Harch and the reply thereto by Mr. Brant, which appear in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF FUEL OIL RATIONING INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE OF ILLINOIS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the report of the Fuel Oil Rationing Investigating Committee appointed by the Sixty-third Illinois General Assembly, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD RATIONING—ARTICLE BY BILL CUNNINGHAM

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Food Ration Based on False Premise," written by Bill Cunningham and published in the Boston Herald of February 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

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. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], 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.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am willing to yield to the Senator from Minnesota for not to exceed 15 minutes, upon the unanimous understanding that I shall not thereby lose the floor, and likewise upon the further statement that beyond that I shall not be willing to yield to any Senator except for routine business, or for interrogatories pertinent to the pending question. I may say that I have been asked by 10 or 15 Senators to yield for a few minutes, and if I accommodated any

Senator I should have to accommodate the others. So, with the understanding I have suggested, that by yielding I shall not lose the floor, I am willing to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection to the request of the Senator from California, it will be so ordered.

ORGANIZATION OF UNITED NATIONS— SENATE RESOLUTION 114

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that out of order I may offer a Senate resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that the pending bill, the Bankhead bill, has been before the Senate for a week, in spite of every effort to obtain action on it last week. It has to do with a matter of very great import to the people of the United States, particularly to the farmers, and if the bill is to have any effect whatever, or to be of any benefit, it should be passed immediately, if it is to be passed at all. I have no disposition to interfere with the request of the Senator from Minnesota to proceed on a different matter, but I feel that notice should be given at this time that the pending measure should not be displaced by setting off a general debate on the subject of our post-war international relations, and I give notice that if anything of that sort shall develop I shall ask for the regular order. Furthermore, I think it should be understood at this time that every effort will be made to dispose of the pending bill today one way or the other, no matter how late it may be necessary to remain in session. With that understanding, I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota that he be permitted to offer a resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Minnesota will be agreed to. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and myself, I submit a resolution. The resolution is short, and I read its text:

Resolved, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority:

(1) To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

(2) To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

(3) To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

(4) To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

(5) To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of

such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

Mr. President, this resolution originated here in the Senate. We who offer it are merely spokesmen for a considerably larger group of Senators who are interested in having the Senate act on this all-important subject. In a larger sense, we speak for all the millions of Americans who are longing for constructive and immediate action toward winning peace as well as victory in the war.

We four were delegated several weeks ago to do the drafting of the resolution, and we have sought advice and counsel from many persons. The resolution represents the ideas and viewpoints of many individuals and we believe it offers a sound starting point for Senate action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the statement which we four Senators issued last Saturday concerning this subject.

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

The statement is as follows:

This is the most recent draft of a proposed Senate resolution seeking to clarify United States post-war foreign policy, on which we have been working for several weeks. We have discussed its subject matter with a number of other Senators and have sought and are still seeking advice and counsel as to both its form and substance. We want it to be in the best form possible before we offer it.

We believe that an organization of the United Nations with the authority and the power to stop any future attempts at military aggression offers the best hope for maintaining world peace and stability after this war and at the same time is the most efficient and the least costly method in lives and wealth for the individual nations to obtain security for themselves.

It is our opinion that the overwhelming majority of the American people favor United States participation in such a United Nations organization, based on the just and democratic principles of the Atlantic Charter, as the most preferable way to maintain our own national security and help maintain world stability and peace. The only way the people can express their desire is through the Congress. Hence this resolution.

It is our deep conviction that the basic foreign policy of the United States should not become an issue in partisan politics, that it should be decided as soon as possible so that post-war planning may be effective, and that our policy should be determined, not on the basis of past debates based on conditions then existing, but on the basis of world conditions as they are today and are likely to develop in the future.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, three basic factors guided us in drafting this resolution.

First, it is our conviction, and we believe it is shared by the overwhelming majority of the American people and

the Members of the Senate, that an organization of the peace-loving nations of the world, with both the authority and the power to stop any future attempts at military aggression, offers the best hope for maintaining the peace and stability of the world after the war. At the same time, such a collective world security system would be the least costly method, in both lives and wealth, for the individual nations of the world to assure security and peace for themselves.

The world has tried many other methods of maintaining peace—balance of power diplomacy, imperialism, peace pacts, multilateral treaties, and nonaggression agreements. All have failed. The most recent and the broadest in conception was the League of Nations. It failed largely because at the critical moment it could not act decisively. It failed at least partly because the United States, one of the three or four most powerful nations in the world, was not a full partner in that effort to achieve lasting world peace.

That leads to the second basic factor which guided us in drafting this resolution. The United States, alone among the great powers of the world, cannot agree finally to any treaty without the advice and consent of two-thirds of the United States Senate. That provision of our constitution was impressed forcibly upon the whole world 23 years ago in this very Chamber. The whole world, and our allies, know today that it is the United States Senate which will finally decide what will be the foreign policy of our country when the war ends.

In the past, this far-reaching power of the Senate under our Constitution has been used negatively. We propose that the Senate act positively, that it define in clear-cut terms the kind of foreign policy which it believes will best serve this Nation and promote world stability and peace.

The third factor which has impelled us to lay this proposal before the Senate at this time is the fact that the forces pulling the United Nations together, making for agreement and cooperation, are dominant now, and will be dominant as long as we are fighting the war. Such forces include our common cause of freedom, our common enemies, and the urgent necessity of effective mobilization of our combined resources to win the war. But once the war ends, some of these forces acting cohesively on the United Nations, and making for harmony and cooperation, will disappear immediately, and others will lose much of their urgency, and at the same time the various forces which might tend to drive the United Nations apart—economic rivalry, nationalistic feeling and immediate and pressing domestic problems—will become relatively more powerful. It is for this reason that we believe positive action is timely and urgent now during the war.

Mr. President, the peace-loving people of the world, here and in China and England and Australia and Russia, the fathers and mothers, the wives and husbands and the sweethearts, watched with growing horror during the thirties as

inexorably, step by step, nation after nation was swept into this second world war. The governments serving those people with all their diplomacy and all their statecraft, failed to stem the tide. Once again all over the world millions of our youth are pouring out their lives because of that failure.

A new approach, a stronger mechanism, is required to meet this need of humanity, to control this age-old plague of war. We have tried in the resolution to set forth clearly and briefly the minimum essentials on which we believe United Nations agreement should be sought before the war ends if we are to have a fair chance of maintaining the peace after it ends.

Mr. President, we are confident today of winning the war. We do not have the same confidence that the United Nations will win the peace. There is uncertainty and questioning here as to the post-war policies of Russia and China and the British Commonwealth of Nations. And, if we can believe the reports in our press, there is uncertainty and questioning in the governments of our allies as to what United States post-war foreign policy will be.

A part of that uncertainty stems directly from the fact that no one knows yet what will be the attitude of the United States Senate, whose consent is essential under the Constitution. And that is a question on which only the Senate itself can speak.

We believe the United States would prefer, as its post-war policy, to participate in an organization of nations, dedicated to justice, democracy, and fair treatment for all peoples, as the most effective and the least costly method of achieving security for ourselves. The only way to find out whether our allies are prepared to join us in that collective effort is to ask them. But we cannot propose nor ask effectively until the Senate has indicated its position.

Mr. President, this war is a total war. It is a people's war in which all our resources and all our people are ranged against the peoples and resources of the Axis. As part of the legislative branch of our Government, we are daily demanding unparalleled sacrifices from our people in order to win victory.

The people want the peace to be a people's peace, a permanent, democratic peace. It can be a people's peace only if the people determine the basic principles. And there is only one instrumentality through which the people of the United States can speak effectively on this issue. That instrumentality is the Congress of the United States.

It is the deepest conviction of everyone who has had anything to do with this proposal that the basic foreign policy of the United States should not and must not become an issue in partisan politics; that it should be determined, not on the basis of past debates based on past conditions, but on the basis of the world as it is today and on the basis of what policy will best serve the people of our Nation in the light of present conditions.

Mr. President, 25 years ago, on the battlefields of France, our fighting men

helped win victory in the First World War. But we lost the peace after that war. History must not repeat itself; that tragedy must not happen again. We who serve the sovereign people in the United States Senate owe a solemn obligation to the Colin Kellys, the Meyer Levins, the Henry Majeskis, the Hans Christiansens, and the Edmund Schroeders, to all the gallant youths who have given, and who will give, their lives in this war. It is our obligation to them to find the way to permanent peace, to do our share to make certain that 15 or 20 years hence the sons of these heroes of today do not fight and die in some distant skies in another and more terrible war. Let us pray God that we shall not fail in that obligation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I previously announced that I am willing to yield for the presentation of routine matters.

Mr. CONNALLY. What I wish to say is routine only.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I yield with that understanding.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] has just discussed, I wish to say that during the day I shall file a press release stating my views on the matter.

The resolution (S. Res. 114) submitted by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. HATCH) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority:

(1) To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

(2) To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

(3) To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

(4) To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

(5) To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE—
ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, after listening to the very interesting remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] in relation to the

resolution which he and three other Senators presented today, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a very illuminating article in the Washington Post of this morning by Walter Lippmann, which I think should be read in connection with the resolution. I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The fundamental question, which has been raised by Senators HATCH, BURTON, BALL, and HILL, is how the Senate can be enabled to play its part in the conduct of American foreign relations. This is a very old question. It has always been a difficult one. But it is not unanswerable.

As we look for the answer to it, two conclusions are, I think, at once self-evident. The first is that the Senate cannot now commit itself to approve treaties which have not yet been negotiated. To expect the Senate to do this is to ask it to vote on abstractions and generalities rather than on practical commitments. The second is that the Executive cannot negotiate with our allies unless at each critical step in the negotiations he knows and they know that he is acting with the advice and consent of the Senate. For unless the Senate is somehow participating in the negotiations, our whole diplomacy becomes a blind gamble as to what the Senate might someday do about them.

The test, therefore, of the move made by the four Senators is not whether the Senate will bind itself now to ratify agreements drawn according to the five general propositions of their resolution. The test is whether the Senate will agree that a way must be found to associate the Senate continually with the President before and during the momentous negotiations that have to be undertaken. Merely to pass a general resolution would no doubt be reassuring to most of mankind. But it would not really resolve the ancient constitutional difficulty. For, if the resolution were passed, the whole dangerous uncertainty would still remain for unpredictable debate, because the question would still be whether the actual treaties negotiated conformed to the meaning of the general propositions.

Therefore, we must fix our attention upon the ways and means of enabling the Senate to participate in the negotiations. If we can do that, we shall be restoring the Senate to the place intended for it by the authors of the Constitution, and we shall have removed the practical difficulty which not only threatens to paralyze the making of peace, but also to make it infinitely more difficult to win the war.

For if the United States Government cannot now confidently make binding engagements with our allies, how can we make sure now that we shall have all the allies we shall need in order to finish the war in Asia as well as in Europe? The situation is such that the Senators simply cannot afford to delude themselves with the idea that the question is whether they will at their leisure at some distant time consider whether they will ratify agreements with our allies.

The situation, in fact, is that the United States must be able now to persuade our allies to make agreements with us. They need us, to be sure. But we need them not one bit less.

In foreign affairs the Senate was intended to be a council that the President would consult continually. The Senate, we must remember, had originally only 26 members, and it was a small enough body to be consulted confidentially. Thus, for example, when the

question was raised whether the House should also be consulted, the proposal was rejected on the ground that 65 Representatives were too many for what John Jay described as the requisite of negotiations—namely perfect secrecy and immediate dispatch. And David Ramsey, a member of the convention, said to the people of South Carolina who wanted the House to be entrusted with the treaty-making power: "When 65 men can keep a secret, they may." Yet the House was then only two-thirds as big as the Senate is today.

There is no doubt that the authors of the Constitution meant to have the Senate do exactly the kind of thing which the four Senators are now trying to arrange to have it do. Six months after he was inaugurated, Washington went to the Senate with the project of a treaty he was negotiating with the southern Indians. He took with him General Knox, his Secretary of War, and after they had been introduced, Washington rose and told the Senate that he had come to them for their advice and consent on certain propositions in the treaty.

Unfortunately, it appears, President Washington neglected to invite Senator Maclay to dinner before he went to the Senate, and for lack of this kind of personal preparation, the Senate stood on its dignity, Washington lost his temper, the Senate never became a council, and Washington declared that he would be damned if he ever went there again.

Nevertheless as Mr. Denna Fleming tells us in his book on The Treaty Veto of the American Senate, Washington "still adhered to the practice of asking the advice of the Senate before negotiations were opened and during their course." Thus he suspended his negotiations with England over the northeastern boundary until he had consulted the Senate, and the Senate agreed in advance to approve a proposed treaty with Algiers. Other Presidents have gone to the Senate for approval in advance—for example, President Polk in 1846 on the suggested terms of peace with Mexico.

But, as we all know, the relations between the Senate and the President have rarely been satisfactory where the treaty-making power was involved. The treaty of peace with Spain in 1898 was almost defeated; it was ratified by just one vote more than the necessary two-thirds. Wilson's treaty was, of course, defeated. This is the third war in which we have been engaged in less than 50 years; once we almost failed to get a treaty of peace, once we did fail, and now for a third time we find ourselves wondering whether the Senate will permit us to make a treaty. Surely, the four Senators cannot be wrong when they say that something has to be done about it, and done about it now before it is too late.

The remedy must lie in assuming that considerably more than two-thirds of the Senators will support the necessary arrangements with our allies if in the course of the negotiations they are consulted about these arrangements and are enabled to understand them. But since it is impossible to consult 66 men daily on all sorts of questions, the practical problem is how to find a working committee which at least 66 Senators will trust.

Theoretically, the committee ought to be the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. That is what it is for. But, in fact, owing to the antiquated rules of the Senate on the subject of seniority, the present committee is unrepresentative and has an appallingly bad record. It is such a bad record that some of the committeemen are determined, it would appear, to make it worse by trying to prove that when they were wrong they were really right. The committee as now constituted is a bad one because such a large number of the Republican members have a vested interest in their own historic mistakes and are, therefore, not to be depended upon altogether to deal confidentially with

delicate matters that must in the early stages of negotiation remain confidential.

The problem, therefore, is either to reconstitute the present committee, perhaps by enlarging it, or to establish a new committee which is representative and efficient.

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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. For what purpose does the Senator ask me to yield, may I ask?

Mr. LANGER. I wish to make a short statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. No, Mr. President, I cannot yield to the Senator. I have already stated that 10 or 15 Senators have requested that I yield to them for the purpose of making short statements, and I have said that I could not yield for other than presentation of routine matters. So I regret I cannot yield to the Senator.

Mr. President, first I wish to compliment the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] upon his eloquent address, his idealism, and his courage. I assume that the ideas he is projecting are based upon the assumption of victory by the United States. I wish to say that I have presented the pending amendment because if conditions on the Pacific coast are allowed to develop for another 90 days, according to their present trend, then, at least so far as the Pacific coast is concerned, that section will be of little use to the rest of the Nation in winning the war. I hope my colleagues will bear with me while I give to them a message of desperation. The message has been repeated time and time again to the administrative officials of the Nation, but no attention is being paid to it, and conditions are now so demoralized and chaotic that I predict dogmatically, unless changes are made in present plans or energetic action otherwise taken, the crumbling within 60 or 90 days of our civilian economy, with the complete handicapping of the war effort.

Mr. President, when the Chief Executive, after Pearl Harbor, announced his program of military production it was immediately apparent that we intended to accelerate our production from about \$75,000,000,000 a year to \$150,000,000,000, and that at the same time we intended to recruit one of the largest armed forces in the entire world. It should have been apparent to the Chief Executive, to the administrative branches, and to the Army and the Navy, that such a program could be carried out only by the utmost vision, wisdom, and energy applied from Washington to every place in the United States. With farm wages generally below those in industry, it should have been

apparent to the most ordinary intellect that if industry was to be so accelerated it would experience difficulty in finding workers. Three things were bound to happen, namely, taking away from the farms of many of their workers, an immediate increase in farm wages, and the necessity for an adjustment in farm prices to meet the new conditions.

It was apparent to us all in California that the program of the Chief Executive would create in farming a crisis of unparalleled magnitude. Immediately there was widespread agitation in California that a number of steps be taken to protect the farmer, the most important being the immediate importation of large bodies of Mexican workers to be used upon the farms.

Mr. President, the administrative agencies of the Government were totally opposed to the adoption of sufficient and effective plans, and were entirely lacking in vision or understanding of the problem. They were so optimistic that their prophecies were almost universally overstated and overexaggerated. After months of attempting to obtain sufficient and adequate action from the appropriate agencies in Washington, I submitted to the Senate a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee of three Senators to investigate western farm-labor conditions. I had the honor of being appointed chairman of that committee. The distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. McNARY] were appointed to serve with me.

The Senator from Arizona and I went to Arizona and California to investigate the farm-labor problems of those two States. We found conditions most lamentable, most unhappy, and being most inadequately dealt with. Specifically, as applied to California, the facts, which everyone now admits to be grave, were these: Ordinarily upon the farms in California there are 200,000 trained permanent farm workers, including the farm proprietors. These are men of considerable ability, who are capable of hard work. They are the peasantry of the State, rugged, strong, and able in agricultural pursuits.

During 1942, commencing almost immediately after Pearl Harbor, that number of 200,000 rapidly declined until, by December 1, when the committee was in California, it had been cut to one-half, or 100,000. There was no failure in many of our crops, because the farmers had started with 200,000 workers and because the weather was so nearly perfect that it seemed as though a miracle had been performed. Our farmers, with their families, worked from 12 to 14 and 15 hours daily. Community labor joined in helping; and, while there were substantial losses because of lack of labor in particular crops, notwithstanding, the yield was bountiful.

However, Mr. President, when we were in California, already the great farm plant of California and the West was beginning to run down. Plowing, planting, spraying, pruning, improvements, and repair of farm machinery, all were fall-

ing behind. Two hundred thousand permanent workers were needed. We had 100,000.

Had the so-called Bankhead amendment been presented to me immediately upon my return, I would not then have contemplated offering an amendment to exempt transport workers in critical areas from selective service, because at that time the crisis was much greater among farm workers than among other groups. Due to the very able and energetic advocacy of the farmers' cause by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the splendid work done by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in the passage of the Tydings amendment, conditions with respect to farm labor in California have improved. The deferment of farm workers, such as it has been, has turned back to our farms about 20,000 additional farm workers, so we now have 120,000 instead of 100,000. However, 30,000 more of this type of workers are vitally needed upon our farms.

Furthermore, at the height of our cropping season we shall need 175,000 additional migratory workers, and there are almost none of those in the State at the present time.

When I was in California in connection with the first investigation the prophecies as to the size of farm crops which might be expected were rather encouraging, and I hoped that California, through its farmers, could do its full share in the war effort called for by the President and by the Secretary of Agriculture. However, I began to receive from almost every industry in the State very alarming reports about the shortage of workers to an extent indicating almost a break-down of our civilian economy. So as a result of a resolution which I offered a few weeks ago I was appointed on a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to go to the Western States for an investigation of the over-all manpower problem.

Mr. President, the conditions there are so plainly apparent that it would seem that anyone could observe them, but apparently they were unseen by any official in administrative authority in Washington. Conditions are so demoralizing and chaotic that I now hazard my reputation by saying that if a change is not brought about the next 90 days will see some sort of a collapse in the West, with a resultant national scandal of most unhappy proportions.

Why do I make that statement, Mr. President? I make it because my investigation clearly revealed that every essential industry in California is now critically short of workers. Industry in California is unable to obtain workers from any sources in the State, and is unable to import them from elsewhere in the United States, to such an extent that essential industries are on a most slender margin, and their increasing inefficiency and failure to produce is already materially impeding the war effort. Our mines, lumber mills, and fisheries are short thousands of workers. The number of railroad and trucking workers is inadequate. Hospitals, garages, hotels, stores, restaurants, and telephone and

telegraph companies are so short of workers that they can hardly operate. What is the result? We find our civilian life imperiled at every point.

First, Mr. President, let me speak upon a subject which is a rather unhappy one to have to discuss. I regret that the military chiefs have made it necessary for me to discuss it. However, this much is truth, and I doubt if any military chieftain would deny it in executive session, though he might not dare to admit it publicly.

Every week thousands of our people are denied much-needed medical attention and hospitalization. Why? Because the call for doctors by the military has taken away so many of our physicians that men and women die upon sick beds, unattended by physicians, and space for them cannot be found in hospitals. Expectant mothers are not receiving proper medical and hospital attention. I think the military in executive session would admit that to be so; but they say, "Since this is war, we need the doctors and hospital beds for the military, and the civilian population must suffer."

Mr. President, a few days ago the proprietor of a large ambulance service in Alameda County, in which Oakland is located, came to me to try to have me assist in securing the deferment of his ambulance drivers. He told me that his ambulance service in that great area was almost near a break-down because of lack of drivers. He told me of two incidents which occurred the night before he left there. One was that of a woman with a bursted appendix, lying for hours on a bed of pain, unable to obtain the services of a physician, because every physician in the community was exhausted, and no hospital bed was available for her. The same night another woman suffering from a severe hemorrhage could not secure medical attention. Such things are occurring today all over the West, because there are insufficient doctors to meet the requirements of the civilian population. If officials in the administrative branches of Government think that the civilian population must suffer in that way, let me tell them of a few other incidents. I talked to a young man who had had a perfect attendance record in a shipyard since Pearl Harbor. During his work a piece of steel entered his eye. Had he been able to receive immediate medical attention he could have returned to work the next day. However, he failed to obtain medical attention for several days. He was detained from his work for 10 days. He almost lost his eye. He has become a bitter and a resentful citizen.

I have heard story after story of the kind I am now about to tell. I talked to a commissioned officer serving in the Army Medical Corps, a man whose word I believe. He told me that his sister had died in childbirth in California, because of lack of medical attention, and he said to me that he had been stationed in Florida and had not been doing more than 2 or 3 hours' work a day, as a commissioned officer in the Medical Corps of the

Army, and that the same statement could be applied to many other physicians in the Army.

I hold in my hand, by way of specific illustration, a letter from the assistant city manager of the city of Alameda, stating exactly, by documentary record, what conditions are in that comparatively small town. Alameda adjoins Oakland. Up to the beginning of the war effort it had been a very fine residential community. It had had a population of 20,000 persons, with 20 physicians. In December the population increased to 40,000, but the number of physicians had been reduced to 10—or 1 physician for every 4,000 people. What a community should have is 1 physician for each 1,500 people. Complaint was made to the Federal Government. Assurances were given that the condition would be promptly corrected. What has happened? Alameda still has the 10 physicians, although there has been some shifting around, but the population has now reached 45,000 or 50,000, due to war defense activities there. The condition which I have been describing is not found everywhere in California, but in many of the defense centers it is found. The civilian population suffers seriously from a shortage of medicines, doctors, and hospitalization. I have talked to doctors who are working themselves to the point of exhaustion, working 10, 12, 15, and even 18 hours a day. They have told me that the cruelest experience they have ever had in their lives has been that of falling upon their beds, late at night, exhausted, and unable to answer the calls of sick and dying people.

I do not know to what extent the lack of physicians and medical and hospital facilities will go. Our Army is to be increased approximately 60 percent during the present year. I understand that an Army engaged in actual combat requires twice as many doctors as does an Army serving in this country. What the condition will be on the west coast by next December, or in the other sections of the United States, I do not know; I have been entirely unable to ascertain it because the military safely guard as confidential information many of the "secrets" applying to their doctors and hospitalization. At any rate, Mr. President, as of today the morale and well-being of the civilian workers and the rest of the population of the Pacific coast are being seriously affected because of lack of proper medical attention.

During the last 3 or 4 months we have had the most serious condition in relation to food. Hundreds of thousands of our workers have not been able to obtain a sufficient diet. I have the testimony of health officers of cities and of physicians attesting to that fact. Meat has been almost nonexistent for the working class in California. Oh, it is true that a wealthy man could go to an expensive hotel and get all the sirloin steak or anything else he wanted to eat; but for the last several months hundreds of thousands of defense workers have not been able to get the food they should have had. I understand that the great majority of our meat has been sold in bootleg markets; but, at any rate, in the re-

tail stores meat costs the workingman two or three or four times as much as he should have to pay—when he can get it, which is not very often.

Mr. President, I shall not intrude further upon the time of the Senate in discussing that phase of the subject, although later I shall return to it. In housing and in transportation California likewise has a most serious condition, and one which constantly approaches nearer the point of breakdown. Summing it all up, we find the following situation to exist: As of today, California alone is short 200,000 or 300,000 workers; and that condition covers every essential industry, as well as the war industries and farms.

Mr. President, I should not blame any colleague of mine if he were skeptical of what I am about to say, but I can prove my statements by documentary evidence. For the present calendar year the program of the Federal Government in the State of California alone calls for 1,000,000 additional workers, more or less—and likely to be more, rather than less. With a shortage of from 200,000 to 300,000 workers as of the present time, the Federal Government has formulated for the Pacific coast a program which will require approximately 1,000,000 additional workers; and if unexpected things begin to occur, the number needed may go as high as 1,250,000. Already great corporations in California are desperately seeking workers all over the State, but are not finding them. We have exhausted the supply of available women workers, workers from nonessential industries, and defective and handicapped people. Work is now being done by boys of from 16 to 17 years of age and by men of from 70 to 80 years of age. We are from 200,000 to 300,000 workers short; and yet official Washington so little understands conditions in the provinces that they now expect us to perform an impossible task.

What is the task the Government expects California to perform? The Selective Service System will take approximately 400,000 men a month in the United States. According to the Army's records, California will contribute approximately 6¼ percent of that number, or 25,000. The War Manpower Commission is counting on obtaining those 25,000, but apparently they are not taking into consideration the fact that during the past 2 or 3 years from 200,000 to 300,000 young men from other sections of the Nation have come to California to work in our defense factories. They have come from Oklahoma, Alabama, Illinois, Iowa, and from other Western and Southern States. They are of fine caliber, and are husky and devoted. Their draft boards are now calling them from California. However, they are not credited to our quota, but are credited to the quota of the States in which they formerly lived. In my opinion, although I admit it to be a guess, the number of workers so taken will be not less than 50,000.

So that California before the next Christmas season rolls around must take out of the trucks which now lack drivers, out of the cabs of locomotives, out of the

shipbuilding plants, and aircraft and other essential factories over a thousand men a day in order to satisfy the call of the Government for the military.

But, Mr. President, we have not yet started the tale of what the Federal Government expects in the West. The War Manpower Commission, as I analyze their figures, have said that California, for the remainder of this year, will require approximately 100,000 additional workers in order to meet aircraft expansion and 100,000 additional workers in order to meet shipbuilding expansion. I do not believe their figures include many of the subcontractors and fabricators and producers of raw material that will be required in the expansion of those two great war industries. I am certain that the present program of the Federal Government for the expansion of aircraft and shipbuilding in California will take at least 250,000 additional workers, and in those figures I am not including certain workers in repair drydock yards and airplane bases. My next figure does include them.

The Army and Navy in scores of small installations now proceeding in California will require at least another hundred thousand personnel. Let me mention two of the largest items in that category. On San Francisco Bay we are building one of the greatest repair drydock yards in the whole world—perhaps the largest; I have heard that suggestion. It will repair aircraft carriers, submarines, destroyers, and cruisers, but, I understand, not capital ships. The maintenance of that one yard will require 20,000 civilian workers, of whom six or seven thousand must be the very finest kind of ship mechanics, men who have the knowledge, almost engineering in character, to enable them to go down into the bowels of a submarine and there repair its very intricate and important parts, men who understand the mechanism and the machinery of aircraft carriers and destroyers and cruisers.

The regional head of the civil service there, who has been of great assistance to me, Mr. Harry Krantz, has told me that he does not know where in the whole United States there can possibly be obtained the 6,500 mechanics who will be required upon that one installation in the State of California. As a matter of fact, he says he has no idea where the 20,000 workers will come from because already existing military installations for months have been seeking unsuccessfully for common laborers, typists, skilled mechanics, and other kinds of workers.

Let me give another example: We have a very fine city within 100 miles or so of Los Angeles, the city of San Bernardino, which is the center for great military activities, for airplane training, and maneuvers in the desert. That one airplane base will require seventeen or eighteen thousand workers of whom a quarter or a third must be skilled aircraft mechanics. For months they have been unsuccessfully trying to get the workers for that military installation. In the same county we have other very large demands by defense factories and by the military; so that we have a very serious

crisis in labor shortage. We have got to find twenty or thirty thousand additional workers in that small community.

Now, I desire to read from a letter from Colonel Beau, colonel, Air Corps, commander at the San Bernardino Depot. I do not criticize Colonel Beau for attempting to obtain workers for his air base wherever he can. He is attempting to do it by methods which the farmers say are destroying them. I will agree that Colonel Beau, a military officer under command from Washington, must do everything he can to obtain workers, even though he destroys the farmers of that section, as they are being destroyed. But to show the Senate the extreme necessity of the demands of the military in that small section, let me read the letter written by Colonel Beau asking for workers for his air base. Again, Mr. President, I wish to say that in reading this letter there is no implication of any criticism against Colonel Beau. I understand he is a very able, fine officer, handling his military operations in a very efficient way.

To the citizens of San Bernardino County—

Says Colonel Beau—

Today's war is no longer the concern of the military alone, but it is the real concern of you, your family, and your neighbor's family. Our front lines today run along every street of your city.

In this area you have the San Bernardino Air Depot now nearing completion. It will be one of the largest establishments of its kind on the Pacific coast, functioning as a servicing and repair shop for military aircraft, a "garage for airplanes."

I then omit two or three paragraphs.

It is you, the people of this community, who will turn the switches to start the machinery and provide the hands and the intelligence to make it perform properly. This important function is your responsibility.

If we are to accomplish the big job our Nation has ahead of it, you can only discharge your responsibility by making your services available in this great effort. There is a job for every man and woman; your skills, talents, and hobbies can be used.

I interpolate there to say that, tragic as this is, to me it is rather amusing to see an Army colonel almost upon his knees imploring men and women to work for him and making the most propagandistic use of every possible pledge he honestly could.

Then Colonel Beau says this:

In addition to aiding in the war effort, each person employed will enjoy all the following benefits:

1. Employment at a good annual salary based on 40 hours a week, with 8 hours of overtime at time and a half, or 21.5 percent above the basic level.
2. Twenty-six days per year vacation with pay, or its equivalent, under civil-service and War Department rules.
3. Fifteen days sick leave with pay, annually.
4. Membership in the civil-service retirement program.
5. Rapid promotion, depending upon your own ability to perform the jobs assigned, or to assume added responsibilities.
6. Valuable training in skilled occupations will be provided for you, with an opportunity to earn while you learn.
7. Your assignment will be one to which you will be best fitted.

8. All the officers of my staff will help to make the conditions under which you work the most comfortable for you.

It is the patriotic duty of all those not now engaged in essential war industry to make their services available. Lack of skill is no handicap. We are all required to do our utmost, there is work for everyone, and this is your opportunity to help.

While I should prefer presenting this appeal to you personally, the limitations on my own time require my taking this means to urge you to file an application with the local civil service board at 323 Court Street, San Bernardino.

I look forward to your working side by side with us.

Sincerely yours,

LUCAS V. BEAU, JR.,
Colonel, Air Corps, Commanding.

(At this point Mr. DOWNEY yielded to several Senators for the presentation of routine business, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD.)

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, because of the interruptions, I should like in a few hundred words to review what I have already said.

All the essential industries in the State of California are critically short of workers, to the extent of two or three hundred thousand in number. The Government, under its program for California, will require upward of 200,000 in the expansion of aircraft establishments and shipyards, upward of 250,000 for military withdrawals, and upward of 100,000 civilian workers in the Army and Navy. I have been discussing some of the particular installations in California which will require large numbers of men.

In the San Bernardino area, to which I have referred, there is not only the great air base commanded by Colonel Beau, but there are other defense factories, such as Mr. Kaiser's steel plant, and very large military installations. It is my opinion that there is almost as great a shortage of workers in that area as the total number of workers now there.

Mr. President, the farmers are in despair. Many of them are cutting down on their crops. Many of them lost substantial parts of their crops last year, and see no chance of finding workers for their farms this year. There has already begun, in the particular county to which I have been referring, a movement which might in a few months sweep large areas of the Pacific coast, and ultimately, perhaps, the whole United States. Many vegetable growers of that section with whom I have talked have told me they were stripping their vegetable operations down to the amount of production which could be handled by themselves and their families.

Of course, one would have thought such a condition must result, that it would have been obvious even to a blind man 3,000 miles from the Pacific coast, but apparently it was only within the last few days that the Secretary of Agriculture realized developing conditions. I hold in my hand an article from a recent issue of the Washington Post stating Secretary Wickard's present understanding, that there will be a marked reduction in the production of vegetables this year compared with last year. How many man

could have failed to realize that months ago I cannot understand. I think scores of Senators prophesied on the floor of the Senate the condition now stated very dismally and unhappily by Mr. Wickard as at present existing.

Figures are given as to the expected yields of certain particular crops, showing a falling off from expectations of 20 or 30 or 40 percent in cabbages, beans, tomatoes, and other vitally required foods.

Mr. President, with conditions as they are now, even though the crisis should become no more severe, we in California would fail to meet the hopes of the Department of Agriculture by 20 or 30 percent at the very least, and if the impossibly titanic program of the Federal Government for the west coast shall be continued, the reduction in our crops may be far greater.

Beyond the need for men which I have already stated, amounting to six or seven hundred thousand in number, there are other very large figures which should engage our attention. In addition to aircraft building and shipbuilding, there are other important defense factories in the State of California, scores of them in number, perhaps hundreds in number, and the employment in those factories, under our titanic war effort, will require another hundred thousand or 150,000 workers.

If we are to meet the program of the Federal Government, not only will our essential industries have to find the 200,000 or 300,000 workers they are now needing, but, as I shall later show, huge numbers of additional workers. If I were compelled to wager whether the calls of the Federal Government upon California to carry out its existing program would be over a million or under a million, I should prefer to wager on the higher figure. That is the condition now in California; we are two or three hundred thousand workers critically short, and calls and demands by the Federal Government are anticipated which will require a million additional.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. I am very much interested in the speech being made by the able Senator from California. I wish to ask him if he has any statistical data or any information with respect to what length of time is required to train workmen to become semiexperts in the airplane industry and in the shipping industry such as are now in operation on the west coast?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that it might take only 6 months or a year to train a mechanic to become semiexpert, but there will be required both at air bases and in the shipyards literally thousands of mechanics who will have to be of such high quality that they could not possibly qualify except after many years of training, probably 4 or 5 years, and that is particularly true in relation to shipbuilding.

Mr. President, I dislike to indulge in any criticism or condemnation of any

minor Government official. I think the responsibility should be placed in high places when I express myself, but unfortunately I am compelled to lay a particular matter before the Senate involving rather minor officials. When I was preparing to go to the west coast a month or so ago upon the investigation concerning which I have spoken, I asked the War Manpower Commission to furnish me with their latest data revealing the number of workers they believed would be required in California in this calendar year, including military replacements. I received from the War Manpower Commission a report which was supposed to have been released February 15, stating that the need would be for 436,000 persons. When I arrived in California, after consultation with the economic analyst of the War Production Board in California, he finally raised the figure from 436,000 to 900,000, and admitted to me that his figure was probably too conservative.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Has not the Senator found in checking figures which have been presented to him in the past, that they represent simply estimates, and that situations with respect to them change? Has not the Senator found in checking such estimates that there has always been a failure to take into account the number of men who would be released from one place and who could be used at some place else, and that delay in supplying men for new needs has resulted because no attempt has been made to eliminate old manpower overages which have become rather obsolete, due probably to change of program? For instance, in the case of a reduction in a tank-building program, or a reduction in a truck-building program, a new need may be superimposed without taking into account the conversion to it of men whose services can be spared. Has it not been the Senator's experience that frequently we have simply a compilation of figures which are superimposed one upon the other?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am very much in agreement with the comments made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. The data I have examined as to the over-all manpower problem of the Nation have, in my opinion, been unsound. I cannot speak dogmatically about the rest of the Nation, but I want to say that if our executive departments are going as far astray as to other sections of the United States as they have gone in respect to the Pacific coast, then within 6 months, Heaven help the American people. I say that not profanely, but with deep conviction, because we will need help.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at the end of my remarks, without reading, a letter dated March 8, signed by Don H. Roney, Assistant Chief, Division of Program

Planning of the War Manpower Commission on the west coast, in which he makes this statement:

It is my personal feeling, and this is not official in any sense, that it may be necessary to recruit upward of 900,000 persons to fill these demands.

Referring to the manpower needs of California in the coming year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, adequately to review the many cities, areas, and activities in California which are demoralized because of manpower shortage, would take much too long a time for me to impose upon the Senate. I should like, however, very briefly to review one additional aspect of this program. In southern California we now have on desert maneuvers many hundred thousand young Americans training in the Army. These men are located near our small desert towns. Perhaps as bad a condition as an, exists at Needles, which is a small railroad town on the border between Arizona and California, on the Colorado River. Eighty thousand troops are closer to Needles than to any other small city. Their number is so great that while commissioned officers are allowed leave to go into Needles once a week, privates are allowed to go there only once every 25 days, and that is much too often for the welfare of the soldiers and of the civilian population. The population of this small town has increased from three or four thousand to five or six thousand, much of the increase being among railroad workers. The Army brings into Needles about 1,500 men every day. Together with the civilian demands this number of men could utilize all the facilities of the town many times over. Probably not one-fourth of the boys who are brought in can obtain a soda water, or a soft drink, go to a show, or find any kind of recreational facilities.

I talked to some of these young men, and, like most of the young men in our Army and Navy, they are of the very finest type of American citizenship; but I must admit a sense of resentment on their part and a break-down of morale. It may interest the distinguished junior Senator [Mr. O'DANIEL] to hear that the young men first try to buy a soda water, or ice cream, or soft drink, and failing that, beer, and then many of them take the last remaining thing; they buy a pint of whisky, and stand on the curb and drink it, frustrated and embittered. We do not even have the energy or the workers or the priorities to build commissaries there, or build recreational facilities, or provide for these young men as we want to do. That situation, Mr. President, is duplicated in place after place in the defense centers of California, where the facilities of the civilians are not sufficient to take care of the civilians and of the soldiers. Of course, much more serious conditions are developing in the large defense centers, such as San Diego, San Francisco, Richmond, and cities of that caliber. I

might say that the War Manpower Commission told me that conditions in the Seattle and Portland areas were even worse, generally speaking, than in the California areas. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is present in the Chamber. I have no doubt that he has been inundated with letters from farmers, management, and soldiers, telling about the steadily developing crisis in his State. I have no personal knowledge of the situation, but I know that it must be very bad if it is as bad as that which exists in the State of California.

Mr. President, as I have already said, if the Bankhead amendment had been presented to me 2 months ago I would not have intruded by offering an amendment to exempt from selective service transport workers in areas declared by the Office of Defense Transportation to be critically short of such workers. The people of my State are grateful to the Senator from Alabama for his fearless and effective advocacy of the cause of the farmer. We are also grateful to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I am exceedingly regretful that I have to delay the adoption of their amendment, to which I strongly favor, in order to express myself upon the amendment which I have offered. However, to such an extent do I consider it to be my duty that I now desire to pass to a discussion of the conditions in the railroad and trucking industries, which, in my opinion, show a steady break-down of the effectiveness of those two industries due to an extreme shortage of workers.

Mr. President, in California the most extreme shortage of transport workers is in the trucking industry. That can be immediately proved in two simple ways. The average number of hours worked by our truck drivers at the present time is 72 a week, and many of them are working 75, 84, and 100 hours a week. They are becoming exhausted, dog tired, and sick under the strain.

We have another index. San Francisco is one of the most important embarkation and freight ports in the world. Around that port for the past 90 days there has been a steadily increasing quantity of freight vitally needed in the war effort, which the trucks and the railroads have not the capacity to move.

Let me read a paragraph from a letter dated March 5, 1943, from the Draymen's Association of San Francisco, narrating the freight conditions at that port. I can assure the Senate, from my own knowledge, that the statement made in this letter is correct.

The port of San Francisco is the collection point for all of the military supplies and lend-lease goods which go out on west-bound convoys. Every bit of available warehouse space has been taken over by various governmental agencies. Docks are piled to capacity, and bulkheads and quartermaster's supply depots are continuously filled with goods. Rail cars not only fill the local yards, but about 3,000 carloads are held at Lathrop, about 75 miles from San Francisco, and are backed up to Roseville, about 125 miles distant.

When the war effort vitally needs goods for China or Australia, it is not uncommon for our great trucks to go a hundred miles to get some of that freight, and a hundred miles back again, when the freight should have been delivered in San Francisco. The condition is so shocking that one wonders at the lack of executive and engineering ability of those who allow it to exist.

I know that some Senators do not consider these matters to be their burden. They are willing to shift them to the military and let the military take the responsibility. I personally see conditions so injurious to the war effort if allowed to exist, that I cannot refrain from speaking out, even though it involves opposition to our Chief Executive and his staff. I am speaking for the war effort, and for the people of my State and Nation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKHEAD in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have listened intently to the Senator's speech. I am interested in it. I should like to know what the Senator's theory is. Should there be more workers or less work?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, later I shall ask permission of the Senate to include in the Record at the end of my speech the documented data proving the statements which I have been making on the subject of transport. I am happy to digress for a few minutes to answer the question of the distinguished Senator.

I am very positive in my own mind that the American people cannot even approximately support an armed force of eleven or twelve million, and meet the requirements of the military for war production. Had I my way, drafting on the west coast—and I think probably throughout the United States—should immediately be stopped. I am certain that the war effort would thereby be advanced.

Mr. President, while I am on this subject, let me say that our very able Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, our Chief Executive, our Chief of Staff, and other leaders of the Nation, have said to the American people that any person who expresses opposition to the announced program is a defeatist and does not understand the numbers and power of the American people. I wonder if our Chief of Staff or our President has ever analyzed what our Government is now asking the American people to do. It is asking them to perform a job so titanic that it almost staggers the imagination.

I ask the Senator who has interrogated me to consider a few simple categories for a moment in order to see whether or not it may be necessary to reduce either our production or our military forces.

In the first place, the aircraft program of the United States calls for building 125,000 airplanes in 1943. All the other nations of the world combined

cannot hope to reach a production of 100,000 airplanes. Great Britain and Germany together will produce about 60,000, and the other countries will produce less than 40,000. So with respect to airplanes, we are undertaking not only to produce more than all the other nations of the world, but 25 percent beyond that point. I do not believe that can be done.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Is it the belief of the distinguished Senator from California that the plan is too large for the possibilities?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is my belief.

Mr. TUNNELL. And that the plans for the war effort should be less magnificent?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am totally in agreement with that statement. However, I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from Delaware, who has very courteously commented on what I have said, the comparative production of other categories of combat armament, as between the United States and the rest of the world.

The figure with respect to aircraft is amazing. We want to outbuild all the other nations of the world combined, plus 25 percent. But think of the burden we are assuming in shipbuilding. We intend—and I believe we can and should do this—to produce 20,000,000 tons of cargo and naval shipping combined. All the other countries of the world combined, including Canada, Great Britain, Germany, Japan, and Russia, will not produce 5,000,000 tons. We are undertaking to produce in cargo shipbuilding four times as much as all our foes and friends put together.

On the Pacific coast alone we are expected to produce six or seven million tons of cargo and naval construction, which is more than the production of Canada, Great Britain, Germany, Japan, and Russia put together. With our 11,000,000 people we are called upon to outproduce in shipbuilding all the rest of the world outside the United States. Moreover, Mr. President, in our aircraft production program the Pacific coast alone, with its 12,000,000 people, will be producing more aircraft than will Great Britain or Germany.

Let me also say to the distinguished Senator that in every category of ordnance and automotive units—tanks, trucks, and automobiles—the United States is expected to outproduce all the rest of the world combined. Furthermore, we will produce a large part of the octane gasoline, synthetic rubber, food, fish, lumber, and iron. We in the United States not only are undertaking to produce more war goods of every kind than every ally and every enemy, all put together will produce, but probably 25 percent beyond that amount. In addition, we are expected to have the largest armed force in the whole world. The figure which has been given out is 11,000,000 men in our armed forces by next December. That figure is somewhat fal-

lacious, because beyond the 11,000,000 we will draft another million; and by the end of this year our so-called program of attrition will meanwhile draw upon the manpower of the United States to the extent of 12,000,000 persons. Beyond that, by next December, the civil-service workers, the civilian workers, in the Army and Navy, will approach 3,000,000 more in number; so that in the Army and Navy, including their civilian personnel, we shall have 15,000,000 persons.

Mr. President, if we were to take all our men and boys from the ages of 20 to 35 years we should not have 15,000,000 of them. However, we are expected to maintain by far the greatest armed force in the world; and in addition thereto we are expected to help feed and equip our allies. Beyond all that, in the manufacture of combat armament, we are expected to outproduce every other people on the face of the earth.

Mr. President, comparisons are odious; and I regret to have to make certain comparisons; but, before the Committee on Military Affairs I have heard certain testimony which has been so derogatory of the American people and so derogatory of the American workers that, in defense of the American people, I am compelled to raise my voice. Recently, I heard a witness express the opinion that as late as December of the past year we were much less mobilized than either Germany, Great Britain, or Japan; indeed, that our mobilization was not one-third as great as theirs. I suppose that the way to judge a pudding is by eating it. I know that all the people in the West are working hard and ably and energetically, and I think they probably have an average workweek of 56 hours.

However, let us forget any considerations of that kind. In California, Oregon, and Washington there are now somewhat less than 11,000,000 people. In Britain there are almost 40,000,000 people. I have heard so much derogatory comparison made as between the methods used in England and the methods used here, comparison between what we are doing here and what they are doing there, that, without making any invidious comparison, I simply want to put in the Record a statement of what we on the Pacific coast are expected to do during the next year, as compared to what the people of the British Isles are expected to do.

In the first place, with our less than 11,000,000 people we are going to build substantially more tonnage of shipping than will be built in both the British Isles and Canada. We are going to put into aircraft production more value and more labor than either Great Britain or Germany are putting. While our building is largely in airplanes, and only to a minor extent in engines, propellers, and instruments, the actual value of the work done on the Pacific coast in the building of 125,000 airplanes will exceed that of the work done by the regimented, slave labor of Germany, or by the unfortunate people of Britain.

As to food, Mr. President, while the British Isles have almost exactly the same acreage as do the States on the

Pacific coast, due to a combination of causes we on the Pacific coast will produce at least twice as much in the way of farm products as will all the 40,000,000 people in the British Isles. It is true that Great Britain will produce substantial numbers of tanks and ordnance, and that only very minor amounts of articles in those categories are produced on the Pacific coast; but let me say that the lumber, fish, petroleum, minerals, octane gasoline, and synthetic rubber which we will produce will outweigh in man-hour value the production of Great Britain in ordnance, tanks, and trucks. I challenge any Senator or any official in Washington to deny the validity of my figures.

That is why it is that we become indignant with any official, however exalted, honest, able, and sincere he may be, who intimates that we are defeatists because we do not think that we can do far more than can be done by all the rest of the world—officials who indicate that our labor, our efforts, our discipline, and our mobilization are inferior to those of our allies.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I hope the Senator from California will not think that I was intimating that he was a defeatist. I was simply trying to understand his viewpoint. Does the Senator think there is any answer other than a lesser program?

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that, of course, judging from the viewpoint of the Pacific coast alone, we would have three different answers. A cessation of the drafting of hundreds of thousands of our very finest workers into the Army and Navy would immediately be a very great relief to us. If the defense program there were to be cut down, that would be a relief; or if the Federal Government were to bring into the West a million fine, high-class workers, and were to provide them with the necessary food, transportation, and housing, in my opinion that would make possible the working out of the very magnificent program.

But, Mr. President, let me point out that the War Manpower Commission says that many areas in the United States already are critically short of workers. I understand that in Detroit, Mich., conditions are most serious because of lack of sufficient workers. I understand that in many sections of New England most unfortunate difficulties are developing. So, whether there is any possibility that the rest of the Nation can provide millions upon millions of additional men for the military services and can proceed with the industrial expansion, so as to help those of us in the West, I have no idea.

Mr. President, perhaps the claim might be made that we might be able to create greater efficiency and effectiveness in our labor by reducing absenteeism or by cutting down the so-called quick rate of turn-over in labor.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I desire to make a comment relative to the discussion of absenteeism. I can state with authority that in the Kaiser shipyards and other ship industries in the Columbia River area there is an absenteeism of from 27 percent to 34 percent daily.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I must certainly challenge the validity of those figures. If it is meant to include in the figures the number of workers who have totally quit their jobs and are not returning, if it is meant to include the shortage among the workers, the figures are correct.

I might say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon I think he has made a misleading statement that should be corrected. I have here all the recent figures on absenteeism, issued for the Nation as a whole, for the aircraft industry, and for the shipbuilding plants.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. DOWNEY. I will ask the Senator to let me conclude this statement. The latest report on shipbuilding, assented to by the Government and by the employers, shows the average rate of absenteeism in shipbuilding plants for the last 30 days to be about 8 percent. There may be some particular reason right now why there should be the extreme absentee rate to which the Senator refers, but I must admit that I do not know the explanation of it.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. In the Portland, Oreg., area a committee of 22 has been organized to address itself to the solution of this serious problem in that area. It is a committee made up of 5 representing labor, 5 representing employers, 5 representing the Government, 5 representing the public at large, and 2 publishers. So it is a composite group. My informant is 1 of that committee of 22 who was in my office yesterday.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. There is about absenteeism much misinformation which is going to present rather a peculiar problem to the American people, because the discussion here is going to be accompanied by considerable guesswork instead of factual information. The greater the number of women who are taken into industry the more absenteeism we are likely to have, for reasons which are obvious to anyone who will think about it.

The more industry gets rid of capable men who are physically strong and draws on older people and children and women, the greater will be the problem of absenteeism, and there is no use trying to escape it. There is going to be a great deal of tearing of nether garments over things we ought to expect in trying to conduct a war of the magnitude of this war. I know of one man who was let off in order to do some work for the union; he was let off with the consent and understanding of everybody involved, yet his time was carried as absenteeism for the full time he would

otherwise have been working. That does not present a fair picture. Obviously, someone is going to have to do that work. An employer comes to Washington on business of his firm. He, too, might well be charged with absenteeism on the same basis. So there will have to be a somewhat more realistic approach to this question, or we will merely feed ourselves on a great deal of misinformation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, one other thing that has disclosed itself very vehemently during the hearings of the Appropriations Committee, for instance, is the fact that it was necessary to retool nearly all the large plants which are now engaged in war work, and the safety devices which were known prior to that time were not available and are not now available to install in the plants, so that accidents and injuries growing out of the new industries have caused a high percentage of absenteeism.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to say, Mr. President, if I may be permitted to do so, that the Senator from California has profoundly impressed me by the splendid description he has given us of the unfortunate and unhappy conditions prevailing on the west coast. After listening to him I feel very strongly that some sort of investigation, followed by appropriate relief, seems to be essential. It seems to me, however, that a matter of this importance and magnitude should have some committee consideration rather than prior action on the floor. I feel that if the Senator's amendment should be adopted by the Senate, it would slow down final action on the pending bill; and all of us appreciate that if we are going to do anything under the pending bill time is of the essence of it.

So, with that statement, and with my assurance to the Senator that I desire to be helpful to him in developing some appropriate relief for the situation which he describes—I am willing to help him follow the matter up in any way he may deem appropriate—I want to ask the Senator if he will not agree to withdraw his amendment and let it go to a committee in the form of a bill or otherwise, with the assurance that I have given him that, in any way I can, I shall be glad to assist him. Such a course would enable us to speed this bill, which has been before the Senate for nearly 10 days, although the planting season is rapidly coming on. I know the Senator's heart is in this situation; I know he realizes the unfortunate plight in the matter of food production, and does not want to impede the progress of this bill. I am certain of that, and I make that appeal to the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that what he has said is sympathetically received. I am very much in favor of his bill, and I do not want to impede it. If the Senator would suggest a quorum call, and I could have the opportunity to discuss the possibility of securing an immediate hearing on my amendment by the Military Affairs Committee, and could re-

ceive some assurance, after a short further discussion to that effect, I would be willing to withdraw my amendment. In view, however, of what I consider to be the very inaccurate and misleading statements just put into the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] I must now place in the RECORD the very exhaustive data on absenteeism which I have before me, indicating a wholly different condition than the one stated by him. I desire to develop at very short length the very critical break-down of the transportation industries in California, and then I shall conclude.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be very glad to cooperate with the Senator. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion in order to permit me to put two or three letters into the RECORD?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I have received some letters on a very grave subject, in my opinion, and I should like the opportunity to read them into the RECORD. The first letter is dated March 3, from Eugene, Oreg., and reads:

MARCH 3, 1943.

The Honorable RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLMAN: Last week at the McDonald Theater here in Eugene, a short film was included in the program which struck me as a specially prepared piece of anti-Congress propaganda.

If it was not the purpose of the film to make people think that the Nation would be better off without Congress, it was at least loaded with such implications. It aroused in me a good deal of indignation, and I cannot but wonder what persons or influences are behind its distribution.

You may know of this film. It is called Carey Longmire's Washington Report, but did not exhibit the name of any producer or sponsor, as is customary with films. I never heard of Longmire before. He spoke sitting at a desk and seemed to have the purpose of putting Congress in the doghouse indefinitely. His comments were blistering.

"Congress," he said, "is Washington's greatest war casualty." Another crack was, "Congress votes against the administration just to be voting. It is sensitive about being unimportant and must give the semblance of doing something. Congress is Washington's real black-out, and when the President does the needed things to get on with the war Congress cries 'Dictator!' because it hasn't enough intelligence to know any better."

About the only courteous comment was in regard to two or three investigating committees that had got the production of synthetic rubber expedited, exposed excessive prices being charged the Government by manufacturers, etc.

I asked the theater manager who was distributing this film, and from his records he gave me this: Troob-Blumenthal, Inc., 1560 Broadway, New York City. It is called a McCrary film.

One of the remarks concerning the Senate had to do with a filibuster. However, said Longmire, the filibuster need disturb no one, for the Senate had no important work to do anyway.

Surely a Senator would be justified in trying to learn just what is the source and purpose behind this film. As much as I love free

speech and forthright commentators, I do not believe it is legitimate to thrust such a film as this upon theatergoing audiences who have no choice but to listen or walk out and lose their money.

At the conclusion of the film perhaps three or four persons gave a couple of handclaps.

I am going to write a similar letter to Congressman ELLSWORTH.

Mr. President, I have another letter from the same town, on the same subject, which is similar to the one I have just read, but which I shall not trespass on the time of the Senate to read. I have also a memorandum in regard to surveillance of Members of Congress, and a copy of the statement entitled "The Pattern for the New Deal Policies as Indicated by the Career of Louis Napoleon (Napoleon III), of France," which I addressed to a constituent some time ago. I should like to have these matters printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

EUGENE, OREG., March 8, 1943.

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOLMAN: After attending a movie, I was so enraged that I felt something should be done. This is the only way I know how to do it—consequently this letter.

There was a short subject, which might have been a newsreel—as it developed, it was a vicious piece of propaganda discrediting Congress. It explained that Congress spent its time bickering and fighting until the administration had to intervene. I had always felt that the administration was our Congress. It also explained that the experts took care of all important regulations (Donald Nelson, Baruch, etc.). At the end the commentator said that Congress really did have a job which consisted of finding the soft spots in the rules made by the experts.

The film was known to the theater manager as McCrary, No. 37, issued by the Newsreel Distributing Co.

I know no reason why the average entertainment seeker should be subjected to New Deal propaganda which is so insidious that it is un-American.

A man who is usually pretty well informed on developments around the Capital stated to me that he was satisfied that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been gathering all possible information about each Member of Congress under orders from the administration.

The interpretation of this effort is that the administration wants to know everything about each Member of Congress in order that it may locate weak spots in any conflict between the President and Congress.

The man who reported to me could not be brought into the issue, nor could I. It may be that some committee of the Senate, if it is believed the above report is true, could learn from Mr. Edgar Hoover whether he is using Federal investigators for this purpose.

If the information could not be secured in any other manner, I assume that Mr. Hoover would be compelled to answer questions propounded by a committee when summoned before it.

THE PATTERN FOR THE NEW DEAL POLICIES AS INDICATED BY THE CAREER OF LOUIS NAPOLEON (NAPOLEON III), OF FRANCE

(By RUFUS C. HOLMAN, United States Senator)

One hundred years ago France was a republic. There was then a citizen of France

by the name of Louis Napoleon, who was the nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte. Louis Napoleon had visions of personal grandeur and ambitions for personal power and personal prestige as a national and international historic character. He had been unsuccessful in a number of his personal enterprises.

While in England he attached to himself and his political schemes a Miss Howard, afterward Comtesse De Beauregard, a very wealthy woman, who proceeded to finance his intrigues for political power by furnishing the funds to hire a number of ghost writers, composers of songs, poets, and others engaged in preparing his propaganda. This was distributed widely throughout France as campaign literature for Louis Napoleon, who offered himself as a candidate for the French National Assembly, to which he was elected (June 1848). Later he was reelected to the Assembly and then took his seat as a member of the Assembly. His name was submitted in the national elections of France for the Presidency of France, to which he also was overwhelmingly elected.

The burden of his promises to the French people, who were harassed with the debts and obligations incident to the Napoleonic wars, such as we in this country have experienced since World War No. 1, was a "job for every Frenchman" and much about "democracy." All his efforts (December 10, 1848–December 2, 1852), while prating about democracy, tended toward the acquisition of absolute authority.

He instituted a studied and determined propaganda to discredit the National Assembly of France and the individual members of it. During domestic controversies thus occasioned, the Assembly was concerned with the harassing problems of the great public expenditures, deficient revenues, and the national debt, while the President (Louis Napoleon) gave these unpopular but vital subjects scant attention. He continued his popular appeals to the unthinking majority with demands for personal benefits, privileges, and facilities for citizens generally without due consideration for the cost of them. Of course, the popularity of the Assembly waned as his popularity increased, which is generally the case when statesmanship contests with demagoguery.

In the meantime, President Louis Napoleon succeeded in placing in command of the armed forces his puppets, who were more intrigued with the personal fortunes of Napoleon than they were loyal to their obligations to serve the Republic of France.

Finally the day came (December 2, 1851) when Louis Napoleon, President of France, saw and grasped his chance to become Napoleon III, Emperor of France. And so the President of France became the Emperor of France.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 13, 1943.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that it is my intention to reply, after the quorum shall have been developed, to the figures he has placed in the RECORD as to absenteeism. I shall question those figures as wholly misleading, as totally incorrect, and as inaccurate in the very highest degree.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Bridges	Chavez
Austin	Brooks	Clark, Idaho
Bailey	Buck	Clark, Mo.
Ball	Burton	Connally
Bankhead	Bushfield	Danaher
Bilbo	Byrd	Davis
Bone	Capper	Downey
Brewster	Caraway	Eastland

Ellender	McCarran	Shipstead
Ferguson	McClellan	Smith
George	McFarland	Taft
Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Gillette	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Guffey	Maybank	Tobey
Gurney	Mead	Tunnell
Hatch	Millikin	Tydings
Hawkes	Moore	Vandenberg
Hayden	Murdock	Wagner
Hill	Nye	Walsh
Holman	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Johnson, Calif.	Overton	Wherry
Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	White
Kilgore	Reed	Wiley
La Follette	Revercomb	Willis
Langer	Reynolds	Wilson
Lodge	Robertson	
Lucas	Scrugham	

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California permit me to read into the RECORD a short statement by Secretary Knox bearing on the subject of absenteeism, which to my mind might well be brought to the attention of the Senator from California at this time?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. The statement I am about to read was made by Secretary Knox before the Committee on Appropriations, and I think it is especially apropos. To my mind it is something to which the Congress should give attention. The Secretary said:

I have had this experience which might be useful. Many times, especially earlier in the war activity, I got complaints from individual workers or people outside of plants, about loafing in plants. Invariably we made an investigation, and have come to this conclusion: The only complaints of that character that you have to give any great attention to and deal with are those in plants where production is going down. In other words, the best and perhaps the only way you can measure a plant, by and large, is in its production.

Inevitably when you get four or five thousand men together, you have a number of loafers. All men are not actuated by the same motives and do not have the same energy. So I think, by and large, the thing for us to do, and especially for Congress to do in dealing with this whole, big problem of production, is to measure the effectiveness of our efforts by what we are getting out of the efforts. Results are what count. I would like to say, on behalf of both the Army and the Navy—and I think I can speak for the Army in this—that the increase in production going on now is extremely gratifying, and that it is going to be ample to meet our military needs. So I wouldn't get too excited about a lot of isolated instances of slow-downs. In dealing with so immense a thing as we are dealing with, you are bound to have those things, and nothing we can do could stop them all. You can never get 100 percent.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Nevada for reading that statement.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have just had a conversation with the Senator from California in regard to his amendment, and likewise in reference to his resolution. I had the pleasure of hearing the Senator testify before the Committee on Military Affairs several days ago regarding certain investigations which he, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, had made

in California. I was so thoroughly interested at that time that I suggested he find the opportunity to advise the Members of this body what his investigations on the coast had revealed. I told the Senator, who I believe will verify this statement, that if he would withdraw his amendment now, the committee would be very glad to give him an early hearing on the subject matter of his amendment, and likewise to consider his resolution, both of which could be considered at the same time. I find now that it will be possible to give the Senator a hearing on his amendment as well as on his resolution Thursday afternoon next. The Senator has told me that it would be convenient for him to appear then, and if he will agree to withdraw his amendment I will agree to give him that early hearing, which is set for Thursday afternoon at 2 o'clock.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina for his statement, and, in accordance with what he has said, at the conclusion of a few more brief remarks I shall withdraw my amendment, and will be very happy to have the hearing as outlined by the Senator from North Carolina, who is chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Therefore, Mr. President, at this time I take the opportunity to advise the members of the Military Affairs Committee that on Thursday afternoon, beginning at 2 o'clock, the Military Affairs Committee will have a hearing in accordance with the agreement which has been entered into here.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I am addressing myself solely to the inquiry. Do I correctly understand that the able Senator from California has withdrawn his amendment, or does he merely intend to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. DOWNEY. I intend at the conclusion of my remarks, which will consume not more than 30 minutes, to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. McNARY. It is, then, the purpose of the Senator to withdraw the amendment at the conclusion of his remarks?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on absenteeism, and I shall do so only because the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], has raised that issue in, I think, a most lamentable and unfortunate way. I know, of course, the Senator is justified in relying upon the statements made to him, but his statement is so wholly inconsistent with the general facts in the shipbuilding industry that it should not be allowed to stand uncontradicted.

The distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], has already read into the RECORD the remarks and the comments of the Secretary of War upon the same subject, which ought to be almost conclusive, and I thank the Senator from Nevada for doing so.

Mr. President, the facts which I have documented, and which I will offer in evidence at the conclusion of my remarks, show that, taking industry as a whole, absenteeism in the United States runs

from 5 to 6 percent; with absenteeism among women about 50 percent greater than among men. In the aircraft industry it runs a little more than 6 percent, and in the shipbuilding industry it runs about 8 percent.

I refer the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and likewise other interested Senators, to the Monthly Labor Review of February 1943, issued by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, which quotes the records from the shipbuilding companies themselves, showing that the absentee rate in the shipyards of the Nation is running slightly over 8 percent, that the rate on Saturdays and Mondays runs about 10 percent, and about 7 percent for the latter part of the week.

Mr. President, it seems to me that anyone who has investigated, as I have, absenteeism, on the Pacific coast, must immediately reach the conclusion that the workers in all defense industries are performing loyal and devoted work. There are certain figures which reveal immediately not only the conditions but the causes for the conditions. The absenteeism rate is much higher among women than among men, because many of the women engaged in defense work are keeping their own homes; they have to do their shopping on a day when they are absent; they have to take care of their children, and they have to take care of their homes. They are not so strong and well and vigorous as are the men. Consequently the absentee rate among women in war defense factories is 50 percent higher than among the men.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I may suggest that there must be a difference then between women employed in munitions industries in California and those employed in munitions industries in Kansas. Recently, about 2 months ago, I was home. A munitions plant is located just outside my home town. I called on the manager there. That plant is employing about 6,000 persons, of whom 40 percent are women. The manager hopes to be able to increase the number of women to 60 percent. I am only offering this statement for the information of the Senator from California. The manager told me that he had less trouble, both in the matter of discipline and in the matter of absenteeism, with women than he had with men. I simply offer that for the information of the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Again we have offered to us a fragmentary bit of testimony, not documented, not generally applicable. That sort of testimony, of course, will be headlined over the United States. I wish to say that the Senator from Kansas cannot produce a single bit of statistical data revealing that absenteeism is not much greater among women than among men. As a matter of fact, in almost every category of employment women are absent almost 50 percent more than are men. In verification of that statement I wish to introduce in the RECORD, to be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, an article appearing in the Sunday Star, of Washington, D. C., March 14, 1943,

dealing with this particular subject. The article is by Edward Robinson, and is entitled "Remedies for Absenteeism."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit B.)

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish only to observe in passing that there may be greater reason for absenteeism in California than in Kansas, because California has the bright sunshine, the fruit, the flowers, the blue skies, and the wonderful climate, which may be conducive to women going out in the open to see a little more of God. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Nevada has said. California has all those charms. I suggest, however, that the ozone of Kansas, the wide horizons, the flowers, the vistas, and the landscapes are just as beautiful in Kansas as they are in California.

Let me say to the Senator from California that I did not mean by anything which I said in any way to question the figures, data, and statistics which the Senator from California has produced. He was touching upon a particular point upon which I happen to have some personal experience. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his remarks.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, of course it is entirely obvious why we must almost certainly expect greater absenteeism among women than among men. In California, at least, a substantial portion of the women who are working in the war factories are married and have the responsibility of maintaining homes for their husbands and children. Of course, one would expect such workers to be absent more often than men who do not have kindred responsibilities.

It is likewise true that women, as a whole, do not possess the same physical stamina and physique as do men. I have carefully analyzed the reports from all the aircraft industries in California. I have placed them in the record before the Military Affairs Committee. They show a 50-percent higher rate of absenteeism among women than among men.

I have already offered for the RECORD an article from the Sunday Star. It shows the condition throughout the Nation. Taken as a whole, absenteeism among women in every industry is about 50 percent greater than among men. The article in the Sunday Star also contains figures from Great Britain, showing that absenteeism in Great Britain runs about 10 percent—which is almost double the rate in the United States—and that the great problem of absenteeism there is among women. I wish to say in fairness to the British workers that their workweek is longer. It is believed that that fact accounts for the greater percentage of absenteeism.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNEL in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In connection with what the Senator has said with respect to absenteeism in England, it will also be noted that Great Britain has a law which penalizes individuals for being absent. Notwithstanding that law, there is still a greater percentage of absenteeism in England than there is at the present time in this country where no similar legislation exists.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his very pertinent comment.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] that absenteeism is greater in Germany than in the United States. It is also greater in Italy than it is in the United States. Mussolini has just issued a decree providing for 6 months' imprisonment as punishment for certain kinds of absenteeism.

I desire also to say, Mr. President, that I exhaustively and carefully investigated the subject of absenteeism on the Pacific coast by talking with almost all the proprietors of the great war industries, as well as the workers themselves. I believe the workers of the United States are doing a magnificent job. It is true that in shipbuilding the work is hazardous. It is a hard task. Broken limbs, steel in the eyes, colds, pneumonia, injured legs and arms are not uncommon. It is dangerous and hard work. For that reason absenteeism in that industry is greater than in other war industries.

In addition to the conditions to which I have referred, around almost all the shipyards there is a heavy congestion of population, where men are not being properly fed, where they do not have proper medical attention, where transportation is very burdensome, where for weeks workers may be sleeping in trailers or, in some instances of which I know, in the public parks. Men are compelled to take time off from their work to find some permanent habitation, or move into it. I only wish for myself—and I speak for myself alone—that my record of absenteeism were as good as that of the workers of America who are doing the tough, hard job of this war.

I am not familiar with the particular condition about which the distinguished Senator from Oregon has spoken. I know that because there has been such a rapid expansion in connection with some of the Kaiser ship plants, workers have been unable to find transportation, housing, or food. That, of course, would account for an abnormal condition.

Mr. President, the castigations which have been directed against the American worker because the absentee rate is slightly higher for a short time immediately following pay day than on other days are totally unfair. The inference has been left with the American people that the absentee rate is higher right after pay day because of unwarranted vacationing, dissipation, debauches, or similar reasons. No statement could be more false or more reprehensible.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from California also observed that plants with the best and most efficient supervision and management, which are producing weapons or ships, and actually making deliveries in rapid fire order, have the lowest records of absenteeism, and that any plant which does not produce very well immediately starts to build up a record of absenteeism, showing that the morale of accomplishment is one of the greatest deterrents to absenteeism? Has the Senator noticed that?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, I have. I thank the Senator for his comment, and I agree with him.

I believe that in factories which are ably and energetically supervised, the percentage of absenteeism is lower than in factories without such supervision.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I studied the large percentage of absenteeism in the Columbia River area only after I have explored the subject at some length in conversation with my informant. I do not wish to delay action on the pending amendment by reciting a bill of particulars, which, after all, depends upon the information furnished me by my informant. My statement is submitted as a statistical proposition. It should be so startling to those who are concerned about the waste of manpower, not only in war industries but in the departments in Washington, that there should be close scrutiny and a verification or denial of the figures which I have cited. I was so amazed at the high percentage revealed that I stated to my informant, "That is one absent in five." He said, "It is more than one in four." So I am not mistaken as to what I was told.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I have no doubt that he has accurately and sincerely reported what was said to him. I will also state to the distinguished Senator that if he desires to have an itemized statement on absenteeism in every type of shipyard in the United States, under every condition, if he will turn to page 216 of the monthly Labor Review for February, he will find there corroboration of the facts which I have stated, as given by the shipbuilding companies themselves.

As I have previously stated, Mr. President, I talked with almost every important leader in the management of war factories in the State of California. Not one of them had the slightest criticism of workers because of absenteeism. On the contrary, every one of them said that he thought that, in view of the unhappy conditions in respect to transportation, housing, food, and similar conditions, the workers were making an extraordinarily good record.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am not leveling criticism against war workers, or any other particular group, because my informant advised me that the employers, or operators, have a large share of the responsibility for absenteeism. An over-all

condition prevails in many war industries which is conducive to the wasting of manpower.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I believe the last remark of the Senator from Oregon shows that his informant was talking about something different from what we are discussing. It is true that in some of the shipyards on the Pacific coast there has been hoarding of labor, and there have been lay-offs of workers. Considering all the factors, including the uneven flow of material and inefficiency in management, it may be possible to find a high rate of absences in isolated cases.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator state again the source of the figures on absenteeism which he gave to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DOWNEY. I referred the Senator to two statements appearing in the Washington Sunday Star of March 14, 1943. In that issue of the Washington Star is to be found a complete discussion of absenteeism in the United States and in England.

Mr. LUCAS. I am interested in ascertaining the name and issue of the magazine or pamphlet to which the Senator referred.

Mr. DOWNEY. In the Monthly Labor Review of February 1943 is to be found a complete discussion of absenteeism, with documented data. The discussion appears on page 216, and contains reports given by the shipbuilding proprietors themselves.

Mr. LUCAS. I take it that there cannot be any question about the accuracy of the data the Senator is giving from the labor records which have been submitted to the persons who wrote the article. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. I can assure the Senator that there can be no mistake.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, I am willing to take the facts which are submitted by someone who apparently knows, rather than the statements of someone who is spreading a rumor here and there with respect to the problem of absenteeism. One of the great troubles at the present time is that during the great emergency through which we are passing, some people are constantly indicting individuals, this department or that department of Government on the basis of rumors, innuendos, and half-baked statistics, thereby getting no place, with the exception of further dividing the American people at a time when we should be concerning ourselves only with facts, facts which will unite the American people. It seems to me the time is long past for anyone to take into consideration, seriously, statements as to what some particular individual has said to someone in private—something which may be, after all, a rumor or an outlandish exaggeration.

It is such secretive things that cause the American people to wonder when the statements appear on the front pages of the press.

Any time we can produce facts, any time we can produce the truth upon a question of this kind or upon any other question in government, it seldom makes sensational news. It is only the secretive things—something that someone has told someone else, something that someone in one of the departments has quietly suggested to some Member of the Senate or some Member of the House—that immediately raise suspicion in the minds of the American people as to whether they are true or false.

With all due deference to everyone, I say that such things are constantly undermining the morale of the American people during the present crisis—a crisis, if you please, wherein we should have the utmost unity if we are to win. By proceeding on the basis of pure facts we can unite the people; we can obtain the right kind of debate in the Senate or in any other place. On facts, we can arrive at a fair and just conclusion about absenteeism which the Senator from California is now discussing.

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, and if the Senator will pardon me, I should like to make one or two observations on the question of absenteeism. It is an important question. The Senator has cited figures relative to what has been done in England and in this country with respect to absenteeism. I come from a State, many sections of which are highly industrialized. Only last week I appeared in the city of Rockford and had an opportunity to talk to the heads of industry located in that city and now engaged in the production of articles and implements of war. I also talked to the leaders of the laboring men. Both the leaders in industry and in labor said the Congress of the United States would make a serious mistake if it were to attempt to legislate upon the question of absenteeism.

Mr. President, I maintain that legislation cannot cure absenteeism. Any time the Congress of the United States attempts to lay down a pattern from the standpoint of compelling the workers to do this or to do that on the question of absenteeism, absenteeism will increase instead of diminish. Efficient management, persuasion from patriotic viewpoint and education are the only means by which we can secure the maximum results. If any proposed legislation on absenteeism comes to the floor of the Senate, on the basis of my personal investigation and research on the question, I shall do everything I can do to defeat it.

Mr. President, I repeat, there is only one way to decrease absenteeism, and that is by means of a program of patriotic education and persuasion upon the part of the Government, upon the part of management, upon the part of labor, and upon the part of every patriot who is vitally interested in winning this war in the shortest possible time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the eloquent, able, and forceful remarks of the Senator from Illinois. He may be interested in another set of figures which are rather derogatory to State from which I come and to the State

from which the Senator from Oregon comes. The extent of absenteeism in shipyards on the Pacific coast is very much higher than in the shipyards on the Great Lakes. Why that is so I do not know; but I venture to say that a careful investigation would reveal that it has come about, not because of greater irresponsibility or apathy on the part of our workers, but because of better conditions relative to living and food in Illinois and other States in the Great Lakes section.

Mr. President, because my particular amendment deals with the deferment of truck drivers and men engaged in working on the railroads, I desire to advert to absenteeism and, likewise, to the number of hours worked by men in those two groups.

First let me say that, so far as the work of the truck drivers is concerned, I secured the figures from the Office of Defense Transportation in San Francisco, from the trucking proprietors, and from the unions themselves.

The week before I was in San Francisco, the truck drivers of that area worked 72 hours a week, and a work-week of 75 or 100 hours was not uncommon. Indeed, the men are being worked so hard that they are becoming exhausted, and no longer are able to endure the ordeal. They are working so hard that the number of accidents in the trucking business has increased 300 percent in the last few months.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks telegrams from trucking proprietors in California describing the alarming increase of trucking accidents because of the overworked truck drivers.

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

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am glad to have an opportunity to pay a tribute to the railroad men of America. Lately, certain newspapers and magazines have been carrying derogatory and false articles concerning the number of hours being worked by railroad men. Someone is trying to popularize and propagandize the expression "feather-bedding" in an attempt to make the public believe that large numbers of railroad workers are working very short hours, and that, due to certain arbitrary rules, there has been a large wastage of railroad workers. I desire to brand such implications and statements and articles as almost wholly false.

The Reader's Digest, in its last issue, had a most unfair and misleading article on that very subject. It is true that in the United States there are approximately 500 railroad engineers and firemen who have what we call a fast, blue-chip run. The article in the Reader's Digest discussed that particular group of 500 men as though its members worked under conditions typical of those of hundreds of thousands of other railroad workers. I have already said that that particular group is limited to approxi-

mately 500 fortunate older men in the railroad service. In the State of California, to which the Reader's Digest refers, the actual hours worked by employees of that class, of whom there are probably only 30 in the whole State, exceeds 30 hours a week. If one were frankly to state the facts and to say that those men should be working 40 or 48 hours a week, that would be just and fair; but to cite conditions surrounding less than 500 workers, in an endeavor to make the American people believe it is typical of the railroad workers cannot be condemned in too vigorous language.

Mr. President, the men on fast runs are at the cabs of locomotive engines running 70, 80, and 90 miles an hour. Many of them travel through heavily populated territory. I am told that because of the shaking of the engine and the great tension involved in driving it this character of work is most severe and onerous. The argument is made that men engaged in that kind of duty perform more burdensome work, more

particular work, than do our transport pilots who, under the law, are not allowed to work more than 30 hours a week. I do not intend to engage in a discussion of that particular group. What I am castigating are the propagandizing articles printed in magazines and broadcast over the Nation to make the American people think that railroad workers at the present time are not working long hours a week.

Mr. President, I now wish to place in the RECORD data furnished me by the Southern Pacific Co. within the last 2 weeks showing the hours of work per month and per week of various selected groups of employees working for the Southern Pacific in December 1942. The report shows that almost all the workers worked in excess of 50 hours a week and that some worked as high as 59 and 67 hours a week. I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD.

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

Southern Pacific Co. (Pacific line), hours of work (per month and per week), various selected groups of employees, December 1942

[Portland, Oreg., to Tucumcari, N. Mex., through San Francisco, Los Angeles, and El Paso. San Francisco, Calif., to Ogden, Utah]

(1)	Number of employees, middle of month	Total hours worked, including overtime	Average hours per—	
			Month	Week
(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Clerical and general:				
Clerks, stenographers, typists, storekeepers, ticket agents, etc.....	8,741	1,831,440	210	47
Telephone operators, office assistants.....	416	84,565	203	46
Messenger and office boys.....	246	50,354	205	46
Maintenance of way and structures:				
Bridge and building carpenters, painters, masons, plasterers, plumbers, maintenance-of-way helpers, etc.....	1,658	383,192	231	53
Extra gang and sectionmen.....	5,268	1,295,927	246	56
Signalmen, maintainers, and helpers.....	665	139,592	210	47
Maintenance of equipment and stores:				
Blacksmiths, boilermakers, electrical workers, machinists, sheet-metal workers.....	5,352	1,362,378	255	57
Carmen, skilled-trade helpers (maintenance of equipment and stores).....	8,201	2,133,129	261	59
Helper and regular apprentices.....	368	83,637	228	52
Coach cleaners.....	938	193,700	207	47
Classified and general laborers (shops, enginehouses, and power plants).....	2,338	486,452	208	47
General laborers (stores, ice, reclamation, and timber-treating plants).....	1,303	281,973	216	49
Transportation (excluding train, engine, and yard):				
Station agents, telegraphers, telephoners, clerk-telegraphers, tower-men.....	1,529	368,280	241	54
Baggage, parcel-room, and station attendants.....	348	74,744	215	48
Callers, loaders, sealers, freight inspectors, truckers, laborers (stations, warehouses).....	1,709	446,972	262	59
Chefs, cooks, waiters, camp cooks, kitchen help, etc.....	1,716	509,272	297	67
Yardmasters, switch tenders, hostlers, hostler helpers.....	645	156,284	242	53
Trainmen, engineers, and yardmen:				
Passenger conductors, brakemen, and baggagemen.....	1,056	222,769	211	48
Freight conductors, brakemen, and flagmen.....	4,094	1,037,869	254	57
Yard foremen and helpers.....	3,185	744,516	234	53
Passenger engineers and firemen.....	696	136,534	205	46
Freight engineers and firemen.....	3,002	693,854	231	52
Yard engineers and firemen.....	1,771	410,244	232	52

Source: Basic data columns 1, 2, and 3 from Interstate Commerce Commission hours and wage statistics. Forms A and B, as reported by Southern Pacific Co.

Mr. DOWNEY. I also desire to place in the RECORD a W. P. B. press release of the 8th of March, headed "Wartime transportation," with the subhead "Railway men work 50-hour week."

I will read merely one short sentence that contains the heart of it:

As an example of the hours worked by railroad employees, management and labor representatives pointed to computations made from Interstate Commerce reports for the first 10 months of 1942, showing that last October the average railroad workweek ranged from 49.1 hours for the professional, clerical, and general group to 56.5 hours in other classifications.

I now ask that the entire release be printed in the RECORD.

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

RAILWAY MEN WORK 50-HOUR WEEK

Most of the Nation's railroad workers average over 50 hours work a week, representatives of railroad labor and management told officials of the Office of Defense Transportation at a conference last week.

With an average workweek already over the 48-hour level, there is little need for stepping up weekly hours of employment on the country's railroads to conform to the new manpower order, the representatives pointed out.

The roads are not subject to the hours provisions of the wage-hour law, the representatives declared, adding that, with the exception of those classifications for which hours of employment are restricted for safety purposes, there are no regulations on the number of hours railway employees may work.

In those occupations where a weekly schedule is feasible, the workweek is uniformly 48 hours, but most railroad workers average above 50 hours a week.

As an example of the hours worked by railroad employees, management and labor representatives pointed to computations made from Interstate Commerce reports for the first 10 months of 1942 showing that last October the average railroad workweek ranged from 49.1 hours for the professional, clerical, and general group to 56.5 hours in other classifications.

In 8 of the 10 months maintenance-of-way and stores department employees on class 1 railroads worked an average of 48 hours or more, while the average weekly employment in train and engine service was 49.3 hours last October.

Since that time, it was pointed out, the average workweek has undoubtedly increased considerably since mileage-limitation rules on many railroads have been eliminated.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have talked to railroad workers in California who have not missed one day since Pearl Harbor. I have talked to railroad workers working from 48 to 50 and 60 hours a week at their own profession and then helping out in some store or elsewhere the remainder of the week.

In addition to the criticism of railroad workers because of so-called blue-chip runs, there are about 5,000 railroad workers whose time of working is being criticized because there is some special rule of the railroad workers which limits how they may work. I have no idea of the justice of the argument about this small group of men but, whatever the truth is, its effect upon a million and a half railroad workers and the time they work is negligible. Any magazine, any newspaper, any speaker who takes isolated statements and then attempts to prove from such statements the truth about the whole group is committing, in my opinion, a reasonable offense. Why do I say "reasonable," Mr. President? I say it in the broad meaning of the word, it is true, but I say it because when magazines and newspapers give out data wholly misleading and unfair to the railroad workers, it not only creates a false impression in the mind of the public as to such workers, but it causes a bitterness and resentment among the railroad workers against the propagandizing instruments that issue the figures.

Likewise I might say, Mr. President, that the same thing is true of the figures with respect to absenteeism. In California, at least—and I speak from certain knowledge—the workers are loyal, energetic, and devoted to their work, and attacks upon them, this sermon, this almost vilification, are creating increased bitterness among them. I cannot believe that that type of unfair attack upon the workers of America will promote or help the war effort.

Mr. President, a few words more and I shall be through. I have submitted this amendment extending to the transport workers in areas of vital shortages

the same exemption the pending bill would give to farm workers. In California, right now, the trucking and railroad industries are close to a breakdown. I am informed that lend-lease shipments through the Golden Gate have greatly increased, and that the shipment of war industries' freight from the Atlantic to the Pacific seaboard is going to be greatly increased. I am also informed that a year from now there will be in California hundreds of thousands of soldiers more than are there now, and, of course, their persons and the freight needed by them will have to be moved by railroad or truck.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we are now in the slackest season relating to the movement of farm crops. The trucking proprietors have served notice upon me that their present equipment and workers will not allow them even to move accepted war freight, let alone handle any of the immense shipments of farm products in California. In California 80 percent of the farm crops are moved by trucks belonging to someone other than the farmer.

I am so much concerned about this question, Mr. President, that I am desperately anxious that the Federal Government shall take some wise and far-reaching step to prevent the breakdown of our transportation systems on the Pacific coast, because, if such steps shall not be taken, the injury to the Pacific coast and to the war effort will be incalculably unfortunate for us all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California withdraw his amendment?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

EXHIBIT A

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
San Francisco Calif., March 8, 1943.
Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am attaching some revised pages of the memorandum I submitted to you recently. These pages should be substituted for the corresponding ones which you now have.

I have discussed the estimates with a number of people in the Manpower Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Civil Service Commission, and elsewhere. These estimates represent our best judgment based on the information available to us, which as you know is quite extensive.

You will note also that some of the narrative statements in the summary have been revised. The estimate of year-round farm workers (which has been raised to 20,000) was the subject of considerable discussion with the Regional Farm Placement representative, representatives of the Department of Agriculture, and other persons whose judgment we felt was acceptable. You understand, of course, that this figure, as well as others, is based upon information available to us. There may, of course, be other material extant which would indicate that a different figure might be more nearly representative of the situation. Our figure is perhaps conservative, but is predicated on the belief that normal year-round farm employment was greater than was necessary to maintain the operations, and that under pressure of war conditions a greater utilization of labor is not only possible but expected.

You will note that the figures include needs for 100,000 Government workers. As is

stated in the summary, these are spread throughout three sections of the report. I have discussed the matter at length with Mr. Kranz and we agree that while the figure is undoubtedly conservative, we know of no method (based on information available to us) by which we can extend the figure quantitatively beyond this total. Similarly I feel that the aircraft forecast may be conservative. However, the most recent reports (which, for the most part, are as of approximately the middle of February) give only slight indication of expansions beyond those forecast.

I have avoided attempting to forecast the number of persons required to fill these labor demands. You will note that the first paragraph of the summary states that "it may require substantially greater numbers of people to meet these requirements." Such a forecast must grow essentially out of an evaluation of supply rather than a prediction of demand. It is my personal feeling—and this is not official in any sense—that it may be necessary to recruit upward of 900,000 persons to fill these demands. This will be true because of the concentration of demand in some areas, which will require digging deeper into the supply of workers whose productivity rate is marginal.

You will understand that it has not been possible to investigate many of the aspects of this problem as thoroughly as I would like to have been able to do. We will continue to revise our estimates as more and better information becomes available, and will be glad to provide them to you at any future time should they be of value to you.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM K. HOPKINS,
Regional Director,
War Manpower Commission.
By D. H. RONEY,
Assistant Chief,
Division of Program Planning.

EXHIBIT B

REMEDIES FOR ABSENTEEISM—BRITAIN SEEKS SOLUTIONS FROM WITHIN INDUSTRIES (By Edward Robinson)

LONDON.—Absenteeism, a mounting problem to the war industries of the United States, is also a problem in Britain; but the Government here believes it can be remedied by internal rather than external measures.

Labor Minister Bevin puts the view this way: The cure "is more likely to be found by those establishments who look for the solution within themselves than by those which tend to rely more on external powers of discipline or punishment."

At the end of 1942 there were about 8,000,000 persons in Britain engaged on essential work, and of these about 10 percent (800,000) were absent from their work each day from one cause or another.

In industries under the "essential work order," labor movements are definitely restricted; an employer cannot discharge a man from his job, nor can an employee quit, without Government permission.

(The Office of War Information, in a report issued February 15, said job absences in the United States now "may be twice" the rate of 3 percent "common in industry" before war industries got under way, and that the rate may be even higher in some plants which experience difficult working and transportation problems.)

(Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, reported that normal pre-war absences in industry was 2.2 percent, and has now increased among men to 4.5 percent and among women to 6.5 percent.)

(According to the Congress of Industrial Organizations, more than half of the absences are caused by illness, inadequate health, transportation and housing difficulties, labor hoarding and inadequate planning of allocation of materials; to draft board examina-

tions, appearances in court, blizzards, and flood.)

In the official view, malicious absence accounted for about 2 percent of the British absentees; the workers who, nursing some sort of grudge, stayed out for days on end or were persistently late. Some, in the "careless" class, excused themselves with "missed the bus," "away for the week end," "alarm clock didn't work" and the like.

Short-period absences reached their peak on Fridays (traditional British pay day), were high on Saturdays and Mondays. "Married women tend to take Saturday mornings for shopping," says a Labor Ministry official.

About two-thirds of the daily absences were accounted for by illness. Absence through this cause has increased since the replacement of younger men by older workers and those of lower medical grades. In seven factories checked by the British Medical Journal, colds and flu were found to be the greatest causes of time lost. Fifty percent of all the male workers and 45 percent of the women lost some working time during the 6 months of 1942 under review.

(Numerous differences make comparisons between the American and British situations difficult, but one factor tending to make absenteeism an even more acute problem in Britain is a longer workweek, taxing health and endurance. The British war industry week is 56 hours. Latest Office of War Information figure for United States is 47.9 hours as the average for all metal-working industry.)

The British Medical Association warned the government at the end of 1942 that "industrial fatigue due to excessive working hours was filling the consulting rooms with thousands of war workers suffering from minor ailments" and pressed for an immediate inquiry.

Government investigators used no rose-colored spectacles when seeking causes and cures. One reported: "What must be accepted is the psychological factor that thousands of workers see in their job the complete disruption of their home life. Married women with the full-time job of looking after husband, children, and home are working long hours in factories and shops. Men's homes are disorganized by the fact that wives, daughters, other relations, parents in some instances, are all going to work, or because they have been sent right away from their families to work."

Another noted that the lack of real interest in the job and lack of conviction about its importance and urgency are mainly due to ignorance. It is too readily assumed that workers generally are only concerned with the money incentive, whereas experience shows that workers in general respond in an increasing degree to the incentive of interest when they are made aware of the part their job plays in the final product.

(The supply ministry in a recent circular emphasized "it is part of the business of good management to keep the work people informed of the use of their products in battle." The ministry itself helps with a thousand day and night cinema shows, mostly of news films, demonstrating to the workers the results of their efforts. Ten-minute pep talks are another feature.)

"Many workers"—commenced another report—"particularly women, cannot be expected to work 5½ days weekly and long hours, week in week out, if they have to spend an additional 2 or 3 hours daily or even more in traveling, possibly by crowded bus or train, in all weathers. It must be remembered that a high percentage of today's war workers are not used to factory life."

Most workers, it was added, were away from their homes or billets about 12 hours, calculating the average traveling time plus work shift.

Another contributory cause noted was idle time, when workers are forced to stand about

for hours, even days, held up by some cause usually completely beyond their control.

A significant point noted by investigators was the gulf in the factories between those who know and those who don't, blamed by many for loss of output through slacking and absenteeism.

Labor Minister Bevin summarized: "The majority of the absentees stay away occasionally because of exhaustion, and the best way to reduce that is to limit the call upon human energy. There must be every possible aid to labor, every device to avoid unnecessary fatigue."

In a recent memorandum to all war industries, Bevin indicated broad and general outlines for cures, asked employers, managements, works production committees, and trade unions to seek the best remedial action "to mitigate difficult conditions and to bring public opinion to bear on those who are careless in attendance or punctuality."

Included in the remedial schemes are:

1. Factory records of absence and all relevant data to be discussed regularly before works production committees and managements. (In previous investigations one stumbling block was the lack or unsuitability of factory records.)

2. A very high rate of sickness absence is to be checked by medical examination; high accident rates to be immediately investigated.

3. Absence backed by what appears to be a reasonable excuse to be watched by welfare officers, in whose hands should be such "cures" as transport improvement, additional nurseries, better hostel arrangements, tastier and more regular meals, suitable leave for shopping.

4. Rotated schedules to give workers another day off weekly besides Sunday; workers to be encouraged to use hostels and billets near the factories where traveling is a hindrance to attendance.

"Works productions committees, personnel departments, and such other bodies," said Bevin, "can and should settle absenteeism locally and without any governmental interference."

Bevin also put on record that "prosecution of young people for absenteeism should be undertaken only as a last resort. I always try to examine these cases in the light of what I might have been at 17."

Prosecution of workers for absenteeism average about 1 in 10,000, imprisonment 1 in 50,000. Fines range from \$4 to a possible maximum of \$400, imprisonment up to 3 months. Prosecution is generally ordered by the national service officer for the area, but in many instances the offender's own workmates have observed, reported, and insisted on prosecution.

EXHIBIT C

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., February 9, 1943.

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Undoubtedly you are familiar with the acute manpower situation in our State. Our business is transportation of large amounts of goods and materials vitally essential to war effort here and for transshipment to armed forces abroad. A break-down of transportation systems is imminent due to unreasonable acts of individual draft boards recognizing no authority but their own and refusing to consider appeals or official orders of other governmental agencies. They continue inducting men whose contribution to war effort as civilians far surpasses ability as soldiers. Something must be done. We find it impossible to replace experienced men or to obtain new men to break in.

Immediate action by you and your colleagues is necessary.

WARD G. WALKUP,
President, Walkup Drayage
& Warehouse Co.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., March 11, 1943.

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Yesterday we had nine accidents in 1 day. One accident will cost this company \$1,000 for the repair of its tractor if we can get the parts. This is a new tractor; having been in service only 1 year. This tractor will be laid up for repairs for 2 weeks and, as mentioned before, the Office of Defense Transportation has given us no relief on equipment. You know the tremendous amount of hauling for the Army and Navy we are doing. The local boards are inducting our drivers and we are forced to take inexperienced men who do not know the streets of San Francisco and it takes 6 months to a year to make drivers for the kind of equipment and service we have to render in these ports of embarkation. Our Oakland company—Merchants Express Corporation—had five accidents yesterday, all caused from using inexperienced drivers. We are constantly forced to meet deadlines and our men work 60 to 84 hours a week to do it. Still there are delays in sailing dates of convoys. Must we await a crisis and complete break-down in transportation in the bay area before action is taken? Every farmer, the armed forces, civilian defense, and civilians on the home front, including shipyards, depend on truck and rail transportation. Therefore, without transportation none of these activities can succeed.

WARD G. WALKUP,
President, Walkup Drayage
& Warehouse Co.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., March 12, 1943.

Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

One of my inexperienced drivers tangled with a freight train at a crossing last night causing severe injuries to himself and the entire loss of newly overhauled truck and its contents. The equipment is irreplaceable. Just another example of waste through inexperience.

ROBERTSON DRAYAGE CO.

OAKLAND, CALIF., February 9, 1943.

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Our association operates 3,000 pieces of modern motorized truck and trailer equipment. Practically all of these units are being used full time in essential war work. We are facing serious curtailment of activities due to many of our experienced drivers being drafted into the armed forces. If immediate deferment is not forthcoming many tons of vital defense materials will stagnate at rail and truck terminals in this area.

E. H. HART,
Manager, Draymen's Association of
Alameda County, Oakland, Calif.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., March 11, 1943.

HON. Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
National Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Drayage situation in San Francisco pathetic on account of manpower in regards local drayage. Have tried every way possible to get drivers through the union and otherwise. Cars loaded backing up on account of the shortage. Trucks laying idle with tons of freight to move.

JOHN MCCARTHY & SON.

SHIPMENT TAX-FREE OF CERTAIN TOBACCO PRODUCTS FOR USE OF MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES

During the delivery of Mr. DOWNEY's speech,

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. From the Committee on Finance I report favorably, without

amendment, House bill 2030, to permit the shipment tax-free of certain tobacco products to territories of the United States for the use of members of the military and naval forces of the United States, and submit a report (Rept. No. 118) thereon, and I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill, without displacing the pending business.

Mr. President, I should like to say that the sole purpose of the bill, which has the recommendation of the War Department and the acquiescence of the Treasury Department, is to permit the shipment of tobacco products tax-free to the members of the armed forces in Hawaii and Alaska, our own possessions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the very able Senator from Georgia has explained the objectives of the bill to me. I can see no reason to oppose the measure or consideration of the measure at this time. Of course consideration of it requires unanimous consent. The Senator has asked for unanimous consent?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I have asked for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. I personally have no objection. I think we probably owe it to the soldiers in the South Seas to take the proposed action. Is the application of the measure general, or is it limited to certain centers?

Mr. GEORGE. It applies to our own possessions, Hawaii and Alaska. Cigarettes sent to the men there are being returned because the tax has not been paid, and it must be paid. The bill has the unanimous approval of the Finance Committee.

Mr. McNARY. With that statement, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2030) to permit the shipment tax free of certain tobacco products to Territories of the United States for the use of members of the military and naval forces of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

During the delivery of Mr. DOWNEY's speech,

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—
CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on House bill 1975 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The conference report will be read.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met,

after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 20, 40, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That no merchant vessel constructed under any contract entered into by the United States Maritime Commission pursuant to any appropriation or contract authorization specifically granted by Act of Congress (except Public Law 5, Seventy-seventh Congress) to such Commission shall be disposed of under the Act of March 11, 1941 (Public Law 11, Seventy-seventh Congress), as amended, except by lease which must end not later than six months after the termination of the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or at such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate"; and on page 11, line 15 of the bill, after the figure "\$16,625,000", insert the following: ", payable from such construction fund"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,722,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"WEATHER BUREAU"

"Observations, warnings, and general weather service: For an additional amount for observations, warnings, and general weather service, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1943, and including not to exceed \$36,945 additional for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$390,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION"

"Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma: For continuation of construction, \$400,000 from the general fund of the Treasury, to remain available until expended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Investigation of bauxite and alunite ores and aluminum clay deposits (national defense): For an additional amount for investigation of bauxite and alunite ores and aluminum clay deposits, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, and including the purchase of drilling rigs mounted on trucks and of auxiliary trucks to service drilling rigs without charge against the limitation on the purchase of motor-propelled vehicles herein-after specified, \$500,000: *Provided*, That the

limitation on the amounts which may be expended for purchase of motor-propelled vehicles, and available to the Geological Survey to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, are hereby increased from \$6,000 to \$25,000, and from \$80,000 to \$115,000, respectively."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", of which \$15,000 shall be chargeable to the water fund of the District of Columbia, said total appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$63,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Before the figure "(2)", of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the word "or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 12, and 19.

CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the report represents a complete agreement between the two Houses. The report has been adopted by the House, and I move its adoption by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION OF NAVAL COURTS MARTIAL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 303) to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States, which was, on page 2, line 10, after the name "Alaska," to insert "The Canal Zone."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

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. MALONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not wish to take the time of the Senator from Connecticut. I had hoped to say a few words about the question of absenteeism, but, in view of the fact that the Senator from Connecticut has the floor, I shall merely ask that I may have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks at this point, an article which I wrote for the Progressive of the issue of Monday, March 15, entitled "A New Assault on the Rights of Labor."

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

The article is as follows:

A NEW ASSAULT ON THE RIGHTS OF LABOR (By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.)

The reactionary enemies of labor are regrouping for a new assault on the rights of the men and women on the production front who are making the guns, tanks, ships, and airplanes needed to fight this war through to a victorious conclusion.

"Absenteeism" is the catchword for the new attack. Under the guise of efforts to increase war production, these reactionary forces in Congress and throughout the Nation are out to emasculate the rights of labor, cripple forever the democratic process of collective bargaining in industrial relations and intimidate the entire labor movement.

With the growing pinch in our labor supply, it is quite natural that attention should be focused on the problem of reducing the amount of time lost because of a worker's temporary absences from his job. It may be because of sickness, either of the worker himself, or sickness in his family. He may take the morning off to fix the roof on his house, go down town to buy some badly needed clothes when the stores are open, or see about getting a loan to tide the family over an emergency. Whatever the cause, his absence from work, even for an hour or two, is lumped under the term "absenteeism" and is now a subject of vital concern to the war effort.

Various estimates have been made of the total amount of time lost to war production through these miscellaneous absences. The fact of the matter is that no one really knows. There have been efforts to gather fairly comprehensive statistics in the shipbuilding and aircraft industries, but beyond those two industries it is almost entirely a matter of guesswork.

SMEARING ORGANIZED LABOR

Nevertheless practically everyone who has made a study of the problem concedes that whatever the total number of man-hours lost, it constitutes a serious leakage of war-production effort. Inasmuch as our supply of manpower is now critically limited, it is absolutely essential that the manpower we have in our war industries be utilized to the fullest extent.

The question is how to do it. The enemies of labor have been quick to seize what appeared to them to be an opportunity. They have jumped into the limelight denouncing absenteeism as though it were the cardinal sin of every man and woman engaged in war industry. At least by implication they have reflected upon the loyalty and devotion of these millions of American workers. They have sought to smear the name and cause of organized labor.

Antilabor elements in the country tried to gain their ends through similar campaigns launched in the name of stopping strikes, and later, extending the workweek.

STRIKES ALL BUT ELIMINATED

In both of those attempts they failed because the general public, as well as their Representatives in Congress, knew enough about the way American labor has come through in this crisis to see the difference between the genuine side of the problem and the phony campaign concocted by reactionary forces to sell the country a bill of goods.

To labor itself must go most of the credit for the virtual elimination of strikes in war production. The man-days lost from war production by strikes now amount to only three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total man-days worked.

The workweek has been extended as production requirements have demanded in each individual industry. Many war plants were working their employees more than 48 hours per week long before the Government's 48-hour-week decree last month. Right now the average workweek in the machine-tool industry, for example, is 53 hours. Ten important war industries are working on a workweek in excess of 48 hours for each employee.

It is to be hoped that the same good judgment that frustrated the reactionaries when they attempted to make political capital out of strikes and the 40-hour law will prevent them from accomplishing their purposes in the current controversy over absenteeism.

NO COMMON DENOMINATOR

When Donald Nelson announced to the American people 3 months ago that the United States was then turning out combat armaments in as great a volume as the entire Axis and that the tide of production is now running strongly in our favor, it must have been obvious to those who read his words that American labor had been one of the great factors in making such an achievement possible. Tanks are not built by bank credits. They take work, skillful work, by men and women in overalls.

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson reported only a few days ago that production of equipment for the air and ground forces of the Army in January was three and one-half times as great as in January a year ago.

The problem of absenteeism, then, is clearly not one of forcing labor to work. Labor is pitching in with a determination to win the war on the production front that is being translated into greater production records every month.

There is no possible common denominator that will allow any meaningful comparison between what the men are contributing to victory on the fighting fronts and the contribution being made by the men and women on the production front. They are all doing their parts, as loyal Americans should.

FORCE MISSES THE POINT

Absenteeism is a malady with many causes. Some are physical, some are social, others are economic, and many are purely psychological. The constructive way to approach it is to determine in each individual case what the cause is and then deal with that. If the worker is sick, he should be given medical attention. If he is living in unwholesome and demoralizing surroundings, as is so common in the boom towns of this war, housing should be provided. If he is careless about coming to work because his employer is hoarding labor and he is not given enough to do, hoarding should be ended and production techniques and shop organization methods should be provided and made more efficient.

To attempt to solve the problem by forcing men and women into jobs and threatening to turn delinquents over to the draft boards for military service, the work or fight idea, misses the whole point.

There may be, and undoubtedly always are, irresponsible individuals who will not live up to their responsibilities as American citizens, whether they are put behind a work bench or behind an antiaircraft gun. They are not a significant portion, however, of American citizenry or American labor.

INVOKING HITLER'S DEVICE

The great rank and file of American men and women are eager to do their part in the war effort, whatever it may be, if they are given an opportunity to do it. No force is needed. That does not need to be taken on faith any longer. It has been demonstrated in the progress of our war production.

Furthermore, if the Nation comes to regard military service as a penalty for slackers, it will certainly be a slap in the face for those heroic men who have freely gone forth in the honest belief that it is to be considered a privilege to serve their country in the armed forces.

To give employers the unchecked power of liquidating any employee—who may have the God-given independence of Americans to stand up for his rights—by invoking the established device of Hitler and Mussolini and sending him to the front to get rid of him has no place in this country, yet that is a sample of what is being proposed in the name of combating absenteeism.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, ever since the war began to produce shortages, one of the persistent mysteries we have faced has been the whereabouts of supplies. For 2 years we have been asking: Where is the steel? Where is the copper? Where is the lumber? Recently we have begun to ask, Where is the food? And now we are asking, Where is the manpower.

Men and women of all ages, of all backgrounds, began pouring into boom industrial centers long before we were faced with either a manpower or a food shortage. Most of this labor was granted blanket deferment early in the emergency program. Labor thus deferred has never since been considered as part of the pool available to selective service.

One of the major reasons for the chaos menacing us today is that the manpower program has been allowed to grow like Topsy on one side of a Chinese wall. The production program, run by O. P. M. and then by W. P. B., has grown on the other side of the same Chinese wall. In this crisis we can no longer afford the luxury of a production and a manpower program which conflict with one another. Either we must merge them harmoniously into one program to keep the civilian economy working—and feeding and supplying our mammoth Army—or the conflict between the production and the manpower programs will tear the economy apart and prevent us from supplying our Army. We cannot have an army of the size contemplated unless the Government changes its habits sufficiently to get maximum utilization out of its army of labor behind the lines.

Because of the lack of connection between the production and the manpower programs, for more than 2 years priority orders have been issued without reference to manufacturers' manpower supply. In many cases production contracts and priorities have been granted far in excess of manufacturers' labor forces, and far in excess of the labor sup-

ply available to the entire region concerned. In equally glaring cases production orders and priorities have been denied areas having large unused reservoirs of labor of all kinds.

The most glaring example of an untapped and ignored labor reservoir is New York City.

The shipyards, the aircraft industry, and our great automobile industry provide equally glaring examples of the opposite abuse. Each of these three industries is feverishly busy, each is working against orders astronomical in size, and yet none of these three industries has been given priorities nearly adequate to enable it to work available manpower at anything like capacity.

Thus, both in cases where priorities have been given generously, and in cases where they have been held back, the result is the same. Our production policy has not been geared in with our manpower policy, with the inevitable result that in boom communities, as well as in communities still looking for the war boom, labor is not working at capacity.

I am told that in the auto industry an impressive dossier of cases has been presented by the United Automobile Workers of America to the Under Secretary of War. This dossier is said to have itemized case after case in which production was increased beyond scheduled expectation by the concentrated efforts of labor. But the men found in these cases that, where they increased their rate of production, they worked themselves out of jobs. The flow of material was not stepped up proportionately with production. Lay-offs resulted. Under pressure, unemployed men drifted to other jobs, losing their seniority, which is one of the rights most precious to union men.

It is understandable that men who have patriotically stepped up production become cynical and bitter when they are rewarded for their pains with unemployment; and when they see that the units they have made at a record pace are simply piled up until the rest of the program catches up with its fastest component. Consequently, apart from bad labor morale, the price we are paying for the lack of connection between our production and manpower programs is that at any time a given group of workers step up their rate of production, the production authorities seize on the momentary surplus thus provided to divert raw material to some other program which is lagging at the moment.

Employers in the automobile industry are fully aware of this. Each employer is in the position of regarding his skilled labor as a precious and irreplaceable asset. It is natural for each employer to hoard his skilled labor as far as he is able to. It is the responsibility of Government to be concerned about how much labor each employer may keep on his rolls, and then to see to it that full employment is provided for all such labor. My contention is that there are many, many more men and women on the rolls of American industry today than can be kept working at even 40 hours a week with the material available. I am advised that today, in

spite of overtime incentives provided to induce men to work 48 hours a week, a distressing number of workers in the auto plants are working less than 40 hours a week. The reason is that there is no work for them. If the employers were forced to disgorge all workers for whom material was not immediately forthcoming to provide employment for a minimum 48-hour week, the manpower pool would be appreciably increased. For one thing many workers who fled farm areas in search of boom wages at the beginning of the emergency would then be rerouted to occupations in which they would be more efficiently employed.

The shipyards provide perhaps the most flagrant example of manpower hoarding. For months it has been known that the shipyards have not had enough material to enable them to work full three shifts a day. It has been known that laborers from the mines and from farm areas—both occupations suffering from labor shortages—have been absorbed in the shipyards. But the shipyards have never digested them. On the west coast, the press has repeatedly exposed cases of enforced idleness and semi-idleness at the shipyards as employers kept men and women on the job vainly hoping that enough material would be provided by Washington to give all of them a full workweek. In addition, the prohibitive turn-over of labor pouring into and out of the west coast aircraft industry has flooded the shipyards with a steady stream of men and women leaving the aircraft plants in search of higher pay.

I have been told, Mr. President, that the rate of turn-over at the Boeing plant, in Seattle, is over 130 percent. It is prohibitively high in the southern California branch of the industry, too. Wages in the shipyards are frozen by a Government agreement at about 50 percent higher than those paid in the aircraft industry in the same area. The entering wage for production labor in the aircraft industry is 60 to 65 cents an hour. This is substantially below the entering wage in the automobile plants. But I am told that the shipyard entering wage of 95 cents is above the entering wage in the auto plants—in spite of the fact that shipyards are the No. 1 example of inefficiently hoarded labor; in spite of the additional fact that aircraft work carries a higher priority than shipyards.

Labor is complaining because of the high cost of living. Two ingredients of the high cost of living are artificially inflated rents and food scarcity. Underlying both abuses is the frightening and wasteful phenomenon of labor turn-over. In a city like Seattle, if the largest regional employer—Boeing—is suffering from a labor turn-over of 134 percent, and if the local shipyards are also suffering from uneconomic labor turn-over, it is obvious that at any given time there are many more people bidding for housing and for food than are going to remain in high-priority work in that community. Until Washington decides for how many people it will provide the raw material needed for a full workweek, too many people are bound to be bidding for liv-

ing facilities in every such industrial center, and labor will have a legitimate grievance. It will be living under conditions not conducive to efficient production. Industry will have the same grievance, and we will be as far as we are today from locating our unused manpower. Any manufacturer forced to operate with this kind of labor turn-over is at any given time wasting at least 15 percent of his work force in training. Of every 10 men he trains, he knows that either the armed service or other employers will get the benefit of at least half in a couple of months. He will be able to work much more efficiently with many fewer workers if his labor turn-over can be held to a minimum.

We should try to find a way to bring about the freezing of jobs. But it is unfair, unworkable, and impossible to freeze men and women to their jobs until inequities between different wage rates are ironed out. No one is going to freeze people to their jobs in the aircraft industry if they cannot make a living under existing living costs, while in the same community the shipbuilding industry, which is granted a less-favored raw material and priority rating, pays a 50 percent higher wage.

It is scandalous that when wages were frozen these inequities were not adjusted. Labor's legitimate grievance on this score is not a matter of labor policy. Failure to adjust wages upward in cases where they are grievously out of line on the down side has proven to be a more potent and explosive cause of inflation than the simple adjustment would have constituted. This is evidenced by the effect of manpower turn-over, resultant overpopulation of industrial centers, rent inflation, food shortage, and transportation congestion.

What I have said at many points may sound quite prolabor. I do not think, however, that it is unfairly prolabor to acknowledge and to correct grievances which are just. The measure of the justice or injustice of any of these grievances is whether, insofar as they affect masses of labor, they impede production. It is obvious that any number of these grievances do.

I favor the elimination of all forms of feather-bedding. I am hateful of the labor racketeering practiced by alleged labor leaders. I note, however, that the Government's recent decree demanding that all workers work 48 hours a week is in the main a paper decree, and is so regarded by the majority of employers and employees.

I assume that we will never get even as far as a uniform minimum 48-hour workweek until wage rates are adjusted into reasonable relationship as between industries and communities. Once this is done, the way will be cleared to checking all priority orders to make sure that their rate of emission corresponds with full employment for the work forces of all recipients of priorities.

Taking inventory of our manpower will reveal the existence of a much larger pool for farm labor and the armed forces than is commonly admitted. It will also enable us to get much more efficient and

greater production from a work force much smaller than that now being hoarded by American industry. To get this we will have to revalue our entire priorities policy, and merge our production and manpower authorities.

RENEWAL OF GOVERNMENT TERM INSURANCE POLICIES OF CERTAIN PERSONS IN MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, there is on the Vice President's desk House bill 2023, which came over from the House of Representatives today and was placed on the calendar. That bill is identical with Senate bill 815, which was unanimously reported last week from the Senate Committee on Finance. It is more or less an emergency measure. It authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to renew expiring 5-year-level premium term policies in the case of men in the armed forces who are outside the United States and who cannot be reached for such renewal, and under certain conditions authorizes the agents of the insured to make renewals. In other cases in which they cannot be reached it raises the presumption that men desire the renewals to be made, and authorizes the Administrator to make the renewal.

I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2023) to 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, was considered, ordered to a third reading read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 815 will be indefinitely postponed.

THE LEND-LEASE PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in our eagerness to renew the Lend-Lease Act on its second birthday, we neglected to say all that should be said about it; and some things that have been said can be reemphasized with profit.

When we were at peace I voted against lend-lease because it placed war powers in the hands of the President. Now that we are at war, I favor it because it is a war measure. Whatever significance it may have had, it is now a military weapon and a very successful one.

In the year 1862, England permitted two ships, the *Florida* and the *Alabama*, to be built at Liverpool for use against the U. S. A. We admire our Minister, Charles Francis Adams, for saying to the British Foreign Office, "This is war." And he was right. In 1872, an international tribunal set its approval on that designation for British "lend-lease" to the Confederacy by awarding damages to the U. S. A.; and Britain paid cash for

the destruction her "lend-lease" ships had wrought. Yes, lend-lease is an effective weapon of war. That is why I opposed it when we were at peace. That is why I am glad to see it succeeding now.

I like it because in war it is economical. Instead of duplicating stores of supplies for each national army in the same locality, all can use whatever is at hand. This pooling of resources saves needless shipping and storing of supplies. It eliminates allied countries' bidding against one another to get the munitions which we can furnish. Also it enables us to control with more ease and certainty the allocation of supplies according to need rather than according to ability to pay. This is important if victory is to be hastened.

Mr. President, I like lend-lease in wartime because it is fair. When some noted European patriots came over here and helped us win the Revolutionary War, I do not suppose we charged them so much a week for their board because they were not Americans. They were fighting for us and we supplied them as we did our own. Lend-lease recognizes that the United Nations are fighting in one general cause. One of us cannot win alone. We are fighting our war.

Of course, to be fair lend-lease must work both ways, and it really does just that. When our boys are in other lands of the United Nations they are cared for generously, as is fitting for those who suffer together in the common cause of freedom.

There has been considerable questioning here about the exact dollars-and-cents valuation of the lend-lease which is reverting to us, and how it compares with what we are paying. It seems to me that it is vital to know that each of the United Nations is doing its utmost. That knowledge is necessary to preserve the high morale which is inspired by a sense of confidence and trust. But might not exact fiscal data on lend-lease in reverse create in many minds a false standard of comparison which would endanger this very unity of heart and soul so necessary to victory? Exact records are kept of amounts of supplies provided. The cash equivalent can be computed. It is more polite not to do it. We are not serving with a please-pay-when-served sign hung on our chest. Buddies in adjoining fox holes are not careful about exact equivalents of barter in water, cigarettes, or bandages. Those who are actually experiencing the give-and-take of lend-lease seem to be instinctively repelled from such a financial check-up. When your neighbor loses his life fighting the fire in your house you hardly feel like presenting a bill to his widow for your pail which he ruined in fighting the fire!

However, as I said, it is vital to the maintenance of morale and confidence that we know that each country is not shirking or chiseling. Those who are closest to the lend-lease activities have testified that there is no evidence of selfish national greed on the part of lend-lease recipients.

LXXXIX—130.

The problem then becomes one of confidence in those delegated to administer lend-lease. That is a subject which I am indeed glad to approach. After seeing so much incompetence in high places that one comes to expect it almost as a matter of course, it is a refreshing and stimulating experience to encounter Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Lend-Lease Administrator. His presentation at the committee hearings displayed his ability to know and to do. He was given a most stupendous task, and he has done it well. This country and all the other allied countries owe a deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Stettinius, and we have confidence that he will increase that debt as the days go by.

Mr. President, lend-lease as a war measure is economical and fair; and it is efficiently administered. I believe in it so heartily that I am profoundly concerned when I see it endangered by extraneous encumbrances. The Scranton Tribune for March 8, 1943, in an editorial urging immediate passage of the Lend-Lease Act, expressed these excellent sentiments:

It would be a mistake at this time, with the Allies readying themselves for major thrusts against the Axis, to hamstring the role of America as the arsenal of democracy by shackling this important tool of victory by tying it to political restriction. Full freedom of operation for lend-lease is now an essential for the successful prosecution of the war.

Then there follows in the editorial a very strange sentence, indeed:

The measure should be passed free of legislative handcuffs.

Mr. President, I submit that lend-lease as a war measure has never been in danger of legislative handcuffs. It is true, there has been too much of tying in to political restrictions, but that has not been done at this end of the Avenue. I contemplate with profound satisfaction the unequivocal emancipating statement of the committee, striking the ball and chain of post-war commitments from lend-lease.

It rings in my heart like a new declaration of independence, not only for lend-lease, but for the Congress of the United States and the people whom we represent, as well as for much of the world besides.

Far sighted statesmanship must look ahead. It is not too early even now for all of us who are constitutionally charged with peace making to do some constructive thinking about the post-war world.

But these things are bound to be matters of controversy. To connect them with a vital war measure like the Lend-Lease Act was a grave mistake. This was the danger in article VII of the Master Agreements, especially as that article was susceptible of such varied interpretations. We know now that in voting for lend-lease we have not committed ourselves to any definite post-war legislation concerning the tariff or any other domestic concern.

Others share with me, I am sure, the sense of alarm at the continually augmenting powers of the Executive, in time

of peace, whether it be in promoting the war measure known as lend-lease before we were at war, or in continuing war economics after the war, on the momentum of lend-lease. The lend-lease program should stick to its avowed purpose, as was well stated by Mr. Cox, general counsel for Mr. Stettinius, before the House committee, hearings, page 35:

The job of lend-lease is primarily a war job and we have no primary concern with the post-war job. Now, it may very well be that the habits of cooperation as distinct from any words on paper may have a predominant force on whatever happens after the war, but we have not been concerned with speculating on that phase of the problem as long as we can carry on with the winning of the war.

In much the same vein, and worthy of all commendation, were the words of Assistant Secretary Acheson—House hearings, page 94:

It would seem to me that the Congress is proceeding very wisely in renewing this act for periods which are foreseeable. You can get a pretty good idea of what is going to happen, so far as the act is concerned, in the period of a year. As that comes to a close, there will be new problems and the Congress can review them in the light of those then existing problems. It is not necessary now to go into the far-distant future, and I think that it is wise not to do so.

Mr. President, I believe it was sentiment similar to that so happily expressed by the Assistant Secretary of State which moved the Committee to go on record against post-war commitments.

While on the matter of separation of powers in government and the alarming growth of the power of the Executive branch, let me read the following lines from a thoroughly scholarly source, the college textbook, *American Constitutional History*, written by the late Erik Eriksson, of the University of Southern California, and David Nelson Rowe, of the University of Chicago:

The tendency has constantly been in the direction of paternalism; that is, the Government has assumed many functions which the people might perform for themselves. More and more the Government has entered into business in competition with private businesses. The ultimate outcome of this trend will be a complete system of state socialism. If the people wish to have a great bureaucracy, performing innumerable services, they must be willing to pay the price, not only in the form of increasing taxes but also in the curtailment of their liberty. It is doubtful whether the American people realize the extent to which their liberties have already been curtailed, particularly through the establishment of administrative agencies exercising police powers, as well as judicial and legislative powers, contrary to the principle of separation of powers (p. 273).

That was written in 1933. What would those writers think now? If those gentlemen are correct, no immediate change is likely to come. They say, again:

In general, the tendency in present-day governmental and political practice is in the direction of placing still more emphasis upon Executive leadership. As between the President and the Congress, the trend seems to be in the direction of Presidential domination. The continuance of this tendency

will depend, of course, upon the quality of the personnel in the executive and legislative departments. It seems, however, in the light of modern emphasis upon administrative management, in the light of the large political influence of the President, and his superior situation and facilities for creating public opinion, that the tendency of recent years is due to continue for some time to come (p. 411).

A good deal has been said recently about nations double-crossing each other after the war and about the need for some definite commitments now to prevent that. Such agreements are so futile. An honest nation does not need them, and a double-crosser will not keep them. There has been plenty of double-crossing, but not by America; no true American can be a double-crosser.

With or without premature commitments made before there are sufficient data to go by, every national government is only as good as its inherent character. It can be trusted or it cannot, and the signing of papers will never change it. That has been illustrated so recently and so frequently by the Axis Powers, that instances need not be cited. Their treachery is still crying to heaven for vengeance.

Mr. President, actual misunderstandings, leading to the cry of dishonesty and broken faith, are much more likely to arise if after the war a nation is faced with commitments made before the post-war situation could be clearly visualized. It might become actually impossible for even an honest government to fulfill its previous promises. When the war is won, and when we see what we have left to offer, what others have, and what they need, we shall more surely arrive at a lasting understanding in justice, certainty, and enduring peace.

COOPERATION OF HOTEL MEN IN NATION'S WAR EFFORT

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I have received copy of a letter sent out by a committee chairman of the American Hotel Association to the 6,000 member hotels, and I wish to comment on it briefly. The letter, dated February 17, and written by Frank L. Andrews, president of the Hotel New Yorker, and chairman of the Public Relations Committee of the American Hotel Association, is as follows:

It is very probable that the Office of Price Administration will take action on black-market operations in the food field in the near future.

We ask all hotel men to prove their willingness to cooperate with the Government by doing three things:

1. Please print on your menus some such statement as: "The management of this hotel assures its patrons that all foods served here are bought from recognized, reputable sources at ceiling prices. We will not tolerate any dealings with black markets."

2. Please write this committee that you have done this, so that we may be able to present these facts to the proper authorities in Washington.

3. Please see that releases on this are sent to your local newspapers.

This is very important. The growth of the black markets will seriously affect our businesses unless we see that they are wiped out of existence now.

Aside from the fact that black markets are illegal, unpatriotic, and have all the evils of

racketeering, they cause an unfair distribution of foods.

Already in many parts of the country criticism is springing up from consumers who can't buy certain meats for their own homes. This causes bad feeling. A big forward step in public relations can be taken by declaring your position on honest purchasing of food.

Sincerely yours,

F. L. ANDREWS,
Chairman.

Mr. President, I think this marks a highly commendable attitude on the part of American hotel owners and operators, in that they have elected to take the lead in bringing their industry, the seventh largest in the United States, into full step with the nation's war efforts, without waiting for Government to invite their cooperation. The Army and Navy give their E awards for high manufacturing performance in the production of war goods. No such citation awaits the service industry which makes available to the nation its complete facilities, but it is deserving of some recognition.

I am proud that a fellow Hoosier, F. Harold Van Orman, of Evansville, Ind., is the president of this forward-looking hotel industry. I compliment his associates, from Thomas Green and Charles Horroth on down, for I understand that the hotels have voluntarily raised a fund of \$100,000 with one view in mind, that of diligently finding new ways and means by which they can contribute to the war effort.

It is interesting to note that upward of 500 American hotels have been taken over by the Government for the housing of men and women in uniform in training groups. Others, such as the New Yorker, report that upward of one-third of their total occupancy during 1942, by actual room count, was by men and women in uniform, exclusive of government officials in civilian dress. They have conceived, and are carrying out, numerous helpful functions by donating space for war bond drives, U. S. O. headquarters, O. C. D. activities, and other projects. Even in the crowded city of Washington, in order to cooperate with the military, they reserve a certain number of their total rooms daily for men in uniform, officers and enlisted men.

They have lost many of their employees to the draft, and to defense industries. They can no longer get enough food to serve their guests in the dignified, pleasant manner to which patrons were accustomed. They find it difficult to replace broken or worn bits of equipment under W. P. B. regulations. To help safeguard the public health, they must continue to operate their laundries with reduced and incompetent staffs. All these and other problems confront them. And yet they seek new and additional ways of cooperating with the war effort. It is to be hoped that this patriotic attitude will be nationally observed, and that they will be recognized as an essential part of the civilian economy. How could our military men, our Government workers, our munitions manufacturers, and others proceed about the Nation in pursuit of their work if no beds awaited

them when they arrived at their destination?

Associated with Mr. Andrews on this public relations committee are: Howard Dugan, New York; Frank Schutt, Memphis, Tenn.; E. T. Lawless, Chicago; Jack W. Connell, Toronto, Canada; L. Gardner Moore, Washington, D. C.; Walter M. Casey, Beaumont, Tex.; P. Tremain Loud, San Francisco; Henry M. Scharf, Gettysburg, Pa.; and Glenwood Sherard, Boston.

Not only on the national front, but down to the State level, the association is seeking to fit its facilities into the Nation's wartime needs. In fact, a wartime committee, headed by Walter O. Gregory, Chicago, has a State chairman in each of the 48 States. Other committees which possess cooperating groups in each State, include: Temperance committee, R. K. Christenberry, New York; food rationing committee, Theodore DeWitt, Cleveland; civilian defense committee, Howard F. Dugan, New York; and the public relations committee, headed by Mr. Andrews.

Surely this is a noteworthy example of the manner in which American industry stands behind our Government in the war effort.

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. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota having suggested the absence of a quorum, the clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. OVERTON (for Mr. McKellar), from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2068) making additional appropriations

for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 119) thereon.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. OVERTON (for Mr. McKELLAR) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2068) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely: On page 2, line 21, after the word "elsewhere" and before the period, insert the following: "Provided, That the first proviso under the heading of 'Miscellaneous expenses' in title I of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1943 (Public Law 441, approved February 7, 1942) is hereby repealed."

On page 4, line 13, after the figures, insert the following: "Provided, That so much of the Naval Appropriation Act, 1943 (Public Law 411, 77th Cong.), under the heading 'Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel' as reads 'Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman appointed from enlisted men of the Navy who has not served aboard a vessel of the Navy in full commission or performed equivalent service with fleet aircraft for at least 9 months prior to admission to the Naval Academy, is amended to read as follows: *Provided further, That during the present emergency qualified enlisted men of the Navy, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps may be appointed to the Naval Academy after such periods and under such conditions of service as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.*'"

Mr. OVERTON also (for Mr. McKELLAR) submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. McKELLAR to the bill (H. R. 2068) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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

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. KILGORE. Mr. President, I desire at this time to take the opportunity to call attention to one point with reference to the bill under discussion, which I think is borne out by the facts and also by the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. I refer to the fact that this bill and the amendment of the Senator from California, nibble by nibble, bit by bit, are striking at the foundation stone of the theory on which our selective service is founded. They strike even at the name "selective service." Selective service in the United States, unlike in other countries, was a selection of individuals for a duty which the individual owed his country, and a selection by individuals by lot. England

and France and other nations selected by age groups; we selected by individuals, and we laid down in the selective-service law also the theory of no class distinction, no class or group deferment, no class or group exemption. That is as plainly the theory behind our Selective Service System as any theory can be written into a law.

That theory has a sound historical background. The trouble with every selective service bill, or, as we used to call it, conscription or draft bill, ever written in this or any other country of Anglo-Saxon background has always arisen over class deferment, class exemption. The wrath, both in the South and in the North, during the Civil War, was based upon the fact that certain groups of people by class, by profession, were exempted from service under the draft acts. This bill is one nibble along that line.

In saying that, I defer to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and his long years of service, but this proposed amendment to the Selective Service Act does that one thing, and will be followed, as proposed by the amendment offered by the Senator from California, by deferments for truck drivers, deferments for railroad locomotive engineers, deferments for machinists, deferments for doctors, deferments for school teachers, and so on down the line. If it is not stopped at its inception, I fear very greatly that we will wreck the entire Selective Service System.

Deferments in the United States must be based upon essential need for the services of the individual at the place for which he was selected. That is the basis of the selective service. A man working at a machine tool may be as essential to war industry in operating that tool as he would be using the products of the tool on the battlefield; but his individual qualification lies in the fact that he is a machine-tool operator; that he knows a trade necessary in war that makes it more essential that he produce the tools of war than that he use the tools of war. For that reason, in connection with the manpower question, we need to have a broad, over-all plan.

As I say, I defer to the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I realize that his amendment to the Selective Service Act, his bill, strikes at a vital need, and touches us in a sore spot, to wit, the question of food supply.

We must have food just as we must have ammunition, because food enables the soldier to get the ammunition to the place where he can use it, and without the food to feed the soldier the ammunition is wasted. The bill strikes at that. I realize that we are facing right now a possible food shortage, nay, I will say a probable food shortage, because, called upon, as we now are, and as we were in World War No. 1, to provide for a great portion of the globe at least a part of their food supply, the question of our crops is vital not only to our allies but to all the United Nations that are engaged in this war effort.

It is essential to keep men in the agricultural industry so that we may not only have a crop equal to the 1942 crop, but

a far greater crop in 1943, and yet a greater crop than that in 1944, and an increasing crop in 1945, because if the war takes the trend we hope it will take, which we trust and pray it will, we will, in 1944 and 1945, be rehabilitating with foodstuffs from the United States of America the countries which have been under the conqueror's heel, involving a still greater drain on our food reserves. I say, however, that we are not approaching that problem in the right way. We are not approaching the method of getting the labor for the farm in the right way when we say that every man engaged on a farm, in the production of farm products, deemed essential under a certain publication of the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be automatically exempted from service under the draft.

In the first place, I think some of the farmers will resent that. It would place the farms in almost the same position in the public mind in which the shipyards were placed in 1917 and 1918.

I know there is no thought of draft evasion on the part of the boys who work on the farm; they do not want to evade service in the Army. The chief trouble we have had with them in my State is in keeping them from enlisting before their numbers are called. They want to get the war over, just as everyone else does, and the automatic freezing of such men to the farm would mean that they could not do what they consider to be their part.

Then, too, the pending bill does not go to the principal difficulty. It freezes only the man within the draft ages, nay, within the very limited draft ages now prescribed for liability to call. It freezes only that man, and, frankly, a large percentage of such men have already gone; but it does not freeze the older worker on the farm, it does not freeze the woman worker on the farm.

It was only 3 weeks ago that I went into an airplane factory in a neighboring State, the State of Ohio, in the finest agricultural section of that State. I saw working in that airplane factory 5,000 girls, drawn from the farms, the general farms, the farms which produce the staples, not luxury crops, but staple crops. The bill would merely freeze men between 18 and 35 who are still left on the farm. To show what the word "freeze" means, recently a distinguished general from the War Department made the suggestion, in a meeting of the National War Investigating Committee, that labor be frozen at the Willow Run plant. In talking with Mr. Ford it was discovered that while Mr. Ford wanted to keep his labor on the job, he knew that freezing would not keep them there, and he said, "We have to get away from that word 'freeze.' We cannot make men stay on the job. We cannot make them produce. We can hold them in the shop, we can hold girls in the shop, possibly, by law, and by penalties, but we cannot make them produce anything." In other words, we can draft a man's body, but we cannot draft his mind, his will to work, his desire to accomplish something, and we cannot force that by any legislation.

It must be brought about by something within the man. Nor can we build that up by deferring him from doing his duty as a citizen, as any other citizen does his, by freezing him in a job.

I see also another weakness in the bill. It is not selective enough. Even if we grant the wisdom of freezing labor on the farm, there is still in the bill a loophole a mile wide. The bill contemplates no real survey, no real planning; it merely contemplates a blanket exemption, and all that is necessary for a man to be placed under the exemption is that he work upon a farm which produces for sale farm products coming within the classification set down by the Secretary of Agriculture in a recent bulletin. Reading that bulletin and reading the bill, we find many other loopholes, to which I wish to call attention. I realize that the bill was seriously drawn by its proponents. I do not think the distinguished group back of it would all have sponsored a bill which they did not sincerely believe to be vitally necessary in the war effort, because I know men endorsed the bill to whom it could mean nothing personally, nothing by way of favorable reaction in the States from which they come. Yet the bill has these weaknesses.

The bill was drawn upon the idea that we would not have enough food. Frankly, Mr. President, our agricultural crops have always been out of balance. We have always had surpluses of one crop. Thank goodness we have always had sufficient of all crops, but there always have been great surpluses, and we now face a time when we cannot afford to have surpluses of nonessential crops. The bill plainly leaves wide open the gate to creating surpluses of some crops which certainly are not essential to the war effort, for all that is necessary to get deferment is that a man be a worker on a farm producing farm products for market, a person the greater portion of whose income is derived from such work.

I wish to call attention to a few instances. Let us for example take the question of short staple cotton, which plainly comes within the purview of the bill. On August 1, 1942, I am informed that there were 10,455,000 bales of short staple cotton in warehouses. There were also stored in warehouses in the United States 2,728,000,000 pounds of tobacco. That was before the 1942 crop. The 1942 production of cotton, short and long staple, amounted to 12,982,000 bales, and of tobacco to 1,417,000,000 pounds.

I single out those two particular crops because they are two crops for which, I believe it can safely be said, there is not enough storage space, though they are capable of storage. Yet labor necessary to produce them comes under the classification in the bill.

Let us consider the question of the labor necessary for the production of those two crops. For instance, the 1943 goal for cotton is twenty-two and a half million bales, 2 percent of which would be long staple and 98 percent short staple, in addition to the warehouse stock. For tobacco the goal is one and a

half billion pounds as compared with only fifty-two and one-half million acres of wheat, 95,000,000 acres of corn. Corn is highly essential, and the question of its production should be studied.

Let us take another subject—the question of man-hours per acre per crop. For short-staple cotton, the figure is 91 hours an acre; for tobacco, it is 616.7 hours an acre; for wheat, it is 8.7 hours; and for corn, it is 27.3 hours. In other words, man-hours, in millions, as to those 4 crops, figure 1,024,000,000 hours for cotton, 308,000,000 hours for tobacco, only 228,000,000 hours for wheat, and 1,300,000,000 hours for corn.

To me—and to anyone else who knows about farming—corn means meat, which is essential; not only that, but it means the necessary animal fats for ammunition, which are likewise absolutely essential.

Let us make the comparison also in the matter of truck crops, by which I mean vegetables which are not rationed—the ones we can buy in the stores—truck garden crops. Of the total man-hours in agriculture, only 2.7 percent of the total is used in the production of truck garden crops.

As for food bought in the grocery stores, the production of sugar beets takes 1 percent, of white potatoes only 2.4 percent, of dried beans nine-tenths of 1 percent of all the man-hours used; soybeans, 1.5 percent; peanuts, 3.4 percent; wheat, 4.9 percent.

Mr. President, where is the food necessary to take care of our Army and the people of this country, as well as of those nations which are depending upon us for food? We are talking in terms of manpower in discussing the bill. Where per man-hour can we get the most essential crops? I think the answer is absolutely and completely and utterly self-explanatory.

Not only that, Mr. President, but the two crops I just mentioned are enormous users of fertilizer. There is a shortage of fertilizer due to the necessity for making ammunition. Those two crops use one-third of the total amount of fertilizer used in the United States. I speak with personal knowledge with respect to tobacco, for tobacco is raised in my own State; I know the tremendous quantity of fertilizer used and the tremendous number of man-hours necessary, because it is a hand-labor crop. I do not say that the man who has a tobacco farm or the man who has a cotton farm should be prevented from operating; but in a recent hearing Selective Service Director General Hershey made the statement, "We are not exempting workers who produce artichokes and things like that," and I say that this bill would exempt the man who produces artichokes and other things of that kind. I maintain that the pending bill would be far better if it were what might be called an over-all bill which would scale men down to the essential requirements of a nation at war, because, Mr. President, we are not now a business-as-usual nation.

As a matter of fact, the expression "ordinary business usages" designates the

worst bottleneck the Nation has faced in the entire war effort. We are not now a nation of ordinary business usages and ordinary farm practices. We are a nation which must husband its manpower, which must make the utmost use of it, and anything that gives a blanket deferment will break down the keystone, the foundation stone of the Selective Service System, because as surely as I am standing on this carpet, if we pass a blanket exemption in connection with foodstuffs we will be asked to pass a blanket exemption with respect to airplane manufacture, shipbuilding, coal mining, railroad workers, truck drivers. Where would we stop? We must enact legislation not for any one group, but to cover all. The selective-service bill, thanks to the wisdom of the Congress of the United States at the time it was passed, embraced as broad a view as possible of that subject. In it Congress provided that deferments should be in fact based upon the individual condition of the man in the place and at the time the deferment was granted; that there should not be deferments or exemptions of groups.

Mr. President, I am taking this opportunity to discuss the amendment which was to have been offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], which would provide for a war cabinet composed of responsible chiefs, incorporating within its body the total responsibility for the war effort, and each with an individual responsibility for a definite segment of the war effort. In my opinion, that is the only way we can handle the question of manpower for the farm, for the factory, for the Army, the shipyards, the merchant marine, or anything else.

So far as I know, a debating society consisting of a large number of persons who have no personal responsibility, who have no personal reputation at stake by reason of the fate of the program, never in the history of any nation produced a workable program. Such debating societies have produced programs, I am informed, that look well on paper but always when it came to practical work there was a failure to get the axles properly lined up to make the chassis run forward. On the other hand, it has always been the practice of established business as well as of government to have programs worked out by the men who are responsible for their performance when they are completed.

Mr. President, the proposed war cabinet must carry in its membership the entire responsibility, and there must be no duplication of responsibility. Each must have his own job before him. Then the manpower problem will be viewed in its right light. Then the manpower problem will be divided into its proper segments and considered at frequent intervals, so that if one particular industry is curtailed, its manpower can be brought into an industry which is being expanded, and the constantly changing picture of manpower for production will be met by a constantly shifting program arranged by men who know and are responsible for the proper use of our manpower.

Such a program committee or war cabinet, or whatever one may choose to call it, must not be large enough to develop into a debating club, and yet it must be sufficiently large to cover the entire program. It must subdivide the war effort, to use a much-abused phrase, into its proper segments, and then put the segments together. As to program requirements, it must eliminate the idea of ex parte hearings in which one group says, "We need so many men, and we are going to have them," and another group says, "Try and get them; there are not that many."

It must contain within it a man who, when he says, "I want 2,000,000 men for heavy industry," is also able to say to the Manpower Director, "And if you obtain the 2,000,000 men for me I will see that heavy industry assists you in your program by stopping the hoarding of manpower by heavy industry, by seeing that there is a proper promotion system, and a proper supervision system." It is impossible for the Director of Manpower, by preaching and begging and pleading, to get industry to conform, particularly when industry is not paying the bill, when payment of the bill is made by the taxpayers generally.

Mr. President, I have frequently been told that we must grow short staple cotton, and plenty of it, in order to obtain the necessary vegetable oil from the cotton seed. It is strange, but it takes more acreage to produce oil from cotton than from any other crop which is oil producing. For instance, from 1.3 to one and a half acres of cotton are required to produce 100 pounds of vegetable oil, while soybeans will produce the same quantity of oil from one-half to six-tenths of an acre. Peanuts from 0.4 to 0.63 of an acre, and flax from 0.5 to 0.75 of an acre.

In other words, in the production of vegetable oil, using cotton as the base of 100 percent efficiency, soybeans are 252 percent efficient, peanuts 316 percent, and flax 242 percent. The production of 100 pounds of oil from a cotton field requires 132 man-hours. The production of 100 pounds of oil from a soybean field requires 6½ man-hours. Peanuts require 27 man-hours, and flax, 5 man-hours.

In terms of manpower consumption, if vegetable oil is desired, there is nothing to be gained by the use of cottonseed oil. Those things must be studied. Agricultural workers cannot be given a blanket exemption merely because they are engaged in producing some kind of a crop which happens to be on a certified list of agricultural products. At the time the bills were being discussed in the Military Affairs Committee it was even debated whether growing timber should not be treated as an agricultural product within the meaning of the proposed statute. That is one of the reasons I opposed the amendment on the floor. I was trying to obtain an opportunity for the Senator from Florida to offer his amendment to provide for an over-all planning program.

There is an interesting thing in connection with the proposal for over-all planning. It also relates to the question

of absenteeism. A study of the manpower problem in the United States will show almost without exception that plants which have honestly figured out manning tables are able to release their men for the armed forces and train others to take their places. Plants which have extravagant manning tables do not conform to this system.

Mr. President, allow me to give an illustration in connection with the subject of deferment in agriculture or other industries. Under the system now used by the English in industry, agriculture, mining, or any other activity in which deferment from military service is requested, each individual case is studied. A manpower representative is sent into the factory. He sees the man at the machine. He questions him when his time comes to be called into the service. Only in exceptional circumstances may the employer ask for a deferment. He may not ask for a blanket deferment for all men, but only key men; and the burden is upon him to show that they are key men.

A representative of the manpower administration, who is a local man, goes into the plant and sees every man for whom deferment has been requested. He interviews him and studies his case. He sees how efficient he is, and ascertains how long it would take to train a replacement for him. If it is then determined that it would be uneconomical to replace him, he alone receives deferment. There is no class deferment.

Under the present manpower system in England, no man may claim deferment unless he has dependent on him aged persons or children who are too young to aid in the support of the family. He may then apply for deferment; and if the manpower administration is convinced that he is supporting a number of persons who would otherwise become public charges, and his services are more valuable in supporting such dependents and otherwise contributing to the war effort, he is deferred; but there is no class deferment.

Mr. President, we must not break through the dam. We must not take one stone out of the wall. We must not upset the theory of individual deferments at the level where the man is located. Congress should not pass legislation providing for class deferment. There must be no blanket deferment.

If I correctly recollect my history of the Civil War, I believe that all school teachers in the South were deferred. At times only one pupil constituted a school room after the war became pretty tough, and naturally the people rebelled against such class deferment or class distinction. There were other laws providing for class deferment in both the North and in the South. The people rebelled against them, and for that reason the laws were failures.

During World War No. 1 Congress enacted an over-all law similar to the present one. However, one mistake was made in that law which almost wrecked the operation of selective service. By a blanket order certain groups in certain industries were deferred in order to

stimulate labor at the Hog Island shipyards. If I recollect correctly, ship workers on Hog Island and in various other places were deferred. I do not believe those ship workers have lived that down yet, nor has the bad taste departed from the mouths of the American people as a result of the blanket deferment of shipyard workers.

When we got into the present war one of the important things was shipbuilding. The shipyard worker in the United States is now just coming back into his own. The blanket deferment during World War No. 1 was not a part of the law, but was a part of an order of the War Department deferring such workers in order to build ships.

Mr. President, shall we put the American farmer in the same class? Instead, why not make a study of the American farm? I do not mean a long-drawn-out study. By an over-all planning system, by a war cabinet properly balanced, why not start a migration of workers from subsistence farms, or farms where a little butter and milk is sold on Saturday, or perhaps a little honey? Get them to migrate to farms producing important foodstuffs from farms which are not producing things which are absolutely essential in the war program. Let us have such a migration to the places where things which the Nation needs in the war effort can be produced. However, let us accomplish it in an orderly way, and not by blanket legislation which will bring resentment as soon as the freezing order goes into effect. Men on the farms would resent any order which would freeze them into their employment. Such an order would penalize farming. We should not say to those men, "In order to stay out of war you will have to stay on the farm; and if you want to get into the war you will have to stay on the farm anyway." That is what we are now asked to say to the boy on the farm.

Frankly, Mr. President, deferment from the Army would save only 30 percent of the losses. To date 70 percent of the men of draft age who have left the farm have gone into industry. I do not say that they have all stayed there. Some have been drafted from industry. However, they left the farm and went into industry. They did not go directly into the Army. Only 30 percent were drafted directly from the farm into the Army. The remainder went to the shipyards, airplane factories, gun shops, and large fabrication plants.

Mr. President, where does the pending bill lead? It leads to the removal of the first stone from the foundation of selective service. Instead, why not consider something which would make the war effort more efficient? Why not consider something which would set the farmer to work supplying essential needs? Such a program would curtail the waste of farm manpower, help the farm which is not carrying its share of the load, and put the good farmer where he can produce a fine crop.

Mr. President, the farmer on the small hillside farm, particularly in the mountain sections, wants to know where to

go. He needs guidance. He should be placed on a farm where he can produce, and also train men who cannot go into the Army.

In the absence of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and in his behalf, I offer an amendment which I wish he were here to offer, as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I ask that it be seriously considered before the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The amendment will be stated. Does the Senator desire to have it read?

Mr. KILGORE. No; I do not desire to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as having been read.

The amendment offered by Mr. KILGORE on behalf of Mr. PEPPER, as a substitute for the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, is as follows:

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 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. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

Mr. KILGORE. The amendment is quite long, Mr. President.

Mr. McNARY. If the amendment is long, I do not care to have it read, if the Senator will state briefly what it provides.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me state briefly the contents of the amendment. It provides for what I have been talking about—an over-all planning and program committee to lay down the program and the plan for the whole war effort, with one man, an administrator, in charge of the domestic economy, which would include farming, coal mining, and all the other things classed as parts of our domestic economy. There would be an administrator of production and procurement, an administrator of research, and an administrator of manpower. The arrangement would be practically the same as the one we now have, except all those men would be put in one group, and we could make them get around the table and agree upon what should be done. In that connection, I sometimes think of the old judge at home who told the members of a board of education who were considering the matter of hiring teachers to get together in a room and not leave it until they hired the teachers. They had been working at the matter for several months, but when the judge had a deputy sheriff stationed at the door of the room, and told the men they could not leave the room until they hired the teachers, they were able to agree in about 2 hours.

Mr. McNARY. Is the purpose of the amendment the same as that of the amendment of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KILGORE. It is about the same, except the amendment which I offer provides for what the Senator calls a land army—in other words, a method of recruitment of farm labor.

Mr. McNARY. It is the desire of some Senators to keep the bill open until the Senator from Florida returns tomorrow. Therefore, I have been curious to know whether the amendment now offered by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia is precisely like the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. KILGORE. No. Mr. President, I was hoping, before I started to speak, that some agreement could be reached to keep the matter open until the Senator from Florida had an opportunity to

Mr. KILGORE. I cannot answer the Senator's question on that point.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think there is any answer.

Mr. KILGORE. Under the amendment the deferments which have been made could continue to be made; but the Congress would give authority to the administrators to bring in various allied agencies, and to proceed to do so in a better way than was formerly possible.

Mr. KILGORE. It is the same.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. The Senator is offering it, then, not as a substitute—

Mr. KILGORE. I am offering it for the Senator from Florida.

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator from Florida has already offered it; has he not?

Mr. KILGORE. No; I think he said he would offer it later in the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been printed and was laid on the table.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the Senator now offering the amendment for the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KILGORE. I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia in behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, another question then arises: If the Senator is able to have the Senate vote on the amendment this afternoon, and is not desirous of having the vote go over until tomorrow—

Mr. KILGORE. Frankly, I should much prefer to have it go over until tomorrow, if possible, in order to give the Senator from Florida a chance to discuss his own amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Then the Senator's purpose in offering the amendment is to cover a hiatus; is that correct?

Mr. KILGORE. It is to cover an emergency situation which I wish did not exist.

Mr. McNARY. If action is taken on the amendment today, there will be no necessity to have consideration of it go over until tomorrow; is that correct?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; there will be no such necessity; but I hope action will not be taken on it today.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have been greatly interested in the Senator's discussion, and I desire to ask him particularly about section 2 of the amendment which he supports. It seems to me that section 2 describes exactly the proper way to set manpower quotas, namely, to call together the administrators responsible to the President, on the one hand for farm manpower, and on the other hand for armed service manpower, and another for industrial manpower, and require of them a joint agreement respecting quotas.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What necessity is there for a new law to that end, and why could not the President have liquidated this mess months ago by simply calling the administrators together and doing precisely what the Senator has recommended—putting them in a room and telling them to stay there until they agree?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is true; but the formula is so obviously correct and so obviously would not require any original legislation in respect to the setting of quotas that for months and months it has passed my understanding why so simple and obvious a thing should not be done by the Chief Executive himself.

Instead of doing that, as I observed the other day, in the presence of this crisis we have a super-super manpower cabinet composed of such gentlemen as Mr. Harry Hopkins and Judge Rosenman, whose judgment, while highly valuable to some, and upon some subjects, is of no such interest to me and to the country in respect to manpower, and not nearly of as much interest as would be an agreement between the direct manpower authorities whom the President has a perfect right to mobilize at any time he wishes to do so, and to demand of them a unified verdict.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan that perhaps he will remember that section 2 is copied verbatim from Senate bill 607 which was so vigorously resisted in the Senate sometime ago.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to speak at any length on the pending bill. I simply desire to make a few brief observations before casting my vote.

The two principal objections urged to this measure are that it comes too late to be of any great benefit, because the harm in depleting workers on the farm has already been done, and, next, that this measure constitutes discriminatory legislation granting blanket exemptions from military service to a special group or class of our citizenship.

There is some merit in the first objection. Certainly the bill, with its present provisions, can do nothing about the persons who already have been drafted and whose induction has to some extent caused the depletion of manpower on the farms.

I think we are all fully cognizant of the great handicaps and burdens that rest upon agriculture by reason of the depletion of manpower on the farms of the Nation and from other causes. One reason for the manpower shortage on farms is the induction of young farmers into the military service, but the greatest cause for the shortage of farm labor is, as we all know, the disparity between farm wages and farm income and the high wages paid in defense plants and industries, which has caused so many workers to leave the farms and to accept employment in other fields of endeavor where compensation for their labor is far greater and where working conditions are more favorable. This double stand-

ard of economy, as applied to industrial workers and to workers in agriculture, is primarily responsible for conditions which now obtain. The same conditions have prevailed in the past, but then our country was not at war. The farmer, although occupying the position of the forgotten man in our economic structure, has struggled on under those disadvantages until the Government has taken it for granted that the farmer would and could produce, irrespective of those economic handicaps.

But now the situation is entirely different. In spite of the farmers' patriotism and sacrifices, which are unexcelled by those of any other class or group in the Nation, the obligations and trials of war have simply placed on the farmers a burden which they cannot carry unless some measure of protection is afforded and some means is employed by the Government to give imperative assistance before it is completely too late.

If the operations of existing law and the functions of various war agencies are continued as they have operated in the past, if the trend of laborers from the farms to industry is not checked, and if we take into our military forces all available and suitable manpower on the farms, we are sure to suffer such an extreme and critical shortage of food that our war effort will be materially weakened and impaired. Food is just as essential in this war as are bullets. Food cannot and will not be produced if past practices are continued and unless existing evils are corrected.

I recognize that the pending measure can salvage and preserve only a small part of the manpower that is going to be needed on the farm.

In the past, we have entrusted the building of our Army under selective service and other agencies by the vesting of authority and discretion in administrative chiefs. The job has been bungled and a crisis is impending.

I say, that, Mr. President, not with any purpose or desire to level criticism against any agency, but I say it is a matter of known fact. Had that condition not arisen by reason of operations in the past there would be no necessity for the pending legislation.

I was attracted a few minutes ago to an editorial in today's issue of the Washington News, the title of which is "While Food Gets Scarcer." I am particularly impressed with this editorial in view of the remarks of the distinguished Senator who preceded me in discussing how the situation ought to be handled and a proper method of approach to it. I read the editorial:

WHILE FOOD GETS SCARCER

Manpower Commissioner McNutt tells a Senate committee which wanted to know why more hadn't been done to solve the farm-labor problem: "I gave that responsibility to the Department of Agriculture. If Agriculture can't do it, then I am going to take it back. The War Manpower Commission was without funds to do this thing."

Secretary of Agriculture Wickard tells another Senate committee that he lacks authority to move quickly in the farm manpower situation, and that Congress should give "immediate consideration" to draft-labor proposals.

Mr. McNutt, supposed to have authority, lacks funds. Mr. Wickard, given responsibility, lacks authority. Mr. Wickard, daily more alarmed by prospects of a food shortage due primarily to farm manpower shortage, leans toward drafting labor. Mr. McNutt leaned the same way a few months ago, but leaned back again when organized labor's protests reached the President. Nobody knows whether Mr. Roosevelt is for or against labor-draft legislation now. Who says this country doesn't need a real War Cabinet to end such muddles?

We do not have a war cabinet. We have agencies, we have laws under which they have been operating, and we have come to this unhappy situation because of them. I think it is imperative that Congress begin to enact some legislation on the subject.

This bill certainly will not accomplish all I should expect or desire it to do. I dislike very much to see arise such a situation as makes it necessary to enact legislation in order to keep manpower on the farm. When it comes, however, in the present crisis to a choice between passing this proposed legislation in order to keep experienced men on the farm and giving to the farmer now some definite plan which will enable him to plant his crops for this year, and a proposal to draft inexperienced men from soda fountains and from other occupations and try to place them on the farms, I say that the pending bill is most tenable and certainly will bring about results which will tend to support the war effort rather than to detract from it or to impair it. Therefore, it becomes necessary that the Congress act by passing some specific legislation.

No one should desire, in view of the gravity of our military problem, to favor any class or group by laws enacted during this tremendous emergency. That shall not be my purpose in supporting the pending bill, and I now refute any assertion or implication that my vote for the passage of the bill is intended as an effort to benefit or favor any class or group of our citizens. Under existing conditions and the imperative need for a remedy, I shall vote for the bill in the honest belief and conviction that its provisions will, in some measure, be a service to all Americans and that it will help rather than hinder the war effort.

Mr. President, along the lines of the problem today confronting the American farmers, and some of their thoughts with reference to the duplication of power and action and the muddle that now faces us in these days of crisis, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD a letter which I have received from the Miller County Farm Bureau of my State. The letter is typical of many I am receiving from the farmers who are faced with such a condition that they do not know where manpower is coming from to enable them to try to meet the increased demands of this emergency. Unless a remedy is provided immediately, not a law merely to favor the farmer, to give him more income, or to favor the farmer or a group or a class by providing exemption from military service, but unless something is done to help the farmer perform his responsibilities to the Nation and to the war effort in the crisis that now faces us, all America, our allies and the war effort

will suffer. I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

The letter is as follows:

MILLER COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Tezakana, Ark., February 25, 1943.
Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The 450 farmers comprising the membership of the Miller County Farm Bureau, and many other nonmember farmers, have been astounded at the multiplicity of Government forms and questionnaires, which are utterly impossible to execute without assistance and many times the voluntary help received is not adequate.

It has been pointed out that one third of the farmer's time is spent in moving from one agency to another in an effort to learn what is expected of him. In every one of these agencies are new forms, new regulations, new interpretations so highly involved that even the best informed person cannot understand them. For what purpose does our Government want this mass of information?

Farmers have watched with interest newspaper articles from your bureaucratic bunglers to the effect that forms and questionnaires are to be simplified and fewer in number. They are increasing every day. Instead of simplification there is added confusion with a growing disposition to ignore every one of them.

Not only are the farmers highly incensed at these ridiculous questionnaires but they are becoming pronounced in their attitude and have publicly stated that they expect to hold the Congress responsible for the unwarranted regimentation by the numerous bureaus in Washington. Unless something is done to change the situation, the farmers of Miller County will hold our Members in Congress accountable for the laws permitting these silly practices in this time of great national distress.

Specifically we call your attention to the operation of the Employment Service at Tezakana. It has been and still is withdrawing labor from the farms in spite of the fact that Congress has urged farmers of America to produce all of the food possible for war purpose.

Moreover, the restrictions on the available farm machinery is further curtailing operations for increased food supplies.

Again, your attention is directed to the operations of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. It is so clumsy, slow, and inadequate in its administrative procedures that the crop season will have passed before the regulations have been fully explained. The farmers of Miller County quite freely express themselves as wishing that the incentive payments, subsidies, and other forms of political baiting may be curtailed, and that they be permitted to pursue farm operations without further interference, regimentation, and wholly in the interest of the war effort. Every member of this bureau is extremely anxious to produce all the food possible and is attempting to do so in spite of the severe handicaps placed on his efforts by Washington.

If you have not seen a copy of Rationing Order No. 13, and the farmer's income tax return form, we sincerely hope you will obtain copies and read them. We are told that there will be many other similar forms to follow.

Congress should compel a simplification of governmental red tape. We shall confidently expect your full support in that direction. Please bear in mind, however, that our members are determined to help win this war in spite of the bureaucrats in Washington.

As an example of superplanning, we quote one of the New Deal planners:

"No matter what may be the conception of it, fully effective public planning is an attribute of a highly refined or advanced stage of government as represented in the extremes by fascism at one end and unadulterated communism on the other. Planning can go only so far and so fast in a democracy founded on individual rights."

Sweet music, isn't it—perhaps grand opera? State socialism and regimentation might travel faster if it were not for the farmers of this country.

Yours very truly,

ARCH SMITH, President.

ROY HOPKINS, Secretary-Treasurer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I make a point of order that no business has been transacted since the last call for a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The Chair is advised that business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A parliamentary inquiry. What was the business transacted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A naval appropriation bill was reported.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to give notice that the rule as to quorum calls will be strictly enforced.

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:

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

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has been called from the city on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. La FOLLETTE in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] as a substitute for

the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow, and that at not later than the hour of 2:30 tomorrow a vote be taken on the bill and on all amendments thereto and substitutes therefor.

Mr. President, will it be necessary to have another quorum call to obtain such an agreement, in view of the fact that the presence of a quorum has just been developed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would under the rule.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then I modify my request.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator can modify his request and omit the question of final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was about to suggest that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow, and that at not later than the hour of 2:30 p. m. a vote be taken on all amendments to or substitutes for the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the pending bill and the amendments thereto I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter written by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, to the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, under date of January 23, 1943.

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

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND
COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1943.

The Honorable CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is an open letter. Its purpose is to inform the public more fully about our present difficulties on the farm production front, to increase support to you in your difficult position as Secretary of Agriculture and Food Administrator, and call to account those who are attempting to put our organizations in a false light, before both the public and the Congress of the United States.

Necessarily, we shall make our statements more in detail for the interest of the public, than we otherwise would to you, because you are thoroughly familiar with the work of our organization and its relationship with the Congress and the United States Department of Agriculture for many years past. We have been most appreciative of the many kind comments you have made about our organizations during the past few years.

We were the first to support you when your name came up for consideration as Secretary of Agriculture. You have always received our loyal support and our many criticisms have always been offered in a manner that we hoped was constructive to you.

You have suffered numerous difficulties, many of which have been insurmountable, with the public little realizing that the lack of agricultural production has not been your fault. We have done everything we could to support you on the manpower issue, the need for more machinery, repair parts, farm supplies, etc., and we have supported you in your difficulties with the Office of Price Administration as regards price ceilings on farm commodities. We feel we have been particularly helpful to you in the field of transportation, storage of farm commodities, processing and distribution. We emphasize that our support was almost without any aid or assistance from other farm organizations, with respect to the following:

Accomplishments through legislation or by Executive order of the national administration, which have been so helpful to the triple A organization, the farmers, and the public interest:

1. The Commodity Exchange Act.
2. Crop insurance.
3. Reduction of interest costs on farm mortgages carried by the Federal Land Bank and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
4. Farm storage, with its ever-normal granary.
5. Prohibition against interstate movement of grain in store without the farmer-holder of the warehouse receipt giving his approval.
6. Increased loan value for wheat producers, based on protein content of the wheat.
7. Increased production of flaxseed, with a guaranty of minimum price at the terminal markets.
8. Floor prices placed on off-grade wheat and soybeans, thus protecting the whole price structure of those commodities.
9. Inclusion of interest and taxes in computing parity prices.
10. Transfer of Commodity Credit Corporation from Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Department of Agriculture.
11. Appropriations for Farm Security Administration, to help low-income farmers to keep them on the land and bring them into increased farm production.
12. Humanizing the treatment of farmers unable to pay their interest and principal to the Farm Credit Administration, thus minimizing evictions from the farms and maintaining that farm family power on the farm, which is now so needed in support of agricultural production in the war effort.

We submitted a plan on behalf of wheat producers, which was the first program put into effect by the triple A in 1933. No other farm organization participated in preparing this plan. It was adopted by the Department of Agriculture and put into effect. The significant part of that plan provided for benefit payments to the wheat producers, based on the historic production of their farm rather than on each year's current production. The wheat farmers thus received the benefit payments whether or not the crop came through.

This amounted to partial crop insurance and proved most beneficial. It established the policy which has been followed by the triple A ever since. While we did not fully approve the triple A legislation in the spring of 1938, we thereafter gave it our complete support, including the annual pilgrimage to Congress begging for appropriations to carry on the triple A program.

The foregoing record is one which cannot be disputed. It is well known to the Vice President, the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, to yourself as Secretary of Agriculture, the present Under Secretary of Agriculture, and the Governor of Farm Credit Administration, Dr. A. G. Black.

The reason we are making this letter open and for stating the foregoing partial record of our organization is to meet the unfair and untrue statements now being made by the largest and loudest farm organization, to wit:

that our organizations, during the last 6 weeks, attempted to destroy all the functions of the Farm Credit Administration and the triple A. It is alleged that we tried to effect a coup. This all evolves around your selection of Mr. Parisius as Director of Food Production; that Mr. Parisius submitted a plan for your consideration which would have made the Farm Security Administration the all-inclusive power of the new food-production program; that, in effect, the personnel of the Farm Security Administration would be the powers in control, and that, thus, the personnel of the Farm Credit Administration and the triple A would be eliminated and all of the good work of the past destroyed.

No one of our organizations prepared any such plan. We did not participate in the preparation of any such plan, and none of us have ever seen the plan that Mr. Parisius submitted to you, nor did we participate or attempt to participate in the selection of the personnel to carry out any such plan.

This large and loud farm organization to which we have referred not only is distributing such false information through the mail and by word of mouth, but it has been able to impress certain Washington correspondents and letter-service organizations to the extent that the public is being given information that our organization did attempt to do the things that are alleged by this large and loud farm organization.

It is not true, and you know it. We intend that the public shall know it. We intend that this large and loud farm organization shall suffer the consequences of such a vicious effort which it has planned to carry through.

The only purpose that this large and loud farm organization has is to attract the attention of the farmers that it is so powerful that it really controls the acts of Congress and directs the policy of the United States Department of Agriculture; that it, alone, has been responsible for the farm legislation of the past few years and for the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated by the Congress each year for the benefit of American agriculture, all to the end that it may increase its membership and become still more powerful.

That sort of internecine warfare between farm groups might be a luxury that could be borne during peacetime, but to have it carried on in this serious hour of global war and the consequent effect to be found in disunity amongst farmers—discouragement and even impeding agricultural production—is of such serious import that we are impelled to get the correct information in the hands of the farmers and the public.

This particular large and loud farm organization has misrepresented its accomplishments for years, in order to increase its membership. You have in your possession factual, indisputable evidence that at the county level it has, in some instances, used jointly the offices of the county agent and influenced the county agent to coerce farmers to join that large and loud farm organization, on the false allegation that that large and loud farm organization was responsible for bringing the admitted increased benefits to American farmers during the past 10 years, as the result of that organization's ability, all by itself, to get legislation and appropriations for the benefit of the farmers.

Of course, you know these statements to be untrue. The former Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, now Vice President, as well as yourself and your associates, have been constantly embarrassed because of the unethical, unwarranted, and untrue statements and activities of this large and loud farm organization, to gain increased membership in its organization through such unfair activities as it has carried on.

We have had the State extension directors in several States complain to us about this and urge us to bring these matters before the public, to the end that the Congress of the

United States might become aware of such misconduct by that large farm organization and put an end to such vicious practice. Of course, we are referring to a handful of lead-95 percent of their membership, who are doing this and in no way are we criticizing 95 percent of their membership, who are fine, loyal American farm families, anxious to do the right thing by the public, their Nation, and the war effort.

We now want to recite for the interest of farmers, the public, and the Congress, a particular activity of ours which is so fully known to you, the Vice President, and the President of the United States. That particular effort relates to the matter of farm-mortgage credit and production credit, carried on by the Farm Credit Administration, and also the work of the Farm Security Administration in its effort to minimize farm tenancy and to aid and assist and supervise low-income farm families up to a higher level, where they could be self-sustaining, self-respecting people in this Nation.

We have been supporting corrective policies in these respects for years, both through legislation and appropriations. We have always contended that our efforts were in the national interest, and time has proven we are right. If we had not made the farm-credit fight, there would have been no change of policy on the matter of farm-mortgage foreclosure, without which thousands of farm families would have been evicted from their farms and would not now be able to contribute to the war effort by participating in increased farm production.

If we had not supported the Farm Security Administration, we would not now have the thousands of farm families on the land who have so greatly improved their status and who, on a percentage basis, have a higher increased rate of farm production during 1942 than any other group. Also, this great body of low-income farm families, who have been brought to a higher level in farm production, are now able to contribute to the farm production so sorely needed this year and in the future.

In January of 1942, a little over a month after Pearl Harbor, the undersigned conferred with the President of the United States on the place of American agriculture in the war effort. We advised him that acreage restriction and scarcity of production of farm products, for the purpose of higher prices, would have to go out; that an entirely new picture faced American agriculture and the Nation, and that immediately we must shift from the program of scarcity production, for the purpose of enhancing price, to total production of farm commodities, for the purpose of meeting the future needs of the Nation and the war effort.

Of course, the President was aware of that because he had gone through the other World War. We told him we feared what would happen in connection with the problems of manpower, manufacturing of machinery, repair parts, and the furnishing of farm supplies, all of which would inevitably affect farm production most unfavorably.

We told him we believed that the greatest reservoir of family manpower would be found in that great group of farm families which does not hire farm labor and where the head of the family would be exempt; that a large percentage of this group were receiving some support from the Farm Security Administration and, therefore, that was a good place to begin, by asking the Congress to appropriate substantially larger sums of money to aid this group of farm families to engage more intensively and extensively in farm production.

He instantly agreed and asked us to make what survey we could and come back and see him the next month. We went to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the one and only reliable place in the United States to get the fullest information available. We

were amazed to find that the potentialities for increased production were so great in this field of low-income farmers.

We met again with the President in February 1942 and gave him our report. He directed us to go immediately to your office and advise you as to his attitude, to fully support larger appropriations for Farm Security Administration as a means to increasing agricultural production. He also directed us to state to you that it was his wish that you immediately call into conference with yourself and us, the Administrator of Farm Security Administration, to the end that immediate plans could be made to enlarge the field work of Farm Security Administration, as a means to increasing agricultural production.

You remember the historic fight that we made for appropriations for Farm Security Administration. You gave your support; the Vice President supported it, and the President sent two messages to Congress on this matter of securing larger appropriations. Unfortunately, the alleged economizers in both branches of the Congress were able to thwart the President's effort to secure larger appropriations for the Farm Security Administration. We are now paying for that character of economy by having less farm production on several hundred thousand farms in the United States, that would otherwise now be available if the position of the President, the Vice President, yourself, and our organizations had been sustained by larger appropriations from the Congress of the United States.

The large and loud farm organization boasts that with this present Congress, the Farm Security Administration shall be eliminated from its present field of operation. It is advertised by this particular farm organization, some commentators from Washington, and through the press, that the Farm Security Administration appropriations are due for the ax. That may be true, but the ax will fall on the consumers of the United States through shorter supplies of food products and more rationing. That character of economy, if carried far enough, will destroy the civilian morale and will seriously endanger our war effort. Time will tell whether we are right or wrong.

The President's Executive order, creating you Food Administrator, and merging the Farm Credit Administration, the triple A, the Soil Conservation Administration and other branches of your Department under a food production administrator, was issued on December 6, 1942. In the meantime you appointed Mr. Parisius and his plans evidently did not meet with your approval and he has resigned. You have since established Governor Townsend as Administrator of Food Production and he has, as associate administrators, the Governor of Farm Credit Administration, Dr. A. G. Black, and the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Mr. J. B. Hutson. We know these three gentlemen very well. We know they are able, patriotic, and conscientious. They will do their level best to successfully and efficiently carry out their responsibilities. They will have our vigorous support in every respect, as you have always had it and will continue to receive it.

It is your responsibility, however, to approve policy, and we want to call your attention in the matter of policy making, to what we believe is one of the most important decisions you will have to make. In making this decision, you are fortunate in that you have been given full authority by the President and in this particular instance, you are not in any way hampered by other divisions or departments of the national administration, such as have so bothered you in other matters, namely, Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, lend-lease operations, etc., etc. So you do have entirely within your hands the matter of determining policy as regards the new form of credit that is to be

extended to farmers as a means to accelerate and increase agricultural production from here on out.

Based on the information had at this time, you are beginning this new credit job with \$250,000,000 available to you. We understand that the credit is to be issued at the county level by the county war board; that at the county level, there will be chosen an individual, to be known as the loan commissioner. We have also been informed that the county war board will approve the loans and that they will be at 5 percent interest and that the farmer, as a borrower, will be responsible for paying that money back to the Government.

If what we have previously recited, as regards this new credit program, is true and that is all there is to it, then we are fearful that you will fail to receive the increased agricultural production that you could otherwise receive if you had a more considerate and understanding policy for the farmers of this country. To begin with, the country banks are bulging with money that they want to loan on a safe, secure, collateral basis. Maybe in some instances, the rate of interest would be higher than 5 percent, but farmers can get large amounts of credit on a collateral basis. The production credit associations all over the country, operating under the auspices of the Farm Credit Administration, make such credit available basis sound collateral, at an approximate cost of 5 percent per annum.

We do not believe that this new line of credit will get the increased agricultural production which you seek. We have two suggestions to make: First, as a means of facilitating and expediting the loan program, that you make the county loan commissioner solely responsible for making the loans under your predetermined policy and that the county war board be used only for providing the farmer a place to appeal, in case the loan commissioner refused to loan him the money; second, we urge you to give comparable consideration to this farmer for taking on more work and risk, that has been assured to the automotive industry and other industries which have converted their institutions to the war effort.

In the case of these industries, the Government has furnished funds without recourse, for the building of plants—the cost of conversion from peacetime manufacturing to wartime manufacturing—and in every instance, the management and stockholders of the industry are guaranteed by contract all costs, plus profit. If you will give the same consideration to the farmers, you will get tremendous increase in agricultural production.

As you know probably better than we, because of your long and successful experience as a farmer, each farmer has learned what he believes is the most adaptable use of his land in production. His livestock, his crop planning and the use of his land is all geared to his concept of what he can most successfully produce and for which he can receive the most income. Take, for illustration, the dairy farmers in the Dairy Belt, where so many of them cannot raise the necessary amount of feed to take care of their dairy stock. They buy tremendous amounts of feed, in addition to what they produce. Is that farmer to use some of his land to grow needed vegetables in support of the war effort? He lacks experience, land, and in some cases, equipment, to do the job you want him to do in this field.

If it is urgent enough for him to put some of his land into the production of vegetables, then a loan to that farmer must be on the basis of a nonrecourse note. That farmer must receive a loan covering all the costs incident to the changing of his farming operations, without risk to himself, or he just won't do it.

Take the case of a farmer who the Government wants to produce flaxseed, which is a very risky undertaking. That farmer is not going to go into that field of production, if it is new to him, unless the money loaned to him for that purpose is without recourse. Why should he? He will properly say to the Government and to you: If that flaxseed crop is hailed on, or the flaxseed suffers from wilt, that he wants his note given for such production likewise to be hailed on or to suffer from wilt. He is a businessman, just like Henry Ford. He will make the changes and do the things that the Government wants him to do if he is treated like the Government has treated Henry Ford. Why should he do otherwise? Why should he be less favorably treated than Mr. Ford, or any other manufacturer?

We must be realistic and practical and fair about this. We urge that you immediately conceive employing this new fund for increased agricultural production along the lines that we have indicated, which will assure maximum effort on the part of the farm family to meet the goals for production which you have in mind.

If the farmer is to buy more hogs, or dairy cows, or to plant certain crops for increased production, extend the credit to him for these increases in production, not as a loan for which he must ultimately repay the Government, but that the liability of the note is limited to the farmer's ability to pay for it out of the proceeds of sale from the increased farm production.

Farmers are generally the most dependable and most patriotic people in this Nation. They haven't learned how to filch millions of dollars from the Federal Government. It has taken some of the big industries of the United States to effectively carry out that character of loot. Go from the lowliest farmer to the largest farmer and extend this credit freely, on the basis of getting increased production, with risk resting upon the national administration as it is carrying other war risks. Limit the liability of the farmer to honestly perform his duty and collect from him the amount of the loan only from the proceeds of the sale from the increased production, after having deducted all costs for such increased production.

It can be done; it must be done; it is your responsibility, and as you well know, you alone will bear this responsibility. With the importance of this effort and this need for increased production of farm commodities, what does it matter if the national administrator absorbs twenty-five or fifty million dollars in losses, if those losses are due to factors beyond the farmer's control, such as livestock disease, hail, drought, rust, wilt, etc.

We repeat—make this money available from the lowliest to the highest of the farm family operators of this Nation. Then you will have done all you could do. You will have discharged your responsibility.

We are anxious to cooperate with you, as we always have. We are at your service, to aid in this war effort to increase agricultural production in any way that you may suggest that we can be helpful.

Respectfully yours,

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,

JAS. G. PATTON, President.

M. W. THATCHER,

Vice Chairman, Executive Council.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair) laid before the

Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

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

Sundry officers for appointment in the Regular Army under the provisions of law.

William J. Fitzgerald, from the State of Connecticut, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the New London area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Dr. Frank H. Sparks, from the State of Indiana, to be director, Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at \$8,000 per annum, in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission;

Lawrence B. Fenneman, from the State of Maryland, to be area director, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Maryland area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Ramy B. Deschner, from the State of Missouri, to be area director, at \$6,600 per annum, in the District of Columbia area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Frank M. Bristow, from the State of Missouri, to be field supervisor, at \$5,600 per annum, in the Kansas City regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Frederick R. Whitney, from the State of Massachusetts, to be head manpower utilization consultant, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Elmer K. Delp, from the State of New York, to be senior training specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission; and

Farrell Daniel Coyle, from the State of Rhode Island, to be area director, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Providence area office of the War Manpower Commission.

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

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

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

That completes the calendar.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

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

RECESS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 17, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of March 9), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Merlin E. Smith, of Ohio, to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

THE JUDICIARY

Tom C. Clark, of Texas, to be Assistant Attorney General of the United States, vice Hon. Thurman Arnold, resigned.

Hugh B. Cox, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Attorney General of the United States; new position.

ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Frank L. Yates, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Comptroller General of the United States for a term of 15 years.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Thomas A. Gallagher, of Cincinnati, Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Ohio; to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, United States Navy, retired, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term of 6 years from April 16, 1943 (reappointment).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of March 9), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Chester C. Stokes, Buckner.
Jessie Garner, Kingsland.
Mildred T. Akin, Proctor.

FLORIDA

Evelyn C. Hunter, Neptune Beach.

NORTH CAROLINA

William B. Flake, Lilesville.
Eunice M. E. Blalock, Longhurst.

OREGON

Paul A. Mills, Woodburn.

TEXAS

Maud English, Kennard.
Lawrence O. Reardon, Mason.
Verda L. White, Royalty.
Willie R. Goodwin, Stinnett.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

O Lord, our God, we do not present our supplications before Thee for our righteousness, but for Thy great mercies; turn us again and cause Thy face to shine and we shall be saved. Grant that those convulsed lands in the distress of gray and stormy skies may see the tokens of Thy will and Thy everliving and unchangeable nature.

Heavenly Father, we pray for wise understanding of that faith which values humanity and for spiritual devotion which endures. O keep us hopeful and

courageous; no frown ever made a dark day radiant and no complaint ever made a heart happier nor the way smoother. We pray for strength to make us valiant when thoughts of regret linger and memory is threatened with bitterness. By inward sympathy unite our country in a common devotion and in a common work to set Thy people free. O forgive our own America for sharing in those sins unspoken and drooped down into the soul of a sorry, dejected world and in the light of a liberal, healing sun. Let every door which is barred by hate and revenge open to the living forms of cooperation and fellowship. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that we have a very full day today, and the Chair will only recognize Members to extend their remarks or to ask to speak at a later time, but not for 1 minute at this time.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have 15 minutes allotted to me today. I ask that that be canceled, and I ask unanimous consent that I may have 15 minutes to address the House on Friday of this week, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have here a press release from the Railroad Commission of the State of California, and I ask unanimous consent to have it placed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a report on the Ruml plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PLUMLEY and Mr. HORAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a recent editorial commenting on the Canadian system of price control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address of the Governor of Hawaii to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was permitted to be included in the Record yesterday, involves an additional cost of \$135. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Record notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table tomorrow and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein two editorials from the Youngstown Vindicator of March 8 entitled "The New Draft Regulations" and "Dwarfs Cost of the Canal."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a brief editorial from the Evening Bulletin, Providence, R. I., of March 5, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a letter received from Mary H. Hartsock, legislative member of the East Wayne Advisory Council, Warren County, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on two subjects and to include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. For the present the calling of bills on the Private Calendar will go over, as some Members in charge of those bills are not present.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 58, Rept. No. 251), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee, or otherwise, to continue during the present Congress the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 15, House Resolution 188, and House Resolution 383, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purposes such committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon such committee by House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Any unexpended balance of the appropriation authorized for the use of such committee under House Resolution 385 of the Seventy-seventh Congress is hereby continued for such purposes.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 170, Rept. No. 250), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1914) to amend the National Housing Act. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year

1943; and pending that motion, I should like to know if it would be agreeable to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to fix the time for general debate at 3 hours.

Mr. TABER. That is satisfactory to us.

Mr. O'NEAL. I trust sufficient time will be reserved so that those opposed to the bill will have an opportunity to express themselves.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Those opposed to the bill will have unlimited time.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman will yield, I have had no knowledge that this bill was to be considered today. There is a great deal of opposition to the bill, I am informed, and a majority of the Members do not know about the bill.

Consequently, I feel sufficient time should be allowed so that there may be full discussion of the bill. Therefore, for the time being I object to fixing the time for general debate, because I believe many Members desire to be heard on the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I say that in the apportionment of the short time to which we necessarily will be limited on this bill, we shall appreciate it if Members who favor the bill will confine themselves to 5 minutes, if that is possible. It is our hope to give all those who oppose the bill all the time they require. I trust those who favor the bill will be agreeable to limiting their remarks to 5 minutes or waiting until the bill is read for amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. It seems to me the request of the chairman is very broad, but I believe many Members do not know anything about this joint resolution. It deals with the manpower problem and the expected food shortage in this country. It seems to me plenty of time for debate should be allowed so that the Members may be informed of just exactly what this resolution does.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the Members will stay on the floor, we expect every Member of this House to be fully advised as to every provision of the resolution before they are asked to vote on it.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

By unanimous consent, a call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 26]

Allen, Ill.	Domengeaux	McGehee
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fellows	McGregor
Buckley	Gallagher	Miller, Conn.
Burdick	Gibson	Morrison, La.
Byrne	Goodwin	Myers
Camp	Guyer	Newsome
Cannon, Fla.	Hagen	Norton
Clark	Hale	O'Toole
Cochran	Harless, Ariz.	Pfeifer
Cole, N. Y.	Hart	Philbin
Colmer	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Crawford	Hinshaw	Rogers, Calif.
Culkin	Howell	Satterfield
Dawson	Jarman	Scott
Dingell	Kennedy	Shafer
Ditter	Lewis, Colo.	Sheridan

Short	Treadway	Winter
Summer, Ill.	Walter	Worley
Taylor	West	
Thomas, N. J.	Wheelchel, Ga.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 96, and pending that motion, may I ask the gentleman from New York if it is agreeable to him that we fix general debate at 3 hours.

Mr. TABER. I rather feel that in view of the interest there seems to be in the bill we had better make it 4 hours.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman divide the difference and say 3½ hours?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3½ hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and one-half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 96, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I shall confine myself to 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the committee submits to the House a bill dealing with one of the most vital subjects before the Nation today. It is—in its prospective effect upon the war effort and in its importance as a factor in bringing the war to a victorious conclusion—one of the half dozen major bills of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

We are engaged in an all-out war. We face today the greatest crisis—the greatest peril that has confronted the Nation since Yorktown or Gettysburg. In this war there are two fronts—the battle front and the home front. And one is as important as the other. If we fail on the home front, our battle lines left without adequate support and supplies, are doomed.

Napoleon said, "An army traveled on its belly." And General Marshall—who with one modern equipped division of marines could drive the Grand Armée from Marengo to Austerlitz—told the committee that food was as important as bullets as a munition of war. Military authorities are agreed that food will win the war and write the peace. And food is a product of the home front.

This bill is a bill to sustain the home front—to implement food production. The American farm must produce sufficient food to feed our civilian population, to feed our munition workers, to feed our armed forces, to provision lend-lease, and to sustain the armies of our allies. Otherwise there is no possible hope of victory. And after the war they must continue to supply sufficient food to sustain the famished nations of Europe until they can produce a crop of their own. There is no tenable alternative.

It is a prodigious order. And the appeal has gone out—over every radio, in every newspaper, and through every official channel—for increased production. The farmers are insistently urged to produce the greatest crop ever grown in America.

But as anxious as the farmers are to comply—and every farmer throughout the length and breadth of the land is working feverishly to turn out every pound of food he can grow—the farmer is facing a heavy handicap. Labor has been drained away from the farm by the draft and the war industries offering shorter hours, easier tasks, and vastly larger pay. Lack of machinery intensifies the labor shortage. And food cannot be produced without labor. While there is a greater demand for food than ever before, there is less labor—farm labor—to produce it than ever before. There is not a farm in the United States that is fully manned. And there is not a farm anywhere in the United States that is not threatened with further loss of manpower unless something can be done to halt the exodus and turn the tide back to the farm and back to larger production.

Of course, the first approach to the problem should have been through the exemption of keymen on essential farms from the draft. As time is limited permit me to revert to a statement which I made here on the floor when the subject was under discussion last year:

The real solution of the problem of farm labor is not in bringing outside men to the farm, but in the retention on the farm of the experienced men already there. The man who comes in from the outside, from the city, even from other sections is not accustomed to standards of farm living; he is invariably inexperienced, unaccustomed, and untrained, and unadaptable to farm operations, a profession which requires more careful training and education, in my opinion, than any other human avocation. You cannot train a farmer in 6 months, hardly in 6 years. You cannot bring in a man and make him an effective farm producer on short notice or through the agency of some employment agency.

The solution of this problem is to keep on the farm the men already there, men who are thoroughly familiar with farm practices and acquainted with local conditions, men who have been farming from their youth up and who are experienced and proficient in producing food in greater quantity and at less expense than any other men you can bring in to supplant them.

The plan of taking away from the farm and putting into the Army essential men on the farm and then trying to fill their places from the outside is utterly idiotic. It lacks every element of economy. The average man on the farm works a maximum of 96 hours a week. When you take him off the farm and

put him in the factory he works a maximum of 45 hours a week. You are trading 96 hours' labor for 45 hours of labor and getting less in both volume and value of production. Clearly the way to conserve labor on the farm is to keep the labor you have there. Some provision should be made immediately for the exemption of essential men on the farm by requiring a certificate or clearance from their local board.

Deferment at that time would in itself have solved the problem although a far larger number have left the farm and are still leaving the farm, lured by higher wages, shorter days, and easier working conditions in the steam-heated and air-conditioned factories of the war industries.

But those are not factors which we can reach in legislation of this character. And so we approach the problem by the only avenue open to us. The measure submitted by the committee after long and arduous consideration provides funds to assist in recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing farm labor for the crop year of 1943. The bill has been reported and analyzed by the press and the printed report submitted with the bill explains it in detail. Suffice to say that in the considered judgment of the majority of a veteran committee of 43 experienced men it is the best solution available at this time.

But the bill is not a panacea. It is in our opinion the best approach that can be devised, but it will not solve the problem. No bill that could be passed by this House will solve the problem. Regardless of what we do or what can be done here today there will not be sufficient labor on the farms. Regardless of the legislation enacted or the amount provided to implement it there will not be enough food. But this is the best that can be done under the circumstances.

The amount recommended by the committee is \$26,100,000. But the amount is in itself relatively unimportant. The mere appropriation of money will provide neither labor nor food. If it were that easy no sum would be too large.

It is the purpose for which the money is to be used and the method of its disposition that promises relief. Accordingly, the committee offers the method it considers most practicable and recommends a sum sufficient for its administration, and no more.

There is some difference of opinion as to how much will be required. Some say it should be more and some think it should be less. Some want to increase it to \$65,000,000 and some insist it should be reduced to \$12,000,000. So it must be about right. Some consider the need for the bill imperative while others protest there is no need for such legislation of any character. Some object to the bill on the grounds that Republicans wrote it. Others are against it because it was formulated by a subcommittee with a majority of Democrats on the subcommittee and then reported out by a committee with a membership of 25 Democrats and only 18 Republicans. So it must be pretty much of a nonpartisan measure.

The important consideration is that there is desperate need of food and labor

to produce food if we are to win the war. After exhaustive study this is the plan approved by a large majority of the committee. Time is short. Crops are already being planted. If farm labor is to be provided it must be provided soon. I trust the recommendation of the committee will be approved by the House and the bill started on its way while there is yet time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I stated, and I repeat, that I have been and I am now a friend of the farmer. For 36 years I have voted for nearly every bill that was admitted to be in the interest of the farmers of the country. I still feel that I can continue to aid the farmer and agriculture to the best of my ability. Yesterday we passed a bill authorizing the sale of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, at a cost to the Government and the taxpayers of approximately between twenty-five and thirty million dollars, in the interest of the farmer. A few days ago we reported a rule on the Pace bill which is pending now. This morning we granted a rule on the Steagall bill to aid the farmer. We have also pending the Brown bill to aid the farmer, and we have several other bills pending to aid the farmer. Some of the bills I feel are unnecessary. This bill comes before the House with hardly any notice to the membership of the House. It is only by chance that I learned that it was to be called up by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is a very hard working, a very shrewd and clever gentleman, having at all times the interest of his and other farmers at heart, but who unfortunately sometimes goes far, far beyond the requests or even the desires of the farmers of the country. The gentleman from Missouri obtained unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with. Consequently I do not think that we have very many Members present who are familiar with the bill. I shall therefore take the privilege of reading a few extracts from the bill for your information. I read it hurriedly last night in the limited time I had, and gave it only a few minutes this morning, because I am kept so very, very busy granting rules for agricultural relief.

The bill provides, in part—

That for expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and placement of workers needed for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States); to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States and in Puerto Rico on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the conduct of extension work and apportioned to the States on the basis of need for the purposes specified herein; for transportation and subsistence of workers

and expenditures for construction, rental, or operation of temporary suitable housing or shelter facilities for such workers where existing housing facilities are not adequate (including for the purposes specified herein, agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States), to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States and Puerto Rico, as hereinbefore specified, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, of which not less than \$100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, and not less than \$13,500,000 shall be apportioned to the extension services in the States on the basis of need to enable them to carry out their responsibilities hereunder within the States, including the recruiting, training, and placement of farm labor, the provision, operation, and supervision of temporary housing and shelter facilities and the transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence, and protection of workers within the States as herein provided; the remaining funds not to exceed \$12,500,000 to be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers while en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this act, but not to exceed a period of 30 days after the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the Office of Extension Service in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the State extension services in the States which are concerned in obtaining such labor are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such domestic and imported labor to and from the respective States and the extension services in the States either individually or collectively may enter into such agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the United States Employment Services: *Provided further*, That the extension services of the land-grant colleges shall be responsible for the recruiting, training, transportation, and placement of all such workers within their respective States; and the Extension Service is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services and to cooperate with any other public or private agency: *Provided further*, That existing farm labor camps and other necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States Department of Agriculture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where suitably located shall be made available to such workers to the extent they are required and shall be operated under the supervision of the Extension Service as hereinbefore provided so long as such facilities are required for this purpose.

And so forth. The bill calls for an appropriation of \$26,000,000. It authorizes the importation of farm labor, whether

there is authority in our immigration laws for it or not. Under our immigration laws only a limited quota of people are permitted to enter the United States in any given time. Under this bill there is no provision to eliminate the restriction on the immigration, but I really would have no objection at this time to that provision permitting the importation of Mexican labor if such labor is needed. I know from past experience we have secured a great deal of farm labor from Mexico and a great deal of it is available today. I concede that we may have a shortage of farm labor. We also have a shortage of industrial and other labor. The shortage of farm labor was brought about because many of the boys have been drafted and are in the service. But there are many, many who have left the farms and who have accepted positions in industrial centers because they could earn more money there than they could on the farm.

In view of the situation that confronts our country, I think it is manifestly unfair that the farm boys, when we need the food that is produced on the farms, should have left the farms in such large numbers just because they can, for the time being, obtain a higher wage and can earn more money than they could on the farm.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I will in a moment. I sympathize with some of the farmers—not all of them—because I have maintained and I believe now that the vast majority of American farmers are better off today than ever before in the history of America. When gentlemen claim there will be a shortage of food because the farmers will not produce, because they are not receiving the compensation that is warranted because of the increase in wages they have to pay, I disagree with them. I believe the American farmer is certainly patriotic and will not go on strike and stop growing whatever crops he can, especially in view of the fact that we have eliminated nearly all restrictions as to the amount that a farmer can grow.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SABATH. I yield first to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I would just like to ask the gentleman if he does not feel that the Government is more responsible for draining those boys away from the farm, by putting on one side of the road a construction camp or some other kind of Government work, setting wages up to \$8, \$10, and \$12 a day, and then expecting that boy to stay on the farm, when the farmer cannot get enough to even pay him \$2.50 a day out of the product he produces?

Mr. SABATH. I think the War Department is responsible, because they have located many of the plants away out in the country where there was no labor available. I grant that some of the plants, such as powder plants, must be far removed from populated sections, but they have placed many of those big plants 30 or 40 miles away from thickly populated sections where they could have

obtained sufficient labor. Consequently, some of the boys on the farms who have seen those plants grow up in their midst have left the farms thinking that they can obtain positions for the time being which will net them much greater incomes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have enjoyed the gentleman's remarks thus far, but before he concludes, will the gentleman tell us whether he is for or against this bill?

Mr. SABATH. I am trying to explain why we should not vote for this bill. It is unnecessary at this time, notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is overanxious to serve the farmers, without giving proper consideration to the consumers of the Nation and to our Treasury.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with you that we should not vote for this bill. Will you yield to me?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Now, under this bill if it is passed, could we or could we not secure Mexican laborers for the purpose of doing the hand work in the sugar-beet fields, where we have to have them if we are going to harvest those sugar beets, because we do not have local help?

Mr. SABATH. For the information of the gentleman from Montana, that section of our country has always received Mexican labor whenever it was required.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But, as a rule, too late. That is what I am getting at.

Mr. SABATH. Because some of you people were too slow. The big growers always got the labor when they needed it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We lost crops because it was too late.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Our boys have been taken into the Army and into the factories, and to replace these boys in their home communities while they are fighting, they are going to bring in these outsiders from Mexico and Puerto Rico?

Mr. SABATH. From Mexico.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Surely. Let our boys fight and die and let those fellows come and take their places at home.

Mr. SABATH. Now, before my time expires, this morning we granted a rule on the so-called Steagall bill. I wish you would hear what the proviso in that bill is. This brings up the point whether we are doing something for the farmers or not:

Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, rule, regulation, or order, no subsidy payment, parity payment, conservation payment, incentive payment, or payment in any other form or by any other term described, shall be deducted in establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices or in determining parity or comparable prices for any agricultural commodity.

All these bills we have passed are in the interest of the farmers and I am for them, but I am against this bill because it is manifestly unfair in itself.

I feel that the people in their respective townships and the county and State authorities are able to handle the shortage of labor to better advantage than the Government agency. It is to be regretted that the people who are complaining and criticizing the so-called bureaucrats still try to give greater power to them when it suits their convenience or when they can be benefited. I feel the bill goes altogether too far, because if we go on record as favoring this bill, or if we pass it, to aid the farmers procure labor and import labor, what is there to prevent industries who also are short of labor asking for the same privilege? I am not in position to state whether this bill has been approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, a real friend of agriculture, but whether it has or not I feel we are entering on a dangerous policy.

As I stated before, some of the gentlemen will claim there is a shortage of food, notwithstanding that we had greater crops in 1942 than in 1941, and the estimates indicate that we will have still more abundant crops in 1943.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution is before the House as the result of a terrible situation that has afflicted the country as the result of the operations and figurings of the long-hairs in the Department of Agriculture and the O. P. A. There is no use of being mealy-mouthed about it; we might just as well acknowledge it. Without the slightest idea of what the agricultural situation is about they have gone ahead with their rationing and fixing of prices, not on the basis of what it would cost the farmer to get the stuff out, but on the basis of what would grind the farmer down. These incompetents, who frankly have more education than they have capacity to absorb, and that is a very charitable statement, have fixed the price of the farmer's product so low that he is unable to pay help in accordance with the competition he has to face. As a result we have an extreme shortage of farm labor. That situation has been getting worse and worse. It has been accentuated by the operations of the Labor Department, by the operations of the War Labor Board, where they have raised the wages without regard to the law, without regard to the going rate for a lot of the war program, way beyond what farmers could pay and so we are brought in here now facing that situation.

There are two possible remedies that really would help a lot. One would be for the O. P. A. to go through this whole situation and give the farmer a price for the things he has to raise that would let him pay wages in competition with those who are pulling help off the farm. That would draw a large amount of help back to the farm which has gone to the factory and which has gone into war operations.

Another thing would be for the Department of Agriculture to cease standing in the way of the farmer. At the present time they are trying, by means of subsidies which are highly inflationary and which cannot be controlled so they will do the job, to keep the prices down. As a result the farmer has become completely discouraged.

This bill has just been brought in here. Frankly I intend to support it. I do not like it; I will be perfectly frank with you. It is not as bad as the program that was brought to us from the Bureau of the Budget to permit the Farm Security Administration to continue to make a mess of the farm labor situation.

The Secretary of Agriculture and three different outfits were before us which he suggested the thing be turned over to. It was perfectly apparent that the whole outfit was incompetent to handle the situation; they showed it. There was not a man on the committee who heard the testimony who would get up and say that that outfit was competent to handle it.

At this time the bill provides \$6,000,000 to be turned over to the extension service of the States so they may operate the labor service within the counties, and that covers 95 percent of whatever labor the Department proposed to attempt to produce for the farmer to start with.

There is also turned over to the Extension Service, under House Resolution 96, another \$7,500,000, making a total of \$13,500,000 for the purpose of handling outside labor and taking care of them within the counties where it is necessary perhaps to look after some housing.

Then there is \$12,500,000 to be available to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service. This whole thing, however, would be under the direction of the extension agents in the local counties—and the State heads of this service, who are generally very competent people, people who have the confidence of the local communities.

It is a difficult situation. It has been made exceedingly difficult because the Secretary of Agriculture has failed to put someone in charge of the job and see that they were good enough and big enough to swing it. I do not have the slightest doubt but what the Extension agents in the country will do the job of getting labor together. Some labor is required in Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, that normally come across the border from Mexico. If they would allow the farmers to handle the situation themselves they could still do it in decent shape. But the administration has entered into an agreement with the Mexican administration and they would not allow that to happen any longer, but they allow the Mexican Government to go into the Mexican States to recruit labor. It is in a mess, but in view of the terrible situation which confronts the people in the border States, and in California, I do not want to stand in the way of what Mexican labor could be brought in that way. We have, however, tried to provide for it in a way that would be intelligent.

I do not believe they can get 50,000. I was satisfied that Secretary Wickard felt

they could not get 50,000. I think they can get 10,000 or 15,000, and that would be about the limit.

Then there is a proposal to take colored labor from the South and bring it North as the crop matures. That has been very useful in the vegetables and the fruit crops.

Then there is a small item here for going into the mountains of Tennessee and Kentucky and taking dairymen who are brought into the dairy States to help on the farm. From that money some good things have come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on the other hand, the way the Farm Security Administration has operated it has been terrible. I was home the other day and there arrived in my home town, sent there by the Farm Security Administration, a man from the Kentucky mountains with a wife and six children for whom the Farm Security Administration had provided no job and no place to live. The first place he landed was the local relief office. That is the way they have been operating. I am just telling you one instance; I could go along a good ways.

The Farm Security Administration down to the time they came to us had spent \$189,000 and obligated a million and a half. The President allocated four and one-half millions to them. It is perfectly apparent they have gotten nowhere, and they are going to get nowhere. The only way we can get anything in the way of farm labor is to do what we have set up here. The executive committee of the Extension Service here in Washington voted to assume this burden; we gave it to them after that. I hope the House will permit this to be tried out because it is the only way I see that the Federal Government can do anything to help the farm labor situation and counteract that terrible situation that these incompetents in the Department of Agriculture and the O. P. A. have created. It is a terrible situation, but we have got to do the best we can to work out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to this bill. I regret that I shall hardly have time to analyze it as I should like to analyze it for the House, but I state to you that in the several years I have been here this is the most amazing performance I have witnessed.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the Dirksen bill, sponsored by a very highly regarded member of the minority party. This bill overrules the Secretary of Agriculture and in effect it denounces and condemns the Department of Agriculture as incompetent and unable to do this job. In effect, it also denounces the Secretary of Agriculture as incompetent and incapable of doing this job. Further, in its amazing provisions, brought out by

the gentleman from Illinois, it requires that this Government change the contract that has been made through long negotiation with Mexico and let the Extension Service and the Employment Service write a new agreement. It almost in that way advocates breaking a treaty. Further, it has the effrontery to say to the Secretary of Agriculture: "We will give you 30 days to get out of this business and no longer." That, Mr. Chairman, is what this bill does. I have the highest respect and regard for the gentleman from Illinois; he is persuasive; he is always intelligent, and he is doing a good job which he thinks is proper. I am one of his greatest admirers in this House; but, Mr. Chairman, this bill is written in my opinion with hatred for the agricultural administration, and with disrespect for its leadership. If such were not the case I do not believe that the Dirksen bill and plan would have been offered.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. After I explain the bill a little further I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

In addition to that, this bill does something which I believe should not be done at this time. I do not think you could do any job by dividing authority, by saying to 48 States that they do this job, instead of placing the responsibility definitely in the hands of some one particular authority, a matter so important as the production of food for the needs of this country, our allies, and their soldiers.

The Commander in Chief of the American Army, the President of the United States, recognizing manpower as a war problem, named the War Manpower Commission as the one agency to handle the over-all manpower problem. The War Manpower Commission, as a part of the war program, named the Secretary of Agriculture and the agricultural administration on January 23 as the agency to handle the farm-labor problem; so there is a direct succession as a matter of conducting the war effort, putting into the hands of the Secretary the job of handling this thing, of making a greater supply of labor available in order to produce more food. Everyone can make mistakes; probably everyone may fall down on the job to a certain extent, but the Commander in Chief put this job in the hands of the War Manpower Commission, and in this bill introduced and passed out by the gentleman from Illinois we take that authority away from the war agency and adopt a different plan. I should now like, as briefly as I can, to make this bill a little bit clearer to the membership if possible.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand that the Department of Agriculture is against this proposal?

Mr. O'NEAL. The Department of Agriculture would naturally be because it has been kicked out of the picture.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Do I understand further that the farm organizations—for instance, the National Grange

and the American Farm Bureau Federation—are likewise against the bill?

Mr. O'NEAL. I am coming to that. That is a part of what I want to say. May I say at this time that no two people of all the experts, Congressmen, farm organizations, or anyone else, agreed on any program. There was tremendous confusion, even among our colleagues who came before us. None of them saw it the same way. The same thing is true of the four farm bureau organizations that came before us. They did not agree in any important particulars, and, as to the Dirksen bill, there were some objections which they voiced. There was objection to the very thing I am discussing.

They doubted the wisdom of taking it away from the Department of Agriculture. My point is not that this is brought in here by a Member of the minority. I confess they do many good things on the minority side, and I would support the bill readily even though the sponsorship came from that side of the aisle if it were the practical sound thing to do. My opposition is based on the fact that it is not logical, it is not well thought out, and it is not practical. We are trifling and fiddling with a problem of tremendous importance, and the only way I know to do it is through your constituted authorities who are charged by the Manpower Commission with doing it.

The Secretary sent his recommendation and came before the committee and asked for \$65,000,000. In that amount was \$6,000,000 which is no longer in dispute from anybody's standpoint, which was to be used through the Secretary of Agriculture and the State extension bureaus to recruit intrastate labor. The farm bureaus backed that up and everyone seemed to be in favor of it, and it is in the Secretary's bill and the Dirksen bill. The intrastate labor which is being considered is 90 percent of all the labor that is to be recruited. So there was complete agreement by all in the Secretary's recommendation that he was willing to turn \$6,000,000 over to the extension services for intrastate labor. There is no quarrel about that and it is 90 percent of the job as far as numbers are concerned.

The Secretary also recommended the construction of 250 camps for migratory labor, and there are now in operation 95 camps. He asked for \$17,000,000 plus for that operation and then asked for \$39,000,000 for the transportation of seasonal workers. The amount of workers they hoped to get was 350,000 seasonal workers and about 42,000 all-year-round workers to be taken from one State to another or from Mexico to this country or from the Bahamas to the Florida coast. That is all the Secretary's bill recommended.

Then they called in the various farm organizations for their advice. These farm organizations did not discuss specifically at the first meeting, and it is all in the hearings, the question of whether this amount of money was right or how the program should proceed, but did discuss the broad problem of greater production of food on the farms and

their recommendations, or at least a part of them, were to the effect we should lengthen the week to 54 hours, with no extra overtime, and that we should exempt the boys from service in the Army and general things of that character.

The committee asked them to come back with more specific recommendations. They came back and tried to be more specific as to the type of bill that should be written.

As a result of that the committee brought out House Joint Resolution 94, which is available here. What we have under discussion is House Joint Resolution 96. In House Joint Resolution 94 the Secretary, the committee and the subcommittee recommended practically what the Secretary asked for except that it cut down the amount of money to \$26,000,000. In the report of the committee on House Joint Resolution 94 there is made this statement which is very interesting in the light of the change now in adopting the Dirksen bill. Apparently the committee changed its point of view very materially.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield for a question at this point?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman tell us just why the committee did not follow the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture when he recommended the \$65,000,000 or thereabouts and distribution, as the gentleman already told us?

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman will have to draw his own deductions. I am giving the whole picture. The gentleman can draw his own deductions from that.

In reporting House Joint Resolution 94, the committee said this:

The committee is glad to note that by this action there has been a concentration of responsibility under the immediate supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture for the functioning of the program and that the policies and procedures for its operation will emanate directly from his immediate control and not be dispersed among the agencies to be utilized in giving effect to the various phases. The committee has left the selection of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture to implement the program to the designation of the Secretary. It does so in view of the issuance of this order of March 1.

That is where there was created a War Labor Board. So they felt the Farm Security Administration, which seems to be particularly under a cloud, was taken out of the picture by the issuance of this order. That was the action of the committee in reporting House Joint Resolution 94.

Then the various farm organizations came in with more specific recommendations, and finally the bill came out known as the Dirksen bill. That bill, Mr. Chairman, kicking the Secretary of Agriculture out and kicking the Agriculture Department out, does not conform completely to the recommendations of these farm organizations. Possibly one did. The others did not. Furthermore, all of them recommended, as far as I recall, not \$26,000,000, but \$37,000,000.

So we have before us today a bill brought out by the minority reducing the amount without reasonable cause. Nobody recommended that amount. The committee brought out the same amount but not upon the recommendation of one so-called expert.

Further, the bill was brought out discharging the Secretary of Agriculture, telling him to get out of this international situation, change the contract which was made, and do it within 30 days. That was not recommended by the farm organizations. I could read to you expressions by them in which most of them recommended keeping it with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this whole bill is an unscientific way to approach the problem. Perhaps no one can solve this problem. The War Manpower Commission has given that responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture. If you do not like it, if you do not like his organization, then, as Old Bill, in Bairnsfather's cartoon, said, "If you know a better 'ole, go to it."

You cannot solve the job of transporting labor across State lines and bringing the workers in from foreign countries by turning it over to the State extension services and the United States Employment Office, and ordering them to negotiate a new contract, and certainly not within a short time, and time is all important.

I say that the Secretary of Agriculture, although you may not like him, has not had a fair chance to demonstrate what he could do on this job. He was not charged with the prime responsibility of doing this job until January 23 of this year. He was given \$4,500,000 out of the President's fund in September. The job began after the summer season was over. At that, he recruited 13,000 men and brought over 5,000 Mexicans into this country to help with the job. The only hope of getting this job done with any amount of intelligence is to do it as a war measure through the agency, the only agency, that is competent to do it.

The truth of the matter is that there is involved some sort of hatred, some sort of suspicion; somebody does not like somebody else. They are always bringing up this question, "Let us get it away from the Department of Agriculture because they are interested in social objectives," or "There is too much concentration of power in Washington."

Here is this apparently small amount, \$26,000,000, to change the nature of our country and to bring more concentration to Washington. Yet, without criticism, I have seen colleagues on both sides of the aisle come here since 1936 and get \$6,000,000,000 of Federal money for the farmer, and all of it out-of-pocket expense. The control of that vast sum in Washington was under that same Department of Agriculture, which you are not now willing to trust with a little \$26,000,000. The Government granted as much as one billion for 1 year. The farm representatives then came here and asked the Federal Government to do a little something along social objective

lines. Our farm bureaus, with all due credit to them, were here advocating it and asking the Federal Government to put out this \$6,000,000,000 to help the farmer. Were they afraid then of too much control in Washington? Yet now there is all this hate for the Department of Agriculture because \$26,000,000 is to be expended by it.

At the proper time I intend to offer as a substitute for this bill House Joint Resolution 94, which was brought out first by the committee, which also provides \$26,000,000, \$6,000,000 of which will handle 90 percent of the labor problem through the Extension Service, the balance to be used as the Secretary in his judgment feels is necessary to promote more farm labor, the only distinction being that we place the responsibility where it should be placed, with the Secretary of Agriculture, and do not divide the responsibility among 48 different States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. It seems to me that all of us, due to the fact that we are at war, seem to be a little overnervous and critical. We expect everybody to do a big job. We try to tell this fellow that he made a mistake, and we overemphasize it. I believe the war effort would go much better if we would criticize where vital things were concerned and were a little more generous, a little more liberal, as to the mistakes and possibly the failures of some others trying to do a patriotic job.

I believe we have to do this job. I do not want this House, though we may think the job cannot be done, to fail to make the effort. We may wake up next year and find that we have not enough food to take care properly of the needs of this country, and that possibly some soldier in Russia is not getting what he should have in the way of help from America to make him a better soldier to fight the cause of the Allies. I do not want us to say the job just cannot be done. This Dirksen bill is just an expression of their attitude as to the futility of the whole job, and they will tell you so. I think we as Members of Congress should provide what the Secretary asked for, and do it the best way we can. It will not be our responsibility then if next year they ask for food and we have no food to give them.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to argue with the gentleman as to his contentions, but I should like to have his explanation of why this work is not in the Department of Agriculture more than it has been. Is not the Extension Service a part of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. O'NEAL. The administration of the job of the State extension services is divided among 48 different States, under the Dirksen bill. The administrators of

the 48 States, in order to make an agreement as to farm labor, must go to the United States Employment Bureau, and they in turn will make an agreement with the Mexican Government or the Bahaman Government or whoever it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], for whom I have the deepest respect and affection, has expressed the opinion that many Members of Congress are suspicious of the social objectives of some of those who are administering the acts passed by Congress. That is undoubtedly true. Some of us are suspicious of what socialistic and crack-pot bureaucrats are seeking to do and we have good grounds for our suspicions.

At this very moment the farmers are urged to produce unprecedented quantities of food and crops. Our farmers are patriotic and are, therefore, anxious to contribute their part to the war effort. To do so they must work under great handicaps brought about largely by the stupidity of certain Government bureaucrats. Without adequate machinery or fertilizer and with no sensible or coordinated program it is most difficult for our farmers, especially in the South, to reach the goals set by the Government. The failure of the Government to treat agriculture as a war industry and to develop a coordinated program have been responsible for many of the problems that now confront our farmers. Nevertheless they are striving to overcome all handicaps and they will largely succeed. The farmers of the South are extremely patriotic and they are doing everything within their power to provide food for the armed forces and the Nation. It is, therefore, most discouraging that at a time like this would be chosen to question their patriotism and attack their honesty. I have here a letter written on February 20, 1943, by the National Sharecroppers Week. This organization is sponsored by a number of people including Harold L. Ickes, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Archibald MacLeish, and others. I want to read you this letter because it viciously attacks the farmers of the South whose boys are fighting in our armed forces at this very moment:

DEAR FRIEND: This is a war about the right of peoples to live decently and in freedom. We cannot win this war simply by freeing all the peoples of Europe, Africa, and the Orient. It is harder than that. We must win it also by giving every American the economic and political freedom which is his birthright.

That is why I ask your help for hundreds of thousands of sharecropper and tenant-farmer families who live bleak, despairing lives in our own South. They are a native stock wedded to the soil which nourished their ancestors. They are no longer free, for they have lost the land which gave them freedom and security. And through the poll tax they have lost the right to vote in defense of their interests. Economically pauperized and politically frustrated, they have

yet sent their sons to defend our cause throughout the world.

Dispossessed and embittered, they are not yet beaten. In the face of an arrogant terrorism exercised by the economic group which rules the agricultural South, these Negro and white sharecroppers and tenant farmers have banded their own organization to reaffirm their dignity as human beings. Through the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, they have advanced a democratic program calling for abolition of the poll tax, protection for civil liberties in the sharecropper country, antilynching legislation, establishment of minimum wage levels for agricultural labor, initiation of cooperative purchasing organizations, and adequate rural housing. They call for the utilization of all land and labor resources of southern agriculture in the interests of victory.

I ask your help in support of this work. We are none of us free while these Americans remain slaves in a vicious economic and political system which crushes their aspirations toward a decent life. We can help them to win freedom and security by supporting their organized effort to better their lives. A gift of \$100 will enable us to reach thousands of sharecroppers with this practical program of aid. Any gift that you make will help. It will help make possible that their sons who left the America of despair may return to an America of hope founded on a new political emancipation and security on the land. I hope that you will help as much as you can.

It is inconceivable that a Cabinet officer and the wife of our President would sponsor an organization which disseminates such outrageous lies. The most superficial investigation would have shown them that these statements are untrue. Mrs. Roosevelt sought in her column a few days ago to justify her association with this organization by saying it is not wrong to recognize conditions and to seek to correct them. She did not repudiate the insulting statements contained in this letter. I must, therefore, assume that she and the other sponsors of this organization approve of these statements and authorize their issuance. When anyone permits his name to be used as sponsor or officer of an organization, he is to some extent accountable for the utterances and statements of the organization. Especially is this true when such sponsor or officer fails to repudiate such statements when they are called to his attention. Does Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Ickes believe that there are "hundreds of thousands of sharecropper and tenant farmer families who live bleak, despairing lives in our own South"? Why limit the statement to people who live in the South? Why hold the South up as an object of scorn and ridicule? It is significant that the sharecroppers and tenants in other sections of the country were not mentioned in this letter, and that not one word was said about the people who live in the slums and alleys of our great cities. Think of this language:

They are no longer free, for they have lost the land which gave them freedom and security. And through the poll tax they have lost the right to vote in defense of these interests.

It was the sharecropper who time and again elected Governors, Senators, and

Congressmen in all of the Southern States.

In my own State of Texas, James E. Ferguson and his wife were each elected to the highest office in our State with the votes of sharecroppers. What is true of my State has been true of all the Southern States time and again, as everyone who is at all familiar with the situation in the South knows. If it is the poll tax that prevents people from voting why is it that throughout the Eastern and Western States, where there are no poll tax requirements, less than half of the people voted at the last general election. It is very seldom that as many as 50 percent of the people in this Nation cast their votes. It is not my purpose to argue for or against the poll tax in this speech, but I do want to point out the hypocrisy of those who say that the failure of many people to vote in the South is due to the poll tax when the record shows that the same situation exists in the States that do not have a poll tax. Consider for a moment this outrageous language, "In the face of an arrogant terrorism exercised by the economic group which rules the agricultural South, these Negro and white sharecroppers and tenant farmers have builded their own organization to reaffirm their dignity as human beings." Does Mr. Ickes and Mrs. Roosevelt actually believe that hundreds of thousands of people throughout the South are enslaved? What more effective propaganda could there be in the hands of the Axis Powers than such statements as these made under the sponsorship of the wife of the President of the United States and a Cabinet officer of this Government. If these statements are correct, what are we fighting for? If the South is controlled by arrogant terrorism exercised by a greedy and unprincipled economic bloc that has ground into slavery the majority of the people of the South, then tell me what is the use to fight on foreign soil to preserve our way of life? What more appealing propaganda can there be than such statements as these, together with the recent statement of the Vice President which admits the possibility or danger of America double-crossing Russia.

Mr. Speaker, we of the South realize that there is poverty in our midst. We know that our people as a whole are the victims of selfish national policies which deny to our section that equal and exact justice which Jefferson said is the essence of democracy. For years we have been grossly discriminated against by the maintenance of artificial freight rates designed to build up other sections of the country at the expense of the South. For decades the tariff laws and other economic policies of the Federal Government drained us of our wealth. The South has tremendous natural resources and land area. We should be and could be one of the most prosperous sections of the Nation if we were given the same consideration as that accorded to other sections of the country. If Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Ickes will help us to receive economic justice we can raise the standard of living of all our people in

the South. The great majority of southerners long for the day when all our farmers, whether landowners, sharecroppers, or tenants, receive their fair share of the national income. Southern Representatives with no exceptions have worked hard for legislation to bring this about. In season and out of season we have fought for parity prices and the removal of discriminatory freight rates. We would welcome constructive and effective assistance from Mrs. Roosevelt and all the others who sponsor this organization. But we resent the apparent effort to exploit the poverty of the South for political purposes in the North. It comes with poor grace for people in New York, Chicago, and the other great industrial cities of the East and West to exaggerate conditions in the South and overlook the slums in their own cities. We suspect that some of these people are more concerned about the Negro vote in the North than they are about the welfare of the Negro in the South.

If you were Goebbels in charge of the propaganda machine of the Axis Powers what more effective propaganda would you want to use throughout Asia, China, and the whole world than such statements made under the sponsorship of people high in this Government? What more inappropriate moment could be chosen for such hypocritical and misleading statements than a time when we are clamoring for more food and urging the farmers of the South to produce it for us under every conceivable handicap? I hold in my hand a pamphlet issued by this same organization entitled, "The America of Despair." It depicts sharecroppers and tenants in the South as wretched and miserable victims of a vicious economic system which has reduced them to despair. Imagine this pamphlet being circulated among the down-trodden people of the earth as an example of what exists in our own United States. Has it never occurred to these professional uplifters to be fair and just in their treatment of the South and to avoid exaggeration of conditions which all of us deplore? The South is sick and tired of this well-organized campaign of abuse which is directed at her people. We are trying in every possible way to improve the economic condition of all our people. All that we ask is justice, not pity; fairness, not hypocrisy and insincere professions of sympathy for us. If the Government will treat us as it does every other section of the country we can raise our standard of living and solve our own problems.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration have failed to deal effectively with the production and distribution of food. That failure threatens to make the food problem the most vital problem on the home front.

We have seen bungling in the field of rubber. We have seen bungling in the field of fuel oil. We have seen bungling in other fields. The Nation cannot afford

continued bungling in the field of food production and distribution. It is a terrible thing to be cold. It is far worse to be hungry.

During the last 10 years the New Deal has engaged in a program of planned scarcity. It has carried out this program through the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Price Administration and other agencies. Many believe that the New Deal is still seeking to reduce the standard of living of the rank and file of this country, to prepare the people for a world standard of living as distinguished from an American standard of living after the war. Whether or not this belief is justified, it is evident that the country is confronted by the threat of severe suffering due to the lack of proper handling of the production and distribution of foodstuffs.

Informed authorities and dealers in foodstuffs report that they are disgusted with operations of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration. They predict the greatest shortages in our history.

The shortages which threaten are the result, as in the case of fuel oil, of bungling, and lack of over-all planning by Administration bureaucrats. It is time for an over-all plan to be presented to the country, a plan based on correct and not incorrect estimates, a plan which provides for proper price ceilings, a plan which facilitates the obtaining of farm labor, farm machinery and farm transportation, a plan which stimulates instead of killing maximum production of foodstuffs essential to the war effort.

I hold in my hand a letter from the Acting Commissioner of Agriculture of Massachusetts.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a portion of that letter at this point in the RECORD:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
State House, Boston, March 2, 1943.
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Food production is probably the liveliest topic right now, and I presume you would be interested in learning of Massachusetts' efforts right up to the minute.

Outside of labor difficulties, the most active factor in depressing production in Massachusetts and in the Nation is the price policy on milk that I have mentioned so frequently. I have read with interest and disgust the form letter from Mr. Prentiss Brown forwarded to me by so many Congressmen. I presume the letter was compiled for Mr. Brown by some smart statistician in the Office of Price Administration or the United States Department of Agriculture. I have gotten beyond appealing to the Office of Price Administration or the United States Department of Agriculture for aid to farmers on milk prices. They are going out of business right and left in order to get into industry or some other type of farming where there is a chance to make a few dollars for their families; and they are better off. What disturbs me is that the short-sighted price policy will make Massachusetts and the Nation dangerously short of milk.

When I wrote you last, the local Boston Office of Price Administration milk executives had tentatively agreed on a State-wide adjustment in prices covering over half of the

State. The local men, Dr. George Taylor and Stanley Ross, have been very cooperative. They apparently were not backed up by the Washington Office of Price Administration. When it came to a show-down, they actually allowed price increases of $\frac{1}{2}$ cent to 1 cent in seven of our lowest-priced areas. We are still expecting more adjustments but, with labor, feeds, and replacement costs as high as they are, it is pretty difficult to expect herd owners to continue producing under our conditions.

Frankly, I think that the attitude toward the milk price apparently held by the Office of Price Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture is dictated by some higher authority, perhaps directly from the White House office. In the matter of potatoes and many other farm commodities, ceilings have been changed as much as 50 percent to allow for the possibility of reasonable production. In view of the fact that the retail price of foods in Massachusetts is up 20 percent above December 1941, and in view of the fact that the State and national income is up enormously, the dairy industry would normally expect an increase of 10 percent to 20 percent since the beginning of hostilities. The weighted average increase in milk prices in Massachusetts, however, from December 1941, to March 1943, have not been over 1 percent.

As I said, the farmers can do better for themselves in doing something else rather than producing milk, but it has come to a point where 1943 will probably see the greatest shortage in our history, and the sad part of it is that, if and when a shortage develops, it takes years to restock dairy herds.

Thanking you for your continued cooperation, I am

Yours truly,

LOUIS A. WEBSTER,
Acting Commissioner.

You will note that the acting commissioner states that there will probably be the greatest shortage of milk in our history in 1943. He states also that he has read with interest and disgust the form letter from the present Price Administrator forwarded to him by so many Members of Congress. He states that he has gotten beyond appealing to the Department of Agriculture or the O. P. A. for aid to farmers on milk prices. He adds that farmers are going out of business right and left in order to get into industry or some other work where there is a chance to make a few dollars for their families.

I also hold in my hand a telegram from the secretary of the Massachusetts Retail Grocers' and Provision Dealers' Association.

I insert the telegram at this point in the RECORD:

BOSTON, MASS., March 5, 1943.

Proposed meat-rationing program calling for substitution of cheese for meat on the basis of $1\frac{3}{4}$ pounds per person of the two combined cruel hoax on American public. Meat famine, including poultry, worst in history. No meat available to eat this week. Rationing no answer to this situation. No magic in rationing program will correct this meat shortage. Packers, shipping from 10 to 20 percent of reduced allowance to New England, state that reason is financial loss suffered on each car shipped. If they are right, demand that they set own price until meat famine is ended. Massachusetts awarded top amount of war material production. War workers need meat quick. Government's assumption that retail dealers can stay in business while rationing and price experiments are worked out is wrong. Strong trend to revolt against Washington's ill-conceived rationing programs now evident in retail food trade. Not

opposition to rationing, but opposition to programs based on lack of supplies of home-grown food that should be available in sufficient quantities to avoid rationing.

MALCOLM McCABE,

Secretary, Massachusetts Retail Grocers' and Provision Dealers' Association.

You will note that the secretary characterizes the proposed meat-rationing program as a cruel hoax on the American public. He states that the meat famine, including poultry, is the worst in history. He says that meat producers are only shipping from 10 to 20 percent of the allowance to New England. He adds that a strong trend of revolt against Washington ill-conceived programs is evident.

On June 23, Mr. Chairman, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture. In that letter I called attention to his official estimate to the effect that the 1943 meat supply after satisfying the requirements of the Army, the Navy, and the Lend-Lease Administration would be only 8 percent less than the supply in 1942. I called attention also to the deplorable conditions said to exist in Boston and other parts of the country; to the fact that meat was said to be obtainable only at exorbitant prices; to the fact that horse meat was said to have been sold in the leading market places.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 23, 1943.

HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am advised that according to official figures from your office, there is in contemplation for the calendar year 1943 a reduction of about only 8 percent in the total supply of meat available for civilian use after the Army, Navy, and lend-lease requirements have been provided for. If this figure is correct, I cannot understand the acute shortage in meat in various parts of the country at this time. The situation in Boston, Mass., as reported by various constituents, is deplorable. I am advised that it is extremely difficult to obtain meat except at exorbitant prices and that horse meat has been sold in leading market places for some time past.

I should appreciate hearing from you at an early date in this connection.

Sincerely yours,

Not until February 24, over a month later, Mr. Chairman, did I receive any reply.

I insert the reply at this point in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 24, 1943.

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WIGGLESWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of January 23 relative to the meat situation in Boston, Mass.

On the basis of estimates prepared in the Department it was contemplated that the total quantity of meat available for civilian consumption in the calendar year 1943 would be approximately 8 to 10 percent smaller than in 1942. However, it was expected that farm slaughter for consumption on the farm would increase materially because it did not appear practical to limit it directly. In addition, local retail slaughter and sales by small non-quota packers were not reduced. As a result the reduction in commercial meat supplies was about 25 percent below 1941 during the 3 months October-December 1942. During the present

quarter the reduction is about 30 percent below January-March 1941, and because the civilian sales in January-March 1942 were exceptionally large, the reduction from 1 year ago is considerably greater. For the past 4 months marketings of hogs have been smaller than anticipated, and marketings of cattle decreased in December and January. These reduced marketings of livestock obviously have not permitted the armed forces and lend-lease to obtain adequate supplies to fill their needs. This has resulted in a sizable reduction of the quantity of meat available for shipment to Great Britain.

The above factors have contributed to the situation but perhaps the factor contributing most is that New England has always been a deficit meat producing area. Before the adoption of price controls, the interaction of supply and demand moved meats from surplus producing areas to deficit areas. Now that ceiling prices have been established for meats and civilian supplies have been reduced, normal distribution has been upset because packers find it possible to sell at ceiling prices in the surplus producing areas most of the meats they have available for civilians. Under these conditions some other means must be found to move meats into deficit areas, but it should be recognized that any measures adopted will be more or less makeshift.

We believe that rationing will result in a more equitable distribution of meat to consumers; however, it will not solve all of the distribution problems at the wholesale level. We are considering all angles of this problem in an effort to find a practical and equitable means of distributing meat supplies, but we do not expect to be able to distribute meat through all handlers who were previously in this business, even though they may have been quite necessary in the meat distribution trade in normal times.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. HILL,
Assistant Secretary.

The reply received, if I read it correctly, is an admission that the estimates of the Department were wrong to the extent of over 400 percent, and a statement that this fact, combined with O. P. A. ceilings, had created a problem for which the Department to date had found no remedy.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to expect the people of the country to have confidence in the bureau chiefs of this administration under such conditions.

The representatives of the Department of Agriculture appeared before your committee with reference to the bill under consideration. They recommended a program costing \$65,000,000.

The evidence was far from satisfactory. Secretary Wickard himself admitted on several occasions that he was not familiar with the details of the plan he sought to justify. His assistants were also unable to give detailed justification, and finally admitted that the estimates were largely a shot in the air.

The committee was informed that some 3,000,000 workers had left the farms in the past 2 years, two-thirds of them going to industry, the other third into the Army or the Navy. We were told also that the objective sought was 3,500,000 additional farm workers. Of this total 350,000 seasonal workers, and 42,000 year-around workers were to be recruited and transported from other States or other countries, the balance to be recruited locally within the several States.

The Secretary's proposal included 6 projects—a project of \$6,000,000 under

the Extension Service for the mobilization of local labor resources; a project of \$40,000,000 for farm labor transportation under the Farm Security Administration; a project of \$17,000,000 for farm labor centers, also under the Farm Security Administration; 2 miscellaneous projects amounting to about \$225,000; and a project for administrative expenses of about \$1,300,000.

The plan called for 90 to 95 percent of the recruiting to be done through the Extension Service with the appropriation of \$8,000,000.

Fifty-seven million dollars were requested for 5 to 10 percent of the recruiting on an interstate basis, including not only recruiting but transporting, housing in some 345 camps, doctoring, and placing in employment.

In this connection form contracts were shown to the committee for execution by farmers which covered wages, hours, housing, collective bargaining, and everything else under the sun, including the requirement that imported labor should not work on Sunday, whether or not apparently the cows insisted on being milked on that day.

The program called for an extensive administrative set-up, including medical officers, dentists, labor coordinators, labor consultants, labor analysts, health specialists, program analysts, information specialists, labor representatives, and many others—a total personnel of 3,447 being contemplated for the 6 projects.

The program was to function through 6 different agencies of Government, and while \$57,000,000 was requested for the transportation features of the plan it appeared from a table, which you will find on page 11 of the hearings, that for the 5-month period ending February 1 for similar work, under allocation from the President, only \$189,000 was actually spent.

For my part, it is impossible to go along with the proposal of the Department of Agriculture. In the light of the evidence submitted to your committee it just does not make sense.

The representatives of the national farm organizations, Mr. Chairman, also appeared before your committee. Representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, and the National Grange were unanimous in condemning the plan proposed by the Department of Agriculture. They were unanimous in condemning the proposed bureaucratic controls and restrictions; the proposed duplication of effort in the field; the proposed social reforms under the guise of war; the proposed contracts to which I have referred. They were unanimous in condemning the work done to date by the Farm Security Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is a lot of detailed criticism of F. S. A. from many sources in the hearings. If you want an extreme example, I call attention to page 119 of the hearings, to the

testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, where you will find a picture painted of drunkenness, debauchery, and refusal to work, by labor imported into the fields of Florida under the Farm Security Administration.

The farm organizations referred to were unanimous in recommending decentralization; unanimous in expressing their confidence in the Extension Service of the several States of the country; unanimous in their opinion that \$65,000,000 was altogether too much money.

Subsequently, Mr. Chairman, the proposal before you was introduced, calling for an appropriation of \$26,100,000.

This proposal would provide \$13,500,000 for recruiting, transportation, and temporary housing within the States and \$12,500,000 for recruiting, training, and placement of labor from outside the several States.

This proposal would reduce the total to be appropriated from \$65,000,000 to \$26,100,000. It would eliminate expensive overhead. It would eliminate duplication of effort in the field, bureaucratic control and restriction, and social reforms under the guise of war.

It would place the program largely in the hands of the Extension Service, in which the farm organizations testify that they have confidence.

The appropriation called for represents, as I understand it, the best estimate of the Extension Service, which is prepared to undertake the suggested program.

There are differing views, Mr. Chairman, in respect to this bill. There may be those who want to go along with the Secretary of Agriculture's proposal. There are those who want to cut the figure to \$12,000,000. There are those who want to eliminate the proposal entirely.

Personally, I am willing to go along with the committee report, which has the support of the national farm organizations referred to. I think the proposal is the best which has been presented. Some action on our part is imperative. With the threat of food shortages ahead, with all that they can mean, not only to this country but to our allies, I prefer in this instance to err on the liberal side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In the light of the testimony of the national farm organizations I am willing to give the committee proposal a trial. I am willing to vote to appropriate \$26,000,000 under the jurisdiction of the Extension Service of the several States of this country. I have confidence enough in that Service to believe that the money will not be expended unless it produces results.

The importance of the farm labor problem cannot be exaggerated. Its solution is vital. Important as it is, however, it is only a part of the manpower problem as a whole which confronts the country. That problem cannot be solved piecemeal. Sooner or later we must have an over-all plan, taking into con-

sideration the requirements of the farm, the requirements of industry, the requirements of the Army and Navy—an over-all plan behind which we can throw the united effort of the Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia 10 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, my excuse for consuming any time, even to the extent of 10 minutes, is that while the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations did not report this bill, it has received a tremendous amount of evidence with reference to the problems which are involved, and with reference to the activities of the Farm Security Administration and the United States Employment Service in endeavoring to deal with that problem.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] says that this is a futile bill. I am afraid that I am compelled to agree with him, although I hope that I am mistaken. The gentleman desires to increase the amount of the bill to \$65,000,000 plus. In my judgment that would do nothing but increase the futility of the bill by two and a half times. I do not believe that you can deal with this very important problem of trying to procure adequate farm labor for those sections of the country where there is a shortage of such labor merely by making either small or large appropriations. If I felt that you could bring about a satisfactory adjustment of that condition by appropriating a half billion dollars I would be one of the first to signify a willingness to do it, but before we undertake to hand the farmers of this country a stone instead of a piece of bread, so far as this labor program is concerned, may we not just for a moment examine the fundamentals of the situation and determine, as men of common sense, whether there is any possibility that this money we are asked to appropriate will accomplish anything toward the solution of the problem for which it is intended to be used.

Of course, I think there is no disagreement of any particular consequence among those who have studied the subject matter as to what is the cause of our current farm-labor shortage. It is brought about in part by the induction of men into the military services of the country who were essential agricultural workers and by the policy of the War Department in refusing to furlough to their farms, on which they had been accustomed to do essential farm work, men who have been inducted into the services.

It is brought about in part by the fact that the farmers of the country are unable, on account of farm prices, to offer prices to labor which are competitive with prices offered in industry, and particularly in war industry.

By this bill we are not asked to undertake to deal with the fundamental causes of the trouble, we are leaving these causes still in existence, and some are attempting to fool the farmers of the country by saying to them that we are setting up a huge organization of Federal employees with an appropriation of

\$26,000,000, and that organization is to secure for them farm labor. Where is it to secure it? They say we are going to get 3,000,000 from the high schools of the country, that we are going to take the city high-school boys, who have never had any experience on the farm, who would not know anything about plowing with a mule, or hoeing cotton or corn, or of discharging the most simple farm tasks, and we are going to supply your needs for farm labor by putting these high-school boys to work. Every man here who was raised on a farm, who knows anything about farm operations, knows that except for the most simple tasks, untrained child or boy labor of that type would be practically useless.

They say we are going to import 50,000 Mexicans. I do not know whether they will be able to do that or not. I do not know anything about Mexican labor. I do know this: That they have had this program in existence for several months. The President allocated, months ago, \$5,000,000 for the purpose of undertaking to deal with this farm-labor situation and not only the Farm Security Administration, but the Employment Service in cooperation therewith, have been endeavoring to do something about it for some 6 or 7 months.

You will note from this bill that the Employment Service is to be charged with a part of the responsibility under this bill. What has been accomplished in their activities and those of F. S. A. to date? They have imported, I think, some 5,000-plus Mexican laborers and they have procured some 8,000-plus laborers for the seasonal truck industry on the eastern coast. In other words, with this \$5,000,000 they have only been able to fill the need for something less than 14,000 laborers. While they have had \$5,000,000 they have only been able to obligate approximately \$1,500,000, and with that record of lack of accomplishment they have shown with the original funds they now come in and ask the Congress to appropriate something over \$65,000,000 to continue a similar program. It would not make so much difference as to what organization of the Department is to carry it on, presumably the Employment Service at least would follow the same practices it has in co-operating with F. S. A.

The question is whether or not from the experiences we have had there is a reasonable prospect of doing anything for the farmers by this sort of program and of getting our money's worth whether we appropriate \$26,000,000 or \$65,000,000. I should like to give you an idea that I advanced in the Committee on Appropriations but which was declined by a very small majority of the committee.

I do not think we should begin this enlarged program with too much money if we begin it at all. As I said awhile ago, they have had \$5,000,000, but they have obligated only \$1,500,000, and their operations have covered a period of some 6 or 7 months. Why give them \$65,000,000 or \$26,000,000? Why not start them out with a modest appropriation of say \$12,000,000, \$6,000,000 to the Extension Service as contemplated in the original esti-

mate and \$6,000,000 to be used in their experimentation in the matter of interstate transportation of laborers and the importation of laborers from Mexico in cooperation with the Employment Service, and \$100,000 to be used to administer the expenses in Washington?

Let them work along with those funds for a while. If they are able to accomplish anything of a material nature toward the relief of this situation then, in my opinion, everyone of us will be willing to give them all the money they need and all that they can use in endeavoring to carry it on; and since Congress will be in session all the time all they will have to do in a month or 6 weeks will be to come back and say: "Here is what we have accomplished with \$12,000,000; we are asking you to give us more money in order that we may successfully carry on this program." Why is not that the sensible thing to do? I want to call your attention to the fact, especially some of you boys from the South, that the Employment Service which has been cooperating in this program carried on by the Farm Security Administration has been in some sections of the country endeavoring to take tenants and sharecroppers away from landlords where they have contracts that they are satisfied with and ship them into other States. In my district a man representing the War Manpower Commission in the Employment Office at Rome, Ga., had in some way procured a list of those who had registered for military service; who had farm background. He sent out notices to those people to have them come in to see him. He told the tenants of a certain reputable farmer, four in number, who went to the office to see him, that they must go to Florida to accept employment.

They said: "No, we have made contracts with Mr. So-and-So; we are satisfied. We don't want to go to Florida."

He said: "Unless you go to Florida you are going to be drafted into the Army."

I have this upon the authority of a gentleman of very high character.

Now the Employment Service is one of the agencies which are to be used under the provisions of the pending bill for carrying on the interstate transportation of labor. This man was using the office of the Employment Service. Is that the sort of thing for which you want to provide unlimited funds?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. We have in this Chamber Representatives from every section of the country. You want laborers in your districts and in your States, and so do we in Georgia. Is there a Member in this House here present today who has any surplus of farm labor in his district that he thinks could be moved to any other district or any other State? If there is, I pause now to invite him to stand and call attention to the surplus labor situation in his district. I observe that not a single Member of the House shows by standing that he has any labor that he wants shipped out of his district

anywhere. So it is a proposal to go somewhere else and get the labor from somebody else who does not want to lose it and bring it in to somebody's district or into somebody's State.

Some high authorities of the Government a few years ago indicated—and some of not so high degree have indicated recently, that they propose to carry on an ambitious program to relocate the farm population of the country. They claim in particular that in the South the ancestors of some of our people showed poor judgment in locating down there and that notwithstanding the fact that their sons and grandsons have been satisfied to live there they should be persuaded to leave for more fertile sections of the country. There are those who think it is intended to carry on that kind of program if this appropriation is granted and that at least some of those back of it are not thinking so much of a present emergency need but of this wild, senseless plan to relocate the farm population of the country. I certainly want us to keep control of this labor program, having them come back for more money when they can justify using it, and not at any time allowing them to start a project of that sort.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one-half additional minute.

Mr. SHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I merely want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that we do not have labor that we wish to move from one section of the country to the other, good farm labor, and that we will have less farm labor in our districts if ceilings are placed on cattle and hogs as is contemplated by O. P. A.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment to cut down this appropriation to \$12,100,000 from the proposed \$26,100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly concerned over features of this bill which would abridge the rights of certain of our citizens to the profit of others. Agriculture as a whole, in spite of the great difficulties with which it is beset, is enjoying its greatest prosperity in many years. The unprecedented demand for foodstuffs is benefiting particularly those growers who, given an adequate supply of labor, are equipped to produce at maximum capacity. This bill proposes to supply such growers with labor drawn from the rank and file of less fortunate farmers, and would permit them to use that labor as they choose, giving no guaranty of fair wages or working conditions, and making no provision for even minimum standards of housing and sanitation. This would be exploitation of a kind repugnant to our American sense of fair play. Moreover, it would make the Gov-

ernment of the United States a party to the exploitation. I think it would be a defeat for the cause of freedom if we now were to withdraw the safeguards which we have provided for agricultural workers and make them mere units of labor at the command of commercial growers. I think the resolution should be rejected as unworthy of this Government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to reduce this to \$12,000,000. I think that is about right. I was against the original proposal involving \$66,000,000 because it is an entirely new set-up. With all the bureaus and agencies that we have now, they want to come along here and create a new set-up complete and ask for \$66,000,000 for that purpose. Six million dollars of that was to take care of 90 percent of the labor, as they estimated it, and \$60,000,000 to take care of the 10 percent. In the \$60,000,000 and the 10 percent was this new set-up guaranteeing social gains, bringing the C. I. O. to the farm.

Now that is going to make your farmers mighty happy. If you vote to bring the C. I. O. out to the farms, with all its social gains, it will please your farmers, I am sure. The C. I. O. wants to get out there. That is a part of the scheme of the \$66,000,000. It is to get them out there and to put these social gains on the farms. As a member of the Labor Committee when the Fair Labor Standards Act was being considered and passed, and I moved to recommit it, which was lost, I stated that they intended to include all labor other than what was just engaged in interstate commerce. I could see it all through the hearings, and they did. They construed everything to be interstate commerce.

My second prophecy is this. Madam Perkins has fixed wage scales in defense areas and they are going to try to foist those on the rest of the country. This is one vehicle to help bring it down to the crossroads. That was evident all the way through. It was evident in the hearings. There were these contracts stating what we had to do with these people, how we had to take care of them, and what we had to pay them and also the camps. It was bringing it down to purely and simply that.

If we want to do anything to discredit ourselves as farmers or people interested in farm constituencies, just vote for anything above \$12,000,000 in this bill and you are giving aid to it. Anything above \$12,000,000 in this bill helps to bring the social gains down to the farmers, and I refer to the social gains of the C. I. O. That is what is in this bill. There is no compromise.

My good friend from Illinois, the author of this bill, and the gentleman from Detroit who is going to talk very soon, as well as the gentleman from Kentucky, are all afraid that maybe they might do a lit-

tle falling down and they better give them a few extra millions on top of it just to say that they cannot hang it on to us if it fails. That is all the excuse and all the argument they have: Let us give them a few extra millions here, and if they do fall down they cannot say that we did it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not subscribe to that sort of legislation and economy myself. There are two ways to get farm help back to the farms. Get the boys out of the service that belong back on the farms who can help. Cut this wage scale and get this 54-hour week, which, of course, is impossible under our present set-up. We are frozen into this very thing. If you could get the 54-hour week and the overtime taken off, we would get more of those farm boys back on the farm who went into defense work. Those are the two things that we could do to help the farmers.

Cloistered people do not know what the hot July sun means. You know, these defense workers all work under roofs. People who do not know what the hot sun is in July are in the way out there on the farms. I have been a farmer all my life, and I know that the city boy who comes out there, who is not used to the hot sun, is not worth much of anything. They talk about bringing girls and Mexicans and other people to handle our farm machinery. That is not going to do much good. As a farmer, I honestly and conscientiously believe, noting the reaction of this thing as applied to the farmers, that if we allow anything more than \$12,000,000 in here we are giving it away for no good purpose. We are riding the fence, we are straddling the issue. That is just exactly what we are doing. I would say, rather, give them the \$66,000,000 and all of their cockeyed theories that go with it and let them repudiate themselves, or else let us hold this down to \$12,000,000. Let us meet the issue.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. May I say to the gentleman I agree 100 percent with all the gentleman is saying, and I hope to ask for that very thing.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Four members out of the seven members of the subcommittee that deals with the appropriations for agriculture are with our chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, on this proposal.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I have before me an article appearing in the Times-Herald today which says:

Chairman Paul V. McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, yesterday endorsed the use of incentive vacations and incentive bonuses for workers to reduce absenteeism in industrial plants.

I would suggest to the gentleman as a member of the Appropriations Committee that he find out how many farm boys it will take to go into the factories and work for these fellows while they take their vacations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that you must watch very carefully that people coming in from Mexico are not undesirable refugees who are just waiting for a chance to get into this country under the guise of being Mexican farmers?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. I heard Mr. McNutt testify before our committee when we asked him what ideas he had for manpower to help out the farmers and his whole idea was we would go to Mexico, the Bahama Islands, and Central America and South America. He even proposed that we bring them up from South America.

Of course, we should have an interpreter with each one of them that is sent out on a farm so that the farmer could talk to him, and then he would have to have his accommodations and his sanitation just right, he would have to have time and a half for overtime, and he would have to have a lot of social workers and bookkeepers along to see that he was taken care of.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has just made another suggestion along that line. I think if we get hordes of workers from South America, Central America, the islands of the West Indies, and from Mexico, and then find they are not worth their salt, then we have them here, and God pity us as to what we shall do with them. And we will have done it all in the name of helping the poor farmer.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. The gentleman is unquestionably an expert at getting people from industry back on the farm. Will the gentleman explain to the House how he got his son to leave a \$125 defense job at Fort Riley, Kans., and go back on the job on the farm?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is a perfect untruth. Since the gentleman wants to bring that up—I heard that somebody made that statement over the radio—I will say that my son has always lived on the farm except 4 years attending the Kansas State College, has been farming for himself and living on the same farm for 10 years, that he is 33 years old, has a wife and two small children and he did not leave any defense job to go to the farm.

Mr. McMURRAY. Just as a question of accuracy, then, will the gentleman answer this question? Did the person we are talking about have a defense job last year?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No; not last year. He worked in the winter about 2 months, 2 years ago, for a Topeka contractor, at Fort Riley, year before Pearl Harbor, driving a caterpillar tractor. His family remained on the farm and a hired man cared for the stock but he has never been off the farm the rest of the years.

He has farmed these 500 acres for 10 years. It is an effort to discredit me because of a statement that has been made here on another subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill has a great deal of merit to it and ought to be considered seriously.

The Department of Agriculture approached the Budget and made out a case that was sufficient for the Budget to recommend that the Department of Agriculture have \$65,075,000 to do what they thought was an important thing to be done in this country at this time, namely, to regulate the distribution of farm labor and adjust it so that various sections of the country could get help on the farm and increase production this year.

It has been said here that this is the Dirksen bill. I do not understand how that could possibly be claimed with any degree of accuracy, because this bill was written by the 43 members of the Committee on Appropriations and is the committee's bill. It is not the bill of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] or the bill of the Farm Bureau. The committee thought the amount recommended by the Budget for the Department of Agriculture, to be largely administered under the Farm Security Administration in that Department, was too much and cut the amount to the \$26,100,000 which is in this bill, \$13,500,000 to be administered through the State extension service or the several States, and \$12,500,000 to be administered through the State and National extension services jointly, and \$100,000 to be used for administrative purposes. This is the bill of the committee now under consideration and represents the amount the committee thought proper to bring here and ask you to appropriate for this important object.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], of whom I am very fond, stated just a few minutes ago on this floor that this bill should be administered under the Farm Security Act. I think he was sincere about it but I disagreed with him. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARTER] says the bill will give no relief at all but that he is willing to cut the appropriation \$12,000,000 just to try it out. I cannot agree with my distinguished friend.

I think this bill should be administered through the State extension service, collaborating with the Federal Extension Service and the United States Employment Service, when it becomes necessary to transport labor, the supervision thereof, and the protection of the worker and his family. The local officials of the county extension services in each State are best equipped to take care of this problem under the direction of the county farm agent and its farm committee than any other agency of the Government, certainly much more efficiently than any other agency set up

or functioning outside of the State and county, and can also perform the services at much less cost. I live in the great agricultural section of North Carolina, and I know that in my State the greatest care was taken in securing in each county the men who would administer the extension services of the State. These men have been selected from among the best farmers in each county; they know the local problems and they know how to best cooperate and get best results for this great industry.

I regret that I have not time to go fully into the discussion of the fine results the farmers of North Carolina have attained through the Extension Service in our State. In the administration of the A. A. A. this Service has, through the direct contact with the individual farmers and its sensible approach to the farmers' problems, created a cooperation on the part of the farmer never before attained, and secured for this great industry a success unparalleled in the country's history. I insist that the cooperation of the Farm Administration of this Nation as provided in this bill is the best and the correct way to meet this labor problem or any other problem affecting the agricultural interest of this Nation.

Insofar as the great agricultural sections of this country are concerned, the committee thought the proper thing to do was to cut this appropriation to \$26,100,000 and then turn its administration over to people who know how to administer it and know the problems they must face.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman that the county agents and local representatives of the Extension Service know about labor conditions within our own country, but how about the importation of foreign labor? Can they do as well on that problem? In my State we need labor from Mexico.

Mr. KERR. This bill takes care of that. This bill provides that the State and Federal Extension Services, collaborating with the United States Employment Service, can take care of the very item of which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, the able sponsor of this resolution, has said that this resolution and no resolution or bill which this House could bring forth, would now solve the farm-labor-shortage problem.

I agree 100 percent with the first part of this statement wherein he admits that this resolution will not solve the farmers' labor problem now, but I can see cause for argument with respect to the last part of this statement, wherein he says that no

bill which we might present could or would solve this problem.

To me that statement is an admission of weakness and helplessness on the part of Congress.

I am not so conceited as to think that I have the complete answer to this problem, but I am so bold as to suggest that if the farm boys who are now in the Army, as well as those who have secured employment in industry since December 7, 1941, be honorably discharged from the Army and from industry and be returned to farm labor, that it will go a long way toward solving this farm-labor shortage and it will not require \$26,000,000 to put this program into operation.

Any vacancies created in industry by the discharge of these farm laborers, can readily be filled by some of those now employed in our defense plants, who are actually falling over themselves in an effort to keep busy with no material with which to work.

I have been told by men and women engaged in defense industry that this overmanned situation does exist, and in my humble opinion this problem as well as the farm problem cannot be solved by importing foreigners.

For God's sake let us keep something for ourselves if that is possible under the present international policies.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I join my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] in his concern about our food production in this country. Also, I am likewise disturbed by not only food production, but the matter of food distribution in this country. We are all familiar with the school-lunch program. We remember that we had a food-surplus program. As I understand it, today the food-surplus program has been changed to what is known as a food-distribution administration. I think if anyone knows what is the situation at home, it is our local officials who are charged with looking after the welfare of our people. In the last week I have had one letter from a county welfare board and a resolution from another county board, in addition to some letters from private individuals with reference to what seems to me to be a rather critical matter in respect to foods. Let me call attention to the fact that I think all of us thought the school-lunch program was a good program at the time for our school children. But here is a letter from a county welfare board upon this subject which I think is rather enlightening. This letter is dated February 25, and it states:

COUNTY WELFARE BOARD,
February 25, 1943.

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
Minnesota Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Now that foods are being rationed and there is supposed to be a food shortage, we cannot understand why the Federal Government continues to send foods to the counties for distribution to the schools for school-lunch programs.

This week, we all registered for our ration book 2 under the point system. We are told prunes will be one of the high point foods—20 points (almost one-half of a person's points for a month) for 1 pound of prunes. Yet, yesterday, February 24, we received notice that seventy 25-pound boxes of prunes are being sent to our county for distribution to the schools. This is only one of the many rationed foods we are to receive. A short time ago, we were asked to send in a requisition for canned tomatoes—another food we have been unable to buy at our grocery stores.

Our men in the armed forces complain of having no milk and having to drink black coffee. We have in storage over 3,000 cans of milk which we are supposed to give to our schools. Our children don't want canned milk. Ninety percent of the children in our schools come from farms and have all the fresh milk they want and can use at home. Nevertheless, we are asked to push this milk. I realize 3,000 cans of milk would not go very far in an Army camp or naval station but there are hundreds or thousands of counties just like ours throughout the United States. Why aren't these things sent to the men who are giving their all for us rather than being stored in courthouse basements? This problem has been discussed many times. Our board feels it is a farce.

In discussing the program with representatives of the State agricultural office, they explain that it no longer is a surplus program but a diversion program—foods that have been bought by the Government for lend-lease and cannot be sent overseas. It is impossible to explain this to the public. The teachers are giving their time to help with registration for rationing and at the same time are asked by our office to come and get some of these rationed foods free of charge for their schools.

We know there are some foods such as fresh fruits that would spoil if not used immediately. Why dried and canned foods should be distributed in this way is the question that keeps turning in our minds.

Anything you can do will be appreciated. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

COUNTY WELFARE BOARD.

Mr. Chairman, here is another from a county board in which they have passed resolutions demanding an investigation of the food administration. They state they have recently had sent to their counties large numbers of canned goods such as grapefruit juice, pork and beans, rationed items, such as apples, peanut butter, walnut meat, and tangerines, all of which are not needed in that county.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the distribution of food commodities has served an important part in the assistance of school children in Blue Earth County and throughout the Nation in times when residents of this county and other counties throughout the Nation were in need of said assistance; and

Whereas a state of emergency in connection with the war effort now exists, and the need for said food distribution has now passed, and some of the items included in said food distribution are rationed items; and

Whereas certain food commodities have recently been sent to Blue Earth County, consisting of grapefruit juice and pork and beans, which are rationed items, and apples, peanut butter, walnut meats, and tangerines, all of which are not needed in Blue Earth County: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Blue Earth County Welfare Board at Mankato, Minn., do hereby protest against the further distribution of said food commodities in Blue Earth County

and elsewhere, and respectfully request our representatives in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress to take immediate action to stop said food distribution immediately.

By order of the Blue Earth County Welfare Board.

W. C. MENKS,
Chairman, Mankato, Minn.

It is not only just in Minnesota, but out of the Washington Star of the issue of March 12, 1943, in Virginia, in the city of Alexandria it is stated by the superintendent of schools that he has received 16 cases of canned tomatoes and 15 boxes of prunes with 25 pounds in each box. I call attention further to the following item of what I think is a terrible wastage of food:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 12, 1943]

VIRGINIA SCHOOLS GIVEN RATIONED FOOD AS SURPLUS

Although they are rationed, canned tomatoes and prunes have been included in the foods classed as surplus commodities and given out by the Virginia State Department of Public Welfare for distribution to school cafeterias, according to T. C. Williams, superintendent of the Alexandria schools.

Mr. Williams revealed that the February allotment to the Alexandria schools included 16 cases of canned tomatoes and 15 boxes of prunes with 25 pounds in each box. Canned tomatoes carry a 13-point-per-pound value. Prunes, however, were cut to an 8-point-a-pound value by the Office of Price Administration yesterday. In addition, seven sacks of dried beans, also a rationed product, were included.

Although the commodities were distributed before rationing went into effect, Mr. Williams said that the amounts of tomatoes and prunes had not been decreased from what the schools have been receiving all along.

The Alexandria Department of Public Welfare, which distributes surplus commodities to indigent families, has received no rationed products other than dry beans, with 280 pounds distributed in February.

Up in Alaska some 350 tons of butter were sent and it was left out on the beach and became immersed in salt brine and spoiled. I discussed this with the Food Administration today. I have not been critical of many of these things because I realize that we have to approach this subject with common sense—with thought—but I did suggest to the gentleman to whom I talked in the Food Administration that not only did I think that the production was important but, for heaven's sake, I did feel that the food-distribution agency in control of these so-called surplus foods, if there is such a thing as surplus food—should exercise a little common sense and judgment. It is true that some of these foods have been picked up in the States, and have been diverted to States, a year or a year and a half ago, but some time this fall some of our people are likely to be hungry for want of that food. If it were a matter of ourselves, it might not be so serious, but if it affects the men in the armed forces, I say it is a very serious thing. I am hopeful that in the discussion of this bill these remarks may meet somebody's attention who will try to do something about saving and conserving the surplus food that these people have, if there is such a thing as surplus food.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY TONS OF BUTTER LEFT ON ALASKA BEACH ALL WINTER

SEATTLE, March 6.—Businessmen returned from Alaska told today, the Post-Intelligencer said, of a cargo of 350 tons of butter landed on an Alaskan beach and left there through the winter because of a lack of storage space.

The Post-Intelligencer quoted them as saying that much of the huge cargo already had spoiled because the brine in which it was carefully packed froze and broke the barrels. They said the shipment arrived last October from the civilian reserve food supply agency.

The Alaskans reported that much of a cargo of 70 tons of canned pears also froze and burst their containers.

"The thing has become a joke the length of Alaska," the paper quoted one Seattle-Alaska businessman as saying. He declined to be identified by name because, he said, of his business relations with Government agencies.

A high-ranking Federal official in Seattle, who likewise declined to be quoted by name, defended the foresight involved in the large-scale shipment to the distant community. He expressed belief, according to the newspaper, that much of the food on the beach could be recovered and the frozen butter could be reprocessed or rebrined.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, in order to have a thorough understanding of the purpose of this resolution we should thoroughly understand its background. We are reminded here every hour of the day that we are in a terrible war—a war that is becoming more fearful every day—a war that can be won only by hard fighting and enormous sacrifice of life and property. It is not a war of our own making—a war we were not prepared or equipped to enter when forced upon us more than a year ago, but when we entered it we pledged our entire resources to win. In order to win we knew it would take men, enormous amounts of equipment, and large quantities of foodstuffs. We knew it would take strong men—men well trained in the arts of warfare—men who would have to know the tricks of the game. We knew it would not only take equipment of the most modern and effective type but it would take enormous and inexhaustible quantities. We knew the men would not only have to be provided with these implements of war but that they would have to have food and plenty of it.

The Congress has the sole power of declaring war and it is charged with the responsibility of providing and maintaining an army and navy. Therefore, one of the first things Congress did after declaring war was to provide ways and means for raising an army and then inaugurate a program for supplying our armed forces with the necessary implements of war. When the Congress passed the Selective Service Act which provided a method for inducting men into the armed forces it endeavored to insure a sufficient amount of foodstuffs by providing for deferment of those engaged in and considered essential to agriculture. The law reads as follows:

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 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.

The program for recruiting an army and producing equipment for use by the armed forces has progressed quite satisfactorily, but two things have happened which may interfere with or delay the food production program.

In the first place those in charge of the equipment production program made the wage scale in industry and construction so much more attractive and out of line with wages paid in agriculture an extra large quantity of farmers left the farms for defense work.

In the second place the local draft boards deferred only such a small percentage of the selectees from the farm as being essential to agriculture there was a further reduction in the supply of farm labor, and we now find there may be a decided reduction in farm production for lack of farm labor, and the Congress is called upon to appropriate the sum of \$26,000,000 with which to start a new program for someone to use in an effort to recruit and effect an equitable distribution of farm labor that our people and armed forces may not suffer for lack of food and feedstuffs. The Congress does not want to be placed in the position of hampering in any way the war effort, but I am greatly surprised and disappointed in the failure of the administrative agencies of government to see and obviate this serious problem. However, the Congress may not hold itself altogether blameless, because the greatest contributing cause for the scarcity of farm labor may be traced to past actions of Congress and, if I may suggest, both of our great political parties are equally guilty. Back in 1931 when the Republican Party was in power Congress passed what is known as the Bacon-Davis Act, which provided that in a contract for the construction or alteration of buildings for the United States Government the Secretary of Labor should have the right to fix the scale of wages for those employed in such construction or alteration.

Then in 1936 when the Democratic Party was in power Congress passed what is known as the Walsh-Healy Act which provided that where one undertook to manufacture or furnish materials, supplies, or equipment for the United States Government and the contract price amounted to more than \$10,000 the wage scale or rate of wages to be paid the employees was to be fixed and determined by the Secretary of Labor. Now what happened? As soon as we began to construct Army camps or cantonments throughout the country there was an urgent demand for labor and under the authority vested in the Secretary of Labor wage scales were fixed all out of proportion to the prevailing wage for farm labor and the natural and logical thing happened—men left the farms by thousands and hundreds of thousands. Soon afterward, contracts involving enormous sums of money for the construction of ships, airplanes, tanks, machine guns, and so forth, were awarded.

This program created additional demands for labor where the wage scale was to be determined by the Secretary of Labor, and the rate fixed ranged from 5 to 10 times higher than the prevailing wage rate for farm labor in many sections, which resulted in additional numbers of laborers leaving the farm for better wages, thereby reducing farm-labor supply to the minimum. Just why those in charge of these 2 programs were unable to see how their actions were depleting the farm-labor supply and reducing the food supply so essential to our war effort I am unable to understand, but apparently they did not see it or else they did not fully appreciate the situation.

Then instead of allowing the selective service boards in the various counties to exercise their own judgment when a farm registrant was entitled to deferment as being essential to agriculture, as planned and contemplated by Congress, it appears from the hearings in support of the resolution now before us the Selective Service System called upon the Department of Agriculture to prepare for the local boards a formula or requirement that a farm registrant would have to meet before they could defer him as being essential to agriculture; the result was that relatively few farm laborers were able to meet the rigid unit requirements and this further depleted the farm labor supply to the point where it created a most serious and difficult problem, the solution of which has been brought back to the Congress for consideration.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Would the gentleman not admit that in addition to the disparity in the wage scale, the 40-hour week as applied to industry alone, has had something to do with this?

Mr. HARE. Yes; that may be true, because there are no 40-hour workweeks on the farm. They run from 60 to 100 hours per week, and they run every week in the year. And some, no doubt, looked for shorter hours as well as better pay.

The Department of Agriculture or whoever may be the author submitted a rather ambitious program to the Deficiency Committee a few weeks ago calling for an appropriation of \$65,000,000 to be used in an effort to find and supply agriculture with additional farm labor for the year 1943. The committee refused to approve the proposal on the ground that the justifications offered did not warrant the expenditure or that the program outlined did not impress the committee as being feasible. Later the program was modified and we are now requested to approve an appropriation for \$26,000,000.

The plan as outlined in the testimony before the committee is to import not over 50,000 laborers from Mexico; recruit and train men and women from the cities and transport them from one section of the country to another to assist primarily in harvesting seasonal crops, and inducing men, women, and children within the several States to volunteer to assist in

planting, cultivating, and harvesting various crops within their respective States. In view of what is considered by many as a distressing need and demand it is almost impossible for any of us to oppose any proposal to aid or assist in implementing the supply of farm labor, but in view of the amount of money involved and in view of the responsibility of your committee, we labor under the necessity of making full and thorough inquiry as to the feasibility of the plan offered before giving it our approval, because none of us wants to be a party to an appropriation unless there is reasonable grounds for believing that its expenditure will be of some real value.

Of course, 50,000 Mexicans should prove to be of some service, but it would hardly be a drop in the bucket; it would add on an average of a little over 1,000 persons to the farm labor supply in each State, but we know they will not be distributed in each State, and this number will probably meet the needs in those States where farmers will accept and know how to handle this type of labor. It is proposed further to recruit 42,000 migratory laborers to be used in meeting seasonal labor requirements in different sections of the country, the Government to pay all transportation costs, including medical facilities when needed, and the employer or farmer to pay not less than \$3 per day or 30 cents per hour. Some farmers have the impression they will be furnished labor free of cost, but there is no provision to this effect in the resolution. It is planned further to recruit 200,000 men and women from towns and cities to be trained as regular farm workers.

I am not convinced by the testimony before the committee that the program for recruiting labor in one section and transporting same to other sections warrants or justifies the full appropriation provided for in this resolution, although it may be necessary to support it in order to be of any assistance. There is no doubt but what a service can be rendered fruit and vegetable growers where crops must be harvested at a particular time and within a reasonably short time, and we may be justified in assisting in bringing the grower and the laborer together and facilitate in some way an adequate supply of labor, but I am not prepared to subscribe to the plan for carrying out this part of the farm-labor program as set out by those proposing it, and here I want to quote what is reported to be a typical circular recently distributed among farm laborers in several of our Southern States, the distribution of which, according to the testimony, was done under the activities of the Farm Security Administration of the Department of Agriculture. I quote:

FARM LABOR WANTED—WAGES \$3 TO \$5 PER DAY

Spend the winter in Florida. Help the United States Government save fruit and vegetable crops needed to win the war. Return home next spring in time to make your own crop. The Government will pay travel expenses for workers and all members of their families to and from the Florida jobs.

Wages are set by the Government at not less than \$3 per day and 4 days' work per week

is guaranteed. Housing is free and medical care if needed. All jobs are under Government contract. Most of the work is on piece-rate basis and good workers can earn \$5 per day and up.

Regular employed farm workers between 18 and 45 may get exemptions from the draft. (See Selective Service Release No. 168.) Farm workers so exempt from the draft are free to go anywhere in the United States to work on farms, producing crops needed for the war effort. Workers and their families going to Florida should carry with them enough clothing, bedding, and cooking utensils. Each person can carry up to 75 pounds of baggage free. Every man of draft age must have his draft card. Everyone must have sugar and other ration books.

Each worker whom we send out, is required to take out a membership card in the Migratory Agricultural Workers Union. The initiation fee is \$1 and monthly dues are \$1 per month while employed (paid up members of the regular S. T. F. U. locals are not charged initiation fees. Dues paid in advance are adjusted.). There are no other charges made for the protection the union offers. We cooperate with the War Manpower Commission and its operating agencies, the United States Employment Service and Farm Security Administration in recruiting and placing farm labor.

Of course, this circular was intended to secure workers in harvesting intensively cultivated fruits and vegetables where prices received for same may justify the payment of from \$3 to \$5 per day, but it should be remembered that the food shortage problem is not confined to fruits and vegetables. They are important and quite essential, but some of us know that soldiers and sailors cannot fight on a fruit and vegetable diet; they must have bread and meat, and these cannot be produced by a transitory group of laborers, and in my section of the country farmers cannot produce bread and meat products at present farm prices if they are required to pay from \$3 to \$5 per day. This is not difficult to analyze.

Every farmer and every man who works on a farm knows that this cannot be done, and I am somewhat disturbed over the fact that we have one Government agency attempting to fix or regulate the price ceiling on farm crops, and another agency attempting to increase production with a minimum wage scale wholly out of line and inconsistent with such prices. The problem of supplying increased food production cannot be solved in this way, and I am sure I am not mistaken.

There are many things I do not know and do not profess to know, but this is one thing I do know and I know that I know it, and when I find someone insisting that such a program is feasible and will fully solve the problem I have a right to question his ability or integrity, for there is deficiency in one or the other. I am not saying the services rendered in some cases may not be worth \$3 to \$5 a day, but I insist that on the general farm where you find a large percentage of food and feedstuffs are produced, the farmer who works wage labor every day in the year cannot pay it with the present price he is receiving for his products.

Furthermore, the evidence shows that every farming locality in this country is short of farm labor and I do not think the problem is going to be solved by re-

cruiting laborers from one section and transporting them to another because that would be just like "robbing Peter to pay Paul." Such a program may operate to the absolute destruction of agricultural activities in various communities. To illustrate, I own and operate three or four small farms, but suppose I were at work there now as a laborer and the Government should come to me with a bona fide offer that I would be given \$5 per day to work on a farm in Mississippi or California and it would pay my railroad transportation and board out there and return and in addition furnish me with a place to live and medical service, if needed. I have an idea it would require a great deal of patriotism not to accept that offer and I am assuming that others on the farm and in the community would feel the same way. My farms would probably grow up in weeds, go to ruin, and the Government would be called upon to institute another program to rehabilitate these farms when this war is over. Although there is some decided merit in this proposal it is somewhat like the proverbial grain of wheat in a bushel of chaff. Another feature in the program that does not appeal to me very strongly, according to the circular quoted above, is that it gives assurance to regularly employed recruited farm workers between 18 and 45 years of age that many of them will obtain exemption from the draft. Think what effect such a policy would have on the morale of the farm boys in the service.

The Selective Service Act provided for their deferment where they were essential to agriculture; they were not deferred for the reason they were not considered as being essential, but apparently they were essential because we now have a request for an appropriation to be used to recruit men and women from the towns and cities to take their places on the farm by telling these city men and women that if they become regular workers they will stand good chances of being exempted from the draft. The farm boy is going to ask why is it he could not be considered just as essential to agriculture as the city boy, and that is what I would like for someone to explain to me. Mr. Chairman, I am not accustomed to criticizing the actions of others and I am not prepared now to question their motives but I am afraid that the mistakes or actions of some of the masterminds in our war program are serving to delay or possibly sabotage to some extent the production of the meat and bread program in our war effort.

Mr. Chairman, if this resolution is enacted into law and administered in the manner contemplated and requested by the proponents of the original proposal I am convinced that agriculture will pay the greatest price for the least benefit ever obtained through our Government. I am convinced further if this resolution is passed and put into effect in the manner contemplated by those who sponsored the original draft there will be a socialized and regimented system of agriculture undreamed of by the most

optimistic dreamers of this country, and I am basing my conclusion solely upon the evidence submitted in the original justification for this appropriation. In order that others will be free to form their own conclusions in this matter I am now incorporating in my remarks a specimen copy of employment agreement between the United States and the employer or employers to be found on pages 49, 50, and 51 of the hearings:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
COOPERATIVE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT

This cooperative employment agreement, made this _____ day of _____, 19____, between the United States of America, hereinafter called the Government, and _____, of _____, State of _____, hereinafter called the employer.

Witnesseth:

Whereas the Government and the employer wish to cooperate in making agricultural workers available to alleviate the present shortage of agricultural labor and to aid in the successful prosecution of the war,

Now, therefore, in consideration of the undertakings hereinafter stated, the Government and the employer agree as follows:

1. The Government shall use its best efforts to recruit and transport agricultural workers for employment by the employer, from points of origin or intermediate points in the United States or Mexico, to the destination point hereinafter stated, and, upon completion of that employment, to the points of origin, or to such intermediate points in the United States as the Government shall determine to be proper.

2. The employer shall employ, exclusively as agricultural laborers, _____ such agricultural workers (if transported by the Government to _____, State of _____, not later than _____, 19____), for at least 75 percent of the workdays (each day in the week except Sunday to be considered a workday) between _____, 19____, and _____, 19____, hereinafter called the period of employment, upon the following terms:

a. The employer shall be required to furnish such employment to a worker hereunder only so long as the worker is ready, willing, and able to work under the supervision and direction of the employer; but shall not require the worker to work on Sundays.

b. The employer shall give each such worker a minimum subsistence allowance of \$3 per day for each workday within said minimum of 75 percent of the workdays that he is not so employed: *Provided, however,* That no subsistence allowance shall be made for workdays in which the worker is unemployed as the result of his refusal to work or his illness or other physical incapacity.

c. A workday shall contain not less than 8 hours nor more than 12 hours. *Provided, however,* That to determine the amount of employment under paragraph 2 of this agreement, hours of work less than 8 done on any day except Sunday may, if the Government consents, be added to hours of work less than 8 done on any other day except Sunday, and for such purpose each 10 hours of work shall be counted as a workday.

d. Work shall be paid for in lawful money of the United States Government at the end of each week of work, at not less than the prevailing wage rates within the particular area of employment. *Provided, however,* That piece work rates, for work to be performed upon that basis, shall be set by the employer so as to enable the workers, if of average ability, to earn not less than the prevailing hourly wage rate. *Provided,*

further, That the wage rates for either hourly or piece work shall in no event be less than 30 cents per hour. The prevailing wage rates shall be conclusively determined by the Government.

e. The employer shall pay all costs of transportation of the workers (and the members of their families transported with them by the Government to the above-specified point of destination) between said destination point and the place or places at which the workers are to perform their work, and return to said destination point.

f. No deductions from wages shall be made for commissions, fees, or any other purpose (except as may be required by law), which shall have the effect of reducing the workers' wages below those required by paragraph 2d of this agreement.

g. The employer shall pay to the Government, in trust for each such worker who has been transported by the Government from Mexico for employment in the United States, 20 percent of his wages, which portion of his wages each such worker will have assigned to the Government in trust, to be held or controlled and disposed of by the Government under the terms of its agreement with the worker.

h. The workers shall be entitled to the benefit and protection of all applicable child labor, compensation, and other laws and regulations of the Government and of the State or States in which the work is performed.

i. The workers shall not be required to purchase articles or services for consumption or use by them or their families at any source not of their choice.

j. The workers shall be entitled to freedom from discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order No. 8802 of the President of the United States, dated June 25, 1941.

k. The employer shall make available to the workers and their families, without charge, such shelter facilities as are owned by the employer and are not otherwise occupied within the period of employment.

l. The workers shall have the right to join with other workers in the election of representatives to bargain and negotiate with the employer: *Provided, however,* That any of the workers who have been imported by the Government from Mexico for employment shall join only with other such workers imported from Mexico and shall elect their representatives from such workers.

m. There shall be no strikes, lock-outs, or stoppages of work during the period of employment. All disputes between the workers and the employer shall be determined by mediation according to procedure prescribed by the Government.

3. The employer shall pay to the Government, to be held and expended by it in trust, subject to the terms of this cooperative agreement, the sum of \$5 for each such worker transported to the above-named destination point by the Government. Each payment shall be made upon demand by the Government after the arrival of the worker at the specified destination point. The employer, at the time of the execution of this agreement, shall deposit with the Government as an advance to be applied by it to the payment of said sums, the sum of \$..... The Government shall refund to the employer, as soon as practicable after termination of employment hereunder, such part of the sum so deposited as the Government is not entitled to under this paragraph.

4. The Government shall determine from time to time, and its determination shall be conclusive, whether the employer has paid all sums to be paid by him hereunder, and shall have the right to pay (as subsistence allowances or otherwise) to the persons it determines to be entitled thereto, all or any part of any such sums which it determines have not been paid, in which case the employer shall repay to the Government, upon demand

by it, all sums so paid, together with interest thereupon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date or dates of such payments by the Government, to be held and expended by the Government in trust subject to the terms of this cooperative agreement.

5. The sums paid to the Government under paragraphs 3 and 4 above shall be held by it in trust, and used and expended within and for the program (of which this agreement is a part) to provide an adequate supply and distribution of labor to produce, harvest, and process crops essential to the war effort. The Government may pool said sums with other sums so paid to it by employers for said program, and shall not be required to keep separate accounts or records therefor.

6. The employer shall keep, upon forms to be supplied by the Government, full and complete records of the employment and wages of each worker under this agreement. Such records shall be at all times open to inspection and examination by the Government, which shall be entitled to make copies thereof. The employer shall also file with the Government such reports concerning said employment and wages as the Government may from time to time require.

7. The employer shall immediately furnish the Government with a performance bond in the penal sum of \$....., in the form and with a surety company approved by the Government, conditioned upon the performance by the employer of all the terms and undertakings of this agreement and upon the prompt payment by the employer to the workers and the Government of all sums due to them or any of them hereunder.

8. If the Government determines that the employer has violated any of the terms or undertakings of this agreement, it may, without waiving any other remedy or course of action, deprive the employer of the further services of the workers under this agreement.

9. All rights, privileges, and powers conferred herein by the Government shall be exercised in its behalf by the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative.

In witness whereof, the Government and the employer have executed this agreement as of the date first above written.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

By _____

(Official title)

Farm Security Administration,
United States Department of Agriculture.

Witnesses:

(Employer)

By _____

Mr. Chairman, I am also including a sample copy of a work agreement between the United States and the worker found on pages 54, 55, and 56 of the hearings:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WORK AGREEMENT

(Domestic workers)

This agreement, made this _____ day of _____, 19____, between the United States of America, hereinafter called the "Government" and _____, of _____, State of _____, hereinafter called the "Worker."

Witnesseth:

Whereas the Government and the worker mutually desire that the worker shall be beneficially employed in the United States of America to alleviate the present shortage of agricultural labor and to aid in the successful prosecution of the war,

Now, therefore, in consideration of this and of the undertakings hereinafter stated, the Government and the worker agree that:

1. The worker shall accept transportation, food, living facilities, subsistence, and employment upon the terms set forth in this

agreement, and shall execute such other agreements, vouchers, and instruments as the Government may require to effect those terms.

2. The Government, at its expense, shall:

(a) Transport, or arrange for the transportation of, the worker and the members of his family named in schedule A on the back of this agreement, all of whom (including the worker) are herein called the "family," and not in excess of 75 pounds of personal belongings for each of them, from _____, State of _____, herein called the "point of origin," to such place or places in, and within, the United States, as the Government shall determine to be suitable for the employment of the worker, and, upon the fulfillment by the worker of his obligations hereunder, return to the point of origin.

(b) Furnish, or arrange to have furnished to the worker and the family all necessary food, health and medical care, and other subsistence living facilities during transportation.

3. The Government shall—

(a) Cause the worker to be employed as an agricultural laborer in the United States for at least 75 percent of the workdays (each day of the week except Sunday to be considered a workday) between the day after the worker's arrival at the original point of destination in the United States and _____ 19____, hereinafter called the "period of employment"; or, in the absence of such employment, make the worker a minimum subsistence allowance of \$3 per day for each workday within said minimum of 75 percent of the workdays that he is not so employed; provided, however, that no subsistence allowance shall be made for workdays in which the worker is unemployed as a result of his refusal to work or his illness or other physical incapacity. The amount of such subsistence allowance, if any, shall be computed and the payment thereof shall be made at the end of the period of employment.

(b) In the event of need as determined by the Government, furnish necessary food, shelter, health, and medical care, and other subsistence living facilities during periods of unemployment occurring within the period of employment.

4. Employment under this agreement shall be upon the following terms:

(a) The worker shall do all work required of him by his employer or employers hereunder during the period of employment in a good and workmanlike manner under the supervision and direction of such employer or employers, but shall not be required to work on Sundays.

(b) A workday shall contain not less than 8 hours nor more than 12 hours: *Provided, however,* That to determine the amount of employment under paragraph 3 (a) above, the Government may, in its discretion, add hours of work less than 8 done on any day except Sunday to hours of work less than 8 done on any other day except Sunday, and for such purpose each 10 hours of work shall be counted as a workday.

(c) Work shall be paid for in lawful money of the Government at the end of each week of work, at not less than the prevailing wage rates within the particular area of employment: *Provided, however,* That piece-work rates, for work to be performed upon that basis, shall be set, so as to enable the worker, if of average ability, to earn not less than the prevailing hourly wage rate: *Provided further,* That the wage rates for either hourly or piece work shall in no event be less than 30 cents per hour.

(d) No deductions from wages shall be made for commissions, fees, or any other purpose (except as may be required by law), which shall have the effect of reducing the worker's wages below those required by paragraph 4 (c) above.

(e) The worker shall be employed exclusively as an agricultural worker.

(f) The worker shall be entitled to the benefit and protection of all applicable child labor, compensation, and other laws and regulations of the Government and of the State or States in which the work is performed.

(g) The worker shall not be required to purchase articles or services for consumption or use by him or the family at any source not of his choice.

(h) The worker shall be entitled to freedom from discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order No. 8802 of the President of the United States, dated June 25, 1941.

(i) Food, shelter, health, and medical services, and other living facilities provided for the worker and the family by the Government or any employer shall meet reasonable minimum standards approved by the Government.

(j) The Worker shall have the right to join with other workers under agreements similar to this agreement in the election of representatives to deal with employers of agricultural labor.

(k) There shall be no strikes, lock-outs, or stoppages of work during the period of employment. All disputes between the worker and his employer or employers shall be determined by mediation according to procedure prescribed by the Government.

5. If the Government determines that the worker is unable or unwilling to work as required by this agreement, or otherwise has violated any of the terms hereof, this agreement may forthwith and without notice be terminated by the Government; provided, however, that, if the agreement is terminated because of the worker's inability as the result of illness or other physical incapacity, the worker and the family shall be entitled to return transportation to their point of origin in accordance with paragraphs 2 (a) and 2 (b) above.

6. All rights, privileges, and powers herein conferred upon the Government shall be exercised by the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative.

In witness whereof, this Work Agreement has been executed as of the date first above written.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

By _____

(Official title)

Farm Security Administration,

United States Department of Agriculture.

Witnesses:

(Worker)

Mr. Chairman, if time permitted I would like to discuss each of these agreements by paragraph, but I think they are sufficiently clear for any interested party to understand the import of the whole matter, but to make a long story short, it simply means that the Government will undertake to recruit men and women wherever they can be found regardless of training or experience, except the 30 days training to be given by the Government, pay their railroad fare and living expenses from their homes to a point where a farmer who is in need of farm labor after an agreement has been made with the employer to furnish living quarters for such a person and pay a minimum wage of \$3 a day or 30 cents per hour for three-fourths of the workdays in each week, whether it is fair or foul and regardless of how capable or inefficient the employee may be. In my State cotton picking time is probably the busiest season of any

time in the year, and a time when labor would probably be in greatest demand, and if a farmer wanted to avail himself of the labor provided for under this resolution he would have to agree to pay not less than \$3 per day or 30 cents per hour regardless of whether the employee picked 50 or 200 pounds of seed cotton per day, and if we had a week's rain the farmer would have to pay the employee or laborer not less than \$3 per day for subsistence even though he picked no cotton whatsoever; however, this provision has been deleted from this bill.

Under subsection J of the Work Agreement we find this language:

The workers shall have the right to join with other workers under agreements similar to this agreement in the election of representatives to deal with employers of agricultural labor.

It is provided further that "all disputes between the worker and his employer or employers shall be determined by mediation according to procedure prescribed by the Government." Congress has enacted no law providing for such mediation and this is just another instance where if this resolution is enacted and administered as originally proposed the executive or administrative department of our Government will make its own law, which it is charged with having done on many occasions within recent years. Who knows what will be the condition or the terms upon which such disputes will be adjudicated? My feeling is that very few farmers, after studying these proposed contracts, will enter into such agreements and what will happen is that this money will all be spent with little or no benefit to agriculture, the war effort, or our Government. It will just be another occasion of confounding confusion.

Of course, it is the intention of the committee under the resolution as now drafted to have the law administered by the Extension Service of the several States. I am in hearty accord with this idea, and if the Extension Service administers the law in accordance with the expressed intent of the committee, and I have sufficient confidence in the Extension Service to believe this will be done, I am sure a great service can be rendered by recruiting or mobilizing labor within the States, which was done in several States last year. The committee indicated its intentions quite clearly on page 8 of the report in the following words:

Before any transportation out of a county or State is effected, clearance should be had with the appropriate county and State authorities so that local and State needs will not be jeopardized by an exodus which cannot be returned in time to meet the local or State crop requirements.

Should promiscuous transportation of labor from one State to another be permitted, the chances are there will be a further decrease of farm labor in my section of the country, because the hearings show that under the original proposal those in charge contemplated the recruitment of the migratory labor groups from the Southern States, but I feel the Extension Service will, under this amended proposal, be able to protect the interests of the State, and it will at the same time be

able to obviate any conflict between Federal activities and State laws, because some States have statutes making it unlawful for anyone to entice or recruit labor within the State and transport same into another state without paying a high license fee. There laws have been found to be constitutional and if they can prevent a person or corporation from doing this without a fee I cannot see but what it can prevent a representative or agent of the United States Government from doing it without paying the fee which it has not done heretofore. This is not a new idea or a new problem. Last year the United States Employment Service directed the head of the employment service in my State to recruit labor to be transported into other States and rather than violate the law of his State he resigned his position.

Mr. Chairman, certainly there is a shortage of farm labor, and certainly the problem of production of food and feed-stuffs must be solved, but I still think that if the intention of the Congress definitely expressed in the Selective Service Act deferring essential farm workers had been adhered to or should it now be adopted, because it is never too late to mend, the shortage of labor on the farm would not be as great and I have the feeling that in this event, the farmers in the several States, their wives, their remaining sons and daughters will demonstrate their accustomed patriotism, meet the challenge and supply the additional labor necessary and supply all the food and feed-stuffs necessary to win this war, and I still believe that with reconsideration and deferment of essential men on the farms with the cooperation of the State Extension Service this problem will be solved without resorting to the socialization and regimentation of agriculture—the oldest, the greatest, and most honored occupation known to mankind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the legislative history of the pending bill is rather interesting. It came from the Budget in February with a request for \$65,000,000 supposed to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. Hearings were held rather extensively in the deficiency committee. That committee modified the bill, reduced the amount, and reported it to the full committee. The full committee, by a unanimous vote, recommended the bill, and as a result the deficiency committee and the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations then considered it jointly. At that joint meeting a substitute was offered and it came out of the joint meeting by a vote of 9 to 2 and was then resubmitted to the full committee. In the full committee a motion was made to strike the enacting clause. It failed. A motion was made to reduce the amount to \$12,000,000. It failed. A motion was made to recommit the bill, and it failed; and so there is before you today a substitute requesting \$26,100,000 for farm manpower.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point for a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very briefly.

Mr. TARVER. The motion to reduce the amount failed by a vote of 14 to 18. I think the gentleman should state that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My recollection is that it failed by a vote of 19 to 12, but I may be in error.

Mr. TARVER. No; it was 14 to 18.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This bill provides \$26,100,000 to be expended under the direction of the Agricultural Extension Service and in cooperation with the United States Employment Service. Briefly, what the pending bill does is this: It makes \$6,000,000 available to the Extension Service for work within the States. There are 2,920 agricultural counties in the United States. This will allow about \$230 per month per county. There is \$7,500,000 for subsistence, for transportation, and for other purposes for workers within the States, including, of course, the building of necessary shelters and the provision for housing. There is some \$12,500,000 in the bill for handling migratory workers across State lines. Five million dollars of the \$12,500,000 is for Mexican workers. So we are asking for \$26,100,000, including \$100,000 for general administrative expenses, as distinguished from the request of the Secretary of Agriculture for \$65,000,000, or more than twice as much.

What has been said against this bill? My good friend from Kentucky paid me a compliment by referring to this as the Dirksen bill. He indicates that we have taken away control from the Secretary of Agriculture. That is correct. After all, have we no legislative responsibility? When the Secretary of Agriculture has failed must the Congress then sit idly by? Lincoln took McClellan out when he failed, and put in Joe Hooker. He took Joe Hooker out when he failed at Chancellorsville, and put in Burnside. He took Burnside out and replaced him with General Meade; but the Commander in Chief has not yet taken cognizance of this failure; so there comes a responsibility on this Congress to deal with this manpower problem. You talk about chiseling away the authority of the Secretary in time of war. We have given some of his authority already to O. P. A. We have given some of his authority already to the Director of Stabilization. So there is something entirely specious in the argument that we have diminished his authority in time of war. We ought to do it when he fails, because you cannot trifle with this problem today.

Another argument is that we are allowing 30 days to renegotiate an agreement with Mexico. That is one of the most amazing agreements I have ever read. It mentions the farm security in that agreement. You will find it on page 34 of the hearings. Here is the Farm Security Administration recited as the employer party in an agreement with the Republic of Mexico and the officials of the Farm Security Administration sign it.

I will not give them any more authority. They have been at it since the 22d

of June of last year. They have had \$4,500,000 from the President's emergency fund and obligated \$1,500,000. They have actually expended \$189,000 in that time. How many workers did they get? Thirteen-thousand-plus—five-thousand-plus Mexicans and eight-thousand-plus domestic workers. Then they come along after all these months of effort, after this expenditure, and would still have the Secretary retain control. Under his bill he would still diffuse this authority to the A. A. A. war board and to the Farm Security Administration to let this failure and this bungling go on. I am not willing to leave the authority in the hands of the Secretary under those circumstances because we will fail as we have failed before.

What did they ask under the Secretary's bill? Three thousand four hundred and forty-seven new employees. That is one-third of the whole number of workers that they have recruited since June last year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Fair enough.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right, fair enough. Think of asking for that kind of a pay roll? I am not willing to give the Secretary this authority.

It has been advanced here that this bill is a futility. It may be. Sometimes I wonder whether a great many of the things that sort of trespass in the Well of this floor are not futile, and I sometimes wonder if a good many things that emanate from here by solemn legislative enactment are not a bit futile when we are dealing with the problem of a great world in chaos at the present time. But at least we must make an effort.

The Secretary said before the Senate committee this month that we are on or may be on the nutrition level of Great Britain. He either confesses disorganization of his own department or is creating a great scarecrow and a nightmare for some purpose or other I know not what; under those circumstances I will not leave it with him. So this bill proposes to put it in the Agricultural Extension Service.

Why? Because they can go into action overnight. There are 2,920 agricultural counties in the United States. All but 15, namely, 2,905, have agricultural extension agents. Nineteen hundred have home economic advisers. Among the 2,905 county agents are 550 Negroes in the Southland. They have a great far-flung organization with a record of 70 years of accomplishment and if they cannot do it, nobody can. At least I am willing to give to them the necessary authority and the funds to make an effort in that direction in the hope that when the snow flies next winter and bellies begin to pinch and children go to bed without their suppers I do not want to have to reproach and abuse my own conscience that I failed. Maybe \$12,000,000 is the proper amount, and an amendment will be offered to that effect. I shall vote against it. Maybe this money will be expended and not get the results that we envision at the present time, but at least I am going to make the money available, and then if they fail it will not be the responsibility or fault of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, do not measure the effect of this action today by what is going to happen next Tuesday. Measure it in terms of next November and next December when there may have been adverse weather, when there may have been a diminution from the high production that we achieved in 1942. Then you try to argue with somebody whose insides begin to pinch, whose belly begins to growl because food is not there. I do not want to get into that kind of an argument. I can argue with my people when the Government threaten to take away their automobiles, when they diminish their gasoline, when they ration their tires, when they give them a ration card for shoes, but I do not believe that I can make a very persuasive argument with a man and his family who are hungry. So I propose to stand by the \$26,100,000, \$6,000,000 of which will go to these counties to cooperate with the extension services, \$7,500,000 for transportation, subsistence, and shelter, and \$12,500,000 for a cooperative effort with the United States Employment Service, so that if they can find workers to be transported across the State line the money will be there to do the job.

My friend from Georgia asked anybody to stand in his place who had any surplus labor in his State. How should I know whether I have surplus labor in my State? How should I know what they could find along Canal Street and West Madison Street in Chicago, where you will find a great host of people drifting in from the vast open spaces of the Northwest and hibernating there for the winter, then available for the spring, summer, and fall harvest seasons. I worked in the harvest fields out in the Northwest years ago when I was going to college. I had to make enough money somehow or other to buy books and to pay a matriculation fee. So I worked part time out in the harvest fields in the Dakotas and I saw the boys gathered up by the employment services and put on the train to come out and help with the harvesting of wheat. Now, then, they have a great many of those in Chicago. I do not know what the surplus is. How could one intelligently respond to the question that was propounded by the gentleman from Georgia, when he said, "If there is a surplus in anybody's State, let him stand in his place now and explain it."

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Illinois, I am sure, does not intend to misquote the gentleman from Georgia. The gentleman from Georgia said, "If there is any Member who has surplus labor in his district," not in his State.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would be the same thing.

Mr. RANKIN. If you sent a bunch of fellows from Chicago down to my State to hoe or pick cotton, it would be a waste of time and money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might agree with the gentleman, and certainly that is not contemplated here. Ninety percent

of all the employees that they seek to procure under this bill will be secured in the areas where they now reside. The other 10 percent, namely 350,000 migratory workers who move from one harvest field to another, and the 42,000 year-round workers, is only 10 percent of the objective under this bill. That will be done in conjunction with the county agents and in cooperation with the United States Employment Service. But, as far as the rest of it is concerned, it is in the hands of the Extension Service.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that if they will apply the same rule in the big cities that has been applied to the farmers in my section of the country, and take as large a proportion of the people there into the armed services, we will at least have a portion of our labor left; but this war has hit hardest the agricultural sections of the South and West. That is the reason they are stripped of their farm labor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts raised a question about Mexican workers. If you want to speak authoritatively on that subject, ask the gentlemen who come from that area. Ask the gentleman from Texas, EWING THOMASON, ask the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES, and ask the gentleman from New Mexico, CLINTON ANDERSON, who gave a very instructive and informative statement when we appeared in joint committee. They know about that situation. For want of Mexican labor in some of those long-staple cotton areas of the West they lost \$4,500,000 in cotton in 1942. That statement was made to us only recently by Mr. Abbott, of the cotton association out there.

The gentlemen from California can testify as to the amount of fruit that was left in the fields and in the orchards due to lack of labor. They depend in large measure upon the labor from Mexico. The regrettable thing is that the Farm Security Administration had to confuse the situation in the first place instead of letting it filter across the line as it has done in other years so as to satisfy the labor demand on this side of the Rio Grande.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that I said that the greatest caution must be exercised to be sure that they are Mexicans and not undesirable refugees who have become Mexicans just to get into this country. I am not trying to exclude real Mexican labor for limited service. Of course I want aid for farming in the United States wherever possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me summarize. It has been said that we have deprived the Secretary of authority. That is correct. That is precisely what I have in

mind, because the program has thus far failed, and it is the legislative responsibility of the Congress now to look elsewhere for better direction.

It has been said that we are modifying the Mexican agreement. That is correct, and the modification must be made within 30 days, for here is an agreement made in which the Farm Security Administration is recited as the employer.

It has been said this is futile. I do not know. I do not know how many workers we are going to get. But I do know that I do not want to charge my own conscience with having been niggardly in the matter. Every Member of this House knows that more often than not I have been on the other side, trying to curtail and economize on appropriations rather than be on the liberal side. But do not forget you are dealing with food, you are dealing with the bodies of the men and women in this country, you are dealing with hunger, you are dealing with the potentialities of starvation. I think I prefer to be liberal on that side.

It has been said that the amount is too great, and an effort will be made to cut it to \$12,000,000. I hope the House will reject that proposal. Let us not take that upon ourselves. We have cut it from \$65,000,000 and changed the direction. I want to go along with an amount that in my judgment will be adequate in an attempt to do this job, and if we fail, not all the criticism will then be directed against the Congress.

So I humbly submit to you that after the tempestuous and tortuous legislative history this bill has had, and in view of the emergent condition we face, when our own Secretary of Agriculture now confesses before a Senate committee that we are proceeding toward a nutrition level on a par with Great Britain and that there will not be food enough to go around for everybody, it becomes an emergency proposition for us. I charge you well to think earnestly about it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman should call attention to the fact that the Extension Service is one that has been successful and has done a good job over a long period of years all over the country, whereas the Farm Security Administration has been a complete failure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is exactly right.

The other thing is, if the funds are not expended, I am reasonably sure they will revert to the Treasury because they can be expended only on this manpower problem. If they do not get the men there will be neither subsistence nor transportation involved. If they do not get the men, they will not have to provide them shelter. Consequently, the money that is earmarked for that purpose in this bill will then revert to the Treasury and we will be right back where we hoped we would be in not having any extravagances in connection with this program.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The last proviso of this bill is distinctly antilabor. I wonder why you put it in there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not an antilabor provision; it is quite in conformity, I think, with the exemptions that were made in the Fair Labor Standards Act and in the National Labor Relations Act. Manifestly, the Congress cannot put itself in the position of making the application of wage rules and hour determinations, grievance boards, and so forth, in their application to farm labor, where the day usually begins at sunrise and ends at sunset, or later in the harvest season. You cannot confine it. If we are going to limit farm hours, regulate farm wages and other conditions then of course we may just as well give up all hope of solving the problem of increased production of foods in the year 1943, and let the situation go. Moreover, safeguards on wages and hours as applied to farm labor were written into the Wages and Hours and Labor Relations Acts several years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that I have very much to offer to you in the way of oratory so far as this resolution is concerned. You have heard the mechanics of the bill thoroughly discussed by competent statesmen, and certainly I would not be one to try to tell you about the mechanics of the bill anyway, because all of you are just as competent to read the resolution and reach your own conclusion as I. However, there is one thing that I want to say to you definitely. There has been considerable said here this afternoon, first, about reducing the bill, or the appropriation that goes to make the bill workable and possible. While I have great admiration for the chairman of my subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, yet I can tell you very frankly that I cannot go along with his theory that the bill is no good, but that he will give \$12,000,000 to throw away. To me that is far-fetched philosophy to apply to the proposed legislation. I have listened for a good many years to many of my good friends talk about their concern and their interest in the farmer, and they have gone to great length in many instances to say what they wanted to do in behalf of the farmer, and then I can recall a few months later that I listened to a good many of my friends in the Well of this House when we were talking about the negotiation of contracts for business, in order to induce business to go ahead and operate and produce because the Nation needed the 7th degree of production possible, "that business should be helped," and let me say to you, and I think I can state it advisedly, being from the western section of this Nation, to wit: The great State of California, that our farmers out there have served notice on the Secretary of Agriculture for the last 9 months, that we were in desperate circumstances to produce agriculturally, and that we were heading down the road to chaotic conditions, if

he did not have something done to relieve them of farm labor shortage. Many of my colleagues on the floor of this House and myself have gone down there to plead with the men in the Department of Agriculture, and with the Secretary of Agriculture to be a little more specific in action about what was definitely indicated as a shortage of manpower that was developing, and I am frank to say to you that I do not think it would take any super intelligence by anyone to have foreseen what was going to happen to agriculture because of the shortage of manpower, as it applied throughout the United States.

We all know that the armed forces have to have their manpower in order to carry on the requirements set by the gentlemen who are there for the purpose of telling us what is necessary for our military activities, and we also know that if we are going to produce the necessary food for those armed forces to continue their efforts to preserve our form of government, that the whole question is to provide agriculture with the necessary machinery and manpower to carry on the program, to provide that necessary food. We have not accomplished a miracle in this bill I know, and this Congress has been as dilatory in its attitude in taking hold of this thing as has the Department of Agriculture, if you want my opinion about it. What are you going to do with it? Are you going to follow the same line of supine lassitude and nonapplication as the Department of Agriculture, or are you going to do what we should as a legislative body, and at least give the farmer the best that we can? I listened to considerable of the testimony brought before the committee for the purpose of getting this bill formulated, and I do not care whose bill it is. It is the best bill we have before us today to relieve an unfortunate condition, and so far as we people in border States with Mexico are concerned, let me say this to my eastern colleagues on the floor of this House. Do not worry about whether we are going to get work out of these Mexicans, do not let that concern you. We know the various proclivities of the Mexicans; we have used them in the Western States for years on our farms, and in the major instances they have done a splendid job for us; and if you give us a chance to get them back again without any quarrel or unsurmountable barriers, I tell you frankly you will not have to worry about California trying to get your manpower. All you have to do is to keep the screwballs out of the way, and we will take care of our own job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the assistance to the farmer in this bill is very little and it comes very late. The problem of food supply and food production is far more serious than we have begun to realize. The food situation is critical. For the past several months there has been too much tinkering and bungling with this extremely important

problem. Not so long ago men in high places in Government were concerned about food surpluses. Even then people in other parts of the world were in need of food. Mr. Chairman, do you realize the demand for food is twice as much as it was 5 years ago? The demand from abroad and for our armed forces and for our own civilians has increased tremendously. Our producers are being asked to increase production 25 percent more than last year—a banner crop year—and do it with 75 percent of last year's manpower, and with less farm equipment and repairs. Why not face the facts? Do we not realize the supply of manpower is dwindling right now and that farmers cannot get near the needed machinery and equipment to do the job? Furthermore I do not believe much will be accomplished in transporting much help from one State to another. If a man is a good farmer in Georgia or Kentucky he will have plenty of work at home. Mexicans can assist locally in places like California or in beet fields in other places.

But, Mr. Chairman, something fundamentally and more important must be done. We have too many agencies attempting to deal with this problem now. The Department of Labor, the War Labor Board, the Office of Price Administration, the Manpower Commission, as well as two or three agencies in the Department of Agriculture all have a hand in it. Mr. Chairman, we already have too much legislation and regulation. What we need is to loosen up these regulations and cut the maze of red tape in which our farmers are tied.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to get down to realities. First, pay the farmer a price for his products on a basis he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy. Encourage him in doing a most important part in carrying this war program to a successful conclusion. Relax the regulations so he may have needed farm equipment and repairs, and fertilizer. Extend the authority of local draft boards in the deferment of men needed on the farms. Let the farmer be recognized when he does a good job just as you do in industry. Let the question of extra labor be handled by local boards rather than through bureaus in Washington.

It is my candid opinion, Mr. Chairman, the farmer will come a lot nearer reaching the goal assigned him, if these suggestions are followed, rather than bind him still further with more and more rules and regulations. All in the world the farmer asks for is an even break. Why not let him have it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this measure is at least a reasonable attempt toward partial solution of a very difficult problem. It has my approval.

I wish to read two short statements from the Niagara and Erie County Farm Bureaus of New York State.

They are as follows:

Responsibility for and development of farm labor program necessary at once. Urge your

support of House Joint Resolution 96 as step in right direction.

HERMAN G. AGLE,
Chairman, Erie County Farm Bureau.

Urge you support Resolution 96 of House Appropriations Committee. We consider Extension organization capable of doing a good job on farm labor if funds are available at once.

HARRY O. AIKIN,
Chairman, Niagara County Farm Bureau.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, during a considerable portion of this debate one of the most successful farmers in my congressional district, Mr. Reese Van Vranken, has been an interested observer in the gallery. When the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] took the floor a few moments ago he, almost word for word, reiterated the views of this successful farmer as they were given to me this afternoon.

In substance his views are that this Congress should take off the restrictions that have been applied by the long-haired dreamers in the Agricultural Department and the O. P. A., release farm machinery that has been frozen, give the farmer a fair price formula to include wages, and he will do the job.

The farmer does not want subsidies. He does not want to be told by Washington how to operate his farm and what crops he can grow. Give him decent prices for his grain and his livestock and he will produce. All he needs is the chance. And let me warn this House today that if the O. P. A. insists upon placing price ceilings on hogs and cattle, as is the announced intention, America is certain to go hungry.

There has been a lot of ballyhoo here this afternoon about what the Nation will think unless this Congress votes this \$26,000,000 for the Extension Service to find farm laborers. Different Members have said that they would rather vote this \$26,000,000 than to be accused of not having voted to give the theory a try. That argument may ease the conscience of those who would vote this appropriation, but you are not fooling the farmer. He knows well who has been responsible for the situation in which we find ourselves today and he will know where to place the responsibility for the lack of food when the famine comes.

This \$26,000,000 that is asked for in this legislation will go down the rat hole the same as other millions have gone down the rat hole in recent years.

An excellent demonstration of how some of these taxpayers' dollars are thrown away was given the past 10 days when committeemen of the A. A. A. were paid \$6 for every 15 letters and postcards that they persuaded farmers to mail to Congress to demand the continuation of the A. A. A. indefinitely; release of 100,000,000 bushels of feed wheat—as we did yesterday—and to demand incentive payments to increase production. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against all this squandering of the taxpayers' money.

Why, up in my district they are already recruiting girls in colleges to work on farms this summer. These girls are all

looking forward to a grand time this summer at wages of \$50 per month and their board. Little do they realize that what the farmer needs is help to pitch manure and hay, plow the ground, and do the jobs that girls from colleges, it is certain, cannot physically qualify to do. The college professors who would put such ideas into their heads and promote such programs should have their heads examined.

Mr. Chairman, it is time this Congress should give some thought to restoring the self-respect of the farmer. Forget these half-witted theories. Give the farmer a chance to produce by furnishing the machinery creating fair prices. He will produce. He is as patriotic as any other American. He does not ask for subsidies to prove his patriotism. I am keeping my promise to my constituents, Mr. Chairman, by voting against this appropriation, which has not been justified in any of the arguments made here this afternoon.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, during the 12 years I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee I have never been puzzled by an appropriations proposition like I have been puzzled by this one. I have voted for appropriations of billions without a fraction of the mental worry this one has caused me. It was not the size of the appropriation that bothered me, but the nature of the problem to be tackled and how it could best be tackled. As a member of the Deficiencies Subcommittee I heard all of the testimony, and while I make no claim as to the wisdom of the decision I have reached after considering all of the perplexing features of the matter, I do believe I should tell my colleagues of this legislative body what my conclusion is and how I arrived at that conclusion.

In our encounter with this estimate we of the committee were in about the same position as a debutante with a blind date, the difference being that after the debutante has been with her "date" for a little while she knows more about him than we were able to extract by cross-examination of the many witnesses who came before us. Perhaps it is true that an estimate has never been presented to our committee in more hazy outline and with less definite knowledge behind it. This is no impeachment of the sincerity and ability of those making the presentation, from Secretary Wickard down the list. It was simply that they found themselves in an unknown and untried field and they did not know, and could not know, their ground.

The one outstanding fact that hit us squarely in the face was that there is an acute shortage of farm workers which makes the recruitment of farm labor an imminent and vital problem. How to meet that situation was the question before us and I am sure every member of the Committee was deeply impressed with the gravity of the undertaking and keenly anxious to find the remedy. Food is as important to winning the war as gunpowder.

Between the fall of 1941 and the fall of 1942 a total of 1,600,000 workers is estimated to have left agricultural pursuits. The Secretary of Agriculture advised the committee that 60 percent of the labor that has left the farms has gone into industry and 40 percent has entered the armed forces. He also stated that as of February 1 there were actually 200,000 less workers on the farms than there were on the same date a year ago.

Many and various were the suggestions of means to create a reservoir of workers to meet the farm labor deficiency but to my way of thinking nearly every suggestion carried its own negation. In the absence of a national selective service law—which God forbid may never be enacted—how are you going to get back to the farms the 60 percent of farm labor which Secretary Wickard says has left the farms and gone into industry? I had a letter from home the other day saying that in one big defense plant of Indianapolis six thousand farm boys are employed. My correspondent also stated:

I was asking some of these young farmers why they came to Indianapolis instead of staying on the farm. The answer from them all was that Dad couldn't pay them more than one or two dollars a day and that they were out after the big money.

If we undertake to raise the price ceiling for farm products so that the farmer could afford to pay higher wages in competition with defense plants we encounter the obvious fact that this would increase the cost of living, followed by a demand for higher industrial wages and that would create a vicious circle.

As I stated, nearly every tangible proposal advanced carried more or less its own negation.

When inquiry was made as to the feasibility of returning farm boys from the Army for work on the farms, Secretary Wickard testified that there are 375,000 in that group, but securing their release is another matter. I quote from page 174 of the hearings as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW. You stated awhile ago that a representative of the War Labor Board would be authorized to ask for deferments of farm boys.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; that is, the county war board, the agricultural war board.

Mr. LUDLOW. Have you thought of going a step further and asking for a reexamination of the rolls of the Army and Navy, of the units that are in this country, and nearby stations, with a view of releasing farmers for farm work?

Secretary WICKARD. No, sir; I have not personally advocated that, because it seemed to me, if we could not stop taking the boys from the farm, there was not much hope of taking boys out who had been in and who had been trained.

Mr. LUDLOW. Would not that open up a considerable reservoir of farm labor?

Secretary WICKARD. We have been told by the Army people—we have had discussions on this topic—but they say that they might have 375,000 farm boys in the Army who are still in this country. They cite the fact that they have had difficulty getting men over 38 who can be released to get back to the farms. A lot of them do not like to leave the service. A lot of them say that the pay is going to be less on the farms, when they go back. A lot of them, since

they have had some training, perhaps have gotten some advancement; I do not know how much we could do.

So it seems there is not much of a prospect in that direction.

It was hoped that 50,000 laborers might be brought from Mexico to work in the production of this year's crops, but that hope is diminishing, due in part to under-cover opposition of the Mexican Government. Plans to import farm labor from Puerto Rico and the Bahamas are likely to prove ineffective, if not nugatory, due to the fact that enemy submarines have virtually stopped transportation from those regions.

I cite these instances to show the immense difficulties of recruiting farm labor up to anything like the necessary requirements. Still it is a problem that must be met and we have sought in this bill to meet it in a logical way.

The original estimate that came to us from the Budget Bureau asked for an appropriation of \$65,075,000, of which in round numbers \$40,000,000 was to be for the transportation, subsistence, medical care, etc., of 350,000 seasonal workers and the movement of 42,000 year-round workers and \$17,500,000 for construction and maintenance of 250 farm-labor camps and the maintenance of 95 existing camps. This arrangement gave the major part of the appropriation to the Farm Security Administration and only about \$6,000,000 to the Farm Extension Service.

There were features of the estimate which seemed to most of us as being unsound and savoring of extravagance. Testimony of witnesses showed an inclination on the part of proponents of the estimate to make over the social order by transferring citizens from places and surroundings where proponents of the estimate thought they ought not to be living, to places and surroundings where proponents of the estimate thought they ought to be living. It seemed to us that this sort of a social transformation was going pretty far in a farm labor recruitment program. It was our belief that the two did not tie in very well together. It was revealed, too, that it was proposed to transport laborers long distances, a thousand miles or more, which seemed unnecessary, and a proposed allowance of \$1 per meal or \$3 per day per person in transit met with criticism, since the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps are able to furnish a nourishing and satisfying ration at a cost of between 50 and 60 cents a day.

The upshot of consideration of the over-all problem before us was that it was decided to reduce the appropriation to \$26,100,000 and to give the job of recruitment of farm labor to the Extension Service in collaboration with the United States Employment Service and such incidental services as may be required. The Extension Service has agreed to accept the over-all responsibility. We increased its apportionment from the \$6,000,000 carried in the estimate to \$13,500,000, partially for the reason that the draft has taken many extension

workers and it will be necessary to build up the personnel of that service for the heavy duties ahead.

The Extension Service has a director in every State, county agents in each of some three thousand counties, and is in close touch with local conditions and the requirements of the farmers and is in the best position to reach out locally and find the needed labor. With its widespread organization already in existence we believe it is well qualified to handle this operation, especially since it is believed that from 90 to 95 percent of the hired labor to be recruited will be local labor.

Why did the committee eliminate farm security from the administration of this program? It was done, I think, because the committee felt that farm security is primarily interested in social objectives. The committee wants this to be an operation and not a social experimentation. The operation is the recruitment of farm labor to meet an emergency, and the committee does not want any Tugwell ideas mixed with it.

My own thought is that in the committee's action there was an undercurrent of subconscious or conscious disapproval of our bureaucracy's attitude toward the farmers.

The American farmer has been the world's prize guinea pig. In an effort to make him feel better he has been salved and poulticed by bureaucratic panaceas until there is not a spot on his anatomy that is not red and blistered and inflamed. His pigs have been snatched from a normal and useful course of life and converted into soap grease, his cotton has been plowed under and he has been told how many acres of this, that and the other crops he can raise and how many acres he cannot raise under the dire penalty of the law. He has been bossed and regimented and goose-stepped by beardless boys in Washington who never saw a plow, and when his load of grief was heaviest and it seemed that he was the chosen goat of punishment he has been miraculously rewarded by being paid for crops he did not raise! He has been caught in a maze of bureaucratic entanglements, directives, and ukases until he did not know whither to go or where to turn. When I see what has been done to him by the boys in Washington I cannot help exclaiming "God help the farmer!" and I wonder whether the academicians who spend their time practicing their remedies on him will ever come to realize that the very best way to help the farmer and to enable him to perform his full part in the Nation's economy is to lift him from under the mass of governmental restrictions and orders, cut down his taxes and leave him alone. All of this is said without any impeachment of Secretary of Agriculture Wickard. The irrational policies of the Department of Agriculture were formulated before he became the head of that establishment. I regard him as a sound and able administrator, but he has inherited some bad practices and some visionary personnel. I think it is entirely proper that Congress should indicate how it wants this program carried out.

In regard to the exact amount to be carried in this bill for the recruitment of farm labor, I am not so particular. In our subcommittee I proposed an appropriation of \$20,000,000 and I assume there is no impropriety in stating that at one time that amount was approved but on more mature consideration an appropriation of \$26,100,000 was decided upon. I believe that Mr. W. R. Ogg, director of research of the American Farm Bureau Federation, made a wise observation to our committee when he said:

I would like to have the committee in making the appropriation make it on a temporary basis for a period to get through the rest of this year, with the understanding that, if this is not adequate, a request for further funds could be made.

Frankly, I doubt whether an appropriation of \$26,100,000 will do the job but I do think it is enough to start with. In an unknown operation of this kind, when so much depends on experience, it is in my opinion a sound and sensible appropriation procedure to start with a conservative amount and feel the way, as it were. It often saves a tremendous amount of money in the long run. The important thing is not so much the amount as it is to get started on this colossal task at the earliest possible moment. If a trial shows that the amount appropriated is not sufficient, Secretary Wickard and his associates will have no trouble in finding the doors of the deficiencies committee room. Speed is essential in the passage of this bill if it is to do any good in the cultivation and harvesting of this year's crops. There is every reason to believe that if the bill is not modified in the House it will run the gauntlet of the Senate and the White House expeditiously. In view of the existing emergency I plead with you fellow Members of the House to pass the bill without delay and send it on its way.

In conclusion, I would like to read a telegram I have today received from Purdue University in respect to this appropriation. As you all know, Purdue University is one of the best agricultural colleges in the world. There is none better on this globe. Mr. H. J. Reed, director, extension service, wires to me in respect to the amount carried in the bill as follows:

We believe that funds carried in present House bill are adequate for agricultural extension service to meet the demands of the farm labor training and placement program insofar as any agency of government can meet the situation in view of present shortage of manpower. Immediate action is imperative in any event.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, for some reason this committee is ashamed of the bill it brought in. I am opposed to this resolution. I am profoundly disturbed by evidence in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies of the Committee on Appropriations that we of the House may be drifting into government off the record. I desire to call your attention to pages 90, 91, 93, 96, 102, and

170 of the printed hearings where at points in the testimony, of extreme importance in the consideration of this appropriation, various witnesses went off the record in their testimony. There obviously were no military secrets involved, and the hearing was closed from the press and the public.

Turn to page 87, and in the opening statement by Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, speaking for the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the Grange, he says:

Mr. Chairman, when you handed this problem to the farm organizations for recommendation, you handed us a pretty tough job, as you know. We have not had time to form complete agreements as to all details. We are agreed that the present system is not working right, by any means; but we have some general recommendations here which we would like to make, and then discuss possibly some other recommendations which we can discuss off the record or on the record, as to details.

Three pages later, concluding his formal statement, Mr. Goss says—

The hearing indicates there followed a discussion off the record.

Again a moment later, Mr. Goss again went off the record and again on page 91 was talking off the record.

Now, turning to page 93, and reading from a colloquy between the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, who is the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, and Mr. Goss, we find:

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to make one statement off the record?

The hearings indicate that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], did make a statement off the record.

Three pages later during the testimony of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] we find the distinguished gentleman from Georgia making another statement off the record.

Now, to indicate that Mr. Goss began his testimony with the intention of going off the record for some part of it and that this was part of a plan agreed upon among the organizations for whom he spoke, we find, at page 102 that Mr. W. R. Ogg, director of research, American Farm Bureau Federation, opened his testimony with the identical request that he be permitted to speak off the record. Finally, while the Secretary of Agriculture was testifying regarding the urgent need for action to meet farm labor needs, we find that he, too, asks permission to speak off the record and was given that permission by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I for one am against government off the record. I do not like testimony given off the record and, as in this instance, so given with premeditation, design, and apparently by agreement. What is going on here that cannot stand the light of day? What was it that these two witnesses planned to pour into the ears of our committee? And did pour into their ears, knowing in advance that it was something they would not want to have spread on the record where it could be answered by any agency or

person affected. I do not like star-chamber proceedings and the atmosphere in which these recommendations have been arrived at. For this reason, and because the resolution will, in my judgment, defeat its own purpose, I intend to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the House should clearly understand who is in favor of and who is opposed to House Joint Resolution 96 as it stands. It is supported by only one of the four major national farm organizations. Its sole supporter is the American Farm Bureau Federation, which is tied up with the very same 48 State extension services which this resolution proposes to make all-powerful.

The resolution does not have the support of at least other groups according to the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, because I read at page 151 that the National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, and the National Council of Farm Cooperatives do not believe the Extension Service is equipped to handle the importation of foreign labor and the interstate migration of labor with maximum speed and effectiveness. They endorse the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Federal Director of Extension on this matter. At page 150, Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, reported on a conference among the Farm Bureau, the Cooperative Council, the Grange, and the Federation of Milk Producers, held in an effort to reach agreement on recommendations to the Appropriations Committee. Here is Mr. Goss's testimony:

We were not entirely agreed on the proposals with reference to the interstate handling question. * * * The Farm Bureau could not see eye to eye with us.

In addition to this split regarding the role of the 48 State extension services, the National Farmers' Union is in wider disagreement, opposing transfer of the interstate farm labor service from the Farm Security Administration. The Farmers Union opposes the prohibition which would make it impossible for any agency to recruit farm labor. I refer to the final provision which stipulates that none of the funds shall be used directly or indirectly to set minimum wage, housing, and sanitary standards.

This resolution, as it stands, satisfies only one out of five farm organizations which, significantly enough, has an exclusive relationship with the State extension services. I submit that the resolution in the present form is unsatisfactory for this and other reasons, and on a vote to approve or reject I will vote against it, not because I am against mobilization of an adequate supply of farm labor but because I want to vote for a measure that will do the job. This resolution, on the word of all but one of the farm organizations, will not do the job.

There is no available labor for farm work located in any considerable number in any State of the Union. This resolution suggests that labor will be imported from foreign countries. If such labor comes in will the county extension agents know it, and will they be able

to make arrangements to secure it? Some labor will come in from Mexico, as it has in the past, and will the county extension agents in 2,920 counties arrange with the Mexican Government for it? That proposition is preposterous on its face. In treating with foreign governments for labor, no government will want to treat with 2,920 individuals instead of one responsible government agency.

Will Mexico respond to our plea for labor when in this resolution we give them only 30 days to get out of their contract already existing with the Government, and join the county-agent system?

The resolution contains this further language:

Provided, That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

Mexico will have to let their labor come in under conditions which this committee has written and do it within 30 days from the final passage of this act. I will suggest that Mexico may have something to say about the conditions under which her citizens are to work.

It is certain from the debate that the majority of the committee who brought this resolution in have no idea that through it the farm-labor shortage will be cured. Through the debate you will note that the Farm Security Administration has been condemned, and in my judgment this attack goes further than this resolution. There is a movement on foot to take all appropriations away from the Farm Security Administration as you will note by remembering the colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I think this debate made that purpose certain. In North Dakota the Farm Security Administration is the only organization we can turn to to put farmers and their families to work who have been foreclosed and dispossessed. Thousands have been reestablished in the United States, and payments to the Government have been overpaid in many instances. This year in North Dakota payments to Farm Security have reached 299 percent of the amount due for 1942. There is not a chance on earth that the Government will lose, and in the meantime families and family homes have been reestablished.

I say to you, as long as you permit Government agencies like the Federal land banks, and the Federal Land Commissioner to foreclose and oust farmers, it will be necessary to retain some organization to put these families on their feet after being knocked down by another Government agency.

I think myself it is too late to do very much for the farmers for 1943. The time we should have done it was when we passed the draft bill in this Congress.

Several of us worked for months, trying to get a modification of the draft, but we never got it. You drafted farmers right and left until now farms have been abandoned and herds of a lifetime sold and if you are hungry it is the fault of this Congress and nobody else. It is no fault of any bureau. You cannot criticize the First Lady of the land for that. You cannot criticize Mr. Ickes for that. You can criticize this Congress, because we did not have the vision to look ahead and see what was going to be done.

I hope the people of the United States will not let this Congress escape the responsibility that it assumed when it passed the draft law permitting the farms to be stripped of workers and which has resulted in the abandonment of thousands of farms and beef and dairy herds. We are trying to dodge the responsibility now by passing this act which no one has had the nerve to say will adjust the situation now.

For the crop year of 1943, if there is to be any farm labor supplied it must be done by local communities calling upon business men, professional men, children, and after-hour workers to lend a hand in the necessary production of food. If further draft of farmers will be stopped that will help some, but this proposal to put 26 million dollars into the hands of county agricultural agents with the hope that this situation will be solved is too visionary even to warrant serious consideration.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, the food and fiber which is produced upon our farms is just as much munitions of war as are the tanks, planes, and guns that are produced in urban factories. If the food and fiber programs fail, the war will be lost just as certainly as if all our warplants were blasted from the face of the earth.

Because of reasons beyond numbering, the operation of the draft, the attraction of the war production centers, many others that might be named, a great scarcity of labor has developed upon our farms. Something must be done to insure an adequate supply of agricultural labor at the farmer's gate or our production programs are bound to fail.

It is absolutely necessary that legislation along the lines of House Joint Resolution 96 be passed as all existing agencies of government to which we have looked in the days gone by for help in the finding of a solution to our all-important problem have failed us. Last year our loss of crops, because of a lack of harvest help, must be measured in millions of dollars—a sad commentary indeed during these days when our country and its fighting men are in such dire need of that of which our farmers are not only anxious to but entirely capable of producing in abundant quantities.

For reasons that will never be fully explained, the United States Employment Service, the Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, the Manpower Commission—every governmental

agency to whom we looked for assistance—turned a deaf ear to our pleas. In view of the dire necessity which then existed and the stupendous financial loss that was the consequence of their indifference to our plight, to leave this great question of farm labor to such agencies of demonstrated incompetence would be folly indeed.

After all their puffing and blowing only 3,000 Mexicans were brought in from Mexico last year, so many less than were required that tears rush to the eyes as we contemplate this direct consequence of official nonfeasance.

We must place the responsibility for the production of a sufficient labor supply, Mexican and domestic, in the hands of officials that, when the necessity arises, will not hesitate to cut red tape in the farmer's interest, not in the interests of those who oppose him.

We cannot forget that when 10,000 Mexicans lined up in the border awaiting the chance to enter our country, that the Immigration and Naturalization Service cut all its red tape to keep them out, but that the United States Employment Service would not cut one strand to get them in. We want no more of that.

So, I earnestly plead that you, my colleagues, pass this legislation. Let us put the administration of this problem in the hands of our neighbors, those who know our farm-labor problems. This bill will do it, will end our labor-procurement difficulties, make certain the attainment of our farm-production quotas, do more perhaps than anything else we might do to win this war. I beseech your favorable consideration of the bill now before us.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I have made a canvass of the situation on the farms in my district in Nebraska. I have received many letters from the farmers giving me their opinion of what they think the Congress can do about helpful legislation. When we go back into the House I shall ask permission to put excerpts from these letters in the Record.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I said on the floor of this House on March 2, that lack of vision and bungling by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Manpower Commission and the O. P. A. have brought the Nation face on with a threatened food shortage this fall.

This bill, known as the Dirksen bill is an emergency attempt by the Congress to set up an organization through the extension services of the State universities to prevent this threatened shortage, or at least to soften the impact against our food production and our national economy. Its purpose is to render such financial aid to the farmer as will mobilize and get to him on the farm all possible labor for his use in planting, producing, and harvesting. I deem it a proper and wise move on the part of Congress and I hope the Members will approve the measure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to the lack of vision, the lack of mature plans by many of the men holding places of great responsibility in the Government by devoting the remainder of my time to Mr. McNutt, of the Manpower Commission, because this agency is typical and closely tied in with the entire labor situation of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I note in the Times-Herald newspaper, of Washington, this morning that Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt has indorsed incentive vacations and incentive bonuses for workers to reduce absenteeism in industrial plants. The news story indicated that it was a bright idea suddenly flashing out of the brain of Ralph Bard, Assistant Secretary of the Navy. It is planned that such vacations and incentive payments would be awarded with the regular pay envelope for exceptionally good work and faithful attendance.

McNutt is said to have told the press conference that such action is one of the several that might be used to combat absenteeism. The general public, when they read of this last "powder-puff smash" of Czar McNutt against absenteeism, will hope that he does not mention any of the several other plans he has in mind in the fear that if he does and applies them they might further impede the efforts of labor to produce the implements of war. If he has other bonuses, we are wondering if he has planned one for the farmers or one for the Main Street merchants, who after struggling with the point rationing system 12 hours a day must spend all day Sunday trying to analyze and make out questionnaires with which they are constantly burdened from the Office of Price Administration.

Does he intend to add any extra bonuses in favor of the white-collared worker who is unorganized and who works at a low salary assisting the small merchant who is trying to hold his business together to render a service of food distribution to the American people who do not live in the offices here in Washington but who carry on an extensive and very important service in the back reaches of the Nation?

And may I divert to say that the Main Street merchant and his employees, by the millions, who are having a part of their salary taken out every week for the buying of bonds; the Main Street merchant who leads the bond drives, who leads the drives for the Red Cross, the salvage drives, who buys bonds till it hurts, who leads in the building of the churches, the schools, the hospitals, who is the nucleus around which the business, civic, and religious life of the community is builded, have about become the forgotten men and women of America. They are not bothered with absenteeism; they are striving without undue complaint to keep the forces and energy of this tremendous effective sector of the home front intact. They are doing their best and more, possibly, than any other group on the home front to win the war and preserve the American way of life. The great group of earnest citizens who have been penalized by Government regulations and restrictions would have a

just right to cry out against this added confusion in this latest suggestion of Commissioner McNutt in his further attempt by such a silly suggestion to coddle organized labor.

Laboring men in the war plants have had the advantage of steady work and high salaries. With their sons fighting in the war and their neighbors' sons, they have not asked for and, in my opinion, would not welcome any such a move by the Manpower Commissioner. As American citizens they would not ask for and would not want special favors now at the hands of the Government. The attempt to claim that such a rule would increase their productive capacity is to question their all-out effort at their jobs now and to question their patriotism.

What will the soldiers in the Southwest Pacific and in northern Africa, who are fighting and dying for \$60 per month, think of such a policy if they read about it on the battle fronts. Does the Government offer any vacations to them, any incentive payments for extra effort in their fight for democracy? What will the fathers and mothers of these sons think of this last suggestion of the Manpower Commissioner? Will such a suggestion tend to increase the morale of the men who are doing the fighting or of the fathers and mothers who are fighting on the home front in the battle of production and in buying bonds?

Commissioner McNutt has recently asked for and has been given tremendous power over the laboring men and women of America. He goes on the radio and threatens men of certain ages with earlier induction into the Army unless they hurry to a wartime job essential to the winning of the war. He spreads confusion. Now, he comes back holding out the "cookie jar of incentives," in vacations and extra pay to the highest paid laboring men in the Nation.

We shall never get a sane, cooperative, coordinated, effective concentration of manpower production with such a senseless vacillating policy. Some sane, well thought out, understandable, manpower policy should have been given to the Nation over a year ago. Someone should be found who can discharge the duties of Manpower Commissioner with such a policy now even though it is fearfully late.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the House that I have a bill that is in the process of being drafted, which I think will help solve this farm-labor problem, if I can ever get it out of the committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, this Resolution 96 is typical of proposals emanating from agricultural wonderland. It is an insult to the intelligence of every Member of the House to highjack the taxpayers for \$26,000,000 for a program to further confuse, conflict, and muddy up the waters now badly muddled by the

crackpot theorists who have the agricultural program in a bad mess from their social reforms. Let the farmer alone. Take the handcuffs off of him; remove the shackles; give him the necessary farm equipment, a fair price for his products, and he will produce the food to win this war. This resolution should be defeated, unless properly amended, and every man who votes for it ought to be ashamed to look into the face of the farmers of his district. It is time to call a halt to non-essential spending. This bill is just another step in the blueprint of social reform, which the bureaucrats are trying to force down the throats of the American people under the guise of the necessary war effort. It should not alone be voted down, but should be returned to the Department of Agriculture with a severe rebuke for attempting to reintroduce schemes and plans that have already proven unsound. It is about time that the Congress discontinue being a rubber stamp for these impractical, visionary dreamers, that have been sabotaging the agricultural life of the Nation. Let us return this Nation back to common sense and forget these half-baked formulas such as the one transporting workers from one State to another. Where are you going to get the workers to transport and house? And in the bill is \$13,500,000 for this item. The only appropriation that should be considered here today is one to provide necessary funds to carry on the work of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the Third District of California, which I represent, raises 28 major agricultural crops. Many of them rely on itinerant labor. This labor is required to plant, cultivate, and harvest the crops.

Last year there was an acute shortage of labor in this area. After much delay Mexican labor was permitted to come into California and they did give some relief in the acute labor shortage in which California found itself.

Consequently we are interested in the passage of House Joint Resolution 96, which provides for the importation of Mexican labor. We are also interested in another provision of that resolution. That is the provision for direction of the labor program by the Extension Division of the United States Department of Agriculture and the extension service of the University of California.

For over half a century the extension service has worked with and among the farmers. They know their needs. The representatives of these services are usually practical agriculturists and have an intimate personal knowledge of the farmers' problems. Under their direction the money appropriated by this bill will be well spent and will produce maximum results.

We most earnestly hope that the resolution will be adopted in its original form.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the press of last week carried an announcement from Secretary Wickard that he was about to send a mission to London, England, to learn how the people of Great Britain are able to subsist on half rations. Now, the situation we have in this country is an accumulation of blundering, and working at cross purposes.

I want to talk to you a little while about the facts that are within my own personal knowledge and observation. The agricultural experts of the University of Tennessee have conducted a State-wide survey of the food situation in Tennessee. They report that with normal weather this year our food production will be from 15 to 25 percent less than what it was last year. That is due to taking the boys from the farms who ought to have been left there by draft boards that had no discretion and by siphoning off farm labor into industry at \$8 or \$10 a day wages with which the farmer cannot compete.

In addition to that, in our program of last year the War Department took over 56,000 acres of farm land in two counties in my district. I sent telegrams to the President, and the Vice President because I felt perhaps he could take time off from throwing boomerangs and blowing bubbles and do something about it. I wired Mr. Wickard and the Secretary of War and told them they were getting ready to dispossess 1,000 farm families from 56,000 acres of farm land, and to this good day more than 500 of those families are wanderers on the face of the earth without a dollar from the Government with which to buy other farms. That is what is going on.

Last week I got a letter from one of the more prominent farmers in my district saying he had been trying for 2 weeks to get two tires for the front wheels of his tractor. He finally got them, but if it had been cromptime he might have lost the entire crop. You cannot stop the processes of the seasons; you cannot turn back the hands of the clock for growing crops. It is time to put the seeds in the ground now and I think it would be well for the War Department to bring back the boys, who were taken from the farms, and who are still in this country, and put them to work.

Every farm in this country is a battlefield, and every farmer, his wife and children are soldiers in this army which will win this war if and when we win it.

I look upon our food supply as a river system. If you dry up the springs, the branches, the creeks, and the tributary streams you dry up the river itself. We do not get all our beef cattle from the West; many of them come from farms, in some instances only 1 steer from a farm, and from that on up to 10, 15, 20, or even 50. If we are to win this war we

must win it on the farm as well as on the battlefield. If you are going to raise food it must be raised on the farm; it cannot be done on the floor of the House or in a committee.

I do not know what this bill will do; I seriously doubt whether it will do any good at all, and sometimes I wonder if it may not do more harm than good, but it is a belated effort to correct a situation that should have been tackled long ago; it is the result of muddling, bungling, and stumbling.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, as I walked down the aisle I passed my colleague the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN. He said to me: "Here goes the city farmer."

Mr. HOFFMAN. I said: "My city farmer."

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; I am Clare's city farmer.

It is very difficult for me to rise today on the floor of the House and oppose a bill brought in by the deficiency subcommittee, of which I am a member, because I have a high admiration for the chairman of the committee and for every member of it, but this is a forum of debate and a place for differences of opinion. I may say also that the size of the official record would be slim if it depended upon the number of times I have taken the floor to speak; but today I wish to be heard.

This bill measures food by a money yardstick. Do not fool yourselves; it is the hottest potato that has ever been placed in a political lap, and you are going to carry it if you pass this resolution, you are going to accept something that the farm groups could not agree on when they were before the committee—and they are sitting in the galleries today. To repeat, I say again you are going to accept the hottest potato that has ever been placed in a political lap, and you are going to take the responsibility if you pass this resolution. This resolution is for the production of food by manpower, food, food for the Army, food for the Navy, food for our allies, food for the boys that carry our allied guns produced here in America, food for the folks at home, and some food produced will find its resting place on the bottom of the sea.

Mr. Chairman, do not be misled, this is a dangerous bill, dangerous because it involves the food problem. Some regard it lightly and are raising a political flag today, waving it above the Stars and Strips, the Stars and Stripes in jeopardy. Some only hoist their State flag above those Stars and Stripes; some would hoist that flag because they are playing around with one of the farm groups but I tell you I will hoist the flag of relief to the homes of America. This bill is one you had better consider. Personally I would place the responsibility with the Secretary of Agriculture and appropriate the amount requested.

Why not follow General Marshall? What did General Marshall say? He paraphrased Napoleon's remarks that were so ably quoted by our chairman: "An army travels on its belly"; but General Marshall says "food is as essential as powder." What good are your boys in Africa without food? What good are your sailors on the ships without food? What good are your tanks or all your glorious armament, against the production of which not a man in this House raised his voice save one and he changed it since that time—what good are they without food to support the men who must use them? Yes; we have millions for armaments. In our own committee we were told: Do not question the size of appropriations for armament. Who are we to question them? I ask you who are we to question the Agriculture Department? The Nation to date has appropriated \$120,000,000 to ration food yet we debate the paltry sum of \$26,100,000 to help produce it.

Do not cut the cloth of this necessary activity to fit a program originally set at a figure of \$65,000,000 to the humble size of the appropriation proposed. My warning is, give the Secretary of Agriculture the green light for the maximum production of food. Remember crops are seasonal. Time and tide wait for no man, not even the farmer or the Congress of the United States.

But there are those in Europe who are waiting, oldsters, enfeebled, hoping the long winter will pass; women, exhausted, longing; children, emaciated, wondering; will the spring days come to find them on their knees planting and praying? Let us consider it seriously. Those scenes could come to us.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK].

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not represent a farming district, but I am a Representative from one of the largest consuming communities in this country. The city of New York. I am here today speaking for the people of my district and the country as a whole to tell you frankly that I am worried when I hear the reports being spread around concerning the shortage of food.

The shortage of food, as I understand it, is due to the shortage of farm labor which this bill is supposed to remedy. We need food. Every man, woman, and child in this country needs food. Our soldiers and sailors need it. Our allies need it.

The original request from the Department of Agriculture was for \$65,075,000. The bill before us now only provides for \$26,000,000. In my opinion this amount is not sufficient to do a good job. In the first proposal, there were provisions for certain housing facilities and transportation to which I feel the workers are entitled. However, none of these provisions are in the present bill. I feel they are most necessary, if we expect to get the proper kind of farm labor.

I say to you members of the committee, this is a serious question. Congress must do something to restore the confidence of the people so they will be

assured of a sufficient supply of food. The amount of money involved is very small as compared to the need to improve the farm-labor shortage.

The Department of Agriculture asked that the experienced and trained personnel of the Farm Security Administration be allowed to handle most of this work; not the Extension Service. I agree with their recommendation. If they are permitted to handle it, I am sure the farm workers will be much better satisfied.

In conclusion, I hope the Members of the House will vote down the present resolution, unless it is amended, so as to give to the Agriculture Department sufficient money to try and cure this labor shortage.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman tell me what States have a surplus of labor now, the manpower that we could get the labor from?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the question involved in this appropriation. It is to furnish sufficient money for the Agricultural Administration to find out where it can get the labor and bring it to the farm.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thought it took about 20 years to produce a farm laborer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, I am for the bill as written and will oppose any amendments that will be offered.

This bill is an attempt to lay the foundation for a successful program on the wreck of what has been done up to date. We do not guarantee that the proposed plan will work but if it does not then none will. If by trial it is found that a solution has been offered by this plan, then the necessary additional funds will be made available to carry the experiment to its successful conclusion.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, in listening to the remarks made by different Members who have spoken on this bill I am led to believe that it is a glorified W. P. A. bill for the big cities and a Mexican labor bill for California. It does not seem anybody else is very much excited about it. Certainly we folks from the Middle West are not overly concerned about the bill because we have made up our own minds out there that this is a job which will have to be handled by the States or it will not be handled at all.

On yesterday in Des Moines, Iowa, Governor Hickenlooper of Iowa called seven other Governors together and they talked about this problem. Here are some of the things the Governors of eight States and high ranking officials of

four other States decided on after a day-long conference:

Drafting a series of recommendations that among other things would recognize agriculture as an essential war industry; release at once all present stocks of farm machinery now in the hands of dealers or distributors and provide enough materials for completion of other units not now finished; grant selective-service deferment for all experienced labor essential to farm production and terminate the present unsatisfactory system of allocation of such farm machinery which sends machinery where it is not adapted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does not the gentleman think it would be better for those States that are not so fortunate in perhaps having the labor within it to take care of the agricultural necessities to get that labor from some source without going into the gentleman's State and disturbing the balance of manpower that may exist there?

Mr. JENSEN. If this bill is made law, Mr. McNutt and Mr. Hershey will say to the draft boards in the State of Iowa, the gentleman's State and every State in the Union: "You can go ahead and take these experienced farmers because we are going to bring some fellows in from the cities and from Mexico, from Puerto Rico and other places to take their place; so you do not have to worry any more, just go ahead and draft these farmers."

We know the folks who come from the cities are not much good on the farms. You cannot teach them in 1 or 2 years to be an expert and it does take experts on the farm these days or you do not last long as a farmer.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman stated there were seven Governors present beside your Governor?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman have the number of points they approved in this resolution?

Mr. JENSEN. I just got this from a District of Columbia paper today. I listened in on the radio last night, but the reception was not very good.

Mr. STEFAN. The Governor of Nebraska was there, I believe?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; he was there.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly would be for this bill if I thought it would do a bit of good. But I think it is going to be a detriment. We cannot solve the farm-labor problems with this kind of a program. Remember that even though it is in the hands of the Extension Service, which is a wonderful organization, it will be guided from bureaucratic Washington. They will have their reins on this bill and they will do just about as they please. The Extension Service and the county agents are going to have to abide by what they tell them to do. So I do not expect this bill to do any good. If I thought it would I certainly would vote for it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the first objection to this resolution of the gentleman from Missouri is that the Agricultural Extension Service itself does not feel equipped by experience or training to undertake the over-all task respecting agricultural labor which is called for in this resolution. I have here a letter from Murray Lincoln, the executive secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, in which he states this position clearly. The letter is as follows:

We understand that the House Committee on Appropriations is going to recommend the allocation of certain funds to the Extension Services of our land grant colleges, in order that the matter of recruiting, placing, and housing farm labor may be turned over to this agency.

Here in the State of Ohio we have set up a voluntary committee in which are represented the Ohio State Grange, the Ohio Farm Bureau, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Farm Security Administration, the War Manpower Commission, Ohio Extension Service, and the Ohio Department of Education. This group has worked out a fine relationship in order to develop a food production program for the State. The matter of handling labor has been divided amongst the different agencies. It would seriously hamper our war effort if this arrangement is disrupted, and further, our extension service does not want to assume this responsibility.

We feel that you should know the American Farm Bureau does not represent the Ohio Farm Bureau, in its advocacy that this whole question of labor be put in the hands of Extension Service.

We respectfully urge that you contact the Members of the House Appropriations Committee you know, and present these facts to them.

From other sources I learn that Extension Service State chiefs are in general quite definitely opposed to the national program of recruiting, training, transportation, and placement being thrust upon them. They are ready to help within each State and have so signified, but in the interest of efficiency in operating the program they think it should be in the hands nationally of those better qualified to handle it.

Of fundamental importance is the resolution's abrogation of an agreement with the Mexican Government on farm labor. This is a serious step and one which the Members of this House should not agree to without a complete understanding of its meaning. Once they have that understanding, I do not believe they would agree to the resolution. Under the terms of the agreement now existing between the United States and Mexico, our neighbor to the south undertakes to recruit and see that transportation to the United States line is provided for Mexican agricultural workers as certification for their need in this country is shown to the Mexican authorities. Under the terms of the agreement, a minimum wage of 30 cents an hour is provided, the barest sort of shelter and health requirements, and the guaranty of payment for 75 percent of the time the Mexicans are on the scene to which they

have been assigned for work, whether or not they are actually given work to occupy their full time.

Several thousand Mexicans have been brought to this country—primarily to California—under the terms of the agreement. The Farm Security Administration was asked by the Mexican Government, by the Manpower Commission, and by the Secretary of Agriculture to handle the importation of farm workers. It did not seek the job. The job was thrust upon it. The same is true of the handling of the recruitment and transportation of domestic farm workers, which this agency has carried on in conjunction with the War Manpower Commission.

Though there have been some unsatisfactory occurrences in the operation of this Mexican program—as there are bound to be in the operation of any new program—the Mexican Government has, in general, found it to be very satisfactory. It is certain that the Mexican Government will not enter into another agreement lowering or removing the standards set in the present agreement, as the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri indicates will be the procedure. In fact, the Mexican Government cannot fail to regard this resolution as a threat to the minimum standards provided in the current agreement and a threat, with its proviso that the new agreement must be negotiated within 30 days, phrased so as almost to be insulting. This resolution, in short, will definitely work against good neighborliness in a period of food-production crisis in which we need good neighborliness more than ever.

The resolution is aimed to provide the cheapest possible labor for the big corporate farmer. It flies in the face of economic facts and is the worst possible way to attempt a farm-labor-stabilization program—unless the author of the resolution wants us to embark upon a type of farm operation in which we keep farm workers in the fields at the point of the bayonet. The family type and smaller farmers—upon whom we must count for the major part of any expansion in food production—see that if they are to survive the big corporate farmer should be made to pay decent wages to his farm workers. It is in large part because of the cheap labor he has had at his disposal that the corporate farmer has extended his holdings so much at the expense of the family farmer who employs only his own and his family's labor.

The discrimination against the Farm Security Administration—the one agency of government which has had some experience in this field—which is provided in the resolution is a classical example of the success of the smear technique. I am satisfied that the charges against the Farm Security Administration are most of them wild and unfounded. I think elimination of Farm Security from this picture is short-sighted and disastrous. The people of that organization are the only ones who have dealt with this problem—through their labor camps and otherwise—over a considerable period.

They know how to handle farm workers in this food-production crisis.

The National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, and the National Council of Farm Cooperatives do not think the Extension Service should handle this farm labor problem. Neither does the National Farmers Union. Nor does M. L. Wilson, the Director of the Extension Service. I hope the resolution is defeated and that the amount of money asked for originally by the Secretary of Agriculture to do the job is restored.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, my good farmer friend from the city of Detroit [Mr. RABAUT] and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK], who said we are going to be short of food unless this bill goes through, forget that the appropriation of money does not produce food. You have to plant the seed and take care of the crop and harvest it before you have food, and that cannot be done unless you have competent farmers.

I recall, too, very distinctly that when we grew some food over on the western side of Michigan that we wanted to take down to Detroit they would not let us in there until we paid the union \$25 for the exercise of our right to deliver that food to the hungry people of Detroit. We do not care very much if some of those union racketeers do get hungry.

The farmer needs relief all right, but he is not going to get it this way. What they should have done before and what we should do now is let the man who is on the farm, who knows how to farm, stay there, or if he has been taken into the Army, put him back on the farm.

FOREIGNERS MOVE IN AS FARM BOYS LEAVE TO FIGHT

Alive at last to the fact that not only will the people of these United States go hungry but that we will be unable to supply our own fighting men and the armies of our allies with the food needed to enable them to carry on the war, the administration now seeks to take belated action to prevent this major disaster. For months it has been obvious that the administration's policy of enticing expert farm workers into defense plants by means of high wages, added to the drafting of farm boys for armed service, would necessarily create a food shortage.

The dumbest bureaucrat must have known, if he paused to think, that a food shortage would destroy the foundation upon which our war effort is based. Nevertheless, after stripping the farms of the expert workers, the administration continued to deny to the American farmers the farm machinery needed to supplement the work of the few who remained.

Now it comes in with a joint resolution providing for an appropriation of some \$26,000,000 to be used to pay the expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and placement of workers needed for

the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States).

The net result of the administration's policy is that the farm boys of America are to be drafted for fighting on some fifty-odd fronts through the world while unskilled workers from cities—yes; and from foreign countries—are to be recruited, trained, and transported to the home jobs made open by the drafting of the farm boys. Labor camps are to be erected, other necessary housing and shelter facilities are to be made available or acquired for the use of these workers.

To take the place of the expert farm worker who has been sent to fight on foreign soil the farmers' tax money and the tax money of other citizens is to be used, among other purposes, to bring in a laborer from a foreign country, who, after training, will be expected to do the work which the farmer's son would have done had he remained at home.

The average American citizen of sound judgment and good sense would have adopted the policy of retaining upon the farms those familiar with farming conditions, with the manner and the methods of good farming, and of supplying the farmers with equipment necessary to increase production.

Unfortunately, here again instead of doing the simple, the obvious thing of using the men available for the performance of the job for which they were most familiar, giving them adequate farm machinery, this administration takes them from the farm and substitutes in their place a man from the city who has to be transported, trained, and housed at public expense, or worse yet, takes a worker from a foreign country, brings him to America, at public expense, and places him in the farm boy's home.

To me such a policy does not make good sense and does not tend to create unity.

I suggest you let the farm workers stay on or return to the farms and forget this idea that you can pick up some fellow from some other country or from the city and overnight make him into a farmer. It cannot be done, as you will discover.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. The racketeers will charge me \$10.20 instead of \$9.41 for driving a truckload of food into the city of New York. I do not yield for any raise in the price that goes to the labor racketeers for tribute so that I may put food into the city.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman made a misstatement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When your people get hungry enough they will open the gates of the city and let the farmers come in with the food they have. Then you will not be hungry any longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to make clear that I do not think that the present resolution under discussion will more than scratch the surface of the farm labor problem; nevertheless I do think it is a step in that direction and because of that shall vote for the resolution.

It is, however, my sincere conviction that legislation of this nature, while perhaps helpful in some small degree, can never do what we must have done if we are to solve the farm labor problem to any successful degree.

In every mail there comes to me letters from farmers of my district, pleading for help that I cannot give to them toward aiding in the deferment or the discharge from the service of their sons who have been their mainstays upon the farms and are absolutely essential to the successful operation of that particular farm.

As I stated to begin with, this proposed legislation offered today merely scratches the surface. In my opinion, ladies and gentlemen, if we are to do any good for America and agriculture today, and by so doing do good for our war effort, we must demand that agriculture be treated as an essential war industry and give it such rating.

We must give to agriculture immediately sufficient tools with which to work and not leave it to any bureaucrat to determine the percentage of steel that can be allocated for the production of any farm machinery, without which food cannot be produced. We must furnish to agriculture in some way sufficient labor to get the job done. How are we going to furnish agriculture with that labor? Two weeks ago I asserted on the floor of the House, and proved my assertions to be the fact, that we have 3,000,000 men and women on the civil-service rolls, men and women drawing more total salary today than all of the total members of the armed forces of America. I suggested at that time that 1 out of every 6 of those 3,000,000 people be eradicated from the civil-service rolls and that this could be done without harming the war effort in the least. I suggested then that this prospective 500,000 men could then go into the Army and war plants and replace an equal number of farm-trained men who have been mistakenly inducted into the service, men who should never have left the farms but should have remained there to produce the food we must have unless our victory in this war be imperiled.

Last September 23, on the floor of this House, I made this statement:

Have you momentarily paused and thought of what may come to our beloved Nation in a few years' time if too much farm labor is stripped from the farms, if experienced farmers continue to be taken in the draft, if dairy cows and brood sows go to the slaughter pens rather than to remain on the farms to further our production? We have plenty of food today. How about tomorrow?

Mr. Chairman, tomorrow is here with us as we are debating this question.

In that same speech on September 23 I raised the issue of the tremendous

number of auction sales that were taking place at the time in my congressional district. I further stated in that particular speech:

How can the farmer ever compete for labor nowadays if he cannot obtain sufficient for his products to justify the wages farm labor demands?

I would further like to quote at this time, Mr. Chairman, from a letter received from a former Congressman from the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota, dated March 12, 1943. The Honorable Frank Clague writes:

I am taking the liberty of writing you this letter to give you first-hand views of the farm labor situation in our county, and I think the same will apply to every county in your district. All our draft boards prior to November 1 were compelled to take a good many men from the farms, particularly the sons of farmers who should have been left on the farm. Since November 1 the papers have been full of statements that many of the farm boys who were badly needed at home would be returned to work on their father's farms or the farmers who needed help, provided a proper showing could be made. I have made out a good many applications for farmers for the purpose of getting boys released, but I find that it is practically impossible to get any releases for boys who are now in the service, excepting for those who are now over 38 years of age. Our farm labor situation is very critical. It is just next to impossible to find a man who is now willing to work on the farm. Plants that are manufacturing airplanes, ships, and other supplies for the Government are paying so much higher wages than farmers are able to pay and for very short hours that practically no farm help can now be secured. Most of our farmers carry on mixed farming. Over 50 percent of our farmers have a good many cows and hogs and are feeding much livestock. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to work more than 10 hours a day and to find a man who is willing to work on a farm is next to impossible.

I want to give you a couple of illustrations. Joe Guetter, one of our most successful farmers in Redwood County, who carries on a farm of about 800 acres near Wabasso in our county, all land being owned by himself, who has 30 milk cows, 200 to 300 hogs, also feeds a number of feeders, has 2 tractors, threshing machine, raises 125 acres of corn each year, probably this year will have 100 acres of flax; he is about 70 years of age, has 2 boys at home, one 16 years of age and one 18 years of age. The 18-year-old boy is in poor health and unable to do very much work. He had a son who was nearly 31 years of age who was taken in the October call from our county and is now located at Camp Adair, Oreg. This son, who is now in the Army, was the mainstay on his father's farm. I know him well. He is a wonderful farmer. He is a first-class mechanic. He thoroughly understands the handling and caring for farm machinery. He knows how to run a threshing machine and do all the repair work on the same.

Along in January I made out for Mr. Guetter several affidavits and got a statement from the chairman of the draft board of Redwood County that he is in great need of the return of this son on his farm for the reason that he cannot get other help. The father has probably driven 150 to 200 miles looking for a good man. The Government agency at Redwood Falls cannot find him a man. Our county agent has tried, but on February 8 we received the letter from the personnel officer of the company in which his son is in stating that it is impossible to discharge the son Anthony,

and in the last paragraph of the letter (you will note) it says, "Contact your county agent." Our county agent is working just as hard as I am to find men who are able and willing to work on the farm but they cannot be found.

I have many similar cases to this, but we are unable to get any releases. The Government is asking all farmers to produce more, to keep more cows, to raise more chickens and hogs and fat cattle, but we can't get the men to take care of them, and unless Mr. Guetter can secure the release of his son it will simply mean that he has got to dispose of most of his cows and hogs and cut down his farming. If he cuts down his farming it is impossible to get his land farmed because no adjoining owners can take on more land to farm.

I had a farmer in yesterday afternoon who is also one of our best farmers, who carries on 320 acres, has for several years had 30 cows and now has 30 milk cows on his farm. Twenty-four of these cows are being milked now, and all 30 will be milked after June 1 during the summer. He is one of the best farmers in the county, and he has tried everywhere to find farm help. Last June the draft board took his man who had been with him for 3 years, but we have been unable to get him released and got our letter from the officer in charge saying, "Get school boys and other help." Other help cannot be found who will do dairy work. I do not know whether there is anything that you and the other Members of Congress in Minnesota can do to get some of these boys released to return to their homes to help us produce these needed crops, but if we can't get some of them returned many of our cows will have to go to the slaughter houses and much less crops can be raised. It is almost impossible for farmers to get extras for a machine if it breaks down and with green help it is almost impossible to get the machinery fixed.

I saw a letter from a farmer's son who is now at a camp in the Army in the United States who stated that he will be glad to come home and made the statement that he is not working over an hour a day in the camp where he is located. If we are going to feed the Army and feed our people we have got to have help on our farms. You are a practical farmer and know that a good farm hand who is able to care for stock has to have some experience and that one good man on a farm is worth three or four poor ones.

Kindly give this matter your consideration.

Best wishes,

Yours truly,

FRANK CLAGUE.

Let me also read you extracts from a letter written to me just a few days ago by a gentleman in my congressional district. He states, among other things:

I am 79 years old and unable to do farm work. My wife is 61 years old and not feeling well. There is no farm help to be obtained for steady employment. The only help obtainable are floaters and are not dependable.

My son, who was inducted into the Army last April a year ago, or about a year ago, was at that time renting from me 240 acres of land. He had farmed this 240 acres for two seasons and when he was inducted he was married and also the owner of a full line of farm machinery, most of which was power machinery. He also owned 19 head of cattle, 12 milk cows, some young stock, 6 brood sows, and some chickens. His two brothers, who farm adjoining farms of 160 acres each, have tried to help take care of the stock of their brother who is in the service.

It has come to the point now where this brother's livestock must be sold and also considerable part of the livestock of his two

brothers who cannot secure sufficient help to farm with. This son of mine is 27 years of age and married, is a very efficient and reliable farmer, and is urgently needed at home to operate the 240-acre farm, and in my opinion can do more for his country on that particular farm at this time than he can in the armed forces.

Mr. Chairman, spending \$26,000,000 upon this problem may scratch the surface but it will not do the job. It will not bring to the farms these men who know how to farm, who know what it is to get up at 4:30 in the morning and work until 9 o'clock at night before they can call it a day. This bill will not solve the problem of the Nation as far as the food situation is concerned.

We in the United States of America must decide here in Congress whether the production of food is essential to victory. If that production of food is decided to be essential to victory, then let us treat the farmer just as we treat the defense plants by giving him machinery that he needs to work with and the labor that he must have to produce this food. Otherwise, victory will not come for many a year.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I address myself particularly at this time to the effort made by my respected friend the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] and my respected friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], by which they would substitute for the present bill the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture. I was much interested in hearing the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky express amazement that the Secretary of Agriculture should be charged with incompetency. He expressed amazement over that. I thought that was such a generally well recognized fact that everybody knew it, and to say that it provoked amazement to me is indeed startling.

Our issue today is simply this: Do we want to use a reasonable, practical method such as that suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], or do we want to approve a social-reform measure such as the Secretary of Agriculture proposed. Boiled down, that is just what it amounts to. The Secretary of Agriculture came before the committee and urged a plan which had every possible social reform incorporated in it. One of my distinguished friends on the majority side facetiously probably, but nevertheless pointedly, asked the Secretary of Agriculture, as he scanned all the social requirements included in his proposal, whether the Secretary had not forgotten to provide pink pajamas for the farm workers that were brought onto the farm. That probably, better than anything else, characterizes the Wickard proposal. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], on the other hand recognizing the need persuaded, mark you, persuades the majority that his proposal was better than that provided by the Secretary of Agri-

culture. That is no small job. Any man on the minority side who can put together a practical proposition that has sufficient merit in it to persuade the majority to accept his proposition in lieu of that of the Secretary of Agriculture must have put something of great merit in it.

The thing that impresses me is that the only Members on the majority side whom I have heard contending for the position of the Secretary of Agriculture were two gentlemen. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] charges that we are pulling down the flag and putting up some State emblem in its stead. I must confess that is imagination carried to a great degree. That was his argument against the Dirksen proposal. It is neither persuasive nor convincing.

Mr. Chairman, I have always firmly believed that nature was more dependable than the New Deal in providing food for the American people. I have always vigorously rejected the notion that any man, even an indispensable one, could plan better than the providence of God. I have always earnestly prayed, "Give us this day our daily bread." I confess, Mr. Chairman, these tenets are a part of a very plain, a very simple, a very homely faith. They may not appeal to some men. But to me, they have been sustaining, especially sustaining when subjected to the white heat of experience. And, I should add, they have been more than confirmed as contradictory experiments have proved to be both delusive and disastrous.

Were I tempted, Mr. Chairman, to entertain any doubt of the value of this faith, that temptation was swept away by the helplessness of Mr. Wickard and his staff of specialists in the face of a real and not a fanciful problem. I fail to find anything other than helplessness in the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture which was intended to meet the pressing needs of the farmer today. What has become of the blueprints of the planners? Only a short time ago we heard much of an ever-normal granary, and yet today that ever-normal granary threatens to be as bare as the cupboard of Mother Hubbard herself. Is there an excuse for the dire conditions which we face as the prospect of food shortages are admitted by the Secretary?

Here we are at the planting season with nothing at hand to give any hope of how the farms are to be manned other than an impractical, and certainly imperfected, proposal of the Secretary which every farm organization has rejected. What excuse can there be for such delay, for the failure to find a workable solution for the problem? I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the agricultural planners, of and from whom we have heard so much, and for whom we have paid so generously out of the Public Treasury, offer us nothing other than an utter helplessness in our time of need.

For more than 10 years, Mr. Wickard and his predecessor have had a field day with the farms of America. It has not been an amateur affair. Far from it. It has been highly professional, with

an imposing array of impressive titles and impressive salaries. Their promises were fulsome. We were led to believe that what nature failed to do they would do, what the farmer did not know how to do, they could do. Every conceivable economic experiment that the mind of a man might turn to was literally foisted on the farmer by a band of star-gazing theorists. Regulation was piled on regulation until the state of our farmers was not altogether unlike a sovietized fellow traveler. Our harvests no longer were to depend on the providences of God and the energy of the men and women on the farm, but on the deductions of mathematically minded manipulators. Nor was the rigidity of these deductions relaxed when the grim specter of famine stalked hideously across the gory and blood-drenched fields of Europe. With the hungry of the world crying piteously for bread, the American farmer was penalized if he planted more wheat than the mathematicians had hit upon as his portion of supplying a dire world need.

As I reflect upon these policies and as I contemplate our present plight, I fail to find the security which was promised in exchange for our liberty. Have I overstated the facts? I submit, Mr. Chairman, these are not my deductions. I acknowledge they are faulty in one respect—they may not be sufficiently graphic and complete to give the entire detail of the ineptitude of the Department of Agriculture to solve in a practical and common-sense way the problems of the American farmer. But what is lacking in description is more than made up for by the accuracy of the facts. One thing is certain. After all its delving into theories and its experimental drivel, the Department of Agriculture tells the American people that it has only an impractical, an unwieldy and costly proposal with which to ward off hunger.

I find one striking similarity, Mr. Chairman, in the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture with what I believe to be a basic and general mistake of the administration now in power. That mistake is the false notion that spending money is the only way to solve every problem with which we may be confronted—that anything can be accomplished by drugging and debauching with gratuities and subsidies—if only the excesses of a Treasury orgy are made attractive. That notion has become so fixed and general that we appear to place very little dependence on the resourcefulness and on the ruggedness of a free people to grapple with perplexing problems. Make an appropriation, has become the cure-all for our ills. The popularity of such a policy is beyond question. A lavish spender of money, whether it be his own or that of others, always finds a ready company of companions. But the popularity of the policy provides no proof of its soundness. Measured in terms of results, so far as the operations of the Department of Agriculture are concerned, I believe the American people will find little nutritive value at this time in the mistaken notion. I confess, Mr. Chairman, I have

fixed convictions on this phase of our present problem and of many other problems as well. I contend we must recur to first principles, to basic and simple truths—truths which may not at the moment be popular, but which time will prove to be substantial. If we are to do this, we must change our policy, we must evaluate proposals not on the basis of how much can be spent on them, but on the basis of what they can accomplish at a time when every nerve and fiber of our being is strained and tense.

As I reflect upon the course followed by the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the food supply for our people, I cannot dismiss from my mind the unexplainable delay on his part in approaching the problem. It would be manifestly unfair, however, to place the whole blame for this delay on his shoulders. Others share it with him. It goes beyond one department or agency of the Government. The fault lies in the failure of the administration now in power to take into proper account all factors involved in the prosecution of the war and to fit these factors together into a composite whole. One department pursues one course. Another department follows the opposite tack. One agency makes one ruling. Some other agency contradicts it. Directives from this, that, and another official are as plentiful as the quills upon a fretful porcupine. With these conditions prevailing it is no wonder that we find ourselves at the planting season, faced as we are with a necessitous demand for increased farm production, with no practical program with which to assure our people that their needs will or can be supplied. The responsibility of leadership entails more than the projection of plans. It carries with it the willingness to make decisions, no matter how unpopular they may be, and the courage to put these decisions into execution.

I find encouragement, Mr. Chairman, in one thing, as I reflect further upon the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture, and that is the attitude of men of both political parties toward it. The Secretary failed to convince either Democrats or Republicans that his proposal had merit. Its faults were so glaring and its worthlessness so obvious that even administration defenders shied away from it. Certainly no better grounds could be found for its complete rejection, and for the criticism which has been directed against it, than the unwillingness of men who usually support administration policies to defend it wholeheartedly. And certainly no fairer appraisal of the failure of the administration now in power to meet our farm needs could be made than that which has been made of the Secretary's proposal by outstanding Democrats.

We have been told that this plan of the Secretary's should be adopted, despite its acknowledged impracticality, simply because of the place which the Secretary occupies in the Cabinet, and the approval which has been given to the plan by the President. It has been suggested that the responsibility will be on our shoulders if our people fail to find food. I cannot subscribe to such sugges-

tions. I refuse to be cowed by the threat of reprisals. Ours is a responsibility, and we would indeed be lacking in courage were we to implement an unworkable program by the appropriation of funds simply because of our fear of what the future holds in store. I am of the opinion that our responsibility goes much deeper than the closing of our eyes to the weakness of a proposal simply because it may have Executive endorsement.

Such a course would mean that we lent our aid to the raising of false hopes and contributed the bitter disappointment of a disillusionment which we have every reason to believe would follow were we to accept the plan offered by the Secretary. If hunger comes, the fault will lie in one place. And it is not in the Congress.

The committee of which I am a member has discarded the Secretary's plan and has reduced very materially the amount of money requested by him. We have frowned upon the emphasis which he placed on the social objectives in his plan. We want our farmers to farm—not to found a fairyland. We have rejected the need for an army of supervisors and administrators such as the Secretary sought. We have availed ourselves of existing agencies rather than creating a new one, and have used the agencies nearer at home rather than one here in Washington. We have disapproved the glorified excursions of prospective farm hands and their families, such as were contemplated by the Secretary. In a word, we have rejected the visionary scheme of the Secretary and substituted for it a practical and workable program which we believe will be of assistance to the farmers of America as they are called upon to furnish the food for our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, a vote for this measure—House Joint Resolution 96—is, in my opinion, a vote for hunger and starvation, a vote to handicap our food production by paralyzing the United States Department of Agriculture in its efforts to mobilize and transport farm labor in considerable numbers from one part of the country to another as needs arise. It is true that the measure appears to have the support of one large farm organization, but that support is based upon a bitter hatred of any and all labor standards, either in agriculture or in industry. Spokesmen for this organization will fight to the last ditch to keep agriculture immune from all labor standards, however low they may be, to keep farm labor exempt from such standards and their enforcement, unprotected against the power of commercialized agriculture to dictate wages, hours, living conditions, sanitary facilities—yes, and even whether he shall have a well to drink from or must drink from the ditches. This has been their historic position. Any move to extend to farm labor the minimum protections given to industrial la-

bor has been defeated in peacetime with the excuse that such legislation was not "practical," that farm prices were so low that farmers could not afford to compete with industry in the payment of decent minimum wages; that, anyway, it was unnecessary because each and every hired hand on every farm in America was practically a member of the family and was treated like a favorite son.

Commercialized agriculture in those peace years dug its own pit, and now in these war years it has fallen into that pit itself. Farm labor, wages and working and living conditions have been so low that, as the great and distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin said a few months ago in introducing bills for economic emancipation of farm labor, these oppressed men escaped from the farms at the first opportunity to industry or the armed services.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that there is poetic justice in the dismal science of economics. If agriculture had raised its wages and labor standards along with industry, there might not have been an exodus from the fields to the factories at the first opportunity. Agriculture would have had its house in order and, if it be true, which I do not admit, that big farmers could not afford to pay higher wages out of prices received, their position would have been adjusted at the same time.

What has happened here in agriculture is, in a small way, what has happened in the international field. If we had not preferred to buy all our rubber from organizations basing their operations on the lowest sweated labor standards of the Far East, rubber sources might have been developed in South America and even within the borders of our own country. Or let us put it in another way: If the great rubber cartels had paid decent wages to their labor in the Far East, that labor would have had something to fight for at the side of the United Nations. That labor would have been more likely to stay loyal to a social, political, and economic order which had recognized them as human beings, more than work units; they would not have been so ready to steal off to the jungle to show the Japanese the shortest paths for invasion.

I say that whether commercialized agriculture wants it or not, the national interest requires that an adequate farm labor force be recruited, mobilized, and transported wherever needed by experienced agencies within the Department of Agriculture. It is important that this be done. The men who are asked to join this force will have to be assured by the Government that when they leave their places of abode to travel hundreds of miles they will be paid at least a definite minimum wage, that they will be furnished with housing for themselves and their families to the extent of a room at least 12 by 14 feet, that they will have one privy for every 25 persons, and that they will have pure drinking water. These are the standards which the supporters of this resolution wish to characterize as "social revolution under the guise of war." I want to know what are the previously existing standards obtaining in the farm

labor field: Just how long are their cash wages? What kind of shelter, what kind of sanitary facilities, what kind of drinking water have these men been offered in the past if these pitifully low standards are now objected to as revolutionary?

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in winning this war. I know that we must have food, as much food as last year, more food than last year if we are to win in the shortest possible time, if we are to make good our pledges under lease-lend and to the nations we propose to liberate. Let us today vote in the best interests of the Nation and, incidentally, in the best long-run interests of agriculture, too, by voting to oppose that part of this measure which forbids the Secretary of Agriculture—

To fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I think we ought to bear this fact in mind, that when we deal with the question of farm labor and the possibility of farm crops we are talking now about what the boys in the service are going to eat in 1944 and not in 1943. What they are going to eat in 1943 was produced on the farms last year, and unless we get busy with this farm problem now, the eating will not be good next year.

I was amazed to see this proposal attacked because it may have emanated from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Frankly, I believe when we come to this problem we ought to remember the good old proverb, "A light is good in whatever lamp it is burning." Even if those gentlemen may sit on the opposite side of the aisle, if they come forth with a good proposal, I shall be very glad to adopt it.

Actually, I think we ought to bear in mind that probably the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did not write a line of this final bill. It is true that he and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had steadfastly advocated this principle, but so have Members on the majority side. I was one of them all the way through, as I think the gentleman from New York will concede.

Let me just say to you that when we deal with this we have to remember that the Appropriations Committee, by unanimous vote, rejected the proposal embraced in House Resolution 94, to which reference has been made. If you will look at the report on page 4, you will see that the proposal for \$65,000,000 did not in any way touch the ordinary method of handling labor in this country through the United States Employment Service. It was a completely different proposal, involving only the use of the Farm Security Administration to move part of

the labor crop of the United States, and I think it was upon that point that the Appropriations Committee took its action.

I wish to remind you in that connection that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] quite correctly stated that the Farm Security Administration had a right to be praised for all the splendid things it has done. Frankly I am one of those who think it has done some fine things, but it ought to be possible to state when it makes a flop that it makes a flop. The Farm Security Administration did not know anything about the importation of farm labor from another country. So it placed into that contract a requirement that the farmer should give a performance bond to guarantee that he would fulfill all of the labor conditions, and return the laborer to Mexico. What they did not know was that the average farmer could not give that kind of bond. It was easy for the big farmer to do it. It was simple for the large cotton growers in Arizona to do it, but it was absolutely impossible for the small farmer to do it. It was absolutely impossible for the Farm Security plan to do it. The result was that no labor came into Texas, into the district represented by the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], which normally has thousands of laborers from Mexico. That district did not receive a single man. The district which I have the honor to represent, which normally imports thousands of these people, did not get a single one, simply because the Farm Security Administration did not know how they should be brought into this country.

They put in there also another provision which required \$5 a head to be paid for them. We found that to be impossible. They put in there certain stipulations with reference to housing standards. Unfortunately, at the time they were trying to write those conditions into the contracts the Government was saying to you what you could not do with reference to farm construction. When the farmers tried to fill out PD Form 100 in order to get materials in order to build the kind of sheds that the Farm Security Administration said they had to have, they could not get the lumber, they could not get the materials, and they could not get the labor. When they found out their mistakes, the Farm Security Administration said to us, "Next year we will try to do better."

But I say to you there is a simple and an easier way to do better. If you will look on page 5 of the report you will see that part of this money is to be used in connection with the United States Employment Service in its Nation-wide services and then it is used by the extension services within the community or within the States. I happen to be one of those who believe firmly in the rights of the United States Employment Service to try to handle the over-all problem of labor. I ask you what is going to happen if you let the United States Employment Service try to recruit industrial labor in a community and then let the Farm Security Administration try to recruit

farm labor? Let us get one over-all picture of this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and placement of workers needed for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States); to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States and in Puerto Rico on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the conduct of extension work and apportioned to the States on the basis of need for the purposes specified herein; for transportation and subsistence of workers and expenditures for construction, rental, or operation of temporary suitable housing or shelter facilities for such workers where existing housing facilities are not adequate (including for the purposes specified herein, agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States), to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States and Puerto Rico, as hereinbefore specified, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, of which not less than \$100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, and not less than \$13,500,000 shall be apportioned to the extension service in the States on the basis of need to enable them to carry out their responsibilities hereunder within the States, including the recruiting, training, and placement of farm labor, the provision, operation, and supervision of temporary housing and shelter facilities and the transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence, and protection of workers within the States as herein provided; the remaining funds not to exceed \$12,500,000 to be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers while en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this act, but not to exceed a period of 30 days after the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the Office of Extension Service in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the State extension services in the States which are concerned in obtaining such labor are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such domestic and imported labor to and from the respective States and the extension services in the States either individually or collectively may enter into such

agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the United States Employment Service: *Provided further*, That the extension services of the land-grant colleges shall be responsible for the recruiting, training, transportation, and placement of all such workers within their respective States; and the Extension Service is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services and to cooperate with any other public or private agency: *Provided further*, That existing farm labor camps and other necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States Department of Agriculture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where suitably located shall be made available to such workers to the extent they are required and shall be operated under the supervision of the Extension Service as hereinbefore provided so long as such facilities are required for this purpose: *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made hereunder without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That any payments made by the United States or private employers to aliens brought in under this program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That for expenses necessary for the formulation, development, and execution, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and either independently or in cooperation with individuals or agencies, public or private, of a plan to assist in providing an adequate supply and distribution of labor, including sharecroppers and tenants (including aliens), for the production of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, including (1) recruiting, placement, and transportation of such labor within the continental United States and elsewhere, including transportation of their families and household effects; (2) furnishing, by loans, grants, or otherwise, of medical services, training, subsistence, and shelter; (3) construction or lease and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services; (4) employment of persons (including aliens) and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (5) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (6) printing and binding; (7) acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and (8) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses to first-duty stations; there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$26,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943: *Provided*, That expenditures may be made

hereunder without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That whenever labor shall be furnished hereunder to any other agency, public or private, or individual, this appropriation shall be reimbursed for expenditures on account of wages paid to such labor and other expenditures in connection therewith to the extent which the Secretary may determine to be practicable: *Provided further*, That effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the act of June 29, 1936 (40 U. S. C. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That not less than \$6,000,000 of the appropriation herein shall be allocated for use by or under the direction of the Extension Service and transfers may be made, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, from \$20,000,000 of this appropriation to any bureau or office of the Department of Agriculture, or to any other agency of the Government, which is assigned functions in connection herewith, in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944: *Provided further*, That any payments made by the United States or private employers to aliens under this program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation herein made nor any of the funds heretofore appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of sections 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. I wish information as to the procedure. This is an amendment which proposes to substitute entirely new language for the language of the pending resolution. There will perhaps be some amendments to the language of the original resolution. The inquiry I wish to make is whether or not amendments to the original resolution will be voted on before there is a vote on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that perfecting amendments will be voted on first.

Mr. TARVER. Perfecting amendments to the original resolution will be voted on first?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. That means perfecting amendments to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. The original resolution.

The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, early in the day I addressed the Committee. The main purport of what I attempted to say was that the Manpower Commission designated by the Commander in Chief of the American Army delegated this responsibility of taking care of the farm-labor situation to the Department of Agriculture. I mentioned at that time that House Joint Resolution 94 was proposed by the subcommittee. When it came before the full committee House Joint Resolution 96, which is the Dirksen bill, was substituted and brought out. In that resolution both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture are practically eliminated from the operation of this job. It is my contention that since the job was put in their hands, since the plan proposed by the Dirksen amendment is so involved that nobody in Congress believes it will do any good—maybe a few here and there believe it will, but generally no one has expressed any confidence in its success—I believe we should revert to House Joint Resolution 94 which gives \$6,000,000 to the Extension Bureau to handle the intrastate labor, which is 90 percent of the numbers involved, and then give the other \$2,000,000 to the Secretary of Agriculture and allow him to handle this job as in his discretion he thinks it should be handled.

It has been said that the farm organizations are backing the Dirksen bill. Permit me to state that in the testimony before our committee Mr. Goss, apparently representing three of the large farm organizations, made this statement:

There are some phases of it which we are not sure whether they are the best people to handle, such as the contacts for Mexican labor and moving from State to State for example. There may be better agencies which are better equipped to do that in co-operation with the Extension Service.

Mr. Handschin, of the National Farm Union, said:

I understand that there has been some discussion of turning all this labor program back to the 48 State extension services. As far as the mobilization of the local labor supply is concerned, I think that is a very sensible proposal. But insofar as labor has to be mobilized and taken over State lines or even carried a long distance in a State, I think we would run into major difficulties. How can we hope to secure proper coordination and some degree of uniform enforcement between the States? There will be a natural hesitancy in any area from which farm people must be drawn into industry or in agriculture to see them go. And if you set up this program on State lines you may be well assured that will prevent us from getting our labor supply.

Another gentleman, speaking for the National Grange Council of Farm Cooperatives, the National Cooperative Milk Producers, said this:

The problem of handling the importation of foreign labor and the problem of migratory labor involve contacts with foreign governments, with different governmental departments, and with State governments. We believe these contacts should be made by the Secretary of Agriculture, his representatives, or such department or division as he may select from time to time to meet whatever situation may arise. Construction and operation of migratory labor camps are also in-

involved. In the judgment of the Secretary and the Federal Director of Extension, the Extension Service is not equipped to handle many of the problems—

And so forth. Mr. Chairman, these farm organizations did not go that far. They even did not want to cut the sum of money that much, and I am offering this House joint resolution 94 to fix the responsibility on the Agriculture Department and rely upon them to do it. If they fail, it is their failure, not the failure of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment to the original resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 2, line 18, after the words "sum of" strike out "\$26,100,000" and insert "\$12,100,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted I will subsequently offer amendments to decrease the amounts named in line 21, page 2, and line 4, page 3, of the resolution to \$6,000,000 in each case. I do not desire to repeat the arguments I advanced earlier in the day. There is, as everyone must feel, a very great difference of opinion between Members of the House who are equally sincere in undertaking to deal with this problem in a practical and common-sense way, and who are equally anxious to do something to remedy the existing critical situation with respect to farm labor, if it is possible to do so. There are also wide differences of opinion between the representatives of the outstanding farm organizations in the country as to just how this problem ought to be dealt with and as to the amount of money that should be made available in an effort to deal with it.

We realize, of course, that the views of the Secretary of Agriculture are not being observed in connection with the pending resolution and however much some Members may advance the idea that the Secretary is inefficient and incapable, there are many of us who feel that he is sincere and is endeavoring as best he can to do a good job with the very difficult problems that come under his jurisdiction. In view of all this doubt, it seems to me that we should not put an unreasonable sum of money at the disposal of the authorities of the Department of Agriculture mentioned in this resolution to deal with this matter. Other authorities of the Department have had close to 7 months now to deal with it, and they have obligated only a million and a half dollars out of \$5,000,000 available.

My amendment would give them \$12,000,000 plus \$100,000 for administrative expenses in Washington and they could continue with their existing program under the Extension Service and with the cooperation of the United States Employment Service. If they are able to make progress, if they are able to use that money and expend it wisely and aid our farmers with a program of this sort, they can come back to us next month or a month after or any time they see fit to do so and seek additional funds. If they have done a good job, if they have spent the money in a way that meets with the

approval of the Congress, they will be provided with the funds in whatever amount may be needed. That does not involve any interference with the program which they have outlined. If they are able to make good on the program, all right. If they are not able to make good on it, as authorities of the Department have not been for the past several months, if they are not able to bring about any substantial accomplishment, then it certainly seems to me that \$12,000,000 is enough to risk on this venture at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I desire to say at this time.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

I am opposed to both the O'Neal and the Tarver amendments. I do not want to join in any personal criticism of the Secretary of Agriculture because I think he has been doing a good job under all the circumstances. He has many difficult and complex problems. He is an honest and patriotic public servant. I think, too, that the Farm Security Administration has accomplished much good in its peacetime program, but I cannot include the farm labor problem among its accomplishments because I think I speak with some personal knowledge. We are faced with an emergency. Social problems can wait.

I do not profess to know anything especially about the interstate or even intrastate labor problems which the Farm Security Administration has had to deal with, but, like my good friend, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], whose statements I concur in, I do have first-hand information as a result of personal knowledge and personal inspection of the situation along the Mexican border involving the Mexican labor situation.

I know that the Senators from New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas, together with the Congressmen from New Mexico, Arizona, and myself, have had repeated conferences with the Agriculture, State, and Immigration Departments, and with the Farm Security Administration in particular, in an effort to get in Mexican labor under proper conditions to harvest the essential war crops in our part of the country. I take the position in this matter that they have had no success in connection with border farm problems, whether it be the gathering of long-staple cotton or the fruit and beet crops of California, or Arizona, or Michigan, or elsewhere, or the rice crops in Judge MANSFIELD's district, then I submit, in all fairness, it is time to try something else. The gentleman from New Mexico and I have in our districts the Rio Grande irrigation project with nearly 200,000 acres of land in the very highest state of cultivation and through the request of the War Production Board and the Department of Agriculture we planted many acres of long-staple cotton to make parachutes and other things that the War Department needed, yet many hundreds of bales of cotton in Arizona and New Mexico and west Texas were not picked.

I take the position that if you will leave the farmers alone in our part of

the country to deal directly with the immigration authorities they will get the necessary farm labor to cultivate and harvest the crops, and then see to it that the Mexicans are returned to their own country.

Farming is expensive in my country. The land is valuable and water taxes very high. When the War Department asked our farmers to grow this extra long-staple cotton, they went to large expense to meet the situation. The ordinary gin would not gin this quality of cotton. They built many new gins at great expense. They did not do this voluntarily. They were not only requested, but given the assurance that labor demands would be met. The farmers' boys in my country have gone to war the same as yours. More than that, several thousand fine young Americans of Mexican descent in my city and valley have gone to the defense of our flag and country. I will never vote to take down the bars on immigration, but I am willing to trust our immigration authorities to make the restrictions as strong as they wish and let laborers come in temporarily to gather our necessary war crops. Leave it to the farmers, immigration officials, and county agents, and they will work it out. I have no doubt about it. I am opposed absolutely to unlimited and unrestricted immigration, but I have consulted with the United States immigration authorities myself, and they will agree to anything reasonable. Our farmers are honest, patriotic citizens, many of whom have sons in the service and who are eager to comply with the request of the Government in the production of long-staple cotton. They are willing to deal directly with the immigration authorities and meet any reasonable requirements and see to it that those men who come over to chop and to pick cotton or to pick fruit or harvest rice are returned to Mexico after the work is completed. They will comply absolutely with the law because they are just as anxious to win this war as the balance of us.

This resolution seems to be the only solution left because you cannot impose the restrictions of the Farm Security contracts and get results for we tried it all last year and failed. They say they will get 50,000 laborers from Mexico. They got only 5,000 all told last year, after we gave them all the money they wanted and gave them 100-percent support. And none of these were sent to my part of the country but scattered to far-distant points.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. On page 45 of the committee hearing appears a table showing the number of workers proposed to be moved into each area. I see that Texas and Oklahoma are allotted 400; 200 to Texas, and 200 to Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMASON. I venture the assertion that not 20 people came in through the El Paso immigration station to harvest crops. At least, they did not remain there and 200 workers for the big State of Texas would not be a starter. Such a proposal is ridiculous.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. I heard today from the State Department that the Mexican Government has again resumed very definite efforts to recruit labor to meet the requirements in this country.

Mr. THOMASON. The trouble is that they are recruiting them down at Mexico City and Vera Cruz, when the men are available along the border. The State Department phoned me this same message today. The trouble is they started 6 months' too late. Our crops are now being planted. The few men recruited last year were from the big cities in the southern part of the republic. They had to come several hundred miles and at great expense. They had never had any experience in farm work. Opposite my city of El Paso is the city of Juarez, where a few thousand seasonal laborers reside who know cotton farming and who want to come over and work. My farmers know many of them, and many have relatives on our side. This is war—total war. Mexico is our ally. We are all engaged in a common fight to save our liberty. We can trust our immigration officials, and also our farmers, to see to it that these workers are sent back to Mexico when the job is done. The Extension Service and county agents have done a fine job for many years. Let us give them a chance. I urge support of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the deficiency subcommittee that heard the testimony on these bills, and being the author of the motion to resubmit the first resolution for consideration, I call the attention of the committee now to two or three things that I believe bear on the subject and which I should like to have you consider when you vote.

No. 1. You have just heard in the well of this House expert testimony to the effect that although the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Security Administration have been working on the problem for a year with the \$5,000,000 at their disposal to use on it, they have succeeded in spending \$1,500,000 and getting no labor. That justifies the committee in taking the thing out of the hands of the people who have been handling it heretofore.

No. 2. Where are you going to find this surplus of agricultural labor you are going to take from Virginia to New York or from Mississippi to Arkansas, or wherever you are going to carry them? It just is not there, unless you go into the industries of the country and take out of there the men who have gone from the farms and are working there at better wages, or unless you go into the Army and take out men who are experienced farm workers.

There is something that can be done to help this situation. I think the bill we have brought here is about all you can do, but I think you should cut the amount to \$12,000,000.

I say sincerely to my friends over here that I got a little satisfaction today out of seeing the position that some of my friends are in, because it demonstrates to me that good people can go wrong sometimes. I have seen my friends over here making a gallant fight to cut down expenses of Government, to cut out waste, to save money, even a few million dollars. I have made that fight here for years, and some of us have joined together, and now we are making progress on it.

Today, when some of them go wrong it encourages me, because I go wrong sometimes. When I see good fellows like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and my friend from New York [Mr. TABER], and my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who are so customarily joining me down here in the well of the House to cut expenditures, fighting here today to give away \$15,000,000—and it will be throwing it away—then I am encouraged because even good men go wrong. Gentlemen, do not forget that mandate from the people. Do not forget that.

Seriously, there is something that can be done and that I think will help this situation in probably a very limited way. The Extension Service has a great organization set up all over this country in every agricultural county and State in the Union. They are all ready to go. They are functioning. They have the people there. The farmers have confidence in them. In this bill we give them \$6,000,000 to go into the agricultural counties within the States and do what they can to stimulate recruitment of agricultural labor. I think that will be helpful and will probably get something done.

If the Tarver amendment cutting the fund to \$12,000,000 is adopted, in addition you give the United States Employment Service another \$6,000,000 to let them try again to see if they can go into Mexico or the Bahamas or wherever they may go outside of the United States to bring in labor. That is a fair, conservative beginning on this thing.

As the gentleman from New Mexico has pointed out, this is not going to help the crops this year. What you do today may help the crops in 1944. But if the Extension Service and the Employment Service can take this \$12,000,000, which is an ample fund for beginning, and show any signs that they are able to accomplish anything with it, this House will be ready to give them more money.

I plead with you today, you will just be throwing that other \$15,000,000 down a rat hole if you appropriate it in this bill. It will not do the farmers any good and will be handing them another gold brick.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the situation in the House today is a peculiar one. The Democrats, with a majority of 13, organized the House. That means the Democrats elect the Speaker, floor leader, and other officers of the House. It also means that the Democrats retain the chairmanships of all committees and the majority on all committees; in other

words, it is a Democratic House—but is it?

To date, with the exception of one important bill, lend-lease, the Republicans, in combination with a small group of southern Democrats, have dominated the situation.

Now, let us take a look at what this coalition has accomplished in the way of beneficial legislation.

First let us take a gander at the Dirksen—Republican—amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill. In cutting the appropriation for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation that organization is forced to liquidate immediately—that is, sell all its good mortgages for whatever it can get and either hold onto and carry at a great monthly loss those of its mortgages that are delinquent. This will enable the building and loan companies and associations to buy the good mortgages in at a discount and permit them to skim the cream off the whole transaction.

In the meantime, the H. O. L. C. under forced liquidation will entail a direct Treasury loss—or taxpayer loss—of approximately \$400,000,000, a loss forced on the Corporation by the very interests it was created to protect. For, just remember, it was not solely for the saving of homes that this Corporation was formed, though that was its primary objective; it also saved, by bailing out, thousands of banks and building and loan associations.

This amendment was building-and-loan inspired and engineered. It may look like good business, but it is anything but good morals, or manners, to deliberately rob your rescuer.

This beneficent amendment is one of the first beneficent products of this unholy alliance between Republican and anti-Roosevelt southern Democrats.

The second piece of legislation that resulted from this unholy alliance is what is known as the Disney amendment to the debt-limit bill.

In the first place that amendment had no right on that bill. It was clearly not germane, but the Rules Committee, composed almost entirely of Republicans and anti-Roosevelt Democrats, gave it a rule, waiving all points of order, thus giving it legislative status free from attack on that ground.

Now what does the Disney amendment do?

First. It repeals the President's salary limitation Executive order.

Second. It permits all salaries, regardless of how large, that were in effect before Pearl Harbor—December 7, 1941—to remain intact, subject only to the regular tax schedules.

Third. It also permits all salaries, under \$67,200—salaries, mind you—to be raised to \$67,200 without restraint. Wages of war workers and others—wages, mind you, as distinct from salaries—are frozen, except for the 15 percent relief afforded by the so-called Little Steel formula.

That it—the Disney amendment—is an inflationary measure there is no doubt, the reason being that there are literally millions of salaries within its fixed brackets that can be raised at will,

depending on just how much of its swollen profits a corporation or partnership might desire to distribute in this way to keep its profits within a bracket that would save it hundreds of thousands in taxes and at the same time mulct the Treasury of its just dues. In the final analysis it amounts to legalized tax evasion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am not forgetting the mandate of the people, nor am I forgetting the positions that I have taken here for over 10 years on the floor of this House in the interest of economy; but there is a larger mandate here, so well expressed by Ralph Waldo Emerson when he said that nothing astonishes man so much as common sense and a little plain dealing; and, in addition, there is another mandate, the mandate of Aristotle, when he said, "Arithmetic, O stranger, is the greatest of sciences and the mother of invention." So, Mr. Chairman, let us apply a little plain common sense, plain dealing, and a little arithmetic to the Tarver amendment. He would reduce the amount from \$26,100,000 to \$12,100,000. What will happen? Six million dollars for the Extension Service. How far will it go? Let us assume that the bill becomes a law the 1st of next month. It will be for 10 months, to December 31, 1943. Scattered among the 2,920 extension agents in 2,920 counties in the United States, the result will be that \$6,000,000 will be \$250 per month in each of the 2,920 agricultural counties, and that will hire one good man. It will leave us nothing for subsistence, nothing for shelter, nothing for housing. His amendment would also provide \$6,000,000 for United States Employment Service under the direction of the Agricultural Extension Service. How far will \$6,000,000 go when it costs \$100 a family to bring people in from Mexico? How far will \$6,000,000 go if you are going to bring 15,000 workers in from the Bahamas? How far will it go when we undertake to transport and subsist seasonal workers to the extent of several hundred thousand from one area to another, if they are available and can be transported? How far will six million go if you are undertaking to make provision for 42,000 all-the-year-round workers? It will not do the job; and so here is arithmetic, to admonish everybody, by the opinion of Aristotle, himself, as being the mother of invention and the greatest of sciences. The very arithmetic of \$12,000,000 will demonstrate that you cannot depend upon it to do the job, so I suggest that the Tarver amendment be rejected, and likewise I suggest that the O'Neal amendment be rejected, because the Secretary of Agriculture has had his chance and has failed. Here is his first press release of February 12, giving the same power to the Extension Service. Here is the second press release, dated March 1, setting up a new agricultural labor administration, and here is the third press release, dated March 5, of bringing in an agricultural work board, diffusing the responsibility, getting the thing all over the lot, and so getting all set for another failure such as we have experienced since we have been at this business from

June 22, 1942, until today. Let us do the sensible thing; let us astonish ourselves and use a little common sense, as Emerson would say, and reject the O'Neal amendment and the Tarver amendment, and prosecute this thing on the basis of common sense.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we cannot come to some agreement as to time for debate on this matter. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I object. The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard every word that has been spoken with reference to the pending resolution. If I have ever observed a proposal that is just sort of pitifully slinking down into a corner, it is this one. It started out with a proposal for \$65,000,000. Then it dropped down to a proposal for \$26,000,000. Now it is proposed, "Well, let us give them \$12,000,000."

The proponents of the \$26,000,000 and the proponents of the \$12,000,000 cannot come into the well of this House and guarantee that the expenditure of either sum is going to do anything to relieve the farm-labor situation in the United States. They are content that we have a situation, which everyone knows exists. Therefore, because we have a farm-labor situation we must do something about it. We must respond to that situation. The only way that we know how to respond is to appropriate money, and then pat ourselves on the back and say, "We have done the usual job of the New Deal. We have appropriated a lot of money and then if it does not relieve the situation we Members of Congress have done our part and we should not feel badly."

Have you not heard that argument time and time again this afternoon? I realize that there is a farm labor situation that must be dealt with. If it is bad to spend \$26,000,000, it is going to be bad to spend \$12,000,000. I, for one, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], am going to vote against spending a dollar of this money for a purpose which none of the members of the committee has demonstrated will accomplish the purpose that is sought to be accomplished. I am one who is going to keep the pledge I gave my people that I would not vote to spend a dollar of the taxpayers' money unless it could be shown that it was essential and necessary. That fact has not been shown by the proponents of this measure.

This problem can be dealt with. It is being dealt with in my district. It is being dealt with by volunteer help. I placed in the RECORD the results of that program some time ago. I submitted that program a year ago to Mr. McNutt and to the Department of Agriculture. It is working in my district in Wisconsin. It is contributing to relieve the farm situation and it is not costing the Federal Government a single penny. It results from a desire, a patriotic desire of

the people in my district to go out and do this job. We do not have a lot of loafers lying around that the Farm Security Administration or the Extension Service or anyone else can come in and dig out by the expenditure of \$26,000,000 or any other sum. There are some people who can be prevailed upon to go out on the farm and work, after they have worked 8 hours in the factory. There are some who are retired who can be recalled to the farm to do something through volunteer service. The people in the schools, the people in the plants, the people in the offices, the people in the stores are responding in my district. You have not had to spend a dime of Federal money.

Now, let us do this on the basis of patriotism and let us do it on a basis that will get some work on the farm and let us save \$26,000,000 or \$12,000,000. Let us save the whole business and not fritter it away as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] says you will be frittering it away if you adopt this resolution to spend \$26,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tarver amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none and the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object until the gentleman tells us what he is going to talk about.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman will just wait a minute he will see.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Then I will object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The objection comes too late.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Kansas ought not to do that.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, but for the importance of the matter about which I propose to speak, I would not detain this House for the 5 minutes I have asked. But there is a conference going on in the city of New York between the owners and operators of the bituminous-coal industry on the one hand and the United Mine Workers of America on the other hand. Mr. John L. Lewis, international president of the United Mine Workers, has issued a challenge, not merely a challenge to the operators with whom he seeks to negotiate, but he has issued a challenge to the American Government, to the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, and to the War Labor Board. He has said in unmistakable terms that unless they accede to his demands—as to the justness or unjustness of which I am making no statement—that on the 1st day of next April there is going to be a walk-out in the bituminous-coal mines of this country. He has even emphasized it by saying it is going to be the biggest single strike

that has taken place during the war. Is that patriotism or is it bordering on treason?

I want to say that he declared war on one of the best friends that the coal miners in my district ever had last year. We had an election in that district on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November and yonder in Cincinnati in his national convention he demanded of his followers that they cut my throat from ear to ear politically and leave me at home and he would send some Representative here to this Congress of his own choosing. They did not follow him then and I do not believe today, when their sons are fighting upon every battle front upon the face of the earth and many of them giving their lives for the country they love, that they will follow him now, and I am persuaded that they remember their friend in the White House, who did not forget them when Lewis tied up the coal mines 2 years ago, and refused to feed them out of the funds he had taken out of their pockets. The President of the United States, with the generous humanitarian heart that is in his bosom, ordered food sent from the Commodity Credit Corporation and from the Department of Agriculture to every coal-mining community in my congressional district and every other mining district in this country where a shut-down of the mines was brought on against the will of the miners themselves. That is what he again proposes, but this time in the midst of war.

I warn you now that if the munition factories and those producing implements of warfare are forced to stop their production on the 1st day of April, there will only be one man in America responsible and that will be John L. Lewis. We have a dictator in Europe by the name of Hitler and we do not want any in this country.

I want the country to know, I want the world to know, that I would regard myself as a contemptible coward, unworthy of the trust of a free people, if I did not stand here and let the country know, let the public know, what is being planned for our war effort by a single individual in all this country. I fully realize that I take my political career in my hands by what I may say here today, but if my political future must depend upon whether I speak out now or whether our men are to have implements of war with which to defend their lives and whether the Nation about whom we are talking here shall face starvation and suffering, then my political future is unimportant. But the important question, under God, is that the public realize that we are up against a would-be dictator who wants to say whether war munitions shall be made; whether the man he hates, because he cannot dictate to him, shall direct the armies of this country or whether he shall do it. I say the time has now arrived when we must have a show-down on the question of whether the constituted authorities shall run the country or whether John L. Lewis shall run it regardless of the President, the Army and Navy, and the Congress.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BRYSON, Mr. ELIZALDE, Mr. SIKES, Mr. CURLEY, Mr. DIMOND, and Mr. LEFEVRE asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a letter and resolution of the Badger Cooperative Creamery.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article by George Rothwell Brown.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include a letter on farm problems as presented by one of my constituents, and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a brief address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a memorial of the Montana State Senate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein an article on taxation from the New York Times of last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein two letters and some newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article on flax entitled "An

American Tragedy" written by Mr. M. W. Thatcher, the vice chairman of the National Council of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America. I am advised by the Printing Office that this will exceed the limit and that the cost will be \$112.50.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a short article from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative program is completed and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered, I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] is recognized for 3 minutes, without objection.

There was no objection.

ABSENTEEISM IN WAR INDUSTRIES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Labor Committee, as you know, started hearings in our committee on Friday, March 12, on the particular subject of absenteeism in war industries. We have continued hearings Monday, today, and shall continue every day this week and next week until we have concluded all available testimony. It is evident that the witnesses so far have all agreed that there are insufficient figures on which to base findings. The Labor Committee is now engaged in developing testimony which will crystallize the situation in an effort to determine the approximate percentage of willful absenteeism as opposed to legitimate absenteeism. At the conclusion of the testimony it is the intention of the Labor Committee to recommend a desirable approach to remedy insofar as possible the existing conditions, and at the same time protect fully the right of workers and with the least amount of disruption to the war effort. The Labor Committee was set up to consider problems concerned with all phases of labor and to recommend legislation when in its judgment it considers legislation necessary.

This morning it was brought to the attention of the committee that definite legislation dealing with labor as a whole in its relation to absenteeism is being considered by the Naval Affairs Committee. The committee feels so strongly against consideration of this legislation by the Naval Affairs Committee that it

directed me as chairman to transmit the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 16, 1943.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As chairman of the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives, I have been ordered by a vote of the committee to transmit to you the insistence of the committee that your committee defer action on bills dealing with matters completely within the jurisdiction of the Labor Committee, namely, absenteeism in industry as a whole.

I enclose herewith verbatim the motion made by Mr. WELCH as adopted by the committee, respecting this action.

Sincerely yours,

MARY T. NORTON.

Mr. WELCH. Madam Chairman, it has been called to my attention that another legislative committee of Congress, the Committee on Naval Affairs, is now considering legislation strictly labor in its character, thereby usurping the prerogatives of this committee. I, therefore, move that word, forthwith, be sent to the Committee on Naval Affairs that the Committee on Labor insists that no further action be taken on labor legislation by that committee until this committee has had reasonable time to take testimony and report to Congress its findings and recommendations.

Motion amended that no more witnesses from the departments be called until we receive reply from the Naval Affairs Committee.

Adopted March 16, 1943.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in my remarks I may include an article entitled "Truman Says Legislation Won't Cure Absenteeism," which was a speech made in the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TRUMAN SAYS LEGISLATION WON'T CURE ABSENTEEISM

NEWARK, N. J., March 15.—Chairman TRUMAN of the committee investigating war production said last night that legislation offered no cure for absenteeism in war plants.

In New Jersey for an inspection of the Brewster Aeronautical Co. plant in Newark, and of the Eastern Aircraft division plant of General Motors Corporation, in Linden, Senator TRUMAN commented: "Morale is the real answer."

He said his investigations had showed that in plants where management took a personal interest in its employees, absenteeism was less than in plants where there was a less intimate relationship.

Week-end overindulgence is not the primary cause of Monday absences, he said.

"Seven-day workweeks cause most of the trouble. Workers get tired and simply can't stand up under the strain."

High pay is a contributing factor in absenteeism, Senator TRUMAN said, because many workers are earning more wages than ever before and are inclined to relax their efforts from time to time.

One plant, where absenteeism had at times reached 25 percent, reduced absences 70 percent by sending telegrams to the homes of workers the days they were absent.

"In many instances this was news to the wives, who were unaware their husbands had taken the day off," the Senator said.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include a few abstracts from a hearing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DIMOND addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the business for Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order after the pending bill is disposed of tomorrow, or when it is disposed of if not on tomorrow, that bills on the Private Calendar may be called.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Talladega Daily Home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to yield back my time, but in doing so I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who has a special order following me on the calendar, may be permitted to proceed for 30 minutes instead of 20, provided this does not meet with the objection of the gentleman from Minnesota or the gentleman from New York, who likewise have special orders on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENTAL HANDLING OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 166, to provide for a complete investigation of the governmental handling of Indian Affairs in the United States. This resolution was introduced in part because the State Legislature of South Dakota this year memorialized Congress to take action along that line, giving reasons why it feels a complete reexamination of the whole governmental approach to the Indian problem should be made at this time.

I have also presented this resolution because in the 4 years I have been a member of the House Committee on Indian Affairs I have had frequent occasion to question certain of our relationships with the red men, and I have devoted some special study to the Indian problem. Out of it all, and out of the fact that my native State of South Dakota has the fourth largest Indian population in America, has come a growing and compelling conviction that a complete congressional study of Indian conditions is needed, and I have presented this resolution requesting an investigation, and I wish to discuss the conditions back of this resolution during the next 25 or 30 minutes.

In the first place, it is my studied conviction that in no other country in the world have so many done so little for so long for so few from the standpoint of absorbing a conquered people into the economic life of the conqueror as is true of our record of mishandling the problem of the American Indian. I think anybody who will explore that problem will have to arrive at that conclusion.

Before continuing my discussion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my resolution may be incorporated as a part of my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURDOCK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

House Resolution 166 follows:

Whereas a concurrent resolution of the South Dakota State Legislature memorializes

the Congress of the United States to instigate an investigation and study to determine the necessity and advisability of revising the Federal laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs pointing out that—

(a) Most of the said existing laws and regulations were formulated at a time when all the Indians were considered as wards and dependents of the Federal Government and incapable of assuming the duties, obligations, and station of citizenship; and

(2) Most of the Indian inhabitants of the Nation have now been accorded the legal status of citizenship and have advanced in education and progress along the lines of racial development to a point where they should be treated as full citizens, and most of the restrictions and regulations limiting their rights and freedom of action should be removed; and

(3) Many of the Indian inhabitants of the Nation are now graduates of high schools and colleges, and all of them are capable of receiving full high school and college education; and

(4) Many of our Indian citizens have entered loyally into the present war and assumed the risks and duties of active warfare on the same basis as other citizens of the Nation, and their efforts should be recognized and rewarded accordingly; and

Whereas members of the Indian Affairs Committee of the South Dakota State Legislature made a personal inspection of living conditions on a typical Indian reservation in South Dakota and there found many of our American Indians living in deplorable conditions, lacking adequate protection against winter weather and suffering from inadequate nourishment, and inadequate sanitary and health provisions; and

Whereas it is believed that many American Indians living on reservations in other States of the Union are similarly lacking in the minimum essentials of living conditions which provide for healthful development and for their eventual assimilation into the general population of the United States; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation to determine whether the changed status of the Indian and the conditions under which he now lives require a revision of the laws and regulations affecting the American Indian and to prepare recommendations to Congress for the enactment of any needed legislation to improve the status and advance the opportunity of the American Indian.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation and changes of policy and program as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I start out this afternoon by quoting from Thomas Jefferson, who it seems to me understood rather clearly the approach which should be made to this whole Indian problem. Thomas Jefferson, writing to a friend of his under date of February

18, 1803, 140 years ago, outlined what in my opinion is a sound approach for Americans to take to the Indian problem today, just as I think it was sound at that time. Thomas Jefferson said:

In truth, the ultimate point of rest for them (the Indians) is to let our settlement and theirs meet and blend together to intermix and become one people, incorporating themselves with us as citizens of the United States. This is the natural progress of things and it will, of course, be better to promote than to retard it. Surely it will be better for them to be identified with us and preserved in the occupation of their lands than to be exposed to the many casualties which may endanger them while a separate people.

I submit in the first place that in the last century and a half we have gotten very far away from this admirable outline suggested by Thomas Jefferson, because we have failed in large extent to incorporate the American Indians into our economical and political systems and have kept them pretty much that separate people about which Thomas Jefferson was speaking.

I want to make clear at this point that I am not indicting the present activities of the Office of Indian Affairs for any special derelictions; in fact, I hope the Commissioner of Indian Affairs will welcome the investigation I have proposed in order that Congress may receive firsthand information concerning the deplorable conditions under which American Indians are living today in various sections of this country.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman agree with me that the question he presents to us today is not one of partisan character and is not a criticism of any one administration? I believe it could be said that our treatment of the American Indian has not been of great credit to any administration at any time in the history of our country.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct; there is no partisanship in this proposal nor in these remarks. I do not know of any President who would be able to ask that it be written into his memoirs that he had solved the Indian problem.

I think, too, that, like charity, our "four freedoms" should begin at home. The basic factor, freedom from want, is notoriously lacking among our American Indians.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I wish to commend the gentleman from South Dakota for introducing that resolution. I do not believe there is anything more needed in this country, especially in the States that have an Indian population. In my district, for instance, there was sad need for a school on the Odanah Indian Reservation. In order to get a decent school built there, the Catholic Sisters have donated 50 percent of their salaries for 15 years. I think the Indians are being sadly neglected. I am very glad

the gentleman has introduced this resolution, and congratulate him on being so farsighted.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that the greatest consideration should be given the Indians in the way of giving them proper hospitalization and furnishing proper equipment for those hospitals?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. The lady is quite correct. I propose to show later in my remarks how very seriously we have neglected the health and sanitary conditions of the Indians.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to my colleague from South Dakota, who is a sincere friend of the Indians.

Mr. CASE. I am very happy that my friend from South Dakota, who is a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs, is acting on the memorial adopted by the Legislature of South Dakota. The point the gentleman has made, that charity should begin at home, or in other words, that the application of the "four freedoms" should begin at home, is especially apropos today, because the Indians of all tribal groups in this country are in the forefront in their response to the war effort. This is true in regard to voluntary enlistment and also in regard to the proportion of bonds purchased in proportion to the per capita wealth.

Mr. MUNDT. I may add that it not only is true in this war but was true in the last war.

Mr. CASE. It comes with poor grace for us to say to those boys who are out defending the "four freedoms" throughout the world that when they come back to their own reservations, when they come back to live at home, they will not find the "four freedoms" awaiting them there.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree thoroughly.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Ohio, with whom I have had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Indian Affairs for a year or two when she was a very valuable and able member of our committee.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have enjoyed my service there and regret my not remaining a member of that committee. Is it not true that the Indian under the Constitution was made a ward of the state?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct, but in 1924 for the first time he was made a full-fledged American citizen. I am happy that this was done under the able administration of the Honorable Charles H. Burke, who was then Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and who is the outstanding man of politics in South Dakota. Charley Burke will also be remembered by many of you for his long years of constructive service as a Member of this House.

Mr. CASE. In spite of the declaration of citizenship by the act of 1924, yet the Indians are very restricted, and are not permitted to exercise the rights of a citizen.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question about that. Although the Indian is now a full-fledged American citizen, he still has imposed upon him a great many restrictions, and he is treated as a ward in many instances. I predict today that out of this investigation which I have proposed, if it is properly conducted, there can be developed specific plans for aiding the Indians to help themselves to become completely independent and self-supporting members of our economic and political society. It should be possible in the predictable future to abolish the entire bureaucratic structure now handling Indian affairs, and it should soon be no longer necessary to maintain such a bureau if wise and proper Indian policies are faithfully followed. It is my hope such an investigation as I have recommended will lead to the adherence to and the adoption of a continuing program of Indian betterment which conforms with the laudable precepts laid down by Thomas Jefferson.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, at this point, to include an article from the Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., reporting the findings of a legislative investigating committee as to conditions on a certain reservation of our State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA SENATE MEMBERS IN INDIAN PROBE—RESOLUTION ASKING CONGRESS TO ACT IS PREPARED IN UPPER HOUSE

(By Ralph O. Hillgren)

PIERRE, March 2.—A resolution calling upon Congress to take drastic action on the Indian problem in South Dakota had been prepared in the State senate today.

The resolution was written by the Indian affairs committee, consisting of Senators Matt Stephenson, Dupree, E. L. Stavig, Rosholt, and Chris Dam, Rosebud.

Consideration of the red man's status followed a trip Sunday to the Crow Creek Reservation, where conditions were described as especially deplorable. All the members of the committee are from areas having Indian population. In the case of Senator Dam, half his constituents are Indians.

STUDY CROW CREEK

The committee was requested to view the Crow Creek situation by Frank Oleisky, proprietor of the Pierre Fruit Co., and Tom Eagleman, Indian, who is a statehouse employee. The writer accompanied the delegation. They visited Indian cabins and tents, not the Indian Bureau offices, to see conditions for themselves.

Eagleman, by the way, was a member of the famous Carlisle football team which in 1907 played 23 games, and won all of them, with such opponents as the Big Four in the East, Minnesota, and Leland Stanford.

Oleisky became interested in the Indians after he had done business with Crow Creek inhabitants. He went to Fort Thompson several years ago to collect some bills. Finding the Indians living in squalid conditions, he was shocked and decided not to press his claims, but rather to divert his attention to remedial measures.

PRIMITIVE EXISTENCE

One of the places visited was the tent inhabited by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Lodge and four children. The family had lived in a tent all winter. It was none too warm the day of the visit, and all six members of the family were found huddled around a fire in a crude sheet metal stove with flat top on which cooking apparently was done. The father sat on a trunk, but the others squatted on the floor. Old blankets were their only protection from the cold ground.

The delegation next visited the cabin of James Fire Cloud, where he lived with his wife and three children. One of the children was sickly and Mrs. Fire Cloud was reported half blind.

Both husband and wife said they were receiving old age assistance, but had been refused attention at the hospital when they were sick, being told that this was a matter for State officials to handle.

Mrs. Ben Felice said a person has to be "almost dead" before being admitted to the hospital.

Men said there was no work to be had anywhere. A few had been employed at the Pierre airdrome during the summer and a few others had worked at the Huron packing plant. None of them had any livestock or farm and ranch interests.

"CHILDREN LACK NOURISHMENT"

Supplementing the delegation's observations with his own information, Eagleman said young children were too listless the past winter to attend school on account of undernourishment, but in such cases the agency policeman would come to the tent or cabin and compel them to attend.

No family had more than a one-room cabin. Walls and roofs were of one thickness of board.

Senator Dam has pronounced views on the Indian question. He declares the redman's status is becoming steadily worse, not better, in the face of increasing congressional appropriations.

Eagleman, too, with more education than most Indians, and with more travel and experience at work, is dissatisfied with the slow progress of members of his race.

At one time he had 53 head of cattle. In no case could he buy and sell without permission of the agency farmer hired by the Government to supervise farm operations.

He said he had tried to advance beyond the status of Government ward, but could not legally do so. He declared the agency farmers don't know the problems of the particular area to which they are assigned and are transferred to other places before they have a chance to learn something about local conditions. He cited the case of one farmer who came to Crow Creek from Ohio and said he was ignorant of the process of listing corn.

I read now from page 286 of a book entitled "Massacre, a Survey of Today's American Indians," by Robert Gessner. This book is filled with examples of the white man's failure to solve the red man's problems. Let me read a description of an investigation made by William Madison, secretary-treasurer of the Society of American Indians. Madison says of an Indian family comprised of "Runs Through" and his wife, "Night Hawk Runs Through":

I found this old man and his wife drying horse meat which they were preparing for food and the only food they had. They informed me that they had secured it from the dump grounds of the town of Wolf Point.

The tent occupied by Runs Through and his wife was about 6 or 7 feet square and slanted all the way from the ridge pole to the ground. There were two bed comforts

on the ground, a box with a couple of tin plates and tin cups and a bread sack. The horse meat that they were drying was hung upon poles, and this was the whole of their estate.

Mr. Madison next visited "Two Woman Armstrong" living in an old, dilapidated log shack. He says of her:

This old log shack, which is her home, has a dirt roof and a dirt floor. She said that she had no articles of furniture, and no food on the premises and that when she asked the subagent at Wolf Point for help and food, he did nothing for her and advised her that she could drown her gophers for meat to eat. That he was particular in advising how she should do it.

THE INDIAN AND THE WAR

Mr. Speaker, these illustrations could be multiplied one after another, but I think it is sufficient to point out the fact that the Indian is left in woeful conditions of abject poverty in many places, despite his status of full citizenship, and despite the fact that in the last war, and in this war, the American Indian has contributed to a greater extent than any other racial group in this country in manpower, and in money. I quote now from a statement by our colleague, Congressman DAN REED of New York, who said on the floor of this House:

Mr. Speaker, when the World War broke out, among the first men in this country to rush to the colors were the Indians of the United States. The Indians furnished more men per capita than any other race, and they furnished more money per capita for the support of the war than any other race. Every general with the allied forces commended them for their heroism.

I could bring in other testimony to the same effect.

The magazine, *Asia*, for November 1942, reports that in this war so far we find the Indians again rushing to the colors and in support of this country. I quote from a paragraph:

When the Sioux registered for selective service they brought along their rifles. The Crow Council sent President Roosevelt \$10,000 out of tribal funds to pay for bombs and guns. Nearly all the able-bodied Chippewas on the Grand Portage Reservation have volunteered for Army duty. The Colvilles and the Cheyennes dropped their outstanding claims against the American Government the day the Japanese flyers attacked Pearl Harbor.

The Marine Corps has an all-Navajo platoon; and a row of machines in the Boeing plant at Seattle, where the flying fortresses take shape, is operated by broad-shouldered Yakimas.

At the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana, for example, of 252 braves registered under the Selective Service Act, 131 have volunteered for Army service.

The Fort Peck Reservation is where I just quoted illustrations from the book by Mr. Gessner showing that the Indians are living in such soul-stirring poverty.

Mr. Speaker, thus far in the war we find that of the 333,969 American Indians in this country as of last October, almost 11,000 were already in the armed services. There is no need to expand upon these illustrations. Let me now touch upon the financial arrangements that this Government has maintained in connection with the administration of Indian affairs.

During the past 20 years the United States Government has spent over \$643,-000,000 on the American Indian and we are presently employing over 8,000 people in the Indian Service. The Indians are living on some 100 reservations. How many Indians are there now? According to the latest census, 333,969. Thus we find 1 Government employee in the Indian Service for about every 40 Indians. If Indians average 5 to a family, this means 1 employee for every 8 Indian families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks two tables, one showing the financial costs to this Government of the Indian problem, and the other showing the present Indian population by States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Indian population of the United States, 1940

New England:	
Maine.....	1,251
New Hampshire.....	50
Vermont.....	16
Massachusetts.....	769
Rhode Island.....	196
Connecticut.....	201
Middle Atlantic:	
New York.....	8,651
New Jersey.....	211
Pennsylvania.....	441
East North Central:	
Ohio.....	338
Indiana.....	223
Illinois.....	624
Michigan.....	6,282
Wisconsin.....	12,265
West North Central:	
Minnesota.....	12,528
Iowa.....	733
Missouri.....	330
North Dakota.....	10,114
South Dakota.....	23,347
Nebraska.....	3,401
Kansas.....	1,165
South Atlantic:	
Delaware.....	14
Maryland.....	73
District of Columbia.....	190
Virginia.....	198
West Virginia.....	25
North Carolina.....	22,546
South Carolina.....	1,234
Georgia.....	106
Florida.....	690
East South Central:	
Kentucky.....	44
Tennessee.....	114
Alabama.....	464
Mississippi.....	2,134
West South Central:	
Arkansas.....	278
Louisiana.....	1,801
Oklahoma.....	63,125
Texas.....	1,103
Mountain:	
Montana.....	16,841
Idaho.....	3,537
Wyoming.....	2,349
Colorado.....	1,360
New Mexico.....	34,510
Arizona.....	55,076
Utah.....	3,611
Nevada.....	4,747
Pacific:	
Washington.....	11,394
Oregon.....	4,594
California.....	18,675

United States total Indian population..... 333,969

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, series P-10, No. 1 (Feb. 2, 1942).

Annual expenditures of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1921-42¹

Year:	
1923.....	\$44,253,540.42
1924.....	46,754,025.92
1925.....	38,755,456.82
1926.....	48,442,119.86
1927.....	35,523,521.49
1928.....	38,729,301.28
1929.....	37,242,839.43
1930.....	19,491,273.12
1931.....	26,253,626.66
1932.....	24,824,395.31
1933.....	22,722,346.53
1934.....	23,372,905.33
1935.....	27,898,987.69
1936.....	25,536,960.64
1937.....	32,814,393.18
1938.....	28,563,697.07
1939.....	39,815,347.93
1940.....	29,180,022.91
1941.....	27,281,755.43
1942.....	26,067,011.77
Total.....	643,523,528.79

¹ Source: The Budget of the United States for the fiscal years 1922-44.

NOTE.—In February 1943, according to the Office of Indian Affairs, its employees totaled 8,000, and approximately 100 reservations were administered at that time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I believe the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Has the gentleman presented this matter to the Committee on Indian Affairs at any session whatsoever?

Mr. MUNDT. This matter has been before the Indian Affairs Committee in one form or another many times since I have been a member of it. We held some hearings about 2 years ago on the general subject of the relationship of the Indian to his Government.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Dealing with the investigation?

Mr. MUNDT. Not dealing with the investigation, but dealing with the conditions out of which this investigation has become apparently necessary.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's proposition except I think it would have been a good plan to present that to the Committee on Indian Affairs. I join the gentleman with my support.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say I have discussed this with the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee and he is strongly in sympathy with my resolution.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What does your resolution propose to do?

Mr. MUNDT. My resolution proposes an investigation of the Indian conditions in this country by a subcommittee of the Indian Affairs Committee, with the request that it bring in such suggestions as it finds necessary for improving the conditions of the Indians.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Have you applied for a rule? Have you introduced the resolution?

Mr. MUNDT. The resolution has been introduced and is now before the Rules Committee. I expect to ask my colleagues on the Indian Affairs Committee at our meeting on Thursday to appear

with me before the Rules Committee seeking a rule.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think that would be the proper thing to do. I think the gentleman "has something."

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me and I appreciate his support in that connection.

HEAVY COSTS—SLIGHT IMPROVEMENT

It is rather an amazing thing to me, to think that in the last 20 years we have spent on the Indians of this country nearly \$2,000 for every Indian man, woman, and child. If they average five to the family, we have spent \$10,000 per Indian family in the past 20 years, and still we find the deplorable conditions such as I have called to your attention today. Even today the Bureau is costing in the neighborhood of \$100 per year per Indian man, woman and child; costing \$500 per year per Indian family. This is an inexcusable expenditure down through the years, when it is considered in connection with the snail's pace rate by which the Indians are being rehabilitated and equipped to take their rightful place as independent citizens of this great and free Republic. Appropriation of the people's money to the Indian problem is not sufficient to bring about the necessary adjustments and corrections. Our attitude cannot be described as being niggardly from the standpoint of finances, but it can be described as being almost a nullity from the standpoint of liquidating the Indian problem and of providing a satisfactory solution to the Indian question.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do I understand the gentleman correctly that the Indians have money to their credit and we are just holding back their own money?

Mr. MUNDT. In some cases that is true and in some cases it is not. It depends upon the tribe.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Can the gentleman give us the amount of money that is in trust for them?

Mr. MUNDT. It runs into many millions, I can assure the gentleman.

Now, I want to quote some rather high and significant authority. I call attention to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John Collier, who in speaking at the Plains Congress March 3, 1934, in Rapid City, S. Dak., he made two or three most significant statements. I wish to quote them to you.

In the first one he said this:

I have stood for one thing above all—

I may say that in saying that he was referring to the years he spent as head of an Indian group, trying to improve the Indian conditions outside of Government, and now, of course, the quotation comes from him at the time he is Commissioner of Indian Affairs:

I have stood for one thing above all, which was that it was the duty of the Indians themselves to determine what their own lives shall be. It is for the Indians themselves to determine what laws Congress shall pass for them.

That is a rather comprehensive statement to be made by the Commissioner of

Indian Affairs, but he made it. I am afraid, however, we have not reached the high goal the Commissioner so definitely described.

He also made this statement in the same conference:

The guardianship maintained by the United States is carried out under bad laws which are wicked and stupid and which makes slaves even of the Government employees hired to enforce the laws.

Mr. Speaker, if there be such bad and wicked laws the investigation I propose should ferret them out and recommend the necessary changes.

Let me quote one more statement from Mr. John Collier, Indian Commissioner, at that same meeting. It probably is the most startling of them all. He said:

The United States, since the year 1900, has misappropriated more than \$100,000,000 of tribal funds, has used these funds in ways which were indefensible, which should have been illegal, and which in Canada would have been illegal and indictable.

I am making only the statement that has been made on the floor of the Senate by Senators King, Frazier, and others, and reported in formal reports by its committees and is an incontestable fact.

By this misappropriation I mean the diversion of Indian trust funds for the support of the Indian Bureau which ought to have been supported by the General Treasury. I mean also the use of Indian trust moneys without the consent of the Indians, to build through highways for tourists and great irrigation systems for white farmers.

Let the Government give back to the Indians just 20 percent of this trust money which the Government misappropriated since 1900 and it will be enough capital for the development of the Indian lands. What I am saying is not needed to convince you.

And he was speaking to the Indians—

But I am saying it to get it into this record, so that you may use it to persuade other people—white people.

That ends the statement by Mr. Collier, which I submit is an astounding, startling, and unprecedented challenge and indictment of the American Indian policy coming from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and if I had said nothing else today these statements by Mr. Collier should warrant the investigation that I am asking the Congress to provide in this resolution.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman has made a very valuable contribution. Here is a point I wish could be brought out: Is anybody checking on the vouchers of money spent in that manner? Have they been approved? And, if so, by whom, by what departments?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not know that aspect personally, but I presume they are handled by the Comptroller General's office in the way other Government expenditures are handled. That is something this investigating committee might well go into if you feel that it is necessary.

With indictments like that, with evidence such as we have before us, I feel that this Congress should and will provide for the investigation which my resolution requests.

I think that among the other things this committee of the Congress ought to investigate are the workings of the

Wheeler-Howard Act. I am neither criticizing nor commending the act in these remarks, but it has now been in operation for a considerable period of years and is either working well or wickedly, and the Congress should find out which from its own committee, after field inspections and careful investigations and make the proper report to the Congress.

At this time we do not have adequate evidence to judge the Wheeler-Howard Act either one way or the other. We do know that some Indians in some other tribes want to be released and come out from under the controls of the Wheeler-Howard Act, and we need the necessary facts to judge the merits of the various contentions in connection with the operation of that act. Congress has a responsibility to acquaint itself by appropriate means of the merits or demerits of this act.

YARDSTICK ON INDIAN POLICY

I think we should apply the yardstick of Thomas Jefferson to all our considerations of the Indian problems. This simple question should be asked of any policy: Does it hasten the day when the Indians can become independent citizens and take their rightful place in American economy and political activity?

If this Government can afford it I say that the Government should then take every action in that direction. If it does not lead in that direction I submit that the Government should not take favorable action on any Indian policy whether the program is inexpensive or expensive.

Numerous suggestions have been made from the standpoint of the proper approach to handling the Indian problems which are listed in this book, *Massacre*, from which I have previously quoted.

The first is from Mr. Collier, himself, starting on page 406, and reads:

Abolish the guardianship of the United States over the Indian person. It is a survival from times when the Indians were enemies or prisoners confined under martial law on reservations serving as prison compounds.

Preserve the Federal guardianship over Indian property, individual and tribal. Regulate that guardianship by statute; make it accountable to the courts; provide for its termination, whether for tribes or individuals, in the discretion of the Federal court or through action by Congress after recommendation by the court. So amend the allotment law and other laws, as to permit joint or corporate land holdings and industrial enterprise by partnerships or tribes. Modern credit facilities to be extended to Indians; property and earning capacity, on initiative of the Indian borrowers, and after approval by the property guardian subject to court review, to be hypothecable against the loans. The spurious reimbursable indebtedness to be remitted through act of Congress.

Comprehensive Federal court jurisdiction to be established over civil and criminal matters on reservations, the court to be empowered in its discretion to recognize tribal custom and authority in matters internal to the tribes.

Transfer, with minor exceptions, all responsibility for Indian health work, education, social service, agricultural guidance and welfare to the States; the Federal appropriations of tax-raised funds and Indian-trust funds for these uses to be transferred to the States under contracts and to be supplemented through State appropriations.

Another set of proposals are made by Mr. A. A. Grorud, who was in charge of investigations of the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, from page 407:

The Indian Bureau's weapon for chastising the Indians is that peculiar body of statutes called Indian law.

Indian law places the Indian wholly at the mercy of the Indian Bureau on the theory that the Bureau is a virtuous and industrious guardian. American politics make the Indian Bureau not a guardian, but an exploiter and betrayer.

When the Indian tries to go into court against his guardian, the Indian Bureau, Indian law fixes it that the culprit and defendant, namely, the Indian Bureau, shall appoint the Indian's lawyer and control his actions. This complete supervision of all litigations must be restricted.

When the Indian is thrown into jail by an Indian Bureau employee, his appeal lies to the Secretary of the Interior, which is another name for the Indian Bureau.

Shall an Indian's son or daughter be permitted to inherit the parent's money or land? The Indian Bureau decides, and if the son or daughter appeals, the appeal is conducted through the Indian Bureau. If the decision is erroneous, there is no appeal or redress. On the other hand, if a previous decision is not to the liking of the Secretary of the Interior, he, according to a December 11, 1930, statement of O. H. Graves, Assistant to the Solicitor, "notwithstanding the decisions of former Secretaries may reopen, revise, decide, and entirely control its final disposition." In other words an Indian never knows when his estate is settled.

Shall an Indian be torn away from parents and home and locked up for 10 years in a boarding school under conditions of endemic disease and child labor, while his religion and language are effaced? The Indian Bureau decides and if the child or parent wants to appeal, he can appeal to the Secretary of the Interior, namely the Indian Bureau.

Shall Indians be permitted to form themselves into organizations, whether for mutual aid or political action or for religious communion? The Indian Bureau decides and if its decision is not obeyed, the Bureau tramples the organization out of life. The Indian Bureau actually maintains regulations which define Indian religions as Indian offenses punishable by fine and imprisonment.

The Indian Bureau banks the Indian's money. It holds the check book. It pays out what it wants to pay out and can demand that the money can be spent exactly as wanted by the Indian superintendent. It may account for the money or not as it chooses and in numerous cases it does not choose.

And meanwhile, the Indian Bureau, through manipulating patronage and funds, exerts a dominant power with Congress, and steadily multiplies the statutes which decade by decade rivet the chains more completely on the Indians' limbs.

The Supreme Court has countenanced the atrocity as a whole by ruling that Indian matters are subject to the political branch of the Government and are not reviewable by the courts on the substantial issues. The Indians are the only people in the United States who for practical purposes are denied access to the courts and the protection of the Constitution.

And today, as before, the Indian Bureau and Interior Department are standing like rock against all efforts to bring Indian law into line with American traditions, constitutional conceptions or ideas of democracy, individual responsibility, and cultural freedom.

Still another series of suggestions are by Alfred E. Smith made at the time he

was running for the Presidency, found on page 411. They are:

The Indians shall have an accounting for all their moneys.

Their moneys shall be used according to their wishes and not otherwise.

The control of the Indian Bureau over Indian funds and Indian life shall be curbed.

The Indians shall be given schools at their homes.

The Indians shall be given all the constitutional rights. This means:

No more putting Indians in jail by the superintendent.

No more interference with Indian religious observances.

A day in court for all Indians in every matter of life and property.

No more confiscation of Indian property.

At this point I might also mention that in 1933 a definite backward step was taken with regard to the whole Indian problem. On May 25, 1933, President Roosevelt abolished the Board of Indian Commissioners giving as his reason and I quote:

There is no necessity for the continuance of this Board and its abolishment will be in the interest of economy.

What are the facts in this connection? This Board was established by an act of Congress approved April 10, 1869. It was contemplated that the President would appoint as its members citizens noted for their intelligence, for their philanthropy, and for their qualities of fair play and good judgment. The purpose of Congress in establishing this Board was to set up a group of reasonable permanence having the sanction of Government and comprised of citizens who understood Indian problems and affairs and who would scrutinize Indian legislation and administration, detect and aid in remedying abuses, and assist in the difficult problems involved in gearing the Indian into the white man's civilization. It is recognized that this Board during its long and useful existence performed many splendid functions and made many constructive suggestions of value in the whole problem of absorption and assimilation.

The annual appropriation for its upkeep was only \$10,000, so no valid argument for its abolition could be based on the grounds of economy. At the time the Board was abolished two of its active members were Gen. Hugh L. Scott and Col. Frank Knox. Since the termination of this Board by Executive order no Government group aside from the Indian Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House has had any responsibility for planning and patrolling Government policies relating to the American Indian.

We have simply been nursing the Indian problem along to keep it ever with us as a healthy governmental gremlin. The time has come to quit nursing the problem and to devote realistic methods to its complete and satisfactory solution. I sincerely believe the adoption of my resolution and the ensuing investigation will make progress toward this goal.

CONSTRUCTIVE LEGISLATION NEEDED

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not also true—and I might preface my question by say-

ing that I have been on this committee many years, and was on it many years before the gentleman from South Dakota—that we have a most difficult time passing Indian legislation through Congress?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, because I intended to speak about that, but it had slipped my mind. I want to point out that we usually have but one calendar day during the session, and then Members having no interest in Indians and having no Indians in their districts have somewhat of a holiday at the expense of the red man. Seldom is our committee given a serious opportunity to pass constructive legislation to benefit the Indian.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They put it on the same basis as immigration. Just the moment a Member gets up on the floor and hollers "immigration" or "Indian affairs" that is enough to insure the defeat of the bill at the hands of those who do not know anything about either Indians or immigration.

Mr. MUNDT. I share the feeling of the gentleman from New York to the extent that the Indian has great difficulty in getting a hearing in Congress.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Since I have been a member of the committee there has not been a bill brought before Congress which was of real benefit to the Indian. It was always in favor of somebody who had a claim against the Indian.

Mr. MUNDT. That is all too often true, I am afraid.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California who serves as our minority whip.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. In my opinion the gentleman's resolution is an important resolution and most timely. I had the pleasure of serving on the Indian Affairs Committee for many years and took a deep interest in the problems of the Indians of the United States. I trust that the investigating committee advocated by the gentleman will be formed and be set up as suggested by the gentleman's resolution. I hope it will have the opportunity of going into these multiple problems which the gentleman has so aptly called to the attention of the House and the conception and ideas of Thomas Jefferson with reference to the part the Indian was supposed to take and the part that Jefferson counselled the Indian should take in American affairs.

If my memory serves me correctly I believe it was understood that a fourteenth State was to be set up at the time of the formation of the Union; that there was such an agreement between Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and others; that an old Iroquois chieftain by the name of White Eye who was very helpful in winning this country's independence, was to be recognized.

I hope the committee will have time to go back into this very early history and demonstrate that the American

Indian was intended to become an integral part of the life of this country.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman for his valuable historical contribution and interesting comments.

Out of the nearly \$1,000,000,000 we have spent in the last 20 years we have failed to get the solution of the Indian problem in return for the taxpayers' money, which they had a right to expect and to which the Indians were entitled. We have also failed to provide equal economic opportunities, proper medical facilities, decent living conditions, and other elemental equities which rightfully belong to the Indian and which form part of the white man's obligation to the original owners of this fair land of ours.

In other words, I think we have simply been nursing the Indian problem along. I submit the time has come now to cease perpetuating the problem and to make a realistic approach to its fair and final solution.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I understand that a native-born Indian, or an Indian in uniform is being discriminated against if he goes in any place where liquor is sold, and that he is not getting the same kind of treatment as the white boy in uniform. Should that not be looked into and should not all these discriminatory laws against Indians be removed?

Mr. MUNDT. No discrimination against Indians is justified because the Indian is a full-fledged American citizen. I know nothing in our Constitution which permits any bureau or even the Congress to discriminate as between American citizens because of race, religion, color, or on account of any other reason.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I understand that has been done because in the last hearings before the Indian Affairs Committee a tribal group came down pleading that we try to do something in reference to this matter.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman and I hope the House will soon act favorably on this resolution, known as House Resolution 166.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURDOCK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have time today, but the hour is very late, and I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

EFFECT OF AIR AGE UPON INLAND CITIES

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the coming of the air age for trade and travel will have far-reaching effects upon many of our inland regions. Cities now thought of as practically isolated may be transformed into great centers of international commerce.

The locations of the world's great cities have almost invariably been fixed by the crossroads of international trade routes. Likewise, within nations, towns and villages have repeatedly grown into great urban centers where domestic trade routes have met and crossed.

If one looks back to the period before the discovery of America and the use of the open ocean for carrying international traffic, he is struck by the importance of Constantinople in the economy of nations. Constantinople, strategically situated at the crossroads between the maritime and caravan routes from Egypt and Arabia to Russia, and the overland trade routes between India and China on the one hand and the whole of western Europe on the other, became the meeting place of a teeming international population where every language was spoken. It became the greatest economic center of the world. The influence which it wielded upon the civilization of our forefathers is still felt even in the twentieth century.

With the discovery of America, and the development of ocean routes for commerce, great cities sprang up on both the eastern and western shores of the Atlantic. Each of these cities, again located at strategic points, became the dominating community in the economy of their nations.

Then, with the development of the steam engine there came a further shift in population centers as a new means of transportation opened routes of trade theretofore unknown. Just as cities dependent upon the caravan routes declined when the sailing ships built rival centers, so cities literally created by the sailing ships sank into obscurity when steam became the motive power for commerce.

During colonial days, because of its geographical location, New York came to the fore as a dominating American city because it was located on the crossroads of travel north and south and east and west between the hinterland of the American Colonies and Europe.

Later the railroads were responsible for the development of cities like Buffalo, Cleveland, Chicago, St. Louis, and

Kansas City. Each, located at the crossroads of some trade routes leading in different directions, became important factors in our economy.

Similarly, at the junction points of rail and sea communication, cities such as Norfolk, New Orleans, San Francisco, took on a greater importance and grew into thriving communities.

Today we stand upon the threshold of a new era, an era that will be marked by shortening further the "time distance" of long stretches of travel and transportation. This new era of the air will leave a far greater imprint upon international commerce than did the invention of the steam engine. With the close of the present global war international trade and commerce by air transport will spring forth full grown.

Entirely new routes of travel will open up, as new to the world of today as the open ocean routes were new to Constantinople many centuries ago. Just as the airplane has changed our concepts of military tactics, so the airplane will change our geographical concepts of direction and distance between nations. Smaller cities at great distances inland will become the important terminals of air transport because, strange as it may seem, they are closer by air to the foreign centers of commerce than many of our most important seaports.

The future traveler, traveling from some point in Arizona, will not need to go to the coast of the Gulf of Mexico or overland to New York to travel by ship to Europe. Instead, he may step into an airplane in his home town and with speed now undreamed of, fly almost due north across Oklahoma, Missouri, South Dakota, and Minnesota, cross the Canadian border, turning northeastward to the coast of Labrador, over Greenland and Iceland to the British Isles or continental Europe.

The future traveler, traveling from the eastern seaboard of our country, will not need to go overland 3,000 miles across to the seaport cities of Seattle, San Francisco, or Los Angeles, and then travel southwestward to the Philippines, the Malayan Archipelago, or Australia. He, too, will step into an airplane in his own community, fly northwestward across the Alleghenies, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Minnesota to the Canadian border, and thence onward to the southern reaches of Alaska, the Aleutians, and down the Siberian and Chinese coasts to his destination.

To follow these new air routes, "time-distance" will be shortened, not by hours, but by days and even weeks.

A most likely development is that the great State of Minnesota will be at the crossroads of international air trade and commerce between the United States and much of the rest of the world. Its ideal geographical location is but one of the major factors lending support to plans which should now be formulated that the United States may be ready when peace suddenly comes. The topography of Minnesota is ideal for the location there of airports where the transshipment of goods can be effected for their distribution throughout the entire Nation. The meteorological and weather experience of

Minnesota is ideal for air traffic throughout the major portion of the year, and with the development of the airplane at the rate it has been progressing since the outbreak of the war, air traffic can be carried on successfully in Minnesota through the entire year.

Much has been said about aviation post-war planning. It takes but some vision as to the future to see some great airport located at some point in Minnesota. At that airport planes will land, coming from Asia and Europe, a port where air routes from every section of the country will converge to meet the traffic of international commerce.

Far greater advances have been made in air transport in the months since Pearl Harbor than in an equal number of years before. With thousands upon thousands of the youth of America returning from the battlefields of global war, trained both as pilots and in the use of aircraft, America will be air-minded. Travel in the future will be by air and much of the traffic in commodities between nations will be by air transport. Recognizing this, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives has been considering H. R. 1012, a bill designed to prepare the United States to meet the challenge of international air transport.

But it will not be enough merely to provide the proper legislative framework for aviation development. It is important that we go further and, at the earliest time possible, have airfields located at those strategic points throughout the Nation that will insure our success in meeting foreign competition. Minnesota meets every requirement as the one State where sufficient airports can be constructed to carry on this international commerce with the greatest efficiency. We must prepare now. As essential as was preparedness for war to save us from destruction by our enemies, so is it essential that we be prepared to meet the economic challenge of the post-war world.

Minnesota is a great natural location for this tremendous airport. Already the eyes of those who have vision have been turned toward our State as a great natural location for this airport. It is a challenge to the vision, and the opportunity is here to commence its planning.

The location of such airport may be a matter of individual or local dispute but the importance of the location of this airport at some point in Minnesota and its importance to the State and the entire Middle West and Northwest sections of our great country, so far transcends personal or local interests that it is sincerely urged that in the consideration of this vital subject that all personal and individual and local differences should be and must be eliminated.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

To Mr. SATTERFIELD (at the request of Mr. BLAND), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To the House Military Affairs Committee (at the request of Mr. MAY), for March 17, on account of request of the

War Department that the committee inspect the work and equipment at the Aberdeen Proving Ground.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 786. An act to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 17, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, March 17, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 149.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:45 a. m., Wednesday, March 17, 1943, to consider various bills.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a hearing of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, March 17, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 1607.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The committee will also hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1361 (Mr. LANE) and H. R. 1409 (Mr. FOGARTY), conferring upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to those serving in the armed forces, and on H. R. 1858, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 1, 1943, at 10 a. m., on S. 163 (H. R. 498) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship-construction reserve funds, and for other purposes.

Congressman GEORGE J. BATES, of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on Thursday, April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee, duties of which will compel him to be absent from Washington on Thursday, April 8, 1943. Accordingly, the hearing sched-

uled for that date has been changed to Thursday, April 15, 1943, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 694, a bill to provide for the attachment, garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, March 24, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

252. A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting the second quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period beginning October 1, 1942, and ending December 31, 1942; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department.

253. A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of November 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

254. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a signed copy of the Forty-second Annual Report of the Governor of Puerto Rico for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

255. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report containing the names and addresses of payees who received \$1,000 or more and showing the amount of payment to each for participation in the 1941 programs administered under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

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

257. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Chief of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, 1942; to the Committee on Agriculture.

258. A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting the copy of the Seventh Annual Report of the Social Security Board (H. Doc. No. 132); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 170. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1914, a bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 250). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 58. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to continue the investigation with respect to petroleum begun under House Reso-

lution 290, Seventy-sixth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 251). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Concurrent Resolution 9. Concurrent resolution condemning outrages inflicted upon civilians in the Nazi occupied countries and favoring punishment of persons responsible therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2201. A bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for small business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2202. 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.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 2203. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2204. A bill relating to pay, allowances, and insurance for members of the land or naval forces training to be pilots under the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. R. 2205. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, so as to permit such federation to extend certain benefits to all its members; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 2206. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 2207. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 2208. A bill to promote the national defense and to facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment and essential to domestic requirements through safe and adequate inland waterways, by the immediate authorization of the construction of the New York Bay-Delaware River section of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2209. A bill to cover the positions of registers of the district land offices into the classified civil service and to fix the compensation thereof; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2210. A bill to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution to permit retailers to combine in negotiating purchases from suppliers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution extending the time within which certain acts under

the Internal Revenue Code are required to be performed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Res. 171. Resolution to establish a special committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2211. A bill for the relief of Francesco Antonio Patata; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2212. A bill for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. R. 2213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Wolters; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McWILLIAMS:

H. R. 2214. A bill for the relief of the East Coast Ship and Yacht Corporation, of Noank, Conn.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2215. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice V. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2216. A bill for the relief of Solon P. Haun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 2217. A bill granting a pension to Ethel Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 9, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., associate minister, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Eternal God, who in times past didst lead our forefathers from lands of oppression, and open before them in the wilderness a new land which by Thy gracious providence has become great among the nations: We beseech Thee to continue thy loving kindness to us, that in these days of strife and strain we lose not the vision of freedom, justice, and equality which Thou didst reveal to them. Guide, we pray Thee, all those to whom Thou hast committed the Government of our Nation, and grant to them at this time special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and of strength.

Bless all who labor in field and factory, in office and home for our country's welfare. May they labor for the work's sake without undue thought of gain, unspoiled by the increase of income, seeking to give the best that is in them.

And stretch forth, we beseech Thee, Thine almighty arm to strengthen and protect the defenders of our country, wherever they may serve at home or abroad, on land, sea, or in the air. Bless them and the cause in which we send them forth. Endue them with courage and loyalty, with patience, fortitude and endurance, and lead them to Thine own

victory of righteousness and peace. We ask it all in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1943.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUCAS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 16, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh annual report of the Social Security Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS OF OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT RENT CONTROL ADMINISTRATOR

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second semiannual report of the operations of the Office of Administrator of Rent Control of the District of Columbia, covering the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, Navy (3), Interior, Agriculture (3), and Commerce; Federal Works Agency (2), The National Archives, and the District Court of the Northern District of California which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of Hollywood Parlor, No. 196, 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.