

Jack Talmadge Davis  
 John McArthur Davis  
 Douglas Lipp Deal  
 Donald Alburts Detwiler  
 William Bradford Dudley  
 Anthony Raymond Durante  
 John Wyeth Earhart, Jr.  
 Preston Warham Easley  
 Phillips Eastman, Jr.  
 Oliver Richard English  
 William Earl Evers  
 James Thomas Fitz-Gerald, Jr.  
 Henry Merritt Fletcher, Jr.  
 James Dixon Fore  
 Tom Bond Foulk, Jr.  
 Norman Horace Frisbie  
 Charles Arthur Gaingnat  
 David Emanuel Galas  
 Thomas Simons Garrett 3d  
 Vincent Augustus Gaudiani, Jr.  
 Eaton Arthur Gorelangton  
 William James Greene  
 Allen Wyant Gullion, Jr.  
 Alfred Dale Hagen  
 Ralph Junior Hallenbeck  
 Jack Willming Hammel  
 Robert Maxwell Hancock, Jr.  
 Burton Clement Hanish  
 Teague Gray Harris, Jr.  
 Frank James Harrold, Jr.  
 Martin Lee Harter  
 Paul Andre Hederstrom, Jr.  
 Harry Ludwick Heintzelman 3d  
 Richard Tilghman Hemsley 3d  
 Robert Alvin Hersberger  
 Edward Jerome Hertel  
 Robert William Hoffman  
 Henry Leon Hogan 3d  
 Arthur William Holderness, Jr.  
 John Mahlon Hommel  
 Luther Walker Hough, Jr.  
 Richard Hugh Houser  
 Joseph Hipolito Huau, Jr.  
 John Bell Hudson  
 Ullin Lee Hudson  
 Herschel DeMent Hughes  
 Paul Joseph Hurley  
 George Howard Ingham  
 Clare Thompson Ireland, Jr.  
 Felix Andrew Kalinski  
 James Moulton Keck  
 William Joseph Kilpatrick, Jr.  
 Harold Ferguson Knowles  
 John Roger Kullman  
 Harvey Haroldson Latson, Jr.  
 Hanford Nichols Lockwood 3d  
 Thomas McAdoo Love  
 Richard Curry McAdam  
 Thomas Eugene McCabe  
 Donald DeForest McClure  
 Robert Dugald McClure  
 Richard David McCord  
 Jack Kenneth McGregor  
 Jack Mann McGregor  
 Frank McCoy McMullen  
 John Robert McNeil  
 Laurence Ronald MacDonnell  
 Robert John MacMullin  
 Gayle Eugene Madison  
 Maurice Langhorne Martin  
 William Wintle Martin  
 Russell Lowell Maughan, Jr.  
 Richard Victor Miracle  
 William Clarence Moore  
 Christopher Henry Munch  
 David Duncan Munro 3d  
 John Walter Myrtetus  
 William Edward Naylor, Jr.  
 Louis Konrad Nesselbush  
 John Jacob Neuer  
 Jack Conrad Novak  
 Edmund Francis O'Connor  
 Robin Olds  
 Thomas Kilbury Oliver  
 Earl Oren Olmstead, Jr.  
 Robert Evans Orr  
 Norbert Joseph Oswald  
 Stanley Carter Pace

Richard Henry Parker  
 Jammie Mendal Philpott  
 John Charles Piebes  
 Waldo Franklin Potter  
 Ernest Collier Price  
 James Rival Pugh, Jr.  
 Robert Duncan MacGregor Randall  
 John William Rawlings, Jr.  
 James Cabell Reed  
 Edward Julius Renth, Jr.  
 Anthony Henry Richard, Jr.  
 Coleman Cabell Richards  
 Zacheus Camp Richardson  
 Scott Brewer Ritchie, Jr.  
 Robert John Rooney  
 Joseph Henry Rosness  
 Francis Earle Rundell 2d  
 George LeRoy Russell  
 Ned Schramm, Jr.  
 David Gibbon Schwartz  
 Ralph Meloy Scott  
 William Fontaine Scott  
 Richard Francis Shaefer  
 Daniel Francis Shea  
 Stephen Hunting Sherill, Jr.  
 Albert Raymond Shiel, Jr.  
 Lindsey McDonald Silvester  
 Eber Eugene Simpson  
 Elwood Frank Smith  
 Hubert Smith, Jr.  
 J. Weller Smith  
 Kenneth Bates Smith  
 Lowell Blair Smith  
 William Wayne Snavely  
 Charles Spleth, Jr.  
 Gordon Hall Steele, Jr.  
 Paul Leonard Stelme  
 Richard Carlton Stickney, Jr.  
 Richard Williams Stoddard  
 Marion Scott Street  
 Richard Donald Sullivan  
 Firman Edward Susan  
 Dale Sidney Sweat  
 John James Swisshelm  
 Franklin Woody Taylor  
 Ralph Jamison Teeter, Jr.  
 Junior Craig Teller  
 James Robert Thomas  
 Albert Sidney Johnston Tucker, Jr.  
 Vernon Richard Turner  
 Francis Veazy Walker  
 James Harper Walker  
 Charles Skillman Waller  
 Edward Joseph Walsh, Jr.  
 Edward Menefee Watkins, Jr.  
 James Howard Watkins  
 Lawrence Middleton Watson  
 William Glenn Watson  
 Lewis Frazer Webster  
 Marston Thorn Westbrook  
 J. Duane Wethe  
 William Joseph Whalen  
 Richard Vincent Wheeler  
 Keith Albert Whitaker  
 Jack Henderson Whitson  
 Warren Tanner Whittemore  
 Fred Ordway Wickham, Jr.  
 Louis Charles Wieser  
 Richard Bocock Willis, Jr.  
 Harold William Woodson  
 Edmund Augustus Wright, Jr.  
 Howard Greenlees Yellding  
 Michael Zubon  
 Lloyd Zuppann, Jr.

To be second lieutenants with rank from  
 June 3, 1943

AIR CORPS

Edgar Knowles Parks, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Charles E. Rosendahl to be a rear admiral,  
 for temporary service, to rank from July 9,  
 1942.

POSTMASTERS

MINNESOTA

Edward T. Gibbons, Sherburn.

MISSISSIPPI

Ola Chandler, Braxton.  
 James O. Waldrop, Newton.  
 Robert A. Dean, Okolona.  
 R. Ben Linn, Pickens.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marvin F. Birely, Blue Ridge Summit.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
 The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of Mankind, we pray that Thy spirit may arouse in us the feeling of unused powers and the consciousness of responsibility. We rejoice that Thou dost pour out of Thy infinite fullness an overflow transcending all human need. As the humblest flower by the way breathes an unconscious fragrance, so may we by gentleness and humility show forth the spirit of our Saviour, nor ever let an unhallowed day pass.

Most graciously regard our country; humanity with all its burdens seems to be wandering between two worlds—the old one dying and a new one struggling to be born. Teach us again and again that life is more than livelihood. Make us to learn the discipline that the world can be saved only by submitting to righteous law, rather than wielding the bludgeon of force. We pray for a gale from heaven, a rushing of a mighty wind, carrying light to those in darkness and life to those in death.

Blessed Lord, we pray for those in sorrow and for those in joy; for those who are cast down and for those exalted; for those in barren lands, weary and worn; and for all in the battle lines of freedom. Almighty God, make us worthy of the sacrifice and the victory on which the rights of man can be restored. In the name of Thy Son, our Redeemer. Amen.

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

LEND-LEASE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, Friday, following disposition of business on the Speaker's table, it shall be in order to consider, under the rules of the House, the defense and lend-lease supplemental appropriation bill, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHEPPARD) there were—ayes 62, noes 0.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. This is an automatic call. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 0, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—360

Abernathy	Domengeaux	Johnson, Ind.
Allen, Ill.	Dondero	Johnson,
Allen, La.	Doughton	J. Leroy
Andersen, H. Carl	Douglas	Johnson,
Anderson, Calif.	Durham	Luther A.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Dworshak	Johnson,
Andresen, August H.	Eaton	Lyndon B.
Andrews	Eberharter	Johnson, Okla.
Angell	Ellison, Md.	Johnson, Ward
Arends	Elmer	Jones
Arnold	Elston, Ohio	Jonkman
Auchincloss	Engel	Kean
Baldwin, Md.	Fay	Kearney
Baldwin, N. Y.	Feighan	Kee
Barden	Fellows	Keeffe
Barrett	Fenton	Kefauver
Barry	Fernandez	Kerr
Bates, Ky.	Fish	Kiburn
Bates, Mass.	Fitzpatrick	Kilday
Beall	Flannagan	Kilday
Beckworth	Fogarty	King
Bell	Folger	Kinzer
Bender	Forand	Kirwan
Bennett, Mich.	Ford	Kleberg
Bennett, Mo.	Fulbright	Knutson
Bishop	Fulmer	Kunkel
Blackney	Gale	LaFollette
Bland	Gamble	Lambertson
Bloom	Gathings	Landis
Bolton	Gavan	Lane
Bonner	Gearhart	Larcade
Boren	Gerlach	LeCompte
Bradley, Mich.	Gifford	LeFevre
Bradley, Pa.	Gilchrist	Lesinski
Brehm	Gillette	Ludlow
Brown, Ga.	Gillie	Lynch
Brown, Ohio	Gordon	McCormack
Bryson	Gore	McCowen
Buffett	Gossett	McGehee
Bulwinkle	Graham	McGregor
Burch, Va.	Grant, Ala.	McKenzie
Burchill, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	McLean
Burdick	Green	McMillan
Burgin	Gregory	McMurray
Busbey	Griffiths	McWilliams
Butler	Gwynne	Madden
Camp	Hagen	Magnuson
Canfield	Hall	Mahon
Cannon, Fla.	Edwin Arthur	Maloney
Cannon, Mo.	Hall	Mansasco
Carlson, Kans.	Leonard W.	Mansfield,
Carson, Ohio	Hancock	Mont.
Carter	Hare	Mansfield, Tex.
Case	Harless, Ariz.	Marcantonio
Chapman	Harness, Ind.	Martin, Iowa
Chenoweth	Harris, Ark.	Martin, Mass.
Chipfield	Harris, Va.	Mason
Church	Hartley	May
Clason	Hays	Michener
Clevenger	Hebert	Miller, Conn.
Coffee	Heldinger	Miller, Mo.
Cole, Mo.	Herter	Miller, Nebr.
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Mills
Colmer	Hill	Monkiewicz
Compton	Hobbs	Moroney
Cooley	Hoch	Morrison, N. C.
Cooper	Hoeven	Mott
Cox	Hoffman	Mundt
Cravens	Hollifield	Murdock
Crawford	Holmes, Mass.	Murphy
Creal	Holmes, Wash.	Murray, Tenn.
Crosser	Hope	Murray, Wis.
Cullen	Horan	Newsome
Cunningham	Howell	Norman
Curtis	Hull	Norrell
D'Alesandro	Izsc	O'Brien, Ill.
Davis	Jackson	O'Brien, Mich.
Dawson	Jarman	O'Brien, N. Y.
Day	Jeffrey	O'Connor
Delaney	Jenkins	O'Hara
Dickstein	Jennings	O'Konski
Dilweg	Jensen	O'Neal
Dingell	Johnson	Outland
Dirksen	Anton J.	Pace
Disney	Johnson	Patman
Ditter	Calvin D.	Patton

Peterson, Fla.	Satterfield	Tarver
Peterson, Ga.	Sauthoff	Thomas, Tex.
Philbin	Scanlon	Thomason
Phillips	Schiffler	Tibbott
Pittenger	Schuetz	Tolan
Ploeser	Shafer	Towe
Plumley	Sheppard	Treadway
Poage	Short	Van Zandt
Poulson	Sikes	Vincent, Ky.
Price	Simpson, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
Priest	Simpson, Pa.	Vorys, Ohio
Rabaut	Slaughter	Vursell
Ramey	Smith, Maine	Wadsworth
Ramspeck	Smith, Ohio	Weaver
Randolph	Smith, Va.	Welchel, Ohio
Rankin	Smith, W. Va.	Weiss
Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Wis.	Wene
Reed, Ill.	Somers, N. Y.	West
Reed, N. Y.	Sparkman	Wheat
Rees, Kans.	Spence	Whelchel, Ga.
Richards	Springer	Whitten
Rivers	Stanley	Whittington
Rizley	Starnes, Ala.	Wickersham
Robinson, Utah	Steagall	Wigglesworth
Robson, Ky.	Stearns, N. H.	Willey
Rockwell	Stefan	Wilson
Rodgers, Pa.	Stevenson	Winstead
Rogers, Calif.	Stewart	Winter
Rogers, Mass.	Stockman	Wolcott
Rohrbough	Sullivan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Rowan	Summer, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Rowe	Sundstrom	Woodrum, Va.
Russell	Taber	Wright
Sadowski	Talbot	Zimmerman
Sasscer	Talle	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—72

Boykin	Guyer	O'Leary
Brooks	Hale	O'Toole
Buckley	Halleck	Pfeifer
Byrne	Hart	Powers
Capozzoli	Heffernan	Pracht
Ceiler	Hendricks	Robertson
Clark	Hinshaw	Rolph
Cochran	Judd	Sabath
Costello	Kelley	Schwabe
Courtney	Kennedy	Scott
Culkin	Klein	Sheridan
Curley	Lea	Snyder
Dewey	Lemke	Summers, Tex.
Dies	Lewis	Taylor
Elliott	Luce	Thomas, N. J.
Ellsworth	McGranery	Troutman
Furlong	Maas	Vinson, Ga.
Gallagher	Merritt	Walter
Gavin	Merrow	Ward
Gibson	Miller, Pa.	Wasielewski
Goodwin	Morrison, La.	Welch
Gorski	Myers	White
Granger	Nichols	Woodruff, Mich.
Gross	Norton	Worley

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Costello with Mr. Ralph.  
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Goodwin.  
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.  
Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.  
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Scott.  
Mr. Curley with Mr. Dewey.  
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Culkin.  
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Maas.  
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Guyer.  
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Ellsworth.  
Mr. Klein with Mr. Schwabe.  
Mr. Worley with Mr. Pracht.  
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Hale.  
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Judd.  
Mr. O'Toole and Mr. Lewis of Ohio.  
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Troutman.  
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Powers.  
Mr. Hart with Mrs. Luce.  
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Taylor.  
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Welch.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Gallagher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks upon the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address entitled "America's Aviation Tomorrow," by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president, Air Transport Association of America; also a statement by 18 air lines, being a joint reply to certain questions by the Civil Aeronautics Board, including a reply by question and answer; together with a letter from the President of the United States to Mr. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first air-mail flight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### C. K. LAWSON AND THE RUML PLAN

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from an outstanding constituent of mine, Mr. C. K. Lawson, of Cedartown, Ga., which I conceive to be a patriotic, open, frank expression representing the attitude of a majority of the laboring men in this country concerning what is known as the Ruml plan. Mr. Lawson writes as follows:

CEDARTOWN, GA., May 13, 1943.  
Hon. MALCOLM TARVER,  
Member of Congress,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a cotton-mill man, working 7 days a week, putting more than 10 percent of my income in bonds and trying to pay for a home to enjoy when I get too old to work. And I need every dollar I can earn. But Uncle Sam went head over heels in debt last year just to protect my home and my job and my right to enjoy them. And since his income is derived from taxes, I don't see how honest men can talk about canceling his income unless they are going to cancel his debts.

Personally I want to get on a pay-as-you-go tax basis, but I don't want to beat my country out of what I owe for last year's protection, nor have a lot of debts for my grandchildren to pay interest on.

Let us have a pay-as-you-go tax bill and forget about that forgiving and forgetting.

Respectfully,

Mr. AVERAGE CITIZEN,  
C. K. LAWSON.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Powers] be granted leave of absence for today on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### THE FOOD SITUATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that our country is in the midst of a very serious food problem. From all indications this problem is getting worse rapidly. This is due largely to the bungling of the food authorities of the Government.

About a month ago the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the Republican leader in Congress, set up from among the Republicans in the House a committee to study the food situation. This committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has been at work diligently, and is alarmed at the seriousness of the food situation. A day or two ago, under the order of this committee, I introduced in the House a bill which, if passed, will bring order out of chaos. This bill provides for the establishment of one single food administrator to have full and complete charge of all of the food departments of the Government. It is our hope that such a measure might be passed by the Congress immediately because the situation warrants immediate action.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by David Lawrence, appearing in today's Washington Star, on the income tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] may extend his remarks in two particulars.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BRYSON was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. NEWSOME addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HARRIS of Virginia was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Aviation News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### GLENN HAMMOND CURTISS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, 65 years ago tomorrow, on the 21st day of May 1878, in the quiet country village of Hammondsport, nestled in the hills of the Finger Lake region of New York State, Glenn Hammond Curtiss was born. Named, first, for a site of local scenic beauty and, second, for the founder of the community which gave him birth, "G. H." as he was wont to be called by his contemporaries, was destined to become one of the great pioneers in the field of aviation. Though credit for having made the first flight in America has been given to others, Glenn Curtiss was the first man to give a public demonstration of a successful flight in what was then known as the flying machine.

Holder of pilot's license No. 1 of the Aero Club of America, he was the first man to complete a sustained flight of 1 kilometer, slightly more than half a mile, in a flimsy crate dubbed the *Juno Bug*. Somewhat later he made the first flight from a water take-off in the *Loon*.

Both in conception and development of the aircraft engine and in the plane itself Curtiss has no peer in American history. To commemorate his great contribution to this modern science, I have today introduced a measure providing for the erection of a suitable memorial at Hammondsport, N. Y., as a fitting tribute by a grateful nation for the work done by Glenn Curtiss and his associates.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

#### OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, my home town is fairly bristling with war industries. Among them is a large rayon plant. This plant was recently visited by two men from the Office of Price Administration. The manager took them through this plant. They were interested in every detail that goes into the manufacture of rayon, so much so that when the manager took them back into the office it was with fear and trepidation in his heart that he faced them. But much to his surprise and amazement and utter relief, one of these so-called experts proffered his hand and said, "Mr. Manager, I want to thank you for this wonderful tour of inspection, for this is the first time I have ever been in a mill in all my life."

Now, that would be funny if it were not the essence of irony.

The soldiers who fight our battles take time out to delouse themselves. It would be well that certain bureaus emulate their example and delouse themselves of some of the vermin that have wormed their way into high offices of trust.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

#### OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a telegram from Mr. George C. Thierbach, president, National Coffee Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. PITTINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### CONGRESSIONAL WAR PARENTS' ASSOCIATION

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, if I may have attention for just a moment to make an announcement. The Congressional War Parents' Association, which is such an informal thing that we do not even send out notices of meetings, will meet Monday afternoon at 4:30 in the Appropriations Committee room opposite the barber shop. I think the Members can all find it. We hope there will be a good attendance.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution of the National Catholic Council.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Daily Times entitled "Copernicus and Hitler."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Fowler McCormack, president of the International Harvester Co.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

**THE SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

**MR. DICKSTEIN.** Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House for 30 minutes on May 26. In view of the fact that May 26 has been set aside as memorial day I ask unanimous consent that my time be transferred to Thursday, May 27, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day.

**THE SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

**COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION**

**MR. DICKSTEIN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may have the right to sit during the sessions of the House on May 26 and May 27.

**THE SPEAKER.** The Chair cannot entertain the gentleman's request at this time. Some time ago the Chair made the announcement that when bills were being read for amendment in the House the Chair would not entertain a request of a committee to sit.

**MR. DICKSTEIN.** Mr. Speaker, may I not make the request subject to the condition that the committee would suspend its sitting if a bill were being read?

**THE SPEAKER.** The Chair would prefer that the gentleman withdraw his request at the present time.

**MR. DICKSTEIN.** Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

**MR. BUSBEY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a statement I made yesterday before the House Committee on Small Business.

**THE SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

**MR. VAN ZANDT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

**THE SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

**O. P. A. SUBSIDIES**

**MR. DWORSHAK.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

**THE SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

**MR. DWORSHAK.** Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. has recently announced a new subsidy program involving the rolling back of prices on many commodities, including butter. I should like to read a telegram at this time I have received from Mr. E. S. Trask, chairman of the Idaho Dairy Products Council:

BOISE, IDAHO, May 15, 1943.

**Congressman HENRY DWORSHAK:**

Idaho dairy products council, made up of Idaho farmer-owned cooperative creameries, with more than 16,000 active patrons, protests the proposed subsidy program to be applied to butter as announced by the Office of Price Administration. Urge you actively oppose this program. Believe that more fruitful results in preventing inflation would be secured by absorbing through increased taxes and enforced savings that portion of

purchasing power for which goods and services are not available. Farmers definitely interested in avoiding the calamity of uncurbed inflation, but do not wish to accept a consumers' subsidy when large portion of consumers amply able to pay prices that will maintain badly needed production. Consumers now certainly more able to pay reasonable prices than loading costs of subsidy program on posterity.

**IDAHO DAIRY PRODUCTS COUNCIL,  
E. S. TRASK, Chairman.**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

**MR. JENKINS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Frank E. Gannett.

**THE SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

**O. P. A. AND SMALL BUSINESS**

**MR. VURSELL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

**THE SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

**COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE MAY 26**

**MR. DICKSTEIN.** Mr. Speaker, I renew my request; I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may sit during the session of the House on May 26 unless there be general debate in the House.

**THE SPEAKER.** The gentleman would not want to do that if his committee had a bill up; would he?

**MR. DICKSTEIN.** No.

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

There was no objection.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

**MR. ROWAN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a very brief article from the Chicago Times.

**THE SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

**WARTIME ATHLETICS**

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

**THE SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEISS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944**

**MR. JOHNSON** of Oklahoma. 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 bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr.

Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate continue not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] and myself.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

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 the bill H. R. 2719, with Mr. BARDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

**MR. JOHNSON** of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 54 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in presenting the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944, from the Committee on Appropriations, let me preface my remarks with a few general statements.

In its deliberations on the pending bill the committee was without the services of several members who have served with distinction for a great many years. I refer, of course, to the present Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], Judge Leavy, who was a tower of strength as Members will recall, and who has been appointed by the President to a Federal judgeship, our colleague and present chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, and Mr. Rich, of Pennsylvania, a sincere and capable gentleman who voluntarily retired from Congress.

The gentlemen who have succeeded these able legislators, Mr. KIRWAN, of Ohio, Mr. NORRELL, of Arkansas, and Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, have displayed a keen interest in the work of the committee and have contributed much to whatever success we may have achieved.

The present distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee was present during the opening session of our hearings and made several valuable contributions to the record and interrogated the witness, the Secretary of the Interior, as to several important matters including the Department's food production program, concerning which I wish to refer later on in my remarks today.

I must not overlook mentioning those hold-over members of the subcommittee. We would not have been able to bring to this House a bill which is as well balanced and at the same time severely reduced, without the valuable and experienced assistance of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK], the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Let me say here that this is the first time during the years I have been a member of this committee that there have been no controversial items in the bill.

In my opening statement to the subcommittee at the beginning of the hearings, after discussing several other matters, I urged that the committee secure all the available information possible concerning the many bureaus and agencies, and then eliminate or drastically reduce every item we could, especially

those which did not bear on the war effort. Let me quote one paragraph from that statement as follows:

And finally, when the hearings have been concluded, let me presume upon the valuable time of the committee further by suggesting that members of this subcommittee make every effort to cut these appropriations to the bone without seriously impairing the efficiency of the various departments and agencies. But let me also suggest that the committee members fight out their differences of opinion here behind closed doors and endeavor to reach an agreement on which they can present a united front both in the full committee and on the floor. Members may be assured of my full cooperation to that end.

A little later I shall give the figures showing how successful the committee was in achieving the ends suggested by me at the opening of the hearings.

I feel that it is correct and accurate to state that we finally agreed unanimously on every item in the bill and that we are all now unanimously behind the bill and every item in it. This does not mean that when we wrote the bill we did not have differences of opinion as to individual items. In fact, there were many such differences of opinion and we spent considerable time in reaching a decision. But we have reached that decision and the bill you have before you represents, so far as I can recall, the first time an appropriation bill has been reported to this House on which all members of the committee were in unanimous agreement.

The subcommittee, of which I have the honor of being chairman, held daily hearings, morning and afternoon, covering a period of about 6 weeks. These were long, tedious, and somewhat nerve-racking hearings. Despite the fact that we heard many witnesses from the various departments, Members of Congress, representatives of pressure groups, and others, your committee has succeeded in keeping down to a minimum the size of the hearings by insisting that much of the discussion not directly related to the appropriation be off the record. Through this procedure we were able to reduce the number of pages by 140.

You will recall that there are 26 agencies and activities in the Department of the Interior. And the committee heard representatives from each of them. There were a total of 88 departmental representatives, including officials from the Department of Agriculture and the War Production Board. In addition, we heard 3 United States Senators, 37 Members of Congress, and 12 representatives of outside organizations.

It is significant that the total cost of all their requests for additional funds would run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

It is also significant to note that not one witness who appeared before the committee asked for a reduction in appropriations for the next fiscal year, but, on the other hand, each and every witness, save possibly one, urged and demanded increased appropriations, despite the fact that there was no Budget estimate for the proposed increases. I might say here that many if not all of

the requests made by Members of Congress and others had considerable merit. In fact, many of the projects proposed involving the expenditure of millions of dollars, undoubtedly should be considered seriously in the post-war program that we hope is not far distant. But your committee recognized the fact that this Nation is engaged in a desperate war that will decide the future of our beloved country for many generations to come, and feel it is a solemn obligation to cut and slash all appropriations not directly related to the war effort and to refuse to seriously consider any and all new projects pending the duration of the war.

Before going into a discussion of the various agencies and activities in the bill permit me to give you a few facts and figures as to the revenues being taken in as a result of the activities carried on by the Interior Department.

For the fiscal year 1942, the actual total of all general and special revenue funds accruing to the Department of the Interior amounted to \$42,063,846. The estimated revenues for the fiscal year 1943 are \$47,593,420, and for the fiscal year 1944 the revenues are estimated at \$54,450,420. This latter sum is only \$18,410,896 less than the total amount contained in the pending bill. If you add the trust funds amounting to nearly \$9,000,000 to general and special funds, the revenues of the Interior Department for the next fiscal year would nearly equal the entire appropriation for this Department, which, it must be agreed, is a remarkable showing. This is especially true when we realize that for the fiscal year 1933 the actual total of all general and special fund revenues accruing to the Interior Department amounted to only \$9,356,678. It is interesting to note that the increase in revenues during the 10-year period of 1933 to 1943 reflects a net increase of \$45,093,742.

Members may be interested in knowing what is primarily responsible for such a remarkable increase in revenues for this Department. The primary reason is, of course, that revenues are now coming in from the operation of huge power and reclamation-development projects which were opposed by many both in and out of Congress, several years ago. It will be recalled that such projects as Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, Parker Dam, and Central Valley were repeatedly referred to as "white elephants."

The fact is, these projects are now beginning to pay back their cost to the Government, not only from a financial standpoint, but, what is more important, some of them are furnishing electric energy and agricultural products, without which our war program would be seriously hampered. Severe criticisms were made in some quarters against all of the Colorado projects, which of course include Boulder Dam, yet it is estimated that revenues from Colorado dam projects, including interest on Colorado dams and other funds, will amount to a sum in excess of \$9,000,000 during the fiscal year 1944. Collections from reclamation projects will exceed \$10,000,000, and revenues from the sale of power from

Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams are estimated to be approximately \$17,000,000. Members will find a complete list of these revenues on page 26 of part 1 of the hearings.

#### REDUCTIONS RECOMMENDED BY COMMITTEE

At this time when the taxpayers are being called upon to finance the most far-reaching war in all history, I know that Members of the House as well as the country at large will be primarily interested in the reductions in the bill.

The committee considered estimates totaling \$82,188,000.

The bill recommends appropriations totaling \$72,861,000.

The amount recommended is a reduction under the 1943 appropriation of \$119,999,000.

The bill also shows a reduction in the Budget estimates of \$9,327,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It will be recalled that that includes the amount that was designated in the 1943 appropriation bill to go for war purposes, \$70,000,000; is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It includes not only that but a number of other reductions in operation and maintenance, including administrative expenses.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I want to separate the amount that was used in the 1943 appropriation bill designated specifically for power devoted to war purposes. You have not that in this bill. As I understand it, there is not much in this bill, if anything, for power for war purposes; is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes. The bill contains funds for continuation of construction of the Central Valley project, for which \$11,500,000 is recommended and which, together with the unobligated balance, will provide a total of \$38,500,000 for this project. This item is for the development of power necessary to the war effort.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that in last year's bill the specific power appropriation was not separated from the general reclamation work. There would be a dam serving power and irrigation purposes and the appropriation would be made for the construction of that dam. Eventually it will be allocated as between irrigation and power. In this bill there is an item of over \$11,000,000 for carrying on the work of the Central Valley project which will be expended largely in the construction of the Shasta Dam, the Shasta power house, the generators and transmission lines in connection with it, and this appropriation was made this year because the War Production Board said that the development of that power there fits into their power program and they wanted that power developed for war purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The only reason I raise the question is the gentleman from Oklahoma will recall that I asked specifically the question what amount of this appropriation is intended for power development specifically, and you will recall that the gentleman from Washington, Mr. Leavy, answered by saying about \$70,000,000. That is the only reason I raise the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman, but, as the gentleman from California has also explained, the power and the reclamation projects are usually tied together.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. It is a fact, is it not, that upward of 95 percent of the power developed in the Columbia River area is being used for war purposes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think that is true.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. May I ask the gentleman whether any of the funds that are available for the Bureau of Reclamation for investigation of projects are available for the investigation of projects under the Water Conservation and Utility Act or are they limited to strictly the original type of reclamation projects?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not believe that there are any funds in here available for the purpose that the gentleman suggests; however, the committee has suggested, and I will be glad to discuss that a little further, that all these reclamation projects that have been stopped by the War Production Board be seriously considered with other projects for the purpose of providing for the war effort.

Mr. CASE. I understand that is for the type of project that can produce quickly needed crops.

Mr. COFFEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I believe in the hearings there is a section devoted to a discussion of the Shipshaw development in Canada, is there not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE. I want to compliment the gentleman and the members of the committee on the advanced and sound stand they take with reference to the Shipshaw development wherein they showed by their sentiments, as they expressed them here, that they thought where priorities were to be granted, certainly we should give priority to our own public and private power development first before we give them to a development in a neighboring country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I may say that the committee stated itself very specifically along that line.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it is well to have the RECORD show on this Central Valley project, that we are in this bill spending

a comparatively small amount in order to get the power and in order to get the revenue flowing into the United States Treasury, and until we can get this work done there will not be any revenue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. The Government has already spent millions and millions of dollars, and it would not be good business to let the project stand idle at this time.

In other words, the bill shows a cut of 60 percent from the current appropriation and a reduction of more than 11 percent in the Budget estimates.

Of course, the reduction of nearly \$120,000,000 below the 1943 appropriation is mainly due to the fact that construction appropriations in the bill have been drastically reduced.

Members will be especially interested, I am sure, in hearing of some of the larger reductions recommended by the committee. They are as follows:

	Reduction	Percent of reduction
Secretary's Office.....	\$322,340	7 1/2
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	1,158,000	5
Bureau of Reclamation.....	5,636,200	27
National Park Service.....	835,000	18
Fish and Wildlife Service.....	855,000	15

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to ask the gentleman if there is any provision made for an appropriation for the development of these projects by the Bureau of Reclamation in the event the War Production Board will relax its order on steel.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; there is no appropriation in this bill for that thing. But, of course if the War Production Board should change its attitude and decide that some of these projects are essential to the war effort—and I will say to the gentleman I think that is in the making—there are two things that can be done. The bill will go over to the other body and will be considered there. I can assure the gentleman that if it is provided for over there the committee will give sympathetic consideration to such projects as the War Production Board finds are essential.

Of course, we have a deficiency committee, in the event this bill is out of the way, that could take care of it.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman. The people of Wyoming are particularly interested in this matter. There are a number of projects in my State that the people could use for the development of food, so vitally needed at this time in the war effort, and we are hoping the War Production Board will relax its restrictions in the matter of steel for these projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I was just about to discuss these War Production Board projects.

#### REMOVAL OF STOP-WORK ORDERS BY WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

As members will recall, the War Production Board issued stop orders against

certain construction features of about 23 reclamation projects. Whether or not we agree with these orders, they have been issued and there is no affirmative action that your committee or this House can take in the matter now. That authority, as Members know, is in the War Production Board. Our committee did hold somewhat lengthy hearings as will be shown in the record, and I am glad to say that the Department of Agriculture has recommended that stop orders on at least some of these projects be lifted. And I might add here that I confidentially expect this to be done in connection with some of these more important projects in the near future. The testimony as to the need of food which can be produced on these projects was convincing.

During the hearings with representatives of the Department of Agriculture the committee questioned the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Grover B. Hill, as to the seriousness of the food situation, and he advised the committee, in part, as follows:

Regardless of how much food we will produce, it will not be enough. Even though we could produce twice as much food as we will be able to produce, we could use it all.

The committee is deeply impressed by the frank statement of the Assistant Secretary and with the testimony of many others who are in agreement with him, and it urgently recommends, in view of Mr. Hill's testimony as to the probability of a food shortage, that the War Production Board promptly reinvestigate and seriously consider allowing priorities which will permit resumption of work on some of these reclamation projects which have been in a deferred status since last October. While some justification may have existed for the issuance of stop orders in October 1942, when the food shortage was not so apparent, the committee is strongly of the opinion that the time for optimism and complacency on the part of responsible officials has passed. These stop orders have involved a serious delay in the development of 877,500 acres of new land and 2,085,000 acres of existing land for which a supplemental water supply is needed. In view of the fact that we must feed our own civilian population, our armed forces, and are now being called upon to shoulder the major portion of the burden of feeding our allies it was and is the unanimous opinion of the committee that the Agriculture Department and the War Production Board should not only consider removing existing stop orders, but that they should also consider the desirability of undertaking a program of new and supplemental reclamation projects referred to by the Commissioner of Reclamation in his testimony which may be found in some detail in the committee hearings.

#### CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood the gentleman from Oklahoma to say that there is an item in here for the Central Valley project?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes,

Mr. RANKIN. On what page does it appear?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It appears on page 66 of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it provide for the building of transmission lines?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It provides for the building of transmission lines to a substation; not as much as was asked for by the Bureau of Reclamation, but it does make provision for the building of transmission lines.

If the gentleman will turn to page 36 of the bill, under the caption "General fund, construction," he will see the item which reads:

Central Valley project, California, \$11,500,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you know to whose substation; who owns the substation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will refer to the report, page 10, he will find this statement:

Central Valley project, California: The committee considered in connection with this item a supplemental estimate of \$16,400,000, in House Document No 180, for continuation of construction of certain features of the project. This supplemental estimate provided funds to expedite completion of construction of the Shasta Dam, Shasta power plant, including the installation of two 75,000-kilovolt-ampere generating units and appurtenant transmission and switching facilities, all items enumerated having received the approval of the War Production Board. The committee has included in the bill a total of \$11,500,000 for continuation of construction of all features of the project referred to in the Budget estimate with the exception of the proposed transmission line from the Shasta substation to Oroville. It is the recommendation of the committee that no funds in the bill and no funds heretofore provided therefor shall be used for the construction of a transmission line by the Government from Shasta substation to Oroville and that funds which have been heretofore provided for that purpose be reallocated for construction in connection with other features of the project. The use of funds necessary to construct the transmission line from Shasta Dam to the Shasta substation—

Which I understand is owned by the Government—

estimated at between \$400,000 and \$500,000, is recommended by the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. But the amount for transmission lines in former bills was not reappropriated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is familiar with the Lugert-Altus Dam in Oklahoma where the Bureau has spent a lot of time. I wonder if the gentleman, who is familiar with that project, does not feel that it would be worthy of any additional expenditure above the amount obligated by the district at Altus to carry the project to completion, as it really involves the use of only a small amount of strategic materials.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I agree fully with the gentleman. The

gentleman knows I have been very much interested in that and many other similar projects. I was rather severe in my criticism of the stoppage orders on 23 projects because I felt, as did the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, that regardless of how much food we might attempt to produce we would not produce enough. The Altus project is one of the outstanding projects in the country and offers a great deal in the matter of producing food for the soldiers and civilians.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Why was this transmission line to Oroville left out this time? It was shown before that it was necessary, and it was appropriated for. It has not been constructed, and it seems to me that it would be absolutely necessary to carry this power to be generated by Shasta Dam. Why was it left out of this bill?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California, who is much more familiar with the project than I.

Mr. CARTER. I think the gentleman is in error in saying that this particular line was ever appropriated for. An appropriation was made for a transmission line that was going direct from the Shasta power plant to the San Francisco Bay region.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Now, during the war emergency it was decided to tie into the already established line there owned by a private company. There are two different places into which it might be tied. One is at the Shasta substation and the other is at Oroville. You are going to tie into the lines of this company regardless of which place the transmission line is built to.

Mr. RANKIN. Then you are hedging this project about with the private power company and shutting out, we will say, for instance, the public power system in Sacramento and probably San Francisco from the benefit of the power development at Shasta Dam.

Mr. CARTER. Not at all. The gentleman perhaps is aware of the order made by the War Production Board in reference to the utilities tying their lines together. I recently visited the Northwest and found there that they use a network over the Northwest at Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and the privately owned power companies that are all interconnected. The War Production Board issued an order more than a year ago saying that this interconnection should be made where possible in the interest of saving. The line to Oroville was never contemplated for a permanent line. It was to be made on wooden poles, as I recall.

Mr. RANKIN. I am also aware of the tie-up of the public utilities in the War Production Board. That is what alarms me about this movement to strangle the distribution of the power to be generated

at this Central Valley project, the Shasta Dam. I hope that if the House does not see fit to put this appropriation back in the bill it will be put in the bill in the Senate. If this Government can supply the money to build a dam in Quebec as large as Boulder Dam, surely we can find materials to transmit the power we are producing at our own dams.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would like to refer to several other agencies in the Interior Department.

#### Grazing Service

We have recommended a moderate reduction in the Grazing Service. The Budget proposed funds to establish four additional grazing districts and we allowed funds for only two. We believe this service is doing a good job and helping to provide food by improving the grazing areas for cattle. As many of you will recall, this activity was started several years ago under the Taylor Grazing Act, and you will also recall the fervor with which our beloved former chairman and sponsor of this legislation supported this proposal. Its headquarters have been moved to Salt Lake City, and it is my definite impression that the move has proved so satisfactory that they will not return to Washington after the war.

#### BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is provided for only on an operation and maintenance basis, all construction work having been stopped by the War Production Board. They have an unexpended balance of about \$46,000,000. There are obligations which will reduce this balance to about \$30,000,000 by June 30, 1943. It is also expected that an additional war construction program will be approved by the War Production Board involving the expenditure of \$16,000,000 for new transmission lines and substations.

#### GENERAL LAND OFFICE

The General Land Office has made an excellent record and has increased its receipts over previous years. Receipts during the fiscal year 1942 were \$9,014,172. The total amount recommended in the bill for this office is \$2,119,350. In spite of this splendid showing, we believe that a reduction can be made in the item for surveying the public lands, although the Land Office is surveying land for the Army and Navy. We feel that the Army and Navy should supply such funds as are necessary to survey bombing ranges, camp sites, and so forth.

#### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The next item is the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We have made some drastic reductions in several items for this service. First, I would like to give you a few facts with reference to the participations of the Indians in the war effort:

Out of a total Indian population of 400,000, 13,000 have entered the armed forces. The Navajo Tribe alone have contributed 1,400 men, 350 of them volunteers, out of a total population of 50,000.

Many thousands of them are engaged in war work, including work in airplane factories and on the farms.

The first Distinguished Service Cross awarded on Bataan Peninsula went to an Indian, Pvt. Charles Ball, of the Fort Belknap Reservation in Montana.

I believe I have referred before to the late Maj. Gen. Clarence L. Tinker, an Osage Indian and commanding general of the American forces in Hawaii who was killed in action.

An unsolicited contribution of \$1,000 for Navy relief came from a Kiowa Indian woman of Cement, Okla., who signed the check with a thumbprint. This woman not only lives in the district which I represent in Congress, but resides in a humble home on a farm a few miles from my own home in Oklahoma.

These are only a few of the contributions the Indians are making to the war effort. Suffice it to say that the Indians of all tribes and in all States are not only joining with other Americans of all races and creeds in buying war bonds but are giving their sons, the most precious heritage that any of us have, to promote the war effort and to keep America and the world a decent place in which to live.

A few of the major reductions we have recommended in connection with Indian Service appropriations are as follows:

Industrial assistance, which includes agriculture and stock raising, has been cut \$135,000. These are worthy activities and have assisted the Indian in becoming self-supporting, but they are not of great value to the war effort, so we have reduced them substantially.

We have cut the estimate of \$925,000 for Indian relief to \$700,000. Because of the fact that opportunities for employment in war activities have greatly reduced unemployment, the committee felt justified in making this substantial reduction.

We have reduced the estimate of \$1,200,000 for road construction and repair to \$750,000 for similar reasons. Undoubtedly, the building of roads will become an important part of the post-war building program.

I see my friend, the Delegate from Alaska, Mr. DIMOND, is here. He appeared before the committee and made a very fine appeal for relief in Alaska. A pitiful condition does exist there. Yet all in all, we felt that we should make a rather sizable reduction in Indian relief.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. DIMOND. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to point out to the gentleman and to the House that the amounts appropriated for relief are not for the people who are able to get jobs under any circumstances, the relief is designed for those who are not employable, most of whom cannot earn a cent no matter what the conditions are in the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I realize there is much merit to what the gentleman says. For that reason, we did leave in the bill \$700,000 for Indian relief.

#### BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

As I have stated heretofore, funds are provided in the bill for only a few reclamation projects as compared with pre-

vious years. Appropriations generally in this bill are for operation and maintenance of existing projects.

One exception is the Central Valley project in California. The War Production Board has very recently given the go signal and the committee has included \$11,500,000 in the bill for continuation of construction of certain features of the project essential to the war program. The amount we have recommended reflects a reduction of \$4,900,000 in the Budget estimate.

We have also included \$775,000 in the bill for installation of an additional generator at Boulder Dam. Power generated at the dam is being used by war plants in that area. Revenue from the sale of power is about \$7,000,000 annually.

Funds are provided in the bill for the first time for operation of the Grand Coulee Dam which is the hub of industrial activity in the Pacific Northwest. Power from the dam is used extensively by war plants in that area engaged in producing aluminum and other important war minerals.

There are three 108,000-kilowatt generators in operation at Grand Coulee Dam at the present time and two 75,000-kilowatt generators. Three additional 108,000-kilowatt generators are being installed, 1 of which will be in service in August, 1 in November, and 1 shortly after the first of the year. That makes a total of 8 generators with a generating capacity of 798,000 kilowatts. Ultimately it is planned to install a total of 18 generators with a generating capacity of 1,944,000 kilowatts.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I notice there has been no money appropriated for certain projects on which there are stop orders from the War Production Board.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I wondered just what position that would place these projects in. Suppose that during the next 4 or 5 or 6 months we can release these stop orders and proceed with these projects. Does not that leave these projects without any money whatever to proceed with?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Does the gentleman believe that is a fair way to deal with the projects that have been approved?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct, with the exception of some unexpended balances that, of course, would be available, but, as I said a moment ago, I am hopeful that the War Production Board will change its attitude. It may be that there was some reason or excuse for these stop orders last fall, but the situation has changed materially since last fall, so we are hopeful and we have reason to believe that a great many of these stop orders will be removed within the next few weeks, not the next few months, but the next few weeks.

Some of them are in the making now. As I suggested a moment ago, this bill

goes to the other body, and if these stoppages are lifted there will be an opportunity to get funds in this bill. If not, Congress will be in session with the exception of a possible vacation in the summer, and in that event the deficiency committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, will, in all probability, be in session. It should not be difficult in a matter like this, which is essential to the war effort, to secure prompt and careful consideration of any deserving items.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this committee should set up some funds for these projects in case the stoppage order is removed. Take the Provo River project: We have been attempting to get the War Production Board to remove the stop order on that for several months, and are expecting to have it removed at any time. But suppose we do not get this removed until this bill is passed. Then will not this put us in the position where the War Production Board can say to us, that we do not have any funds to proceed with, and therefore it would be of no value for them to release their stoppage order? It seems to me the gentleman's committee is putting these projects in a very unusual and a very precarious position by not appropriating money to proceed with them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It may seem to the gentleman that this committee is derelict in its duty, but I think it is not this committee, but the War Production Board, which is all-powerful.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This particular project I might say that it is 49 percent completed, that is, the Provo River project. It has been stopped because it uses a certain amount of steel, and steel right now is a strategic material which is needed in the war effort. For several months we have been trying to have the project approved in such a way that it would not require that much steel, and that it would be satisfactory to proceed with the completion of the project. I might say that the completion of this project is essential to the lives of practically all of the people in Salt Lake City, and the surrounding territory, if we happen to have a shortage of water. We have not been able to procure from the War Production Board as yet a release of this stoppage order. My question is, suppose this bill is passed without any appropriation for this project, then, right after the bill is passed, we go to the War Production Board again, trying to get a release. They are then in a position to say to us, "You have not any money to proceed with this project."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think that this committee would be in a very awkward position to begin making appropriations for projects that have been stopped by the War Production Board? Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the particular project to which the gentleman refers is an extremely important project, and I agree with all he says. However, there is now in the general fund \$1,217,771 for the Provo project available now. If they lift the War Production order, the gentleman knows that there is \$1,217,771 available.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. But it would take \$10,000,000 to complete the project.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes; it will take more, but in the meantime, I find that Members of Congress, as well as the department heads, know and others know the way at the other end of the Capitol, and they often get what they want over there. I think that if this stop order is not lifted until after this bill becomes a law, the deficiency subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which, as I have said, is in session nearly all of the time, can consider the matter. The gentleman with his persuasive powers would still have an opportunity to come before his own colleagues, and tell them that this is essential.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have the statement that when we go back to the deficiency appropriation subcommittee, that we will at least have a favorable consideration of this project, because I feel that this one project is absolutely essential to the war effort. It will not be very long before we can convince the War Production Board that that is a fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Along the same line, with regard to the same character of item, do I understand the gentleman to say that the appropriations herein made are really token appropriations or sustaining appropriations and may be added to as circumstances warrant, later? I am hopeful that the stop order will not need to remain in effect long on some of these projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will look at these items he will see that they are very much more than token appropriations. They amount to millions and millions of dollars, much more than token appropriations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certain appropriations here seem to me too small even under war conditions, for reclamation works mean power production and food production vitally necessary in war.

#### GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would like next, to refer to the Geological Survey.

We have recommended a total cut of only \$72,702 in this activity. A considerable portion of the work of the Survey is of direct value to the war and it is for this reason we have not made greater reductions in this activity. Let me give you one or two instances of what they have accomplished.

One geologist employed by the Survey was exploring deposits in the State of Idaho when he discovered ore containing tungsten, which is essential for the hardening of steel. This deposit has been developed and is now producing over 10 percent of our total need. It is valued at between \$15,000,000 and \$20,000,000.

Another outstanding accomplishment of the Survey, with the cooperation of the Bureau of Mines, was the location of chromite deposits in the Stillwater region

of Montana. Chromite is also used in the manufacture of steel alloys and as a rust resistant. As a result of this discovery, plants are now in operation capable of supplying about two-thirds of our total needs.

#### BUREAU OF MINES

The Bureau of Mines is, without doubt, more actively engaged in the war effort than any other bureau in the entire Department. For this reason, your committee recommended a reduction of slightly less than \$200,000 in the estimate of \$8,835,130. Let me call attention of Members especially to the fact that the Bureau's experimental and research work in connection with strategic minerals, pilot plant experiments, and the development of helium wells are all directly and materially aiding in the war program.

In connection with the item under the Bureau of Mines for oil and gas investigations the committee was particularly interested in a new estimate of \$33,000 to stimulate oil production by secondary recovery methods which method is proving very successful. In view of the vital importance of oil in connection with the war effort, the committee is impressed with the urgency of this program and recommends that the Bureau of Mines exert every effort to carry the work forward to a successful conclusion.

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

We have recommended a reduction of \$835,190 in funds for this activity, a cut of about 18 percent, as heretofore stated. While this is a drastic reduction, we felt this was one activity which could be reduced during the present emergency without seriously impairing the administration, protection, and maintenance of the national parks of the country. Travel in the parks will undoubtedly be cut in half or more during the coming season, and large numbers of resignations to enter the war effort and the ever-increasing demand for manpower will make it impossible for this Service to secure qualified personnel to fill vacancies as they occur.

It is probable that some of the parks will be used to rehabilitate our men who have been disabled in the service of their country. In fact, park officials advised the committee that this is not only seriously contemplated, but that arrangements are now being made to use some of the parks for such purpose. Yosemite National Park is one of them. We feel that this is a very commendable undertaking on the part of the Park Service, and that several parks of the country would make ideal homes in which our war-weary, shell-shocked, and otherwise disabled veterans may be able to rest and recuperate.

To utilize the present parks, in our judgment, would be much more practical as well as far more economical than to build additional Federal hospitals. And one or the other must be done in view of the losses we have thus far suffered and the heavier losses we are fearful our Nation must suffer, according to those in a position to know, if and when we invade the continent of Europe and the islands of Japan.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

#### FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When are we going to get to the Fish and Wildlife Service?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I shall be very glad to discuss that now, and I will say to the gentleman that I have long been a believer in the Fish and Wildlife Service. I have long been a member of the Izaak Walton League. It is a great league and has done a great deal for the country in promoting fish and wildlife. I know the officials in charge of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Dr. Gabrielson is a great expert and efficient officer. And my friend Mr. Jackson, the assistant director, is doing a fine job. But some of the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service are not directly connected with the war effort. Therefore, the committee felt that pending the duration it would be possible for the Fish and Wildlife Service to take a rather drastic cut, along with the Indian Service, along with the Bureau of Reclamation, and along with many other departments. There are 26 agencies of government in this department and we made substantial reductions in every one of them.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Now let me interrogate the gentleman. I appreciate the gentleman's membership in the Izaak Walton League and the sportsmanship angle of it, but what we are interested in is the commercial fishing industry. Those of us who live in that part of the country where these industries are located are constantly getting complaints about their inability to get information or advice or any kind of cooperation worthy of the name to maintain and build up the fishery organizations in this country. What I would like to ask the gentleman is whether or not in this appropriation any substantial cut has been made in the fishery-industry item?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And whether or not the officials in charge of the Division of Fisheries are taking some notice of the complaints of the fishery organizations all over the country in respect to their inability to get information, advice, and cooperation from that department?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I must say to the gentleman that this item is cut, and cut drastically; cut more than some members of the committee felt it should be cut.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Has the fisheries-industry item been cut?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Because of the general feeling that it could be cut without doing any great injustice to the service and without greatly impairing the efficiency of that particular activity.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When Dr. Gabrielson appeared before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries last week in respect to a bill that had as its objective the transferring of the Fish and Wildlife Service from the

Interior Department to the Department of Agriculture, he said then that he had not been able to give, or the Division had not been able to give as much service to the commercial fisheries as they would like, because they are limited. The gentleman says they have ample funds. They say to us they are interested in the fisheries industry, but that they are limited. What are the facts?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I made the statement at the outset that this was cut drastically along with every other agency of Government. All 26 agencies are cut. This is not the only agency that took a reduction. I made the further statement that it was cut more than some of the members thought it should be cut. We are in a desperate war, a war that will decide the future of this country for generations to come. I would rather be charged with cutting a little too drastically during these perilous times than to say the committee has spent too much money.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman of course knows that the fishery industry is one of the basic food sources of the country. Last year we suffered a loss of over a hundred million pounds of fish below the year 1941. If we are going to build up our food supply, certainly we ought to lend every encouragement we can to that department of Government that has charge and has authority and has the machinery and the personnel to maintain that source of food supply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now the gentleman has made a very excellent speech and I appreciate it and I agree with him, but I hold in my hand a list of 37 Members of Congress who came before our committee, every one of them just as interested as is the gentleman in this particular industry; everyone of them showing us that their particular item was in the interest of the war effort. They were just as enthusiastic about it as is the gentleman. I will say to the gentleman that I think in most cases they were as much justified in asking for an increase as is the gentleman. Thirty-seven Members of Congress and three United States Senators and twelve pressure groups—everyone of them asking us for money, money, money. "Give us money." And, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rich, used to say, "Where are you going to get the money?" If the committee had given those 37 Members of Congress, and the 3 United States Senators, one-tenth of what they asked, this committee instead of coming here and saying, "We have reduced the Interior Department bill 60 percent this year under what it took to operate last year," we would have to tell you that we had increased it more than 60 percent. So I will say to the gentleman, as important as it is, as much as I agree with him that this is an important item, there are other items and other people who were demanding additional funds.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. As I understand from reading the hearings the only reduction made in this appropriation is \$172,000, an appropriation which was made a year ago for the pur-

pose of making some sort of a substitute for tin for containers. That is the only reduction that is made in this item.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is not the only thing. We reduced the Budget estimate \$68,540 because the committee was not convinced that it was connected with the war effort.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is that in the "Fisheries industry" item?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is not shown here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The Budget cut out \$172,000.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. \$172,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then the committee reduced the item an additional \$68,540.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is the committee going to have any meeting at a subsequent date?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This is the annual appropriation bill. There will not be another such bill until next year.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is the deficiency committee meeting?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is meeting today. As the gentleman, I am sure, knows, it meets during this emergency almost daily. It meets almost every day. We should be glad to have the gentleman come before the committee. He talks very persuasively.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes; I must be making an impression.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to state to the gentleman from Oklahoma that in some sections of New England our people have not had meat for over a week, and they can get no fish. I should like very much to appear before the gentleman's committee at a later date. I am hoping that the gentleman from Oklahoma will join in supporting the Senate's action when it puts the item back in the bill. We have simply got to maintain the strength of our workers; they must have the necessary food, especially when they are working in heavy industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I am certain the Committee on Appropriations would always be glad to hear her; for she, too, is very persuasive. I noticed that instead of saying: "If the Senate puts the item back" she said: "When it puts the item back." I may say that she is probably correct in her statement of the situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with our need.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have a few more remarks which I would like to make in connection with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

For the second consecutive year, the committee has been faced with the duty of making rather severe reductions in some very worthy items for this activity. Doubtless they can and will be restored when the war is over. We have recom-

mended a total reduction of \$855,015 in the estimate which, as I have said, is a cut of 15 percent.

Under the heading, "Biological Investigations," we have eliminated an item of \$87,500 for studies under the heading "Life History, Interrelation, and Distributional Studies of Wildlife." We felt that this was one item which could be deferred at least for the duration.

#### PITTMAN-ROBERTSON FUNDS REDUCED

The item of Federal-aid to wildlife under the Pittman-Robertson Act has been reduced by \$500,000. The committee is aware of the fact that funds for this particular purpose are secured from a special tax on small arms and ammunition and that a bookkeeping credit on the books of the Treasury in excess of \$9,000,000 is available for appropriation. However, in recommending a reduction of \$500,000 the committee believes it is not asking too much of the sportsmen and conservation authorities of America to accept further retrenchment in this activity during the war period. While the committee is in sympathy with the purpose of the Pittman-Robertson Act, it wishes to point out that the fund will remain intact and be available for appropriation at a later date, particularly during the post-war period when millions of men returning from the armed forces will be desperately in need of work. This fund will provide a reservoir of peacetime projects which will assist in giving employment to such men.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I am after some information, Mr. Chairman. I have not been able to go through all these hearings as yet, but I notice where the committee took testimony on the Bonneville Authority. Was any statement made before the gentleman's committee about extending Bonneville power up into Idaho and Montana, specifically up into the Flathead Lake region?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that from time to time that suggestion has been made. I believe I am not giving away any secret when I say that it is actually contemplated as soon as it is humanly possible to do so. Whether it can be done during these wartimes I do not know.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. What justifications do they offer for raising the level of Flathead Lake, for example, and raising the level of Lake Pend Oreille?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I cannot tell the gentleman, but I shall be pleased to see if I can get the information for him.

#### GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Funds are provided in the bill for administrative expenses and other obligations in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands.

You will be interested to know that the Alaska Railroad is now operating without a deficit which we had to meet annually up to a few years ago. For one period of time, covering several years, the deficit amounted to approximately \$1,000,000 annually. It is estimated that

there will be a profit of \$1,500,000 during the next fiscal year. Profits for the current year are estimated at about \$2,300,000.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

The last matter which I wish to call to your attention is the appropriation for salaries and expenses in the Virgin Islands, in which was contained an estimate of \$5,800 for the salary of the Secretary of the Virgin Islands, Mr. Robert Morss Lovett. As you know, the House on day before yesterday approved the action of the Kerr subcommittee and the whole Appropriations Committee in recommending that no part of any appropriation, allocation, or other fund should be available for payment of compensation to this employee. The committee received a vote of approval of its recommendation by adoption of the amendment, the vote being 318 to 62.

While the Interior Department subcommittee was not charged with the duty of investigating subversive activities in the case of this individual, we were interested in the matter so widely publicized inasmuch as his salary was contained in the Interior Department appropriation bill. It is significant that in a personal letter from the Secretary of the Interior to Mr. Lovett under date of April 25, 1941, a copy of which was furnished the committee, the Secretary severely criticized this employee in a rather lengthy and sharply worded letter to him because of his alleged membership in certain subversive organizations. The Secretary, according to the letter, stated that the Department had frequently been called upon to defend Lovett against charges, first, that he was a Communist and, second, that he was sympathetic to communism and therefore in effect a so-called fellow traveler.

The committee made no effort to try this employee. But it did hear the present occupant of the office, who appeared at the request of the committee and expressed his opinions and so-called philosophies. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that the salary, amounting to \$5,800, could be eliminated from the bill, especially in view of the present occupant, without impairing to the remotest degree the efficiency of the administration of the Virgin Islands. The committee reached this deliberate conclusion despite a lengthy communication from the Secretary of the Interior defending the record, activities, and general conduct of the present occupant of the position recommended for elimination.

#### RÉSUMÉ OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMITTEE

In conclusion and in summing up, permit me to remind Members of the House again that drastic reductions have been made in some instances. But, frankly, I would rather be charged with reducing some of these activities, especially nondefense activities, too drastically during this desperate emergency than to be charged with being too liberal with the various activities affected. It is one thing to talk about economy in government and it is entirely another thing

to vote for drastic economies, especially when there are so many pressure groups, departmental heads, and others who are demanding more and more funds.

If you will examine the bill and the report you will find that all of the 26 agencies in the Department of the Interior have been rather severely cut. It cannot be successfully charged that the committee has picked on any one particular agency or activity. Let me remind Members also that this bill represents a 60-percent reduction under the current year, that it is reduced more than 11 percent below the Budget estimates, and that the Interior Department is now operating on an operation-and-maintenance basis. There are no new construction projects in the entire bill, and except for Central Valley, which the War Production Board and the Department of Agriculture tell our committee has become increasingly urgent for the war effort, there are no funds even for the continuation of projects heretofore approved by Congress and on which construction work had heretofore been undertaken.

It is with more than an ordinary degree of pride that your committee presents the Interior bill today, and it is our sincere hope that the bill can be expedited through the House without delay and without any material changes.

#### CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What happened in connection with the Central Valley project, Shasta Dam, and those items?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] will go into some detail about those items. The Budget estimate was for \$16,400,000. It was urged by the War Production Board as well as other Government agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, and while the committee did make a considerable cut in it, there is an item of nearly \$12,000,000 in the bill for it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That was a supplemental request which was not contained in the original Budget estimate.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to compliment the gentleman and his committee and state that I believe that the War Production Board stop orders as to work necessary for the food program should be lifted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FORD. It had been my intention to offer a proviso containing a declaration of policy that by reason of the hooking up of this authority and private power in this particular case that the private corporations should have no vested right which they could assert after

the emergency was over, but the Parliamentarian informs me that it would be out of order and could not be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from California that private power certainly would not receive any vested right simply because of the action of the committee. I think the committee made itself plain, and the gentleman knows my position. I supported Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and the Parker Dam. In my statement here I show that the revenue from these dams has been very gratifying and that those gentlemen who called them white elephants and ridiculed the idea of those dams as power projects are now admitting that they were not "white elephants."

Mr. FORD. I simply wanted to get the intent of Congress in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee for the very fair and impartial manner in which he conducted the hearings. We of the minority were given every opportunity to examine witnesses and any other evidence that was presented. I also want to say that Mr. William Duvall, clerk of the committee, was very helpful at these hearings. He is a most capable clerk and renders a splendid service.

This bill is cut nearly \$120,000,000 below the 1943 bill. Of course, we have got to do a lot of cutting in order to reduce the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944 nearly \$120,000,000 under what it was for 1943. After the Bureau of the Budget had used the pruning shears on this bill, the committee considered it and cut an additional \$9,227,226 off the bill below the Bureau of the Budget estimate.

That is going to make cuts in matters in which many of us are interested. It made cuts in matters in which I was interested, I know. While I have been a member of this committee I have endeavored to hold the appropriations down; however, may I say that I am more satisfied with this bill than any bill that I have ever had anything to do with bringing on the floor of the House. I did not have my way in all respects. There are some items in this bill that I believe could stand even greater cuts. There are some items, a few, one in particular, that I feel have been cut too much, but you must appreciate that we cannot have our way in all these matters. We have to work cooperatively and we have to give and take. So for the first time since I have been on the Appropriations Committee I stand here on the floor of this House prepared to defend every item in this bill. I have never made that statement before, but I am here to do that in reference to this bill because it has been cut to somewhere near the place that I feel it should be cut.

Considerable was said a few moments ago about the matter of reclamation. I

know the gentleman from Utah (Mr. ROBINSON) is very much interested in that, and I am, too. May I say to the gentleman that a number of those recommended projects are being studied at the present time and I am hopeful that the stop orders will be removed as to a number of them. The fact that we did not make an appropriation for them in no way militates against the consideration that is being given them at the present time. I have talked with members of the War Production Board about these reclamation projects. I have talked to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and others who are interested in them from a food point of view. The question of their not being appropriated for has never been raised. In fact, as was pointed out a few minutes ago, there is money available at the present time to carry on some of that construction work. To be sure it is not enough to finish it, but may I say to the gentleman from Utah and to the other Members who are interested in reclamation, as I am, that the minute these stop orders are removed immediate steps will be taken to provide the money. May I say further that I will be one who will be helping those who are out to get the money so that the work can be carried on with the greatest dispatch.

Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said here about the reduction of the appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Service. May I say that personally I am very much in sympathy with the work that that Service is carrying on. I believe that Dr. Gabrielson and Mr. Jackson and their efficient staff are carrying on that work and doing a very splendid job. But if you will turn to page 2 of the report you will find there that of the various items set out there is not one single item but what received a good cut. Perhaps our cuts were too drastic at times in connection with some of these particular items, and, as I told you awhile ago, I think they were in reference to one which I want to speak about a little later. While I feel they were very drastic, I think that all of us must take our cuts in good spirit. We have to work out this problem as best we can. May I say that I have been advocating cutting, so my colleagues on the committee endeavored to demonstrate to me in connection with an item I was especially interested in what might be accomplished when it came to real cutting.

The Bureau of the Budget was late in getting in their report on the Central Valley project, and when it finally reached our committee they approved an item amounting to \$16,400,000. As the bill originally came to the committee there was not 1 cent in it for the Central Valley Authority, but this supplemental estimate was sent up after the hearings closed, and at my request the committee held a special meeting, considered that item, and then to demonstrate to me what good cutting was they cut it down to \$11,500,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it is fair to say, however, that there was cash available, unexpended, in that particular fund of \$26,500,000. I think the gentleman is going to have to agree that I was one of the members opposed quite violently to the full request of \$16,400,000.

Mr. CARTER. I will agree that the gentleman was violent when it came to cutting that particular item. He will not have any trouble in getting me to agree to that.

Mr. JENSEN. Very well. It had been shown they got more money than they could expend because there was \$26,500,000 left in that fund. They asked for an additional \$16,400,000, which the committee finally cut down to \$11,500,000. If it had not been for the fact that so much money had been expended on this project a different attitude might have been taken, but this was originally supposed to cost only \$170,000,000, while to date we have spent over \$300,000,000. Somebody's figures were wrong, and, in my opinion, the committee was justified in cutting down this amount in the light of those facts and figures which we had.

Mr. CARTER. May I say in reply to the gentleman from Iowa, it is true that they have a carry-over of \$26,500,000 as of January 31 of this year, and that is one reason why I reluctantly accepted this cut; otherwise, I would have been down there battling for the rest of it yet. But the gentleman is in error in one statement. He said the original estimate on the project was \$170,000,000, which is true. However, the gentleman said that around \$300,000,000 had been spent up to this time. The gentleman is in error in reference to that. It is now estimated it will cost, when finished, about \$333,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. I did make that error.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. It is now estimated to cost \$333,605,000.

Mr. CARTER. I will say a part of the additional cost has been by reason of increasing the height of the Shasta Dam so that more power could be generated; a part of that is brought about by reason of the fact that they propose to build a steam plant costing between \$15,000,000 and \$20,000,000, something I had never heard of until a couple of years ago; a part of it is for transmission lines, costing approximately \$25,000,000, that I am not sure should be built. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that if it is demonstrated the steam plant and this additional power line are necessary I am going to be down here advocating them, even though the project does ultimately cost \$333,000,000, instead of \$170,000,000 as originally estimated, because I believe it is worth that to this country, and I believe the power generated at Shasta Dam will largely amortize the entire project—irrigation, flood control, salinity control, and navigation combined.

Mr. JENSEN. If those facts had not been stressed and established before the committee, certainly he would not have got even the \$11,500,000.

Mr. CARTER. Yes. I hope the gentleman from Iowa will study this Central Valley project carefully. I know he is sincerely interested in it, and I hope that

I may have his support in the future in reference to other appropriations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I appreciate it very much, and I am very sure that the gentleman will feel sympathetic to restoring the fisheries item when the bill comes back from the Senate. You know fish is a good brain food, and at the same time it provides physical strength, and there is need for all the brains and all the physical strength we can have today; there is a shortage of both fish and meat today.

Mr. CARTER. I am just wondering if the gentlewoman is suggesting fish as a diet for the speaker of the present moment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from California has a very fine mind. He does not need fish for that purpose; but there is a shortage of both meat and fish, and I know he would like to have it in order that the population of the country may maintain its full strength during these critical war days.

Mr. CARTER. I have a large fisheries industry in my own district, and I am interested in that. When this bill is in conference and this item of the fisheries industry is being considered, I will, as she requests, assume a very sympathetic attitude toward that item.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. For which we all thank you very much.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the same virtues that applied to the Central Valley project, all of which are very true, do not apply to most of the reclamation projects.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I think the gentleman's statement is correct; I think that is true. These reclamation projects, generally, are projects that pay by their ultimate cost into the Treasury of the United States. In addition to that, they increase property values and stabilize communities and are very beneficial to the country generally.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman said he would be glad to answer any question as to the reasons for the decrease of any item within the bureaus. May I ask the gentleman if he can inform us why they cut \$68,540 out of the fisheries industry item, when it was admitted that they cannot carry on the work of that organization with that amount?

Mr. CARTER. As has just been said, and the chairman also answered that question, and as I called to the attention of the Committee a few minutes ago, we cut every item. There is not a bureau or an agency in here that, perhaps, could not take care of its work better if it had more money. They have just got to work a little harder. As I stated awhile ago, I have a great deal of faith in Mr. Gabrielson and Mr. Jackson, and I

believe that even with the reduced funds they can carry on and do a very splendid work.

It may be that we hit that item a little hard. The gentleman is on the Appropriations Committee and he knows we must cover a large number of items, often in a short time, and it may be that we were a little unduly hard. I thought we were unduly hard about the Central Valley project itself, but, as I stated a few moments ago, if that item should be increased in the Senate, I would look with sympathy on the matter when we get in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I can join with other members of the subcommittee that brought in this bill in saying that I firmly in my heart believe it to be a good bill. There are some items I should like to cut considerably more. Without hunting very far, I think I could find an additional cut of \$1,000,000. I do not, however, propose to offer any amendments because this appropriation bill is such a departure from the bills I have worked on in the past that the improvement, I think, is worthy of a little support even from a humble Republican member of the economy bloc.

In the first place, this bill dramatizes some fights we have had on the floor in the past. You recall that for the fiscal year 1941 the appropriation for the Interior Department was \$155,000,000. For the fiscal year 1942, upon which we voted in the summer of 1941, the committee brought in a bill of \$177,000,000. At the time that bill was brought before the House for consideration, I presented a motion to recommit the bill to the subcommittee for a cut of approximately \$20,000,000 because I felt we should be gearing the Interior Department to war. In 1941, the Secretary of the Interior was running around the country telling the people to get ready to get into World War No. 2, and I felt that if the Secretary of the Interior was aware of impending war his Department ought to be one of the first to gear itself to war.

During the hearings of 1941 I asked the Interior Department to prepare for me a statement of the actual amount that was for national defense. Out of the Budget estimate of \$183,000,000 for the fiscal year 1942, only \$43,420,400 was for national defense. That prompted me to make the motion in 1941 to cut \$20,000,000 from the 1942 fiscal year appropriation bill. This attempt to hold the line against inflation and to hold the line against Government boondoggling, leaving the bill at the 1941 figure of \$155,000,000, was wholly unappreciated by the majority of the membership.

The motion to recommit was overwhelmingly defeated and the bill went to conference, was raised considerably, approved by the Senate and House, and signed by the President.

Last year a considerable effort was made, especially by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rich, to successively amend the bill, and I confess I was not

a shrinking violet in offering economy amendments to the Department of the Interior appropriation bill. I see here now the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], who offered several amendments at the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment last year. The first amendment the gentleman from Ohio offered, as I recall, was to cut the nondefense items of the Interior bill by 50 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The amendment was to cut the nondefense portion of the bill—\$92,000,000—by 50 percent, which would have been \$46,000,000. That would have amounted actually to a reduction of 28 percent in the entire appropriation. In this bill the subcommittee made a reduction of nearly 60 percent of the 1943 appropriation.

That amendment received 5 votes in the affirmative. I then offered an amendment cutting the nondefense portion of the appropriation, \$92,000,000, by 25 percent. That amendment received 14 votes. Then I offered an amendment cutting the nondefense portion by 10 percent, and that amendment, if I recall correctly, received approximately 38 favorable votes.

I am happy to see that a change has come upon the Members of this House, especially the members of the appropriations subcommittee having this particular portion of the Interior Department appropriation under consideration. It is truly gratifying.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I know that our former colleague from Pennsylvania, who many times stood on the floor of this House and asked "Where are you going to get the money?" would be pleased today if he were here to see the subcommittee reporting the bill as you find it today, recommending to the House for appropriation the total sum of \$72,861,316 for the entire Department of the Interior.

Now I want to turn to the portions of the bill in which I think I could save another \$1,000,000 if I were writing it myself. I want to pay my humble tribute to the other members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle for the fine spirit with which we approached the writing of this bill. There was never a time when we disagreed to the point of becoming disagreeable on any provisions regarding the amounts to be appropriated for any bureau or agency within the Interior Department.

The portion with which I find fault is in the authorization to allow unexpended funds of last year to be used for administrative purposes this year. The amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget was \$3,287,000. The committee allowed \$3,200,000 for administrative expenses. The cut of \$87,000 was for these purposes, and I quote now the committee report:

There was a total unexpended balance of \$46,800,000 available as of January 31, 1943, and it is estimated there will be an unallocated balance of \$30,000,000 as of June 30,

1943. Of this latter sum the committee has recommended that \$3,200,000 be made available for expenses of marketing, operation, and administrative costs, a reduction of \$87,000 in the Budget estimate. The committee has applied the major part of this reduction to funds for district offices and has apportioned the remainder to miscellaneous administrative expenses, and particularly to such items as involve informational activities.

I hope the language of the committee in this report will be adhered to by the Bonneville Power Administration. I think this is the heart of the waste perpetrated upon the American people. I think the \$87,000 is a meritorious cut, made at a strategic place.

If you will turn to the hearings, you will find a statement placed in the record showing the difference between the administrative costs for 1943, with a sizable construction program, and the 1944 administrative costs, with zero construction. The 1943 total figure, with the enormous amounts that were appropriated for construction, included only \$3,525,000 for both construction cost and operating cost. The operation limitation, the major activity for the fiscal year 1944 with zero construction, was \$1,655,112. If they could get along with an allocation of \$1,655,000 for the administration of the Bonneville power operation during the present fiscal year, then they should not have a sizable increase for the 1944 fiscal year.

At page 482 you will find a table describing exactly what I mean. The table is prepared by Bonneville Administration officials:

Division	Requirements 1943			Estimated requirement, 1944 zero construction
	Construction funds	Operation limitation	Total	
Administrative	\$56,411	\$188,854	\$245,265	\$206,578
Accounting	142,894	174,647	317,541	180,664
Engineering	577,204	684,171	1,561,375	1,791,768
Information	24,701	27,359	52,060	31,917
Land	64,433		64,433	24,619
Legal	43,540	92,522	136,062	101,046
Office service	208,472	35,050	243,522	196,346
Defense guards	388,620		388,620	367,000
Personnel	108,225	15,480	123,705	52,854
Procurement	75,400	5,770	81,170	36,187
Power management	170,000	131,259	301,259	297,521
Total	1,869,950	1,655,112	3,525,062	3,287,000

<sup>1</sup> Represents fiscal year total requirements and gives effect to reductions in staff already accomplished.

I have not heard anybody, outside of Dr. Raver, estimate there would be more than \$16,000,000 for construction next fiscal year. I doubt if W. P. B. will release material for that much expenditure. So, if you cut \$1,000,000 from the \$3,200,000 that we have allowed to Bonneville, and leave this authorization at \$2,200,000, there will still be a \$600,000 leeway for whatever construction W. P. B. may allow, and Congress will still be in session, certainly, as in the past, to bring in a deficiency appropriation bill for any emergency that we do not foresee now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. JONES. I think this is a logical approach to cutting another million dollars from this appropriation bill, and that it should be made, because the type of personnel they have at the Bonneville Administration is the type that the Army and the Navy need—skilled personnel men, skilled engineers. We certainly need to enlist all of these people in the war effort.

I call attention to another item that bears reflection, and that is the number of personnel in the Interior Department by years. In 1944, for the fiscal year 1944, with the reductions that we have made, I do not know what the final amount of personnel will be, but I can say that if the Interior Department does what it should these cuts will find their way to the personnel that should be shaved in the war effort from the ordinary peacetime functions of the Interior Department.

I asked the Secretary to put a statement in the record of the number of personnel necessary to run the Interior Department by years. You will find the information tabulated on page 33 of the hearings. As of June 30, 1940, there were 48,947 employees in the Interior Department; as of June 30, 1941, there were 48,569; as of June 30, 1942, 47,823; as of December 31, 1942, 13 months after Pearl Harbor, there were 39,774. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this record is a challenge to the great problem of manpower for the battle fronts, and on the home fronts. It seems to me that if the Secretary of the Interior had been as alert to gear his agency into the war effort as he has been advising others to gear themselves into the war effort, that we could have cut this personnel 1 year ago somewhere near the same proportion that the committee has cut the dollar sign in this bill today.

There is another item that seems to me very important and that is the cost of information in the Interior Department. Every year there is a battle to find out how much the Interior Department is spending for press releases and publicity. Two years ago I asked them to give me information as to the entire cost to the Interior Department and they gave me something near the figure of \$76,000. Then a year later I was able to get a report from the Bureau of the Budget showing that the entire information cost of the Department of the Interior was something more than \$2,400,000. This year I presented Mike Strauss, one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Interior, with these Budget figures. They are not prepared by any partisan, or by me. They were prepared by the Interior Department itself, who confessed that they had spent \$1,429,873 for publications and \$69,076 for press releases alone.

I asked them, first, to put a table into the record showing where any of this 1941 information personnel had been eliminated. You will not find the statement of that. Then I told them to break down the figures, category by category, on the same blanks and forms, so that the membership would have a basis to compare the 1944 fiscal year

costs of the information service with the 1941 costs which Interior prepared and gave to the Bureau of the Budget. To this date they have not sent any letter containing the information to either the clerk of the committee or to members of the subcommittee containing the amount. This flagrant denial of information for the committee is a challenge to the integrity of the House. I must confess it has a New Deal pattern not wholly without precedent. If we want to know how much money the Interior Department has spent for information, certainly Congress or Congressmen ought to be able to get it. We should be the judge of what we should or should not get. Certainly it is not within the discretion of any agency in the executive branch of the Government to deny us any material for which we ask. At this moment the Department has not given us the figures that they have or should have, and I am sorry that the committee did not eliminate the entire amount for information service in the Secretary's office, because of this flagrant denial of the rights of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, the House has designated the Committee on Appropriations to investigate, prepare and report the necessary appropriation measures for consideration. This is a tremendous responsibility.

Your committee on appropriations is making every effort to be fair, reasonable and economical in the discharge of its duties; especially is this true of your subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations headed by our very able and considerate Chairman, Hon. JED JOHNSON, and Messrs. FITZPATRICK, KIRKMAN, CARTER, JONES, and JENSEN. These other members of the subcommittee are also very able and conscientious. I endeavor to be helpful.

We are presenting for your consideration today the annual appropriation for the Department of the Interior, your division or branch of government having jurisdiction or custody of the Nation's natural resources.

At this particular time this Department is of very great importance. This war will be won by and with our courageous soldiers and our natural resources. This Department is mobilizing our resources—such as minerals, fuels, power and other critical and strategic materials for our war program.

At the time Germany invaded Norway in 1940 the Anglo-Saxon peoples controlled approximately 75 percent of the world's metals supply. Within a short time, Germany acquired the iron of Norway, the coal and iron of France and Belgium, the copper and aluminum-bearing bauxite of southeastern Europe and, in addition to this, the amount of metal available to us was reduced by Axis raids on our shipping. I think it can be said now that through the very outstanding accomplishments of the

Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines, the United Nations can and will be supplied with sufficient critical and strategic resources for all our needs.

We have allowed the Grazing Service the sum of \$856,700, which is \$26,000 below Budget estimates, to continue the administration, management, and protection of grazing resources on more than 140,000,000 acres of public range lands in grazing districts established in 10 Western States. These services make it possible for this section of our Nation to produce 9,000,000 head of sheep; approximately 2,000,000 head of cattle, 130,000 head of horses, 150,000 head of goats, and approximately 400,000 head of big-game animals. Other appropriations are for construction and maintenance, \$75,000, and for leasing of grazing lands, \$8,000. The domestic livestock are owned by more than 21,000 operators who receive licenses and permits for public-range privileges and they actually paid to the United States Treasury in fees, \$634,790 last year.

Your committee has recommended the sum of \$225,000, which is \$22,030 less than was appropriated last year, for the Petroleum Conservation Division which is necessary for continuing the work as contemplated by Executive Order No. 7756 of December 1, 1936.

The sum of \$1,198,200, which is \$141,800 less than last year's appropriation, has been provided for soil and moisture conservation. This amount is necessary to finance soil and moisture conservation operations on lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior as authorized under provisions of the Soil Conservation Act of April 27, 1935. Approximately 450,000,000 acres of land or 23 percent of the total area of the continental United States remain in Federal ownership. Of this area 280,000,000 acres are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Reports indicate that about 230,000,000 acres are in a condition requiring conservation treatment if the lands are to be kept in production and the badly eroded areas rehabilitated. Something like 60,000,000 acres under the jurisdiction of this Department is in a serious state of erosion. This program is partly self-sustaining. I believe last year they collected in excess of \$812,305 for services rendered.

The above and some other divisions are located in the Secretary's office. The total appropriation for all these activities in the Secretary's office last year amounted to \$6,855,365, whereas, this year the total amount recommended is \$4,026,480 which is \$2,828,885 less than it was a year ago.

I wish to call your attention at this point that no direct appropriation of new money is provided for the Bonneville Power Administration. It is, however, authorized to use not in excess of \$3,200,000 of its unobligated balance of the current appropriation.

The sum of \$97,200 is recommended for the High Commissioner of the Philippine Islands. This is \$66,300 less than the appropriation last year. This reduction is due to cessation of activities in the Philippines. Personnel detained by

the enemy in the Philippines are paid salaries and wages totaling \$62,800 per annum. This amount is frozen as an obligation under the provisions of Public Law No. 490—Seventy-seventh Congress. The balance of the appropriation covers necessary funds for salaries and expenses of other officers, presently located in this Nation.

The sum of \$850,000 has been recommended for the Solid Fuels Administration for War, which was created by Executive order under date of April 19, 1943. Under the terms of the order this organization absorbs the office of Fuel Coordinator for War. This amount is \$70,000 less than the amount provided in the last appropriation bill.

The General Land Office has been provided with the total sum of \$2,119,350. This is \$201,110, less than was provided in the last appropriation measure. In this connection I call your attention to the fact that the earnings of this Department for the fiscal year for 1942 were \$9,014,172.87. Their income approximately was four and one-half times as much last year as their expenditures.

Your committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,388,500 for the Bureau of Reclamation, which is \$1,258,560 less than the amount that was provided last year, and \$12,100,000 for general construction funds which is \$67,279,340 less than last year. The Bureau played a very important role during the fiscal year. It functioned as chief supplier of electric power, foodstuffs, and water—three basic essentials of national existence in war or in peace. Stored water irrigated more than 3,000,000 acres of productive land, and the gross value of 1941 crops on land served with Reclamation water was \$159,885,998. These values do not, of course, include the livestock fattened on Reclamation projects, nor dairy products which, if included, would increase the production by approximately 25 percent. The Bureau is the principal Federal agency engaged in the construction and operation of water projects for irrigation and power. Its activities are confined to 17 western States. The rainfall in this region is insufficient for crop production. Without water conservation and irrigation it would be impossible for the 15,000,000 people who live in that area, to sustain themselves or maintain their great military centers and other war activities. Last year the Bureau supplied irrigation water to 37,000,000 acres of western land which produced two and one-half million 100-pound sacks of beans, about 36,000,000 bushels of potatoes, and they were able to feed their dairy herds which yielded to the Nation 144,000,000 pounds of beef and 1,709,000 pounds of milk. The gross revenue in 1942 from power plants on 10 projects operated by the Bureau exceeded \$9,000,000. Receipts from landowners whose lands were irrigated by Reclamation Bureau amount to \$6,122,430.56.

This committee has recommended for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds, the sum of \$26,926,421, which is \$1,845,320.43 less than was provided in the current appropriation bill.

In addition to this sum, we have recommended a total for the Bureau of Indian Affairs from tribal funds the sum of \$1,577,655. This is \$20,205 more than was spent last year but this money belongs to these tribes and they have recommended this method of expenditure. I do not believe that the Indians are receiving as much consideration at the hands of Congress as other citizens of the United States, but these services do offer some measure of equality and the appropriation is much less than was provided last year.

We have recommended for the Geological Survey the total sum of \$4,474,600, which is \$216,490 less than the amount provided last year. During the past several years with the gathering of war clouds in Europe, the outbreak of war on that continent, its rapid spread to other parts of the world, its close threat to our peace and security, and finally our entry into the conflict, it became necessary for the Geological Survey to mobilize its facilities and its strength and shift its energies from peace to wartime activities. No agency of the Government has been of more vital service to the war effort than the Geological Survey and practically all its work presently is being done for the military services. The hearings are complete and I wish all Members would read the outstanding accomplishments of this great department. They have done very outstanding work in Arkansas in the exploration of zinc deposits in southwest Arkansas; quartz crystals in central Arkansas. Our quartz crystals are now being developed in greater quantity, and tests heretofore made of a small amount of crude crystals turned out to be higher in grade than that from Brazil. The Metal Reserve Corporation has leased certain areas containing quartz crystals in the Ouachita National Forests and this corporation proposes to do very extensive mining. Bauxite, of course, is our No. 1 mineral. More men and more money have been devoted by the Geological Survey on this mineral than all other minerals in Arkansas. More extensive geological surveys are planned for the future with money provided in this bill, and it can be said now that Arkansas will give forth to the Nation sufficient bauxite from which aluminum will be made to supply our needs.

We have recommended for the Bureau of Mines a total appropriation of \$8,835,130, which is a decrease over the budget estimate of \$194,905. It is hard to discuss separately the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey, because their work is to some extent in the same field. The Geological Survey makes the necessary surveys and the Bureau of Mines makes the necessary investigations and tests. Extensive studies and investigations, however, have been made of practically all of Arkansas' minerals as well as the minerals of other States. The hearings are very extensive. Sixty million tons of bauxite and "potential ores" depending on the perfection of the extraction process have been discovered in Arkansas: 6,835,000 tons grade A; 8,941,000 tons grade B; 10,439,000 tons grade C; and

the balance of 34,000,000 which cannot presently be processed; and extensive investigations are planned for the ensuing year, by which it is believed that additional large deposits may be discovered. Arkansas produces presently 97.3 percent of the bauxite produced in the United States. Other strategic minerals, such as manganese, mercury, nickel, tungsten, chromium, tin, and a multiplicity of other critical materials have been discovered throughout the Nation, and these deposits assure us of victory insofar as the mobilization of strategic and critical materials are concerned.

The National Park Service has been provided with \$3,957,810, which is \$1,529,555 less than they had last year, and many of our parks are now being used exclusively by our military services. Others are being turned over to the military services, soldiers from the battlefields are going to have the exclusive use of many of our best and most beautiful parks for their enjoyment. The Park Service has rendered a very great contribution to the war effort.

This committee recommended \$4,897,350 for the Fish and Wildlife Service, which is \$1,014,220 less than last year. This Service is also engaged in the war effort and they are making a tremendous contribution toward solving the food supply of this and the other United Nations.

For all activities in Alaska we have recommended \$1,392,600, which is \$607,720 less than they had last year. Alaska has become a strategic area. For the first time in my knowledge the Alaskan Railroad has been more than self-sustaining. It may be said that Alaska is, so far as this Nation is concerned, the most strategic area at the present time.

We have recommended \$21,600 for Hawaii, which is \$46,800 less than the amount they had last year—the total amount for last year being \$68,400. The Virgin Islands have been given \$125,000.

I have not agreed with all of the reductions made in this bill. I do not agree with all items that have been allowed. However, as a whole, I think the bill represents the very careful and considerate judgment of this committee, and while very drastic cuts have been made in practically all items I wish to compliment the various departments and other witnesses for being charitable with this committee in its endeavor to honestly extend in this bill the economies so desired by the people in all matters and more especially in those items which do not make some contribution to the war effort.

Also, I would like to call your attention to the fact that while we have reduced the total appropriation from \$192,860,791.43, allowed last year, to the sum of \$82,188,576, which is the amount recommended this year, "making a net reduction of \$110,999,475.43." I wish to call your attention to the fact that of the amount allowed for expenditures for the next fiscal year, all but approximately \$19,000,000 will be expended from receipts of the various divisions of the Department of the Interior. In other words, the taxpayers of the United States, for the maintenance of all these

activities, shall not be called upon to pay more than approximately \$19,000,000. This is an excellent record, and, in my judgment, all sections of the Department of the Interior from its director to its minor officers should be highly complimented.

We think we have done a reasonably good job. We hope the House may reach such conclusion from a very careful study and consideration of the bill, and we believe the amounts finally allowed by the House should be sustained, bearing in mind the historic function of the House of Representatives with reference to making appropriation bills.

Summing up the status of the bill, I advise that the amount for the next fiscal year is \$119,999,475, below the 1943 appropriation. This represents a very drastic reduction in practically all funds for the many activities of the Department of the Interior. The reduction in Budget estimates recommended by your committee is \$9,327,260. The bill as reported to the House through voluntary cuts by the Department of the Interior, reductions made by the Bureau of the Budget, and reductions made by your committee, all told, reflects a 60-percent cut from the current appropriations.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to congratulate my colleague and the other members of the subcommittee for the splendid job they have done in bringing this appropriation bill to the House at a considerably less amount than was contained in the bill last year. I feel that the action of the subcommittee can be followed by some of the other subcommittees. It is a splendid example and I hope the example set will be contagious.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, before covering the subject matter pertaining to the Bonneville item in this bill, I wish to point out the great contribution to the common defense made by this committee. This contribution has resulted from the committee's early vision in providing transmission capacity from the Bonneville plant, which is in my district. The War Department subcommittee also shares in this contribution by their early vision in authorizing the last eight generating units. It is with a high degree of satisfaction that I refer to the committee's contribution, as I can speak with intimate knowledge.

The facts are that when our Nation entered this war, we were ill prepared to fight a modern war. Such wars are based on highly developed electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries. Through the operations of international cartels, during the period from 1920 to 1941, this Nation was relegated to an inferior position in this field of activity. Those of us who have investigated this matter early knew that Germany was

expanding such industries by 1,000 percent of the capacity available in 1933.

It is hard to realize how this Nation would have been able to cope with the existing situation without the early provision for Federal hydropower. It is apparent to those of us who are familiar with the situation, that our Nation's expenditure of blood and treasure, would have been far greater if we had no early expanded electrical capacity, so as to make electrometallurgical and electrochemical processes early available.

At least 75 percent of the light metals going into our air program comes from the Federal power plants in the Pacific Northwest, in California, the Western States, and the Southeast. The largest portion of these light-metal requirements comes from the western plants. Appropriation provisions for these western plants comes within the jurisdiction of the Interior committee. It has been stated on several occasions that preparedness depends on foresight. Without the foresight of this committee, our country would have been ill-prepared.

When the factual history of our war effort is written the work of this committee will stand out as an outstanding example of vision. The sad part of the story is that the men in the war agencies did not have vision or make full use of the authority and funds that Congress provided. Congress was way in advance of the war agencies on the light metal, rubber, mineral, and power problems when it passed the Thomas Act and provided funds for Federal hydro plants and the necessary investigations and processes connected therewith. What is more remarkable still, this vision was exercised in the midst of highly conflicting points of view growing out of the public-private power controversy. These controversies, from my observation point, are secondary to the proper utilization of our resources, both in peace and war. I take pride in the fact that I early urged what this committee approved. I pointed out the basic facts on the power, metal, and rubber situation when I addressed this House in May 1940—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, page 5786. This was 8 days before the President addressed both Houses on the emergency and what lay ahead.

From this observation point it can be plainly seen that the prime industries of the future will be those engaged in the production of electrochemical and electro metals. Airplanes and our future commerce will not be possible without such productivity. In addition, we, as the arsenal for the world, are drawing on our own resources at a rate higher than any of us can visualize. We must find substitutes, if we are to hold our own as a first-class nation.

It is clear that to Congress belongs the task of post-war planning. In the consideration of such planning this House will find that they will have to consider two approaches to the resources phase. These approaches will be concerned with an inventory and use of the national resources that should be dedicated to future new competitive commercial uses, and secondly, such planning must cover

necessary substitutions for those resources entering the depletion cycle.

Energy and power will play an important part in such future planning. Base metal electroproduction must come from low-cost power. The post-war unemployment problem is definitely tied up with adequate and proper resource utilization.

I deem it advisable for the membership of this House to be fully acquainted with the war-power developments in the Axis countries of Norway, and especially in Japan. We on the Pacific coast are especially interested in what Japan has and will be doing. Such an investigation will bring out the advanced preparations of all of these countries to secure world domination.

The South American situation also needs close study. That continent has nearly 50,000,000 horsepower of potential hydropower which is largely unused. This South American power is extremely high class on account of great falls and heavy, steady rainfalls. In the hands of unfriendly competitors, it can become a threat to our position. Nearly half of this South American potential power lies in Brazil in close proximity to high-quality and extensive mineral deposits. Another highly important study should cover the depletion of our own resources and an inventory of what we have and what we need. The growing pains experienced by our war agencies bespeak the necessity of a worth-while inventory.

I have been impressed particularly by these agencies' part in the shipbuilding program now being carried on by Henry J. Kaiser in the Pacific Northwest region. I doubt if there is any question in anyone's mind as to the importance of the Kaiser shipyards.

I think too many of us have not realized the importance of electric power in ship production. We hear of ship production always in terms of the large number of workers required. We usually hear of ship production in terms of astronomical man-hour figures, but it is quite apparent to anyone who delves into the subject that the modern, high-speed shipbuilding, which may prove the salvation of the United Nations, is at least equally dependent upon high-speed electrically operated tools, such as heavy duty cranes, presses, drills, lathes, and particularly the electric welding arc. These tools have been the instruments through which ship fabrication has been reduced from the World War No. 1 record of 236 days to less than 10 days at present in some cases. The yards in my district lead the country in ship production speed.

One kilowatt of electric power is necessary to make every five shipyard workers effective. A yard employing 50,000 men must have at least 10,000 kilowatts of electricity. If the electricity is not available, the 50,000 men must work under the obsolete methods of 25 years ago.

The figures given by Department of the Interior officials to the Appropriations Committee show that the Northwest region as a whole, and particularly the area around the city of Portland where the

Kaiser shipyards are located would be a power shortage area if it were not for Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee Dam, and for the system of transmission lines and substations through which the electric power from those two dams is transmitted to the industrial sections.

The power companies established in the Portland area have for several years been dependent upon Columbia River power which has been made available to them. Without this power they would be unable to meet the rapidly growing needs of their normal market, to say nothing of the added demands for power placed upon them by the shipyard developments. In view of this fact I am convinced that the present is no time to deny the reasonable request of the Department of the Interior for the use of funds for operation and maintenance.

On the basis of the committee's evidence I believe the Department of the Interior has been cooperating with existing privately owned utility systems in the region. It is pouring its power without stint into practically all of these systems. Through these interconnections Columbia River power is being made available not only to the shipyards in the Portland area but in the Puget Sound area as well.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the following excerpts from the hearings, page 470, showing the operations of the Bonneville agencies:

The vital role being played by the Administration in the war program is indicated by the fact that the region will be producing about 30 percent of the total aluminum pig capacity of the Nation, utilizing more than 625,000 kilowatts of power, which is more than the ultimate capacity of Bonneville Dam when completed—518,400 kilowatts; an aluminum rolling mill capable of producing 240,000,000 pounds of aluminum sheet annually, and using approximately 50,000 kilowatts of power; production of tremendous tonnage of new ships, 1 shipyard alone turning out 113 Liberty ships during 1942, with a dead-weight tonnage of over 1,000,000 tons; a steel-rolling mill capable of producing 72,000 tons of steel annually, requiring 14,000 kilowatts of power; the production of magnesium requiring 57,000 kilowatts of power; and many other essential products, such as calcium carbide, sodium chlorate, and ferro-alloys. In addition, many other types of industries which are not direct customers of Bonneville have developed in the region in the war production effort, all of which development would have been impossible had not these power projects been built by the Federal Government. The war strategy has also required the construction of many airports, Army camps, naval stations, and other similar establishments of the War and Navy Departments in this area. The Administration has undertaken the servicing of all these activities, including defense housing projects, which have been necessary because of the tremendous increase in the number of defense workers required for this expanded production program.

As a result of recommendations made by the Administration for the acceleration of construction of electrical facilities in the region in anticipation of the present crisis, Bonneville Dam, which was scheduled for completion in 1946, will now be completed in 1943, and installation of generators at Grand Coulee Dam has been advanced so that six units will be in operation by February 1944, in addition to two Shasta units loaned to Grand Coulee for the duration of the war. Three more generating units have

been authorized at Grand Coulee by Congress, but their completion date thus far is indefinite due to priority difficulties.

The present rated generating capacity at these two dams of 626,000 kilowatts will be increased by the end of the calendar year 1943 to more than 1,200,000 kilowatts, approximately 100 percent increase in capacity during this calendar year. The increasing tempo of the Administration's part in the war effort is reflected in its power deliveries since 1940:

Year	Kilowatt-hours	Increase over previous year
1940	354,208,000	
1941	1,568,728,000	1,214,520,000
1942	3,939,600,000	2,370,872,000
1943 <sup>1</sup>	7,637,800,000	3,693,200,000
1944 <sup>1</sup>	9,647,533,000	2,009,733,000

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

To meet these large increases in load, a rapid expansion of transmission facilities to take the tremendous quantities of power from the generating plants to the load centers was required. The construction of electrical facilities, accelerated in 1941 in anticipation of these new loads, was interrupted upon the declaration of war in order to conserve critical material. Only such lines and substation requirements were continued as were necessary to maintain minimum service to war plants. The rapid expansion of these facilities is best illustrated by the following data:

Fiscal year—	Mile-years of line in operation	Substa-tions	Kilovolt-ampere-years capacity
1940	52.1	3	14,910
1941	614.6	25	265,020
1942	1,403.6	34	840,625
1943 <sup>1</sup>	2,228.9	50	1,639,369

<sup>1</sup> This includes only projects authorized as of Jan. 1, 1943.

#### FINANCIAL STATUS

The accomplishments of the Administration and the effect of contracts and new commitments are being reflected in the revenues being returned to the Treasury. A summary of actual revenues received to June 30, 1942, with estimated revenues for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944, follows:

1940, actual	\$367,900
1941, actual	1,874,645
1942, actual	6,100,368
1943, estimated	12,003,519
1944, estimated	18,007,166

Estimated total June 30, 1944 37,413,598

The Bonneville Agency, which is under consideration, operates the transmission facilities, markets the power, and collects the revenues. The Corps of Engineers, another agency, operates the Bonneville generating plant. Its power costs have been allocated as provided by law. The Grand Coulee plant is operated by another agency, the Bureau of Reclamation. It is not completed, and its first costs have not been allocated as provided in the reclamation law. Therefore in approaching a pay-out cost determination we can deal with absolute figures as far as Bonneville power plant and Bonneville Power Administration are concerned and estimated figures for Grand Coulee. This will be close enough for the purposes at hand.

I will not deal with this over-all figure by combining the figures given in the hearings with citation thereto. The

figures I am covering apply to the fiscal year 1944 as given in the RECORD. Revenues and expenses are given for other years also, but for brevity I will cover the 1 year:

The gross revenue given on p. 480 is	\$18,085,500
Operating and depreciation expenses, Bonneville Power Administration alone, p. 481	4,271,990
Net Bonneville Power Administration operating income, p. 481	13,813,510
Interest on Bonneville Power Administration Federal investment, p. 481	2,145,696
Net income available for power cost and surplus, and operating expenses at generating stations, p. 481	11,667,814
The operating expenses at stations, p. 521	1,344,675
Net for interest and amortization of two dam plants	10,323,139

The only item that need be covered to complete the over-all pay-out calculation is the interest and amortization of the plant costs allocated to power. This is given on page 518 of the hearings, and when considered with the generating plant operating expenses I have just cited, shows surplus over-all charges of all kind: of \$3,267,000 for the fiscal year 1944. These figures definitely answer the question of returns as given from the balance sheet figures submitted by the Administrator.

I must add a word of caution at this point, and that is not to take random figures scattered throughout the hearings. The only correct approach is via the balance sheet route as given on pages 480 and 518 of the record.

The real control must not be lost in any discussion. This control is the requirement of the basic act that requires rate reviews every 5 years to insure a balance sheet return to the Federal Treasury. It is mandatory for the Administrator to charge rates which will insure a full return.

I need to point out that the War Production Board has not used these facilities to their fullest extent. If they had we would have had more planes in the hands of General MacArthur. The testimony of Mr. Krug, as given on pages 959 to 983, is misleading as there is a gap of 2 years in W.P.B. recited activities, which is ignored. The record is complete in the appropriation hearings on the Senate side.

If this record is compared with the House Krug testimony, the gaps will be obvious.

The Department of the Interior is asking for no new appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration in 1944. It is asking only for congressional approval to reallocate \$3,287,000 of moneys already appropriated so that the Bonneville Administration can carry on its operation and management functions effectively during the next fiscal year.

Such funds are to be used primarily for the purpose of transmitting power to war industries in the Pacific Northwest with a combined metal-plant valuation in the neighborhood of \$300,000,000. Those plants are all being operated by private enterprise and their combined value is roughly equal in amount to the

total investment thus far in Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and the Federal electric power transmission system which takes the power from those dams to market.

I should like to point out that power, when it is made in the generators at Grand Coulee Dam and at Bonneville Dam, is of little value to anyone. There are no big cities close to either of those dams. There are no industries located at either of those dams. Bonneville and Grand Coulee power is of value only when it can be delivered to the industrial centers and the military zones of the Northwest.

That is what the Department of the Interior, through the Bonneville Power Administration, is doing, and that is the purpose of the requested funds.

I am informed that 95 percent of all Bonneville and Grand Coulee power will be delivered to war industries during the next fiscal year. These war enterprises include pig aluminum plants capable of producing more than 600,000,000 pounds of raw metal annually, one of the largest sheet rolling mills in the country, a new magnesium metal plant with 800 electric furnaces, several chemical plants devoted to the manufacture of explosives and other war materials, a number of alloy plants which make materials vital in the production of armor plate and other hard-steel products, and at least 1 dozen military installations such as Army and Navy airfields, depots, and encampments. All of these enterprises are war enterprises; and all of them require electric power which they would be unable to receive if it were not for the Federal development of the Columbia River. For the delivery of power to all of these enterprises and to others which will be established during the fiscal year 1944, the Bonneville Administration will collect more than \$15,000,000—perhaps as much as \$20,000,000—which will be paid into the Treasury of the United States. These power sales will more than double the volume of sales by the Bonneville Administration during the past 12 months.

The Bonneville Administrator has testified before the Appropriations Committee that he will require \$3,287,000 to operate his agency. More than 10 percent of that money is required for armed guards to protect the system against accident and sabotage.

According to the Bonneville Administrator's figures 3,287,000 operating dollars will put into the United States Treasury more than \$15,000,000.

That sounds like good business. I urge the approval of this item in the pending bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, over a period of years I have entertained some difficulty about the ramifications of the various power agencies in the Federal Government. As a result of some studies in that field I dropped a bill in the hopper today to consolidate all power activities of the Federal Government in a so-called Federal Power Administration, under the direction and

supervision of a Federal Power Administrator.

One never realizes the diffusion of power operations in the Government until he sets himself about it for a little while and determines how far they go. Nor do we have an adequate conception of the immensity of our power operations and the investment in public power today. We ought to make up our minds that public power is here to stay. It is like administrative law. It is here to stay, and it has to have some good direction. It has to have some coordination when necessary. But I start from the broad premise that public power is here to stay. So the thing to do is to coordinate these activities whenever possible, that we may more intelligently legislate and appropriate in this field.

It occurs to me we are appropriating something in excess of \$300,000,000 a year or more on power projects and that our investment in public-power projects is well in excess of \$2,000,000,000. You cannot minimize that kind of an investment, and it certainly needs the attention of Congress.

I doubt very much whether there is a single individual in Congress or out, or in any place in the Government today who has a truly comprehensive understanding of our power activities. We have already consolidated in some other fields. We have taken the security agencies and put them under the Federal Security Agency. The Federal loan functions have been placed under the Federal Loan Agency. Public works functions have been placed under the Federal Works Agency. By the same token it occurs to me that all power activities ought to be put under a single power administration for better direction and development.

Let us take a look at the ramifications of power throughout the Government. In the field of planning for power projects we have the National Resources Planning Board. We have the War Production Board, which deals with the allocation of power supply. We have the Army and Navy Munitions Board and the National Power Policy Committee.

In the field of power generation, marketing, and distribution we have the Bureau of Reclamation, which is considered in the instant bill, which includes Grand Coulee, Fort Peck, and others. In fact, the Bureau of Reclamation has charge today of some 28 power projects on 17 reclamation projects, and its installed capacity is 1,447,000 kilowatts. In the field of generation you also have the Indian Bureau. Next, you have the Tennessee Valley Authority, with 1,300,000 of installed kilowatts. Finally, you have the Federal Works Agency, which has control of the construction of a power project on the Santee-Cooper and also supervises the Grand River Dam in Oklahoma, and a number of projects in Nebraska.

Here then are two categories, namely, those agencies dealing with planning in the power field and those that deal with generation. Next, you have those that are lending agencies on public power.

That includes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It includes the Defense Plant Corporation and the Rural Electrification Administration. There is a fourth category—the control agencies that deal with the regulation of power. That would include the War Production Board, as it relates to allocations of power supply. It would include the Federal Power Commission, which deals with rates and applications. It would include the Securities and Exchange Commission, which deals with regulation of holding companies and securities.

It is a rather interesting thing that if you go about looking for all these power agencies you will find them in four different departments of government and in six or more differentiating agencies. Obviously, no legislator can keep that whole complicated picture in mind.

If we consider it from the standpoint of legislation, think of the legislative committees that deal with the subject. First of all, the Committee on Military Affairs has jurisdiction over certain power activities—all legislation dealing with the Tennessee Valley comes under that committee; second, there is the Flood Control Committee; third, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, where power is involved; fourth, there is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which deals with power as it relates to control, through the Securities and Exchange Commission; next, you have the legislative Committee on Agriculture, which legislates on matters that pertain to the Rural Electrification Administration; finally, when it comes to the lending functions involving power, the Defense Plant Corporation and the R. F. C. customarily appear before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There you have six legislative committees of the Congress that deal with this question of power legislation.

When it comes to appropriations for power it is the same bewildering labyrinth of authority. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations deals with appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration. This Interior Department bill from the Interior Subcommittee deals with the Bureau of Reclamation, Indian Affairs, and National Park Service, including Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Fort Peck, and others. The Independent Offices Subcommittee has jurisdiction over T. V. A., the Federal Power Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. The War Department Civil Functions Committee has jurisdiction over the Army and Navy Munitions Board and the planning activities of the War Department in the field of power. Finally, if there is any deficiency or supplemental requests that the other five subcommittees did not catch, then you still have the deficiency subcommittee. Here, then, are six subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations and six legislative committees that deal with this whole question of power.

There is not only duplication in the field of public-power activities but there is duplication right here in Congress in handling problems relating to the power

activities of government. We must spell out this whole program of consolidation. I am persuaded that we have got to consolidate. We must unify these activities if we are going to have a harmonious and effective public power policy; so the bill which went into the hopper today sets up the Office of Power Administration under the supervision and direction of a Federal Power Administrator. Consolidated therein will be Bonneville, Tennessee Valley Authority, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Federal Power Commission, the R. F. C. activities insofar as they relate to power loans, the Securities and Exchange functions that relate to the control and consolidation of power activities, and similar functions of the Federal Works Agency. In addition thereto, it sets up an advisory committee consisting of the chairman or the administrative heads of every one of these agencies, who, taken together, shall be a Federal public-power advisory committee in wartime and in peacetime.

The National Power Policy Committee and the Power Division in Interior would be abolished. I propose to bring about a transfer of those functions in the interest of economy, in the interest of efficiency, in the interest of a coordinated public power policy, and in the interest of a development in the future that will be coordinated, that will have good substantial direction, and that will make it possible then for the Congress to intelligently deal with this whole ramifying and complicated subject.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Has the gentleman included anywhere in his bill coal or oil? They are a form of power that is increasingly tied up with the public interest and increasingly subject to Federal regulation. It seems to me some day we have got to have some sort of coordinated regulation of these competing forms of power that compete between each other and we have got to have regulation that will include both public and privately owned sources of these three competing kinds of power.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not include them for a very good reason. I realized first that they are competitive, and secondly there has been a good deal of controversy already over regulation of these competing fuels whether we call it power, oil, coal, hydro, or something else; and for that reason I leave it as a sort of separate domain because each of them is already being separately dealt with by different agencies of the Government.

Several years ago, I served on the special committee of this House on the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. It was a fruitful and constructive experience. The studies of that committee were persuasive of the need for more and more reorganization of Federal agencies in the interest of economy, better policy, and improved public service. Here is a field in which the reorganization technique can be applied in the interest of consolidation of these activities that should prove most salutary. I believe that this proposal

merits the immediate consideration of the appropriate committee of the House.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, a very valuable member of the committee [Mr. JENSEN.]

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, most of the items in this bill have been covered quite thoroughly by our very able chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], and by the very able ranking Member on our side, the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], and also by my colleague on the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]. I wish to say here that every member of the committee worked hard and long to bring out a bill that we could support on the floor unanimously. For almost 6 weeks we met daily. We listened to over 100 people who came before us to testify. After that we marked up the bill, which was no small job. Generally speaking, the workings of the Interior Department are carried on very efficiently. Nevertheless, there was room for saving and so we did cut this bill to what we thought necessary, but leaving enough money for every branch of the Interior Department to carry on the work of the Department and carry it on efficiently. I possibly got a little tough on occasion, but I am not apologizing for it, because under present conditions it is necessary to cut all nonwar expenditures to the bone. Our Treasury is in mighty bad shape right now, and it is going to be in worse shape as this war goes along; so it behooves everyone of us to save every dime we can without detriment to our war effort. It is not pleasant to me to have to take sharp issue with the ranking Member, the distinguished and able gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER]. I appreciate his position in regard to the Central Valley project in his State. The argument was developed quite thoroughly and we finally decided to permit an expenditure of \$11,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, some disturbing things were brought up and aired quite thoroughly in the committee, part of which had to be off the record because it was of such a nature as to be military secrets. The disturbing thing that came before our committee was the fact that there seems to be a disposition on the part of some high officials in this Government to hinder the development of our national resources.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I hesitate at this time during this war emergency to bring this out too forcibly, but I can say in all honesty and sincerity that it just does not make sense when we need every kind of strategic war material, when we stop projects of all kinds, reclamation, power, and every other kind of Government project and many private projects and industries from getting the necessary steel and other materials that they need to carry on their business that at the same time something should be stopping

these mines and our domestic resources from being developed.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman on the fine statement he is making. I would like to ask one question, however. On page 27 of the report which accompanies the bill I find that attorneys' fees for certain Indian tribes of the Flathead Indian Reservation in Montana have been increased \$18,400 over the amount which was awarded in 1943. Will the gentleman explain that large increase in attorneys' fees for those Indian tribes?

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. May I say that the attorneys' fees for the Indians comes out of the tribal fund.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. CARTER. They have a tribal council that carries on the business of the tribe and it has requested this. As I recall they pay the attorneys for a period of 10 years. I have forgotten the exact number of years, but it is over a number of years. May I say further that the committee has scrutinized these attorneys' fees very carefully in this bill and in every other bill since I have been on the committee because we did not want unscrupulous attorneys taking advantage of the Indians. I think the gentleman will find upon investigation that there is ample justification for every cent that is allowed for attorneys' fees.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask this additional question of the distinguished gentleman now speaking and also members of the committee: Is it the opinion of the committee that this increase of attorneys' fees is fully justified by the testimony which was heard by the committee?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. In fact, proven to our satisfaction, I may say to the gentleman. There was need for this additional attorney's fee and consequently we all agreed on it. I do not think there was a dissenting vote on this particular item.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I was speaking about these metals that we have which are not being developed. Since the time our report has been made public and our hearings have been made public just a few days ago I have received numerous letters from people in different sections of the United States who have private metal deposits. They all tell me how they have been given the walk-around and have not had an opportunity to develop their mines right at a time when we need these metals so badly, not only for our war effort but also to produce food. Our farmers are being stymied to a marked degree because they cannot get the necessary machinery, consequently our food-production program suffers while at the

same time this is permitted to go on. Some individuals in high places are holding back the development of our own natural resources and I promise right now that I shall not stop until I have a pretty good idea who the fellows are who are guilty of what I call sabotaging our war program. I invite every good American to assist me in correcting this thing at the earliest possible moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gwynne].

Mr. Gwynne. Mr. Chairman, the bill we now have before us carries appropriations involving some \$72,000,000. It makes appropriations for at least 6 unrelated subjects and has over 100 separate and distinct items. To my mind this raises the question of the desirability of a separate item veto in our procedure here in Congress. In the past various Presidents, including President Grant, President Hayes and, I believe, President Taft, have recommended a separate item veto by constitutional amendment. Thirty-nine States in the Union have a program under which the Governor may veto an item separately or in some cases he may reduce an item.

I think the principal question here, perhaps the only question, aside from the desirability of the program, is whether or not it can be accomplished without amending the Constitution. It is my view that it can be. In order to stimulate a little thought on this subject I am today introducing a bill which is very simple and provides in substance that each item of an appropriation bill shall be considered a bill within the meaning of article I, section 7, and may be vetoed by the President separately. The item vetoed would be returned to the Congress for further consideration just as other bills are considered under such circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief statement I have prepared on the constitutionality of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gwynne]?

There was no objection.

Mr. Gwynne. Mr. Chairman, in his budget message several years ago President Roosevelt directed the attention of Congress to the desirability of a power in the Executive to veto separate items in an appropriation bill, and called upon Congress to decide whether this result should be accomplished by a constitutional amendment or by legislation. A constitutional amendment would, of course, make this practice obligatory on all future Congresses. However, it would seem that the desired result could be attained without the necessity of a constitutional amendment.

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution provides as follows:

All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

In construing this section, it is necessary to consider other pertinent sections as well as the general intent of the instrument as a whole. While the section provides that "all legislative power \* \* \* shall be vested in a Congress," it is clear that the framers were referring here only to affirmative legislative power. In article I, section 7, they gave legislative power to the Executive in the following language:

Article I, section 7: Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law. But in all such cases, the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the journal of each House respectively. If any bill shall not be returned by the President within 10 days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress, by their adjournment, prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.

The Courts have held that this provision confers upon the Executive legislative power. The legislative power of the Executive is purely negative in character, and even that power of negation is subject to being overruled by a two-thirds vote of Congress. In brief, Congress is the sole repository of affirmative legislative power; that is, the power to say what the law shall be. The Executive has only the power to say that a certain measure adopted by Congress shall or shall not be the law. However, the right and duty of the Executive to exercise this negative power as his judgment dictates, is as clearly expressed in the Constitution as is the right and duty of Congress to perform its part of the legislative function. This is clearly borne out not only by the language of the Constitution, but by the history of the veto power in Anglo-Saxon government.

In an early day in England, the Crown possessed all the powers of legislation. The rise of the English Parliament first restricted this power of legislation to a negative power of veto, and finally abolished it altogether, the last veto being by Queen Anne in 1708. In the American Colonies, the veto power had a different history. In all the Colonies, the Governor could veto legislation, and in all but Maryland, Rhode Island, and Connecticut the King could veto a bill, even after it had been approved by the Governor. The King used the veto power freely to prevent acts of the Colonies injurious to the mother country. This abuse of the veto was complained of in the Declaration of Independence. After the beginning of the Revolutionary War, the American Colonies limited the veto power of their respective Governors. In no State but Massachusetts did the Governor

have even a qualified veto over legislation, and that not until the Constitution of 1789 was adopted. Under the Articles of Confederation there was, of course, no Executive veto.

The framers of the Constitution were, of course, familiar with this history. They knew both the advantages and disadvantages of the Executive veto, and the subject was very carefully discussed at the Constitutional Convention. It was their general purpose to create a Government consisting of three coordinate branches, legislative, executive, and judicial. In order to maintain such a government, it was necessary not only to carve out the place of each branch in the whole scheme, but also to declare certain fundamental principles for keeping each in its respective sphere. The power of veto was given to the President as a check on the law-making powers of the Congress. The delegates evidently had in mind two main purposes; first, the protection of the executive branch from encroachment by Congress; second, the prevention of hasty and ill-advised legislation. This was well expressed by Alexander Hamilton in the following language:

It establishes a salutary check upon the legislative body, calculated to guard the community against the effects of faction, precipitancy, or of any impulse unfriendly to the public good, which may happen to influence the majority of that body (Federalist, No. 73).

Beginning in 1820, the use of the rider—often attached to an appropriation bill—became prevalent and often reduced the Executive veto to a nullity. By rule, the House of Representatives subsequently prohibited this practice. However, the practice of assembling appropriations in large bills containing hundreds of separate items on wholly unrelated subjects is rapidly accomplishing the same result.

Many of the States, confronted with this problem, have met it by constitutional provisions definitely giving the Executive the power to veto a separate item of an appropriation bill. Thirty-nine States have taken such action. As opposed to this plan of protecting the integrity of the Executive veto by constitutional provision, the Federal Constitution leaves the matter to the good faith of Congress. The Constitution is, after all, not a mere compilation of legalistic rules. It is rather the pattern of a certain philosophy of government. It states general principles rather than detailed procedure. The fundamental object of the Constitution was to create a government of laws as distinguished from a government of men. It sought to accomplish this by dividing the powers of government among three independent and coordinate branches, each one of which should be a check on the other. It is to this fundamental principle rather than to any mere declaration in the Constitution that the citizen must look for the protection of his property, his liberty, and even his life. The Constitution does little more than to create these three branches and draw the line between them. It seeks to maintain that division for all time by setting up certain

checks and balances. In the last analysis, however, the preservation of that form of government is not to be sought in any mere words written on paper, but rather in the acceptance of that philosophy of government of which the words themselves are the mere evidence. Such a government can only be maintained if each independent branch thereof recognizes the rights and duties of the others and protects them as actively as it protects its own.

In the matter of legislative procedure, the Constitution simply says:

Article I, section 5: Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

This was intended as a broad and comprehensive grant of power and has so been recognized by all three branches of the Government. In construing the right of Congress to make rules, the Supreme Court has said, in *United States v. Ballin* (144 U. S. 1):

It—

The House of Representatives—  
may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights, and there should be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained. But within these limitations, all matters of method are open to the determination of the House, and it is no impeachment of the rule to say that some other way would be better, more accurate, or even more just. It is no objection to the validity of a rule that a different one has been prescribed and in force for a length of time. The power to make rules is not one which once exercised is exhausted. It is a continuous power, always subject to be exercised by the House and within the limitations suggested, absolute and beyond the challenge of any other body or tribunal.

In that case, the Supreme Court called attention to the fact that the Constitution required the presence of a quorum, but set up no method of making this determination and that it was therefore within the power of the House to prescribe any method which would be reasonably certain to ascertain the fact. The right of Congress to make rules for the purpose of legislation is so broad and final that the Supreme Court accepts the complete law as it has passed Congress and been signed by the President and deposited with the Secretary of State, as the law which passed the House in accordance with their rules, and will not have recourse to the Journals of the respective Houses to prove the contrary.

Attention has been called to article I, section 7, which provides that "every bill shall be presented to the President of the United States." Webster defines a bill as follows:

A form or draft of a law presented to a legislature but not yet enacted, or before it is enacted; a proposed or projected law.

The term "bill," as used in the Constitution, does not have any definite or technical meaning and apparently had none at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. It is simply a vehicle for carrying proposed law through the legislative bodies. There is no constitutional requirement that it shall be in any

particular form, or that it shall contain any designated elements. It is simply a device by which the legislative will is expressed concerning suggested legislation. Neither usage nor constitutional limitation requires us to attach any technical or restricted meaning to the word "bill" which will prevent the carrying out of the real intent of the framers in adopting the Executive veto. We must, as in all construction of the Constitution, look to substance and not to mere form.

In *State v. Platt* (2 S. C. 150), in discussing the meaning of the term "bill," the court says:

In a technical sense, the term "bill" is applicable properly to the enactment as a whole. Although the technical use of words should prevail where not inconsistent with the clear intent of the instrument, yet when such intent requires that words should be used in the larger sense, it is competent so to regard them. If we should hold that the Constitution regards the enactment as a whole, in an exclusive sense, we would be led to the inevitable conclusion that to become a law, all the substantial parts of the measure must have together passed through all the requisite stages. The consequence of this would be that alteration in a substantial part during such progress would be fatal to the whole bill.

Forced upon the opposite construction that every substantial part of a bill is to be regarded as a bill in the sense of the Constitution, we find nothing in our way but the technical import of the term "bill." It is not easy to perceive why, if any detached part of a statute is a law within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States forbidding States passing laws impairing the obligation of contracts, any part of a bill is not a bill under a clause intended to secure deliberation in the passage of legislative enactments. Such a conclusion is inevitable if regard is had to the fixed principles governing constitutional construction. The objects had in view by a constitution in government are habitually substantial; matters of form are usually left to the legislative body as subject to change with the progress of ideas and events. The great objects in view in framing a constitution are the division and distribution of the powers of government, the establishment of limits and boundaries beyond which they shall not be exercised, and the creation of an efficient responsibility, tending to restrain and furnish the means to correct neglect or abuse of public authority. Clauses having for their object the creation of responsibility in the exercise of political functions are, to a large extent, intended to act upon the motive, either by way of creating inducement for right action or removing the temptation or opportunity to such abusive exercises. This is in part accomplished by fixing the responsibility for all political action in some definite person, or body of persons, by securing deliberation in the performance of public acts, and by ascertaining modes of authentication and action in important cases vitally affecting the welfare of the state. It is obvious that, in construing clauses of this class, substance rather than form is to be considered. The object to be secured is to be sought for not alone in the formal expressions of the Constitution, nor yet in the technical character of the means employed to serve its ends, but in the nature of the subject intended to be acted upon through such means. In a word, the language of the Constitution in such cases is to be construed in the largest sense fairly attributable to it, and that will best subserve the objects it has in view.

Article I, section 7, simply means that all legislation which has passed the Congress must, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President. The intent of the Constitution is that legislation shall be a result of the meeting of the minds of the Congress and of the Executive—the former affirmatively creating the legislation and the President exercising his right of affirming or denying.

The method by which this result is to be accomplished is left largely in the discretion of Congress. For example, a provision could be put in each appropriation bill stating definitely that for the purpose of the Executive veto, each item shall be considered as a separate enactment of the Congress and subject to a separate veto. There are, no doubt, other ways by which this result could be obtained.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill for amendment be dispensed with and that it be in order at this time to offer amendments to any part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, on page 93, line 5, makes an appropriation of \$125,000 for the fisheries industry. The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$193,540, while the appropriation for 1943 was \$365,540.

I respectfully submit that the item should be increased from \$125,000 to \$193,540. This is an increase of \$68,540 over the amount provided in the pending bill, but it is a decrease of \$172,000 under the appropriation for 1943. The increase I request conforms identically with the suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget.

I think the item is most important, and while I realize it cannot be considered adequately at this time, I hope that the item may be restored in the Senate and that it may receive sympathetic support of the subcommittee, with acceptance in conference, if increased by the Senate.

I know the deep interest manifested by the subcommittee in matters pertaining to fisheries. This particular item has to do with the production of food for war purposes. I do not think that was generally understood by the subcommittee at the time of its consideration, and I believe that the subcommittee would be sympathetic upon due consideration.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I said earlier in the day on the floor of the House that perhaps some of the items were cut more than they should have been cut, and I referred to this item in particular. I think this: That the committee exercised its very best judgment at the time, but perhaps was not aware of the facts and circumstances, and I would be inclined to follow the suggestions of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and consider this item very sympathetically in conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I gladly yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have been very much interested in the general information the gentleman is giving the House. I think what the gentleman from California (Mr. CARTER), the ranking minority Member, has said is the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee handling the bill.

Mr. BLAND. I thank both the gentlemen.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman stated that the reduction in this item will considerably interfere with the production of food. I think one of the sources of information that came to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was that about 100,000,000 pounds less of fish was caught in 1942 than in 1941.

Mr. BLAND. Something like that. I am going to ask permission to extend and revise my remarks, which will contain that very statement.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is very important that we should keep that item in the bill and I am glad to see the Chairman of the Committee having jurisdiction over fisheries, here to support it.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I agree heartily with what the gentleman has said. I am a member of the special Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources. We have held extensive hearings and we went at some length into the question of conservation of food fish, and we found in some reports that were submitted to us that there was an immense quantity of food in the fish and wildlife that we could make use of in the war effort if we give it proper protection. On the basis of information that came to us, I think it would be a very grave mistake at this time to make the reduction proposed under the Budget estimate.

Mr. BLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I gladly yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, we must never lose sight of the fact that there are many groups of people that are asking for appropriations, great, huge appropriations, to produce everything imaginable in the way of food.

Mr. BLAND. I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman says.

Mr. JENSEN. We have cut the agricultural appropriation bill and other bills. We cut that bill down by the hundreds of millions of dollars, and we are cutting out expenditures for reclamation projects, irrigation projects, at the request of the War Department and the War Production Board, and we had to be fair about this thing.

Mr. BLAND. I am not criticizing the committee; I appreciate its task.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if this matter does not go in in the Senate, I

certainly hope that everyone who asks for an increase will exercise discretion, because I am sure if they do not exercise discretion the conferees are liable to turn them all down.

Mr. BLAND. I simply ask that it be given full consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is necessary in arriving at the best economy, the important thing is the selection of the items where economies are effected. This particular item, it occurs to me, involves the very foundation of the work of the Fisheries and Wildlife Service and if economies are necessary I think they might come from some other item.

Mr. BLAND. This is a highly important item.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. BLAND. I gladly yield for that purpose.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois where we are going to draw the line.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a matter for the subcommittee to determine, after it has heard the justification for the items.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right, but this is one of the border line cases.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The determination rests with the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Just as in the selective service.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. It is quite a problem.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, the fishing industry has been asked to produce some 6,000,000,000 pounds of fish and fishery products during 1943 as its contribution to the war effort. The highest peacetime production has been about 5,000,000,000 pounds, with production during recent years ranging between three and one-half and four billion pounds.

The Department of the Interior has been given the responsibility for fish production in the war food program and of coordinating the activities of all war agencies affecting fisheries. In this work the Division of Fishery Industries is the focal point for basic information regarding the commercial fishing industry; thus the Nation's wartime food program, insofar as it pertains to fish and fishery products, is influenced by the functions performed by this small but essential unit.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended a reduction of \$68,540 in the item for fishery industries in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill for 1944. This represents a 35 percent cut below the Budget estimate and strikes at the heart of the Nation's wartime fishery program since the major portion of these funds are used for the employment of highly specialized fishery experts.

It is with this appropriation that the Government maintains a record of some 37,500 fishing vessels of the commercial fishery and provides the basis for the

withdrawal and return of fishing craft by the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and War Shipping Administration.

It is with this appropriation that the Government maintains record of the some one hundred and thirty thousand fishermen in our commercial fisheries, providing data for the War Manpower Commission, Selective Service, and United States Employment Service.

It is with this appropriation that the Government maintains record of the production and prices of fishery products for guidance in allocating food for military, lend-lease, and civilian needs, and for establishment of price ceilings.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains data on the materials and equipment requirements of the fishing industry for guidance in the allocation of essential materials and equipment to an industry vital to the war program.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains data to guide the fishing industry in the care and more effective use of its fishing gear.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains information necessary in guiding the Nation in making adjustment to wartime food shortages.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains the necessary technological information to guide the fishing industry in obtaining more efficient and effective utilization of its products during wartime.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains necessary information on the nutritive value of fishery products and recommends the best methods of preparation so as to conserve nutritional properties in a diet being affected by war.

Knowing first-hand the importance of the work coming under this item, I am convinced that inadvertently a mistake has been made in reducing this item. I note that, commenting upon the appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Service, the subcommittee, on page 15 of the report, says:

In considering estimates for this activity the committee for the second consecutive year was faced with the necessity of making deductions in many deserving and valuable projects which are not related to the war. It is hoped that many of them may be restored to their former level when the existing emergency has passed.

The entire amount of \$193,540 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is used exclusively to carry on the Government's fish-production program. It is an essential part of our war food program, the fisheries being one of the principal sources of vital protein foods needed by our soldiers and sailors on the battle fronts, by our allies, and by our people at home.

In view of the serious effect the reduction in the item for fishery industries would have on functions so essential to the Nation's war program, I hope that the amount of the item be restored to the Budget estimate. I realize that there is no opportunity now for the subcommittee to consider the full effect of this reduc-

tion. I am hoping that the Senate will restore the item and that the subcommittee in conference will accept the item.

Much of the attention of Congress has recently been centered on the food situation. The Nation's fisheries are of vital importance, both as a source of food and of other products essential to the prosecution of the war. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has given close attention to fishery problems for many years, and it is intensifying its study of these problems under the guidance of its subcommittee on fisheries, which consists of Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON of Florida; Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD of Texas; Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON, Hon. CECIL R. KING, Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, Hon. FRED BRADLEY of Michigan, Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH of Wisconsin, and Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL of Ohio.

Our fisheries have never been organized. The truth is that the various groups are distinctly individualistic, and there is lacking that unity of effort which is essential to a satisfactory solution of existing problems.

The Coordinator of Fisheries, Mr. Harold Ickes, has issued a statement to the effect that although the production goal for our fisheries has been set for 1943 at an all-time high, the best information is that the catch will not be greater than 3,650,000,000 pounds. This is 2,000,000,000 pounds less than we will require. The industry must find the remedy.

It may be reasonably assumed that the fish may be caught if the fishing industry has the boats and the manpower with which to do the catching, and if the labor and equipment to process the catch can be found.

There are very many disturbing factors in the present situation. One of these is that hundreds of vessels, including a very large percentage of the most efficient deep water craft, have been taken over by the armed services. Every boat taken over has meant that much less production. There has been enacted into law H. R. 2238, which it is hoped will facilitate the return to private ownership for fishing purposes of some of the fishing vessels and similar craft that have been acquired by the United States and other vessels adaptable to the fisheries. It was realized that the withdrawal of vessels from the fisheries had meant a curtailment in the catch and the need to implement the fisheries with whatever equipment can now be made available is obvious. Secretary Ickes and Admiral Land recommended the passage of the legislation.

Appearing in support of the bill, and speaking of the efforts of the Coordinator of Fisheries, Mr. Charles E. Jackson, Deputy Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, said:

Without floating equipment it is impossible for the fishing industry to produce. This is borne out by the fact that in a single year's time the production of fish dropped from 4,900,000,000 in 1941 to 3,700,000,000 pounds in 1942, a drop of approximately 25 percent. It was not until toward the end of 1942 that the drain of manpower from the fishing industry further seriously cur-

tailed production. The industry today is faced with two serious problems: first, the shortage of floating equipment, and, second, the reduction in manpower. The Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries has been working on these two major problems since the very beginning of the war.

Little success was obtained in the early part of the war in securing the return of vessels, the military situation being such that floating equipment simply could not be returned to the fishing industry. In the last few months, however, the situation has improved materially. On last October 30 the War Shipping Administration wrote the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries, advising that as of that date the War Shipping Administration would submit all requests for fishery floating equipment to the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries for it to pass on. This policy has consistently been followed, and only a few fishing vessels have been taken out of the fishery. These few were not suitable for fishing or had not been engaged in fishing for a number of years. The Army, Navy, and Coast Guard have gradually shifted their demands so that needed vessels are recruited from sources other than the fisheries.

Such a serious situation with regard to floating equipment for the production of Alaska salmon was confronting the industry for the coming season that the Secretary of the Interior directed a letter to the Secretary of War on January 18, 1943, a copy of which is submitted for the record, together with a copy of the reply from the Secretary of War of January 25, both of which are self-explanatory. Suffice it to say that the War Department is cooperating in every way with the Coordinator of Fisheries and the War Shipping Administration to supply sufficient floating equipment to obtain the maximum production of Alaska salmon this coming season.

In a coordinated plan, the War Shipping Administration, the Army, the Navy, and the Coordinator of Fisheries have gradually undertaken a program of returning vessels and floating equipment to the fishing industry. It is not difficult to return those vessels that were taken on a charter basis, but in those cases where fishing vessels have been purchased outright it is impossible under present laws to return these vessels to the original owners. The legislation proposed here is designed to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. Jackson also testified that in order to expedite the return of fishing craft to the fishing industry, the War Shipping Administration had arranged with the Navy to set up a committee composed of a naval officer, a representative of the War Shipping Administration and the Coordinator of Fisheries to proceed to the various naval districts for the purpose of working out an arrangement with the commandants of the naval districts to release the fishing vessels. Mr. Jackson said that this committee was then, March 18, 1943, on the west coast.

Another disturbing factor in the fishery situation is that until recently the Selective Service System did not regard fishing as an essential occupation and consequently many of the best fishermen were drafted. It takes time and experience to make a good fisherman, and the removal of skilled captains and engineers has been a blow to the industry at many points. I hope that this will be rectified.

Another disturbing factor has been and is that wages and salaries in industrial plants doing war work have attracted hundreds of men and women who for-

merly helped to process and handle fish products.

It is also feared that either entire or partial restrictions imposed on many productive areas may contribute to a shortage.

Other factors enter. Rope, twine, and netting are essential to fishing and are difficult to obtain. Food rationing detains many boats in port because of the difficulty of obtaining sufficient points to supply the food these men need at sea. It must be realized by those administering food priorities that if adequate supplies of fish are to be caught, these obstacles must be removed. It is of paramount importance that those agencies which have placed restrictions on the fishing industry should remove them at once. The removal of present handicaps will result in immediate increased production. Sympathetic consideration is being given to these problems by those who have them in charge and it is hoped they may be solved.

It is becoming increasingly obvious to all that if we are to have sufficient food for our armed services, for our allies, and for our own people we cannot neglect this vital industry. The importance of the fisheries in the war effort becomes clear when we recall that fishery products rank fifth in the essential food list besides supplying vitamins, oils, and fish meal byproducts for livestock and poultry feeds. During 1941, 4,900,000,000 pounds of fish were sold through commercial channels for human consumption and for industrial uses, while more than 12,000,000 sport fishermen took with hook and line and consumed at home, or gave to their friends, another 300,000,000 pounds of nutritious fresh-water fish.

Fish utilization has been increased. Some personnel have been assigned to the task of developing uses for fishery products not now popular as food on American markets. There has been developed from menhaden, a canned food product. Menhaden were formerly used only for making fertilizer and oils. This new use should result in the production of 15 to 20 million pounds of food for domestic and export use. A total of 150,000,000 pounds of new sea-food products can be made available next year as a result of developing methods of utilizing common sea mussels, never before marketed in the United States in commercial quantities, but long popular in European countries. I am informed that, based on the work of the Fish and Wildlife Service, approximately 10,000,000 pounds of the common fresh-water smelts of the Great Lakes for which there was formerly a very limited market, will go to the armed services and civilian trade for the first time. More than 200,000 pounds of fillets from the Great Lakes herring are now being marketed for the first time, and this yield can be increased materially in the future. Similar studies may result in great new quantities of clams, of carp, and of other species being used as food to serve the United States and for lend-lease.

The Fish and Wildlife Service reports that the fish hatchery program has been

realized to produce more food fishes for the duration and that the soil and water conservation programs of recent years have been responsible for the construction of thousands of new ponds that can produce an estimated 100,000,000 pounds of pan and game fish after stocking.

The Fish and Wildlife Service also reports that in order to provide essential food for war purposes personnel of the Service have been loaned to friendly South and Central American republics to make surveys of their coastal fishing grounds and to assist in organizing operations to take the fish locally so as to reduce long, expensive shipments of cured fishes from distant waters. These surveys have been made in the Caribbean, in Mexico, the British West Indies, in waters of the Pacific off Peru, and within the past 60 days, of the South Pacific where our troops are now fighting.

The situation demands organization and cooperation between individuals, local groups, State associations, the State officials, and the Federal officials. By intelligent cooperation and organization far more can be accomplished in the future than in the past. One thing needed to be learned by all groups of fishermen in the United States is that "In unity there is strength."

For more than 25 years I have been a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. During all of that time, I have been peculiarly interested as the fishing industry is the most important in my district.

It is gratifying for me to report that there is a greater manifestation of interest shown in the fisheries by the Department of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service than ever before in the period of my service.

Recently, Secretary Ickes, head of the Department of the Interior, appeared before the committee and discussed its problems. Secretary Ickes manifested a comprehensive and keen interest in the fisheries and a knowledge of fishery problems, which in my opinion promises well for the future. Certainly, it is a much greater interest than has ever been shown before, for during my 25 years of service, this is the first time that the Secretary of a Department having jurisdiction over the fisheries has appeared to discuss the problems of the fisheries, and its related industries.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 2 words.

Mr. Chairman, I am addressing my remarks principally to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma. I note that the bill provides a total of \$15,118,500 for reclamation purposes, which is a reduction of \$74,554,770 from the 1943 appropriation and \$5,636,200 less than the Budget estimates. Of course, this can mean but one thing, and that is that many of our reclamation projects that are in the course of development in such States as my own will have to be stopped. I cannot understand why the War Production Board has stopped the construction of many of these works.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of the \$5,200,000 to which the gentleman refers, \$4,000,000 was cut out of the Central Valley projects, so that the other reclamation projects are cut but very little.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course that applies only to the reduction in Budget estimate. May I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma this? Do I correctly understand that all work has been stopped by the War Production Board on the reclamation projects, except in minor matters, unless priorities are secured from the War Production Board for the necessary materials with which to complete these projects?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that he is correct. Of course, \$55,650,000 is carried over in the reclamation fund, and then there is some money in the general funds. It would not stop all the reclamation projects, but it would stop some of them, and certainly would slow up many others. On the other hand, the War Production Board issues its stop orders, and during this emergency it is supreme and there is just nothing that our committee or this House can do about it until those stop orders have been suspended. As I said in my opening remarks, I hope they will be suspended within a few days or a few weeks.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I regret very much that funds are not provided in the bill to carry on the development of what is known as Buffalo Rapids No. 2 in eastern Montana. It is a pumping project on the Yellowstone River.

Buffalo Rapids No. 2 is under construction. No. 1 has already been constructed. It is a water conservation and utilization development where labor was contributed by the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. Of course, since the C. C. C. and W. P. A. folded up we now have a camp consisting of 150 men, what we call a conscientious objector's camp, and they work on this project. This project is just about two-thirds completed.

The construction of Buffalo Rapids No. 1 has been completed and the project turned over to the Department of Agriculture, which under the water conservation and utilization law will supervise its operation. No. 2 is two-thirds completed.

The two projects can bring 8,100 acres under irrigation in 1943, in addition to the 12,000 acres now under ditches, and 6,800 acres in 1944.

Now, the amount of steel required to complete these undertakings is insignificant, 31 tons in 1943 and 100 tons in 1944. From this small expenditure we would reap 40,350 tons of alfalfa in 1944, and 80,700 tons in 1945, which is important to the livestock industry in that section of my State.

It will require \$345,000 from the Department of Agriculture and \$515,000 from the Bureau of Reclamation to complete this project.

Also there is the Canyon Ferry project. I am going to give a brief outline of this project. It is over in the First District, and my understanding is that this pro-

posed Canyon Ferry project will bring a supplemental supply of water by 1945 for 50,000 acres now periodically affected by water shortages. When fully developed it will irrigate 300,000 acres of new land and provide a partial supply of water to an additional 150,000 acres, plus generating 35,000 kilowatts of power. Through its power plant and regulation of the river for the benefit of power developments downstream, the output of electrical energy along the river will be ultimately increased by 150,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year.

This is a pretty big project. It is on the Missouri River.

The area in which the Canyon Ferry development will be constructed is already settled, having a farm population of 42,000 people, and an annual crop production of \$9,500,000. The power development would be deferred.

On the additional 50,000 acres to be provided supplemental water by 1945 could be grown 50,000 tons of alfalfa, 1,000,000 bushels of potatoes and 112,500 hundred-pound sacks of dry edible beans.

During 1943 the construction would require 300 tons of steel. The new facilities needed for irrigation would cost about \$8,749,000. The cost of the power plant and transmission lines, to be constructed later, is estimated at \$2,655,000.

Now, there is another project known as the Missoula Valley development, near the city of Missoula, Mont. This is also over in the other district. But I understand it is a distinctly worth-while undertaking.

The Missoula Valley development near the city of Missoula in western Montana and the Bonanza and N-Bar-N projects in northeastern Montana are water conservation and utilization projects where investigations have been completed and work could be begun promptly. They are small undertakings and under an accelerated program could be completed within 1 or 2 years.

Now, to complete the Missoula Valley project would require but 17 tons of steel in 1943 and 60 tons in 1944; again, relatively small amounts. The completed facilities will water 2,100 acres of land by 1944, on which can be grown 9,450 tons of alfalfa in 1944. The estimated cost of the project is \$360,000.

Only 21 tons of steel in 1943 and 26 tons in 1944 are required to complete the Bonanza development of 910 acres. The construction costs would total \$75,000.

Then, we have what is known as the N-Bar-N project at a cost of \$500,000, located below Fort Peck. This project would consume only 55 tons of steel in 1943, 200 tons in 1944, and 100 tons in 1945, and bring in 1,000 acres of new land in 1944, and 6,380 acres in 1945. Livestock in this area would be fed 12,720 additional tons of alfalfa that can be grown there by 1945.

In addition to the projects included in the program, I wish to call the Committee's attention to the need for work to improve the Milk River and Sun River projects in my State to prevent crop loss and to restore to productivity areas damaged by drainage. Only small amounts of material would be required.

The wood-stave Fishkin Canal siphon crossing of the Sun River development is in extremely poor condition and must be replaced with a steel conduit. The construction, estimated to cost \$50,000, would provide a greater water supply and remove the hazard of a serious crop loss through a system failure.

It is also urgent that drainage of Greenfield Lake on this project, which has been rising steadily with run-off water from increased irrigated acreage, be provided. The development will restore to agricultural use considerable lake-shore land and will remove a seepage threat from adjacent and somewhat higher lands. An appropriation of \$40,000 is required. About \$100,000 will be needed to continue the present drainage program of the Sun River project, where seepage has been increasing steadily as more land is irrigated.

The Milk River project is also affected by a major drainage problem. About 3,200 acres of the Fort Belknap irrigation district of the Chinook division has been taken out of production as a result of seepage. Drainage of this idle land, capable of producing as good crops as any land in northern Montana, is essential if the district is to survive. Much of the area is only slightly affected and can be placed in production immediately. The cost of this improvement is about \$100,000.

The Montana areas in which there are investigations yet to be completed are the Bitter-Root, Marias, the Yellowstone, Big Horn, and Powder River, the Kalispell, Milk River, and Sweetgrass. In connection with the Yellowstone River survey, there is the Laurel-Park City area where an important agricultural section needs attention.

The construction or completion of these various projects would require very little steel, yet we were unable to secure such priorities. I repeat again that this is a mighty short-sighted policy of the War Production Board and the O. P. A. That there is a shortage of food no one will deny, and it is going to get mighty keen before this emergency is over. Already we are told that there are many places where the farmers are flooded out.

Along the main stem of the Missouri River from Fort Peck to Kansas City over 800,000 acres have been flooded out. The number of acres would run into millions if we take into account the flooded acres along the tributaries which flow into the Missouri River.

In other places they are being frozen out by late frost and snows. In my own State my understanding is that 45 percent of the fall wheat crop has been already destroyed. It is impossible to predict just what is going to happen.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Did the gentleman take up any of those projects with the War Production Board?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I did, and I could not get any priority either, so I am not blaming the committee. But I am

pointing out that it is a mighty short-sighted policy. I do not care whether it comes from the War Production Board, or where. We must have food in this country.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Our committee has been very sympathetic with reclamation projects, but under the circumstances the committee could not recommend an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to my distinguished colleague from New York that I have pointed out to my friends in the West that the West has no better friend than the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK]. He has always been a supporter of our reclamation projects. We appreciate the splendid work he has done. As a matter of fact, we appreciate all the members of this committee, and in fact all the members of the Committee on Appropriations, because they have treated us very fine in the past. But whether this policy is a War Production Board policy or not I do not care. I repeat that it is a short-sighted policy. If they do not change their ways, we may find ourselves short of food right here in this country in the not very far distant future.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I should like to have the chairman of the subcommittee make an explanation as to why the Central Valley project in California is receiving an appropriation here of \$11,000,000. If all the other reclamation projects have been eliminated, why has this been left in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that that is obvious. The War Production Board has lifted the stoppages on this particular project. A representative of the War Production Board appeared before our committee and urged that this item be included. It was stated that they were giving very serious consideration to other items. We are hopeful that the stop orders will be canceled against many of the other projects.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. So the War Production Board is granting priorities in this particular case?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the subcommittee if it investigated priorities and releases of material now being made by the War Production Board to build reclamation projects in South America and Africa, at a time when they deny them in this country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That was entirely without our province. Our committee could not investigate a matter of that kind.

Mr. CURTIS. It is taking place, though, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

#### THE AMAZING AND INCREDIBLE SHIPSHAW TRANSACTION

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

#### DENIAL OF PRIORITIES TO AMERICAN PROJECTS CONTRASTED WITH WAR PRODUCTION BOARD TREATMENT OF SHIPSHAW OF CANADA

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, because of the question propounded by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] just a moment ago and because in the minds of many of the Members there is some doubt about this granting of priorities to plants outside of the United States and the denial of priorities to plants in this country, I take this time to discuss the matter in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill. I direct your attention to page 486 of the hearings under the title "Loan to the Aluminum Co. of Canada," wherein will be found a very illuminating discussion by the distinguished members of the committee with Dr. Paul Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE EXHIBITED COMMENDABLE SKEPTICISM OF SHIPSHAW

In that section of the hearings there are statements made by the members of the subcommittee who participated, questioning the advisability of the War Production Board granting at times higher priorities to the Shipshaw project on the Saguenay River in the Dominion of Canada, than to power projects in the United States. I have introduced a resolution in this Congress seeking to have the transactions making that development possible, and similar transactions investigated. House Resolution 212, to investigate the supplying of equipment and facilities for furnishing electric power and energy for war purposes, is now pending before the Committee on Rules.

#### WE UNDERWROTE SHIPSHAW

Let me give you briefly the history of this Shipshaw scandal. The whole thing was kept very secret until this year, approximately 2 years after the first agreements were entered into between Metals Reserve Company of the United States and the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd. The New York Times on January 31 gave the first public intimation that the United States Government was financing a branch of the Aluminum Trust in Canada. I quote from the New York Times:

Not the least amazing thing about it is that it is already paid for. The \$65,000,000 cost of the new plant was financed by the

Aluminum Co. of Canada out of contracts for sales of aluminum to Britain and to the United States, which were in some measure paid for in advance so as to encourage this enormous new power development so essential to war.

NO INTEREST ASKED ON LOAN TO CANADIAN PLANT

By a series of four contracts, two in 1941, two in 1942, Metals Reserve Company of the United States, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, advanced \$68,500,000 to the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd. That money was an advance payment on 1,370,000,000 pounds of aluminum to be delivered by the end of 1945. The first two contracts provided for interest to be paid on the advance until it was amortized by the delivery of aluminum. That is the usual procedure. The 1942 contracts, however, provided that, not only would no interest be paid on additional advances provided for therein, but that interest already paid on the first advances would be returned. In other words, the end result was that \$68,500,000 was advanced the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., without interest at all.

SHIPSHAW A SECRET UNTIL RECENTLY

In October 1941 construction began on the Shipshaw power development in Canada. As I have pointed out, it was kept very secret until recently. The project will have cost \$65,900,000 when it is completed in November of this year. In other words, our advance payment completely covered the cost of that power development.

WHY CODDL THE ALUMINUM TRUST?

The Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., is controlled by exactly the same interests as control the Aluminum Co. of America. They are both part of the international Aluminum Trust, with I. G. Farbenindustrie of Germany. The Canadian branch was established in 1928 by the American company as "Aluminum, Ltd." to develop certain properties of the Aluminum Co. of America. The Aluminum Co. of Canada is a wholly owned subsidiary of Aluminum, Ltd. May I quote from page 2725 of the Canadian House of Commons debate of May 14, 1943, on this matter:

The Canadian company obviously was organized originally as a separate corporation to escape the United States antitrust laws in order that this company might be able to play its part in the international cartel, whose agreements restricted production in the democratic countries and allowed Germany greatly to expand her aluminum production before the war.

A HIGHLY DUBIOUS POLICY

The United States has financed, interest free, a power project for this international cartel, which will enable it to produce aluminum in such quantities and at such a low price as completely to prevent light-metals production in competition anywhere in the world.

WE SUPPLIED CRITICAL MATERIALS AS WELL AS MONEY

The financing of this project by an American agency is a disgrace in itself. That is, however, by no means the end of the story. Materials for the construction of this Canadian project were sent

from the United States. The War Production Board has admitted that shafts and certain other items were sent to Shipshaw. Power projects in this country vitally needed the same materials. It is claimed that most of the fabrication for Shipshaw was done in Canada by Canadian firms. It develops, however, that those Canadian firms are Canadian subsidiaries of American firms—Canadian General Electric, Canadian Westinghouse, Canadian Allis-Chalmers, and so forth. I have reason to believe that these Canadian plants are not capable of building the large fabrications required for this huge project. How much material was fabricated here in American plants and merely distributed through the Canadian subsidiaries?

POWER PROJECTS HERE WERE STOPPED WHILE THIS GREAT CANADIAN ENTERPRISE WAS GIVEN ALL HELP

While we were helping build Shipshaw, the erection of power projects in the United States was being stopped by War Production Board, which denied priorities sufficient to enable them to go into the open market and secure the material with which to carry on. I have here a description of many of the projects in the United States against which the Board issued stop orders.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. OUTLAND. Was not one of the projects stopped the Central Valley project?

CALIFORNIA POWER PROJECTS AFFECTED ADVERSELY

Mr. COFFEE. Yes. And the need for power in that area is particularly acute because of the fuel-oil shortage. At Keswick Dam, three 25,000 kilowatt units were cut out by W. P. B. stop order. At Shasta Dam, unit No. 5, with 75,000 kilowatt planned capacity, was also stopped. These units, if they were all allowed to go to completion, would replace annually about 2,000,000 barrels of fuel oil now being used to run steam-generating plants. There is a tight oil situation in that area now, which development of hydro power projects would greatly relieve. When the major emphasis of this war shifts to the Pacific, as it must if we are ever to defeat Japan, the situation will be a great deal tighter. As a matter of fact, it has been suggested that with increased demand for oil for fighting craft in the Pacific, it may be necessary to shut down war production plants in California now using oil.

Yet construction of these hydro plants in California was stopped while construction of the Shipshaw project in Canada went on.

These California plants were not to be used for power alone. If completed, they would have enabled supplemental irrigation water to be furnished to 2,000,000 acres of land. That land is not now growing food at top capacity.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I call attention to the fact that that stop order was only partially issued.

Mr. COFFEE. That is correct. Construction was allowed to go on under low priorities on facilities for fish protection and that sort of thing. The generating units I've mentioned were not allowed to go to completion, however.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. And is the Grand Coulee project not one of them also?

GRAND COULEE HELD UP

Mr. COFFEE. Yes. Construction of generating units 7, 8, and 9 was stopped. At Grand Coulee, a dam and a powerhouse are already built to hold these three new generating units. Their construction has been authorized by Congress, and shafts for two units were nearly completed when their construction was stopped last year. Each unit had a rated capacity of 108,000 kilowatts. All existing capacity is now being used and new loads are being located in the area.

SHIPSHAW ADVANCES WHILE GRAND COULEE IS ORDERED TO STAND STILL

I have the names of the companies, where generator shafts were being manufactured for Grand Coulee, before the order went out to take them out of production. Shafts for Grand Coulee Units 7 and 8 were taken out of the production schedules of the Mesta Machine Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., after some work had been done on them. Why were they removed from the production schedules of one of the few machine shops in the country capable of handling such large shafts? Presumably because of a shortage of critical materials. Yet a letter from Hon. Donald M. Nelson, chairman of the War Production Board, answering some questions I asked him, admits that shafts for generators and turbines at Shipshaw were put in the production schedules of Camden Forge Co. and the Midvale Co. in the United States.

Power engineers say that shafts are the bottleneck in power plant construction. Every shaft sent to the Shipshaw project, owned by the Aluminum Trust, meant one less shaft for badly needed projects in this country, Government owned, and privately owned.

Not only were production schedules shifted around, but priorities higher than those for power projects in this country were given to materials to go to Shipshaw. Mr. Nelson, in his letter to me, says this "was part of the uprating to AA-1 of the entire aluminum program." Why were materials meant for this power project in Canada considered more a part of the aluminum program than materials going to power projects in this country, equally vital to aluminum production?

GRADES IN PRIORITIES

Nelson's letter belittles the amount of materials given high ratings and sent to Shipshaw. As a matter of fact, at the time that the blanket priority for the power program was AA-3, men within the Power Branch of the War Production Board itself expressed great concern for the completion of the scheduled projects on time, if the policy of giving higher priorities to certain projects were

continued and allowed to interfere with regular production schedules. All assurances given to the President and to the Secretary of War, and others, as to the adequacy of our war power supply, were based on the assumption that all projects scheduled for completion would be completed on time. Upgrading of particular units was interfering with the schedules. It would seem that not only did materials go to Shipshaw, but the upgrading of Shipshaw construction in this country interfered directly with our own war power program.

**STOPPAGE OF GRAND COULEE CONSTRUCTION HAS GREATLY INTERFERED WITH OUR WAR POWER PROGRAM**

Mr. ANGELL. And is it not a fact also that they are in need of additional power in that area—I mean the Pacific Northwest—where 30 percent of the aluminum will be manufactured?

Mr. COFFEE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the situation is too tight right now, that with a dry year, war plants may have to cut down.

**DAVIS PROJECT DISCRIMINATED AGAINST**

Mr. MURDOCK. Can the gentleman say whether the Davis project in Colorado was also one of those against which a stop order was issued?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes. I have a complete break-down of the whole proposition. Davis Dam, which would have an initial installation of 180,000 kilowatts which would have augmented the supply of power in southern California, southern Nevada, and Arizona, where large war plants are located, was not allowed to go to completion. Congress had appropriated \$8,000,000 for construction which was proceeding under low priorities. By a stop order, the project was abandoned and must, in the future, start from scratch. Yet, as I have pointed out, materials, time, and manpower went into the construction of shafts and forgings for Shipshaw in Canada.

**OTHER AMERICAN ENTERPRISES DENIED PRIORITIES**

I could enumerate many more projects that have been stopped while construction of Shipshaw went on. Work on the Colorado-Big Thompson project on the Continental Divide has been stopped. The power plants originally to be built would have generated a total of 103,000 kilowatts. Work on the third generating unit of Douglas Dam and the third generating unit at Cherokee Dam, both in east Tennessee—part of the T. V. A.—was stopped in December of last year. Each unit would have had 30,000 kilowatts capacity.

Smaller power projects all over the country, serving Army camps, or small communities, or rural electric cooperatives, have not been allowed to go to completion. Some of them lack only small amounts of steel or fabrications.

These are mentioned because they are pertinent to the Interior Department appropriation bill, because the subcommittee manifested an interest in the fact that we have for some peculiar reason sent materials, under high priorities, to this project in Canada while our own projects are being cut out.

What I say here I do not want to be construed in any sense as reflecting upon our good ally, one of the United Nations, the Dominion of Canada. There have been heated discussions in the Canadian Parliament on Thursday and Friday of last week, on this same matter. The matter has been discussed in the Canadian press. The Canadians are not sold on this deal any more than we are. They do not like the war emergency to be used as an excuse for giving the international aluminum trust a power project that will enable it to control the aluminum market after this war.

**CANADIAN MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT DENOUNCES SHIPSHAW FINANCING METHODS**

Let me quote from a speech the Honorable M. J. Coldwell, M. P., made in the Canadian House of Commons on May 14. This will indicate how Canadians feel about this project:

On March 23 the Minister of Munitions and Supply said that in the dim and distant future the Aluminum Co. may obtain some benefit from the Shipshaw development and there may be some post-war value in it for them. I say that these powerful aluminum interests have obtained in effect the greatest power resources at present available in the world, virtually as a gift; and thus they can, if they will, effectively block, in Ontario and New York State and eastern North America as well, any government-owned public power development because their plant will be paid for during the war, and any plant which the Province of Ontario or the government of New York State, or the Government of Canada or that of the United States, or both, may wish to build, will have to be paid for over a period of years. Not only that, but they will be able, through the cheapness of power, to control the price of aluminum almost everywhere on earth, and when we realize that we are entering upon an age of light metals and that they have entered into the field of magnesium production as well, we can understand how dangerous a monopoly we are building up by our public funds and war activities in this country.

I wish I had time to go into all the details with reference to this project. I have spent considerable time in attempting to ferret out all the facts.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I want to compliment the gentleman for calling this to the attention of the House, and remind him that when we passed the reciprocal trade agreements we placed an amendment in that bill this year urging the President to take cognizance of these cartel arrangements which threaten every business interest in our Nation. It is time that our Nation stopped and considered what is happening to it under these cartel arrangements.

**INTERNATIONAL CARTELS ARE INDEFENSIBLE**

Mr. COFFEE. I thank the gentleman for bringing up this matter of cartel arrangements. It is part of this whole situation I am bringing to your attention today. In January of 1941 a Federal grand jury brought in indictments against the Aluminum Co. of America and several other companies for conspiring and combining with the German

firm, I. G. Farben Industrie, to keep the price of magnesium artificially high by restricting production. Magnesium is a lighter metal than aluminum. The two metals together make a very strong alloy used in the construction of airplanes. Aluminum Co. of America (Alcoa) and these other companies conspired to prevent the proper development of our light metals program.

As I have pointed out, the Aluminum Co. of America and the Aluminum Co. of Canada are controlled by the same interests. They are the two biggest branches of the International Aluminum Trust. Is this most recent transaction another big step toward complete monopolization of the light metals market of the world? That is exactly what it is.

**CANADIANS WAKING UP TO THE IMPLICATIONS OF SHIPSHAW**

I should like to discuss the way the Canadian Government has been taken in on this deal. That is, of course, a matter for the Canadian Government to investigate, if it sees fit, but I think it should be brought up here just to emphasize the fact that the investigation I am urging is not, by any stretch of the imagination, meant as a reflection on our good neighbor and ally, Canada. As a matter of fact, you will find that some gentlemen in the Canadian House of Commons have already indicated a desire to have this whole thing investigated from their side of the border.

I think I may conclusively demonstrate the benefits the aluminum trust has gained in agreements with the Canadian Government, by quoting rather extensively from remarks by Hon. M. J. Coldwell, whom I have quoted before:

It is to this giant corporation that the governments concerned have given or advanced hundreds of millions of dollars to enable them to build a huge plant at Shipshaw and to expand their aluminum monopoly. How was this huge expansion financed? This is where we enter more directly into the provisions of the bill we are now discussing. Part of Canada's contribution, although not all, is covered by P. C. 11745, which provides for a special write-off or accelerated depreciation of \$154,500,000 \* \* \*. I have the prospectus of the company, and it has the following to say about Canada's contribution:

"Normally such capital expenditures for plant additions are written off for tax purposes over a period of years. In order to give effect to the fundamental basis of the contracts, permission has been granted the company to amortize these capital expenditures by a special deduction from income at a stipulated rate per pound of all aluminum delivered, \* \* \* the effect being to amortize the estimated cost of the additional aluminum producing facilities and 60 percent of the estimated cost of the additional power facilities by the time all deliveries have been made under the war contracts."

**A GREAT CANADIAN STATESMAN FEARLESSLY EXPOSES SLIMY RECORD OF SHIPSHAW**

Mr. Coldwell then goes on to discuss some other projects of this company, Aluminum Co. of Canada, costs of which have been written off by accelerated depreciation. He concludes:

It seems to me therefore that the total is not \$154,500,000, as we were told in the house this year, but nearer to \$175,000,000.

## A STRANGE OFFERING OF ALUMINUM TRUST SECURITIES

The prospectus from which Mr. Coldwell quotes is the prospectus of the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., published in conjunction with the issuance of \$15,000,000 preferred stock. Mr. Coldwell discusses this stock issue:

Why are the preference shares being offered now for the first time in the company's history? \* \* \* I am advised by people who have made inquiries that if one wants to get preferred shares the limit is 25 shares. Why? Because they want to give the small investor a chance to get in first, they say. In my opinion what they really wish to do is to spread some of the preferred shares over the country in order that there will be public opinion favorable to the aluminum company. That is a trick of utility corporations everywhere.

I might point out that the prospectus mentioned above, says, on the front cover:

This prospectus is not, and under no circumstances is to be, construed as, an offering of any of this issue for sale in the United States of America or the territories or possessions thereof, or an offering to any resident thereof or a solicitation therein of an offer to buy any of this issue.

That is very clear is it not? Why does the company not want shares sold in the United States? Because then the company would come under the prying eyes of the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States. It evidently does not want that.

## WHY SHOULD UNCLE SAM FINANCE THE ALUMINUM TRUST?

We can see from this little bit of information I have given the House this afternoon, some of the ramifications of this huge advance the United States has given to the Aluminum Trust. We can see some of its effects upon our war power program now, and on our light metals development program. We can see its probable effects on the light metals market after the war. We can see its effect on any further power development in the St. Lawrence region of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this whole matter should be investigated by Congress in the interests of effective prosecution of the war, and in the interests of proper development of the natural resources of this country when the war is over. House Resolution 212 provides for the establishment of an investigatory committee to do just this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. First, I want to compliment this committee for the statesmanlike job they have done in matters of wartime economy concerning progress very close to my own heart.

Secondly, I would like to talk about the Columbia River which enters the United States in my own State and travels to the sea. It never leaves the State of Washington. During that travel it falls hundreds of feet, and constitutes, to my knowledge, today the greatest single source of water power in the Western Hemisphere.

When we speak of water power in the United States it might be wise for us to

realize that nearly 40 percent of all the water power is to be found in the State of Washington. We have there, when we shall have fully developed all the water power possible in the State of Washington, nearly 50,000,000 horsepower. I mention this for only one reason. When we speak of developing our water power as a national resource; when we speak of our national investments in water power; when we speak of that investment as an obligation against our national integrity, let us remember that to liquidate that obligation will require the sweat and purpose of the people who will live near our rivers, those who use that water power to create useful things for the rest of the Nation. Specifically, in the case of the Columbia River, it will be paid for through the service that the people whom I now represent can render to the rest of the Nation. We should not forget that. In any bill, such as the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has introduced today, which would allow Federal jurisdiction over that vast amount of water power, out there along the Columbia and elsewhere in the Nation, we should not lose sight of the fact that those people should be allowed wide latitude in the use of that water power through the trying years, the lean as well as the fat. Their voice should be dominant in matters of policy. Their continuous industry demands it. Their continuous industry spells part of our security.

I also want to compliment this committee for calling attention to the discriminatory act in the matter of the Shipshaw affair and to call the attention of this House to the printed proceedings of the committee, particularly pages 486, 487, 488, and 489, as well as the letter to be found on page 539, which is Jesse Jones' letter to Senator TRUMAN, who investigated it. It should be investigated further. If we want to have healthy international relationships it must be by open covenants openly arrived at. There is entirely too much secrecy in what is to be found in these hearings. I want to quote, if I may, something that the able chairman of your subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], said during these hearings. He said:

Referring to the story that was in the paper that morning about the Shipshaw affair, I have just heard about it. Frankly, I was not only amazed, but shocked at the story. I have known and admired Secretary Jones for many years. I have also admired his businesslike methods, as well as his quick and definite decisions. I shall, of course, not pass final judgment until I hear his side of the controversy, but the story, to say the least, calls for a clear-cut explanation, or else there must be a thorough investigation of the whole transaction.

My colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] has introduced a resolution calling for such an investigation. I believe it should be allowed to come to the floor of this House by the Rules Committee and this matter at least have some light thrown on it.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to compliment the gentleman for his statement and for

the vigor with which, as a new Member, he is representing his district. But I also call attention to the fact that the Columbia River is not entirely in the State of Washington. It is the boundary line between Oregon and Washington, and the great Bonneville project, a portion of which lies in my district, is in the State of Oregon. I know the gentleman agrees with that.

Mr. HORAN. I want to assure my able friend, the gentleman from Oregon, that the things I said in behalf of the people of Washington I would certainly not deny to the people he represents. We can work together out there, I assure him.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, he will, of course, realize that Washington was originally part of the Oregon country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, when I asked this question about irrigation projects in foreign lands I was not aware of the facts about the Shipshaw project. It, of course, will have to stand or fall on whatever the facts are. It is alleged that the United States is now supplying materials for irrigation works in South America and Africa. If this is true, it should be stopped so long as our own projects are held in abeyance. I do not believe it is a safe proposition to turn the future of reclamation over to the War Production Board. I have the greatest respect for many of the eminent businessmen on the War Production Board; they are doing a good job; they have many problems, many things on their minds, but they are not familiar with the reclamation program. Unless someone has lived with it and has seen reclamation projects work, they do not know how vital they are to the economy of our country. As one Member of this House, I seriously object to letting the War Production Board write the ticket so far as the future development of irrigation is concerned, for the simple reason that the top-notch men down there do not know about irrigation matters. I realize, of course, that there will have to be restrictions of material, but I do say that this splendid subcommittee which has given so many hours of careful study and has been fair in its consideration of these matters in times past should continue to handle this matter. We should not make our program of appropriations dependent upon the will of any executive bureau. Personally, I hope that before this bill is sent to the White House a few changes can be made.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The gentleman is familiar with the particular problem that affects the Great Plains States as far as irrigation projects are

concerned. I wonder if he has any thought as to what might be done to give consideration to this area by way of small projects in view of the decisions of the War Production Board?

Mr. CURTIS. Without a doubt the studies should go on. There are many projects which could be built even during wartime and which should be built. Chester Davis has made the statement that if we produced all the food possible through using every avenue of production we still would not have enough to meet the demands being made on this country. A certain amount of construction should go on as a part of the war program, but by all means a full program of studies and investigations for post-war irrigation projects should be carried on.

The gentleman is interested in the same valley I am, the Republican River and its tributaries. These projects should be advanced, for they will make a great contribution to the war effort. I want all parts of that great valley to have the benefits of flood control and irrigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this subcommittee has been diligent and has been motivated in its activities in presenting this bill to the committee with a desire to effect savings of public funds wherever possible, particularly those which do not have to do with the prosecution of the war. However, I regret that the committee has seen fit to drastically curtail the appropriation requested by the Fish and Wildlife Service for Federal aid in wildlife restoration and for funds to permit the Fish and Wildlife Service to carry out its activities.

The total amount recommended for this service is \$4,897,350, which is a reduction of \$1,014,220 below the 1943 appropriation and \$855,015 less than the Budget estimates.

I am a member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and we have held extensive hearings considering the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the conservation program and particularly its functions which have to do with the furthering of our war efforts. I call the committee's attention to the testimony given by Dr. Gabrielson, who heads this department of Fish and Wildlife Service, appearing in the hearings on page 627. Here is given the evidence disclosing that this department is making an unusual contribution toward supplying the Nation with fish and game for food during this critical time.

Fishing is an essential war industry. In 1941 the commercial production of fish for food and other purposes reached an all-time high of approximately 5,000,000,000 pounds. It fell materially last year due to interference of the war in our commercial fishing efforts. The Fish and Wildlife Service reports that it could if provided with the staff and the necessary funds produce safely over 6,000,000,000 pounds of fish products in a

year without depleting this resource. They estimate that there could be safely taken this year 2,000,000,000 pounds more than was taken last year. They point out that fish and wildlife constitute a resource that costs very little so far as the Federal Government is concerned and the only investment of the Federal Government for the production of this great natural resource is the funds provided to the Fish and Wildlife Service. Last year hunters alone during the open season took about 255,000,000 pounds of meat from game birds and game animals. Dr. Gabrielson points out that during the last 5 years his department has been able to take more than 50,000,000 pounds of salmon per year out of the Alaskan waters than each of the first 5 years after the passing of the 1924 act, known as the White Act, establishing a system of regulations of the commercial fisheries of Alaska. With rationing and the extreme shortage of meat we should not curtail this supply of fish and wild game.

In March of this year I asked Dr. Gabrielson to give me a short report on the activities of his department and received in reply the following letter, which I include as a part of my remarks:

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,  
Washington, March 20, 1943  
Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: In accordance with our telephone conversation, I am submitting the following information concerning the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service in connection with the fisheries and the war food program.

Normally, we have no regulatory authority over the commercial fisheries with the sole exception of that exercised with regard to the aquatic resources of the Territory of Alaska. There our jurisdiction is directly comparable to that exercised by the individual States through their State conservation authorities and organizations. Our activities with regard to the commercial fisheries carried out under authorization of organic legislation and annual appropriation acts, consists of biological investigations with a view toward recommending conservation and management measures, methods of increasing the populations, and means of restoring depleted resources; the collection and analysis of statistical information on the fisheries and its publication; the collection, compilation, and daily publication and dissemination of market news information at seven field offices in important commercial fishing regions, and technological studies to improve handling, processing, and refrigeration practices, to develop new fishery products, as well as to conduct investigations on net preservatives and improvements of fishing gear. These are the only services which the Federal Government ever has provided for the fishing industry, and in this respect the United States is far behind the other main fish-producing nations such as Great Britain, Norway, and Japan.

Even before the declaration of war we realized that some conservation of our fishery activities to an emergency basis was necessary in order that we might be able to render more effective assistance to other agencies concerned with fishery matters and production, and such conversion was undertaken as necessity demanded. Immediately upon the establishment of the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations, the War Production Board, and the Office of Price Administration, we

were called upon to perform special services in order to provide these agencies with the information they needed. We have furnished these agencies regularly and promptly basic information upon which many important plans, decisions, and orders were based.

On July 21, 1942, the President signed Executive Order 9204 (7 F. R. 5657) designating the Secretary of the Interior as Coordinator of Fisheries and establishing the office of the Coordinator of Fisheries. The primary duty of this office originally was to coordinate the plans, policies, and programs of Federal and State agencies, and the commercial fishing industry in the interest of maintaining an adequate fishery production program. At the outset we found that 21 different Federal agencies were carrying on work or issuing orders that affected the fishing industry. Through work with a liaison committee composed of representatives of each of the 21 agencies, and our continuous insistence and efforts to insure that the fisheries be recognized as an important, essential, and indispensable food producing industry, we now have overcome many formerly troublesome problems and cleared away some confusing issues and uncertainties. Some examples of the type of work we have been doing will show the diverse nature of our activities:

Upon the outbreak of war the Navy, Army, and the Coast Guard began at once to purchase, requisition, or charter fishing vessels both along our coasts and in Alaska. The fleets were reduced so greatly that production of fishery products declined. By constant effort we have finally effected an arrangement whereby the armed services may not take over any fishing vessel without the approval of the office of the Coordinator of Fisheries. During recent weeks progress has been made in effecting return of purchased and requisitioned vessels to the industry.

Through our negotiations with the War Manpower Commission on the subject of occupational deferment of skilled men in the industry, Occupational Bulletins 18 and 20 recently were issued by the Director of the Selective Service System. These bulletins declare commercial fishing to be an essential war industry and list as eligible for deferment from induction men holding the majority of the important positions in the fish-producing and processing industries.

With the recent rationing of canned foods, fishing vessels began at once to experience difficulties in obtaining adequate supplies for their crews. Through work with the Office of Price Administration, amendments to General Ration Order No. 5 (institutional users) and Ration Order No. 13 (individuals) have just been issued which classify the major fishing vessels as "institutional users" and which list fishermen as eligible for supplemental supplies of rationed foods. Adequate provisioning of fishing vessels is thus assured.

The controlled materials plan soon to be substituted for the priorities system by the War Production Board, as it will affect the fishing industry, has been based on our estimates and recommendations.

Pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order 9280 (7 F. R. 10179), the Secretary of Agriculture, on February 8, 1943, issued Food Directive No. 2 (8 F. R. 1777) delegating to the Secretary of the Interior responsibility for those phases of the war food program concerned with the production and processing of fishery commodities. Prior to that time the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries served as an investigative and advisory agency, but was without any regulatory authority. Food Directive No. 2 confers authority to issue such orders as may be necessary to insure the maintenance of an adequate fishery production program. The Directive was issued by the Secretary of Agriculture because of the fact that the desired personnel and facilities for administering the production and processing phases of the war food program existed in

the Department of the Interior. The Secretary of Agriculture also recognized that utilization of these facilities instead of setting up units and personnel in his own Department for the purpose of administering the fishery program would result in greater efficiency and economy of funds and personnel. Arrangements have been perfected so that the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries, handling production and processing, works closely and in complete harmony with the Food Distribution Administration of the Department of Agriculture which is responsible for distribution of fishery products and purchases for Government requirements.

We have worked out a program designed to increase production with a view toward meeting the requirements stipulated by the Food Distribution Administration for the coming year. At the present time prospects for large increases in production are not too good because of the shortage of boats and manpower. Unless these shortages are alleviated production may fall as much as 2,000,000 pounds below the fish requirements for 1943 desired by the Army, Navy, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, other Federal agencies, and the civilian population. There are plenty of fish available and new sources have been explored successfully for producing substitute processed fishery products to compensate somewhat for the great demands for such items as canned salmon, canned sardines, and salted codfish that are in short supply.

On March 1 and 2, at the invitation of Secretary Ickes, 17 representatives of the fishing industry, labor, and consumers, met with our staff in Washington to discuss industry's problems, devise means of solving them, and to develop a practical production program for 1943-45. The meeting served to focus attention upon many important problems, facilitated exchange of information, and has led to the development of methods of offering to the industry direct assistance in meeting their problems. To accomplish the latter objective, the country has been divided into 11 principal areas and a man with the best overall knowledge and widest experience has been placed in charge of each area to serve as area coordinator. Local representatives will be stationed in the major fishing ports, under the supervision of the area coordinator, and local industry committees will be appointed soon in order that the local representatives and the area coordinator may bring into their work the benefits, advice, and collaboration in solving the industry's problems. The local committees will be especially helpful in devising means of utilizing existing facilities, equipment, and manpower to better advantage, and in some instances short-cut methods of increasing production undoubtedly may be devised.

For the first time we have the authority to set up and operate an effective fishery program. The production program which has been outlined is constructive and is designed to effect healthy developments in the industry and substantial increases in yield. We are working on a 3-year program rather than a program for the present year only, inasmuch as food will be a badly needed item until long after the war. We shall have to supply food to the war-torn countries until they have had time to reestablish their own agriculture, cattle raising, dairy industries, and fishing enterprises.

The cooperative arrangement between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture for handling the fishery war program, referred to above, is functioning efficiently. All of the most able men in both departments are hard at work and things are moving satisfactorily as never before. There appears to be no justification for disturbing the existing arrangements at the present time, especially since serious interruptions in important work and loss of val-

uable time are always coincident with organizational transfers and revisions.

Sincerely yours,  
IRA N. GABRIELSON,  
Director.

Mr. Chairman, I express the hope that the Senate will restore the appropriation requested and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and that our conferees will support the restorations when the matter is returned to the conference committee.

The committee has seen fit also, Mr. Chairman, to reduce the allowance for Federal aid in wildlife restoration. This activity is under the provisions of the Robertson-Pittman Act. In 1943 there was an appropriation of \$1,250,000. The Budget estimate for 1944 is a like amount. The funds from which this appropriation is paid are provided by a special tax paid by sportsmen under the provisions of the Robertson-Pittman Act. There is at the present time over \$9,000,000 in this fund. It is in the nature of a trust fund. Dr. Gabrielson testified with respect to it, hearings, page 706, as follows:

That fund, as you know, comes from a special tax on sporting arms and ammunition, the collections from which are set aside in the Treasury by act of Congress in a special fund known as the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund. A great many of the States have built up programs based on that act, for land purchase, and various other things that they are doing, so it would be very difficult for them if appropriations were suddenly discontinued.

The appropriation has been cut very materially, from \$2,750,000 for fiscal year 1942 down to \$1,250,000 for the current fiscal year, largely because the States could not continue some of the previously planned development work; but they are anxious to keep enough of this fund so that they can keep up their commitments on land acquisition and keep their key personnel now employed on essential wildlife management fact-finding work.

Under the provisions of this law the State matches funds provided by the Government, and, as Dr. Gabrielson testified, they have built up programs based on a continuing policy with the expectation of receiving their proportion of these funds.

It is not only unfair to the sportsmen who have contributed the funds, but to the States which have been induced to provide projects under the act, and they will suffer great loss if the appropriations are cut off and they are not allowed to proceed with their programs.

I include as a part of my remarks the following excerpts from the testimony and a statement presented by Dr. Gabrielson which appears in the hearings, page 707:

#### FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

When this Federal aid in Wildlife restoration program started functioning almost 5 years ago, the majority of the States were badly in need of factual information on how best to manage their wildlife. This undesirable condition stemmed from the fact that funds were not available to enable them to procure such information. With funds that have been made available, the cooperators have stressed wildlife management fact-finding. The program has been highly successful and much of the success has come from the technically trained men employed as project leaders. These men have accom-

plished splendid results in the field of wildlife conservation and restoration by furnishing information and advice on how State wildlife resources can be increased and more effectively administered.

Wildlife populations are not static and certain species of game birds and mammals, such as ring-necked pheasants and cottontail rabbits, which have high reproduction potentialities, under favorable conditions can quickly produce populations that are capable of assuming pest proportions if they are not held in check. Likewise big game ranges must be investigated annually and their populations inventoried to ascertain whether hunting pressure must be increased or decreased in order to insure sound utilization of available ranges and the wildlife inhabiting them. Through the assembling of factual information by trained workers and the translation of that information into appropriate seasons and bag limits, perpetuation of the Nation's wildlife resources is assured, along with assurance that maximum utilization is obtained.

Outside of birds classed as migratory, in treaties with Canada and Mexico, the States are responsible for the management of the Nation's wildlife. In normal times the pursuit of wildlife is most important in providing healthful outdoor recreation for more than 10,000,000 licensed and unlicensed hunters. While the recreational benefits are paramount even in times of war, wildlife does provide a very useful supplemental supply of highly nutritious meat. During the last hunting season more than one-quarter billion pounds of usable meat was harvested by the Nation's sportsmen. This is a solid contribution to the present inadequate meat supply of the Nation.

In the Southeast particularly, and to a considerable extent elsewhere, the State game departments, through this program are cooperating with organized Soil Conservation Service districts in providing supplies of seed of perennial legumes, particularly for strip plantings adjacent to woodlands. Farmers thereby are not obliged to plow to the edge of the woods and cultivate land that is not productive, due to the shading and leaching action of bordering trees. These wildlife strips provide food and cover for farmland wildlife but most important to the farmer, they insure permanent cover on a strip of nonproductive land, which has had to be cultivated heretofore to prevent the encroachment of woodlands. Through such cultivation in the past, serious soil erosion has frequently resulted. In Virginia last year seed distributed to the farmers permitted the establishment of field border strips 1 rod wide for a distance of 300 miles.

As the result of studies carried on under this program, the Missouri Conservation Commission last year inaugurated a farm pond construction program. Thereby more than 650 demonstration farm ponds were constructed and as a result of that demonstration it is reported that 4,500 of these one-half to 2-acre ponds were constructed by farmers last year. Through the fencing of these ponds with a margin of land around them, wildlife seed stock refuges have been established. Through this work the farmers are assured of a dependable water supply for livestock and culinary use during drought periods and in addition, through stocking the ponds with fish, a supplemental food supply of a high protein value is being produced. Encouraged by Missouri's successful efforts, Ohio has undertaken like work under its Federal-aid program.

Number of States are engaged on fur-management studies designed to increase returns from this natural resource which annually provides around \$50,000,000 in raw pelts. Surveys and investigations are being

conducted to determine methods of improving environments of fur animals, to find ways to trap and prepare the skins for the market so that better utilization will be made of fur bearers, and to trap and distribute fur animals to suitable but vacant areas. For example, Louisiana, which annually harvests around 6,000,000 muskrats, is conducting studies on its extensive coastal marshes to determine how the productivity of those marshes can be increased.

A number of the States, especially in the West have undertaken the live trapping and transplanting of beaver. These animals stabilize stream flow, impound water, improve environmental conditions for wildlife, and in addition are real assets to the livestock industry in providing dependable water supplies in areas which otherwise could not be used for the summer grazing of livestock. Idaho, through this program has trapped and transplanted more than 3,700 beaver, most of which have been placed on lands administered by the United States Forest Service and the Grazing Service. Those two services have requested the planting of these valuable fur bearers in selected locations with the view of expanding grazing opportunities for range livestock.

Many of the participating States have emphasized the acquisition of lands for wildlife use. In the West, particularly, lands have been acquired in order to provide a badly needed balance between summer range and winter range for deer and elk. Lands of no value to agriculture have been purchased for waterfowl usage by a number of the States in order that the waterfowl population, which has been greatly increased through sound management in recent years, may be spread out and harvested more effectively by the Nation's sportsmen. During the fiscal year, which ended June 30 last, the 46 participating States had 301 projects approved. Of the money obligated thereby, 41 percent was for the acquisition of land, 30 percent was for wildlife restoration development activities, 24 percent was for wildlife management research and 5 percent was for wildlife management coordination.

With the decrease in the appropriation from \$2,750,000 for the fiscal year 1942 to \$1,250,000 for the current fiscal year, together with the war and the impossibility of obtaining materials for construction work, the 47 participating States are stressing wildlife management investigations more than has heretofore been the case. Their object is to assemble facts for translation into action to insure that the maximum wildlife populations may be harvested without impairing the basic resource and concurrently to institute measures to make certain that wildlife populations are maintained at maximum levels consistent with prudent management so that they will be able to bear the greatly increased hunting pressure that can be anticipated after the war is over. Estimates as to increased pressure are predicted on the 30-percent increase in hunting licenses sales immediately following the termination of World War No. 1, notwithstanding that during that war more hunting licenses were sold progressively from 1916 through 1918.

The recommended appropriation of \$1,250,000 for carrying on this cooperative wildlife restoration program in which the State game departments participate to the extent of 25 percent of project costs will enable the several State game departments to carry forward well conceived long-range wildlife restoration fact-finding and management programs on a reduced scale. It will enable them to maintain a nucleus of trained and experienced wildlife technicians who will be available after the war to counsel and advise State game administrators on the multitude of problems pressing for solution in connection with the management of the Nation's

wildlife, a product of the soil, the supply of which in normal times is never equal to the demand of those who desire to participate in its taking.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This is an item that does not reflect in the Budget estimate. What would happen if we cut this half in two? That proposal has been made seriously, and I would like to know what objection there is to it.

Dr. GABRIELSON. You will notice that it has been cut very drastically from a \$2,750,000 appropriation in 1942. This really should not show in our appropriation either, because we do not get this money; we just distribute it to the States. We get a small portion of whatever is appropriated for the administration of the act, but not to exceed 8 percent of the appropriation for administration.

#### TAX ON SPORTING ARMS AND AMMUNITION

This money is collected through a special tax on sporting arms and ammunition. It was imposed for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act. It comes out of a special tax which a special group of people pay. The money is distributed to the State game departments under a formula set up by Congress.

The work under this appropriation is carried on in the various States.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate will restore this item as recommended by the Budget so that this useful service and wildlife restoration may go forward and by so doing help in the winning of the war, and that our conferees will agree thereto when it goes to conference.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest today, as I do whenever we have an appropriation bill before us. It seems to me that we have reached the state of mind in regard to these appropriation bills that many seem to think all we have need to do is to appropriate enough money and we can produce all the food we can possibly need. We are in a much more embarrassing position as far as food is concerned than most people realize.

Today I received the report showing the downward trend, as far as butter is concerned. Butter production is more than 7 percent below 1 year ago. Day before yesterday I had the weekly report on cheese. Cheese is 24 percent below last year's production. We sit here appropriating money but at the same time we let these agencies for whom we also appropriate money run hog-wild and some of these agencies are doing more harm to food production than all the money we appropriate and our efforts can remedy.

#### WHY IS THE AVERAGE BUSINESSMAN NOT DESERVING OF SIMILAR CONSIDERATION TO THAT AFFORDED OTHER GROUPS?

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to two situations. First, I wish to remind you of the Ways and Means

Committee bill to allow the increase in the public debt with the special amendment attached to it preventing the Executive Department of our Government from placing a \$25,000 limit on salaries. The reason given for the amendment was that the Executive had exceeded his authority, and this assumption of power was corrected by the amendment. This amendment had majority sponsorship, as well as majority and minority support.

Secondly, I wish to call your attention to the following section of the same Price Control Act—paragraph (h) of section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act (Public Law No. 421):

The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

If there is a Member of this House who believes that this section of the Price Control Act has been followed by the O. P. A., I wish to yield to him to so state at this time. Everyone knows that the O. P. A. has disregarded, not only the spirit of this law but the word of the law as well. We have seen hundreds of small businesses hampered, hamstrung, and, in fact, put out of business. The small packing plants and the canneries of our country are two good examples of what the O. P. A. has done to prevent the orderly marketing of food products and to prevent the maximum food pack for this season.

This O. P. A. outfit, since its inception, has seemed to be more interested in making America over than in making America strong. They now seem more interested in putting through their particular schemes than they are in providing for maximum food production in 1943. The question resolves itself around to this point. If the Congress was justified in correcting the Price Control Act so that the executive department could not place a \$25,000 ceiling on the salaries of a limited number of people in the higher income brackets, why has it not by corrective legislation action clarified the provisions of this same Price Control Act so that this O. P. A. outfit will not continue to ruin one small business after another? There surely was no more assumption of power by the executive branch in regard to the \$25,000 salary limitation than there has been by the machinations of this O. P. A. outfit. What is fair for one group is fair for the other.

We have had enough committees, we have had enough hearings—but where are the legislative proposals to do anything about it?

We passed the Wolcott amendment to protect all our citizens from the O. P. A. This provision was eliminated by the other body. We should not be put in the position of advising our constituents that they must continue to suffer from the unfair rulings and the assumed powers of the O. P. A.

Mr. PITTINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTINGER. I want to pay my tribute to the gentleman from Wisconsin as being one of the leading agricultural experts in the Congress of the United States. He is one of the most valuable Members of Congress. Now, he does not have to answer this question, but if he wishes, he can. I think the Department of Agriculture is equally at fault with the O. P. A. in connection with this food shortage. I think the O. P. A. has done more harm than good in its effort to ruin small business. Does the gentleman agree with me, and he may answer or not.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I always answer if I have the time. First, I humbly thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his kind words. My answer is that the Agriculture Department has had a lot of criticism that it should not have had. We must realize that the Department of Agriculture has not been able to put through a program that it wants any more than you or I can put through the kind of program that you or I may want.

Taking the whole picture into consideration, I personally must stand here and defend what the Agriculture Department has tried to do, though I know they have made mistakes. Covering as many fields as does the United States Department of Agriculture, it is not humanly possible to avoid mistakes. There is one thing about the Department of Agriculture, and that is this—if you have a grievance, you can present your grievance to them and you get sympathetic consideration of it, but as far as the O. P. A. is concerned, all you get is a promise. The Agriculture Department has been most cooperative with me ever since I have been a Member of this House. They furnish the facts and do not add their interpretations unless asked to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last eight words.

Mr. Chairman, this is one appropriation bill in which I always take much interest because I come from one of the great western States which has much public land and a large proportional interest in the Interior Department appropriation bill, with regard to Indian reservations, reclamation, and the like.

I expected this cut. We anticipated there would have to be a severe cut on account of war conditions, although it is a little heavy in spots. I want to add my word of commendation of the fine work of the committee and I want to sanction what my friend from Montana said about the gentleman from Manhattan who has always been so considerate of us in the great open spaces of the West. May I also join with the gentleman from Utah in what he said earlier today. I feel that the War Production Board has stopped work on some mighty important reclamation projects which would have contributed very powerfully to the war effort.

There is one matter which I did not mention to the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I shall mention it here.

Uncle Sam is a great land owner. Two-thirds of the area of my State is in the public domain, or at least under the control of the Forestry Department, the Indian Service, or some such agency. Throughout the entire West a great deal of the public domain has been used for war training purposes, bombing ranges, and that sort of thing, having been taken over by the War or Navy Departments.

I hope that some provision will be made either in the Interior bill or in some military appropriation bill for the rehabilitation of those vast areas which have served as a proving ground for tanks, bombing ranges, and so forth, before they are turned back to us, as we hope they will eventually be turned back to the livestock people for grazing purposes and other uses of that kind.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say for the Record that 54.6 percent of all the land in the gentleman's State is owned by the Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is a little less than I thought, but it confirms what I just said.

Mr. JENSEN. On page 227 of the hearings, the gentleman will find a table showing the percentage of land and the acres owned by the United States Government in every State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes, I notice that; but the column to which the gentleman refers is administered by the Interior Department. However, that confirms my statement that Uncle Sam is a great landowner, and we hope he will continue to be a good husbandman. It is in such appropriation bills as the Department of the Interior appropriation bill that we look to Uncle Sam to take good care of his resources and develop them to the limit.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say further that Uncle Sam owns 14.5 percent of all the land in the whole of the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, much of that great area is forest land and mineral ground and we are interested in roads. Especially do we need access roads to tap the forests and the new mines that are being developed and more which ought to be developed. Right now we are called on to furnish more and more critical materials. The great Rocky Mountain region is the treasure chest of America and that is where we need development.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish to again advert to the subject I mentioned this afternoon when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] so graciously yielded to me.

It will be recalled the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1943 called for the amount of \$162,000,000. Perhaps some of you will also remember I offered 3 amendments to reduce that amount. The first called for a reduction of approximately 28 percent. When I offered this amendment, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] opposed it and questioned my sincerity in offering

it. That amendment received 5 affirmative votes, including my own, and had 82 votes against it.

My second amendment called for a reduction of 14 percent and it received 14 "aye" votes and 76 "no" votes.

My third amendment called for a reduction of the amount requested—that is, \$162,000,000 of 5-plus percent and it received 37 affirmative votes and 86 negative votes.

Now just a year hence, the Appropriations Committee has brought in this bill which calls for a reduction of 56 percent of the amount requested in the appropriation bill last year. Strange to say, this reduction has had the unanimous approval of the Appropriations Committee and will probably have the unanimous support of the House. What a change of spirit must have come over the Appropriations Committee and the Members of this House. It is encouraging, to say the least. Now if the Congress can only come to realize the need of making comparable savings in other governmental departments it will be truly wonderful.

How my heart throbbed with joy as I sat here this afternoon listening to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] so vigorously and enthusiastically making the same speech, in substance, I made a year ago—the speech wherein he questioned my sincerity.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want this bill to pass without calling attention to one more item in it. I shall not offer an amendment today to this bill, but I am expecting that the Senate will offer an amendment and I want to say just a word concerning it.

On page 96 is what we generally speak of as the Robertson-Pittman Act. For those who are not familiar with this act I want to say that there is a 10-percent tax on munitions for civilian use which goes into a fund, which is used for the preservation of wildlife. Up to last year there was about \$2,500,000 a year appropriated out of that fund but last year the amount was cut, on account of the war, to \$1,250,000. It was hoped that at least an equal amount would be put into the bill this year, but the committee decided to cut it \$500,000 from last year's appropriation, or a cut to about one-third the amount provided in normal times.

That particularly affects my State of Colorado. In my particular district, in just one little section, over 2,000 elk and deer died this past winter because they lacked proper feed and too much segregation resulting in disease. There was over \$4,000,000 worth of wild game killed in my State last year, and more than that will probably be killed this year. This is important when our civilians do not have sufficient meat. This section of the bill should appropriate sufficient money to properly protect this wildlife.

I mention this item particularly because it does not cost the Treasury anything. The money is already in a fund which has accumulated to some \$10,000,000; it is increasing all the time and I ask the committee, when and if the Senate increases the appropriation to

somewhere near what it ought to be, that they be sympathetic to it.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. It is true, is it not, that this is really a trust fund, a fund provided for the sportsman and is not out of the public Treasury; it is money that is paid by the sportsmen, who are glad to put it up, in order that this very fine work may be carried on?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is true.

Mr. ANGELL. For the protection of wildlife.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse what the gentleman has said regarding the attitude of sportsmen; I am sure that is quite true all through the West, and I know, particularly in my State, exactly what the gentleman has indicated is correct. The sportsmen gladly pay this money into this fund, and I think the major proportion of it ought to be expended for the purposes for which it is collected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I wonder if the gentleman is entirely correct that this money in the Treasury is not usable by the Treasury for other purposes. I am interested in this fund. As a matter of fact, the first year I came to Congress I offered an amendment to increase the appropriation bill which made the first \$1,000,000 available under the Pittman-Robertson Act. The House accepted it. The explanation was given at that time that this tax was a tax which had been put on with some other nuisance taxes, and this particular tax on ammunition was not repealed with a sort of gentlemen's understanding that it would be the measure of appropriations that might be made under the Pittman-Robertson Act. However, I think the money is in the Treasury and could be appropriated for other purposes, except that from a bookkeeping standpoint the appropriations that are made under the Pittman-Robertson Act are measured against it.

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is not my understanding. My understanding is, as the gentleman from Oregon says, that a trust fund has been created and can be used for no other purpose. The committee, in its report, states that the money will stay there and accumulate. Their idea is that it will all be spent after the war, if the money is not spent now. My contention is that it is an economy to spend enough of it now to keep going in a small way the work that has been done up to this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, America is today the strongest country financially in the world. Nevertheless, we are headed toward an economic Pearl Harbor infinite-

ly more disastrous than the defeat at Oahu unless we begin immediately to put government finances in order.

I am no alarmist. But I know of no greater disservice to America than to remain silent about the administration's policy of financial appeasement. Their financial failures parallel with deadly exactness the events leading to Pearl Harbor. When China was attacked in 1937 the President talked about quarantining aggressor nations, but war exports to Japan increased. After we had babied Japan with war materials, what happened? The strongest fortification in the world, America's bastion of strength that dominated the entire Pacific, was smashed to pieces in a few hours.

Mr. Roosevelt's policy on inflation has followed the same pattern that produced Pearl Harbor. To keep this discussion clear, let us define the term "inflation": inflation is a major decline in the purchasing power of the dollar. In 1932 Mr. Roosevelt campaigned with energy on the theme that the country was going into bankruptcy because of the deficits of those years. Those deficits of 1931 and 1932, of which he talked so eloquently, were \$901,959,080 and \$2,942,051,451, respectively. Today, every 12 days, on the average, our deficit is greater than was the shortage then in a full year. Think of it! An increase in our shortage of about 3,000 percent from a condition which Mr. Roosevelt represented as the road to bankruptcy. I say this with no partisanship, because the cost of living and the arithmetic table are nonpartisan. Inflation, like rain, falls on the just and the unjust alike. But when we are making a mistake that Mr. Roosevelt has said will lead to disaster, and then he enlarges that mistake 30 times, either we are going to wake up promptly or calamity will befall us.

Here we encounter the alibis for this fantastic situation. It is explained that because we are at war, the budget of America must be unbalanced as it is today. That simply is not true. Practically all our expenditures are being paid to American people in dollars. These dollars could be collected from them in proportion to the increase in Government expense if the administration willed it. There will never be as good a time to do this task as now. Certainly the willingness and ability to pay heavy taxes will not increase after peace has arrived. Then the fervor of our war patriotism will have cooled.

England is collecting over 50 percent of her war expenditures in taxes. In the year ended April 1, Canada collected about 48 percent of her governmental costs. But what is the record in America? During the 1943 fiscal year to date, only 25 percent of our expenditures have been collected in taxes. Unfortunately, there is no way of accurately portraying the ominous consequences of this failure of America's leadership. Like floating downstream in the Niagara River above the falls, the signs of disaster are recognized only by those who have explored

the end of the journey. So it is with a financial policy of collecting only one-fourth of the cost of this war, while our allies are doing 100 percent better on this vital front. Frantic skirmishing on the price-fixing front cannot conceal the danger or substitute for action in the decisive field of taxation.

In his message to Congress the President asked for \$16,000,000,000 in new taxes for the coming fiscal year. So far Congress has made no progress on this task. With all the earnestness at my command, I plead with the majority leadership of this House to prepare a tax program immediately that will raise not less than \$16,000,000,000. What should those taxes be? Frankly, as a new Member of this body, I am not a tax expert. But I have some ideas. No political cowardice will keep me from presenting them in this hour of national crisis. Let me suggest them briefly: first, a Federal sales tax on goods and services, possibly excepting basic food commodities; second, a special Victory tax on gasoline and other motor fuels and oils, replacing rationing and black markets; third, additional or new taxes on tobacco, coffee, chocolate, and beverages generally; fourth, some increase in personal income-tax rates. Any large increase in personal tax rates will black-out the middle class. It will masquerade as a soak-the-rich policy. Actually, it will result in making "poor whites" out of everyone except the bureaucrats and the idle rich. Other specific taxes could be designed to absorb excess income before it produced explosive inflation in the market places of the Nation.

My suggestions may not provide the right answer and certainly not the full answer. But I say this—either levy new taxes in proportion to our expanded spending or curtail our commitments abroad to fit our resources. Whatever taxes we levy will be labeled unfair and unjust. They can result in general defeat at the polls for those with the courage to vote for them. But if America is to be saved we here must exhibit moral courage that will match the physical courage of our boys on the battle fronts. Taxes commensurate with Government expenditures are one of the prices of liberty. Actually, liberty with high taxes or slavery with high taxes is the choice confronting us. Can we see that truth in time?

To do this job, Congress must have genuine help from the Executive department. The blame for our present plight does not rest alone on the shoulders of Congress. Mr. Roosevelt has taken credit, and rightly, for the overdue social gains of the past 10 years. The credit is due the President because he dominated Congress and controlled its efforts. So then it is only correct and logical that the economic crisis existing today be charged up to the President who has controlled the actions of Congress. Just as the social reforms are a New Deal achievement, the financial errors and today's inflation are likewise his failure. Let me be specific.

Following the first major inflationary act, breaking the gold pledge, the New Deal, quite like a spendthrift who finances his riotous living by loans from his friends and relatives, kept borrowing steadily until the war danger threatened us. The insidious progress of this financial sickness was never effectively challenged. The forces for upright financial practices could not effectively combat such tricky arguments about debt as, "We owe it to ourselves," and other sleight-of-hand financial phrases. Compare that kind of leadership with what Churchill said to England a few weeks ago, and I quote:

The savings of the nation arising from the thrift, skill, or devotion of individuals are sacred. The state is built around them and it is the duty of the state to redeem its faith in an equal degree of value.

The policy here of evading and confusing the problem fooled many of the people but it did not entirely mislead Congress. Occasional attempts were made in this legislative body to levy taxes that would balance the Budget. A Federal sales tax, higher personal taxes, and other special taxes have been proposed from time to time. But for 10 years the Executive has had practically absolute control of legislation. Programs to tax adequately have been pettifogged by the Executive branch again and again, just as the Administration has blocked pay-as-you-earn taxation for many months. It is clear that the failure to prevent inflation by higher tax levies is not alone the failure of Congress. It is important that that responsibility be squarely placed.

For we are now nearing the crisis in our financial affairs. Strong measures to preserve the value of the frugal savings of the common people of America must be enacted, or else the same formula that has produced dictatorship in other parts of the world will produce it here. First would come social dissensions, resulting from the disruption of home life and skyrocketing of prices. These disorders would take the form of food riots, sectional strife, or recurrent labor disputes. Whatever their apparent nature, the underlying cause would be the protest of the people against destruction of the America they love by unsound economic practices. Should that day arrive, it will provide an alluring setting for the Executive power to seize all the reins of government. All that would be necessary then would be to shrewdly charge that the Congress had caused the crisis by failing to enact adequate tax legislation.

Special powers would be arbitrarily assumed, based on the necessity for preserving order and stopping dissension. That old alibi for despotism is hard to combat in a critical hour. It has been used wherever democratic nations have been destroyed from within. Always the primary cause has been inflation and economic distress. The first act of the dictator has always been to dissolve the legislative body, claiming that the legislature is incapable of dealing with prevailing conditions. Likewise, the promise is always made that once the emergency is over, the Reichstag—Hit-

ler—the Chamber of Deputies—Mussolini—or whatever the legislative body is, will resume its functions. This sort of tragedy need not happen here. If it does happen, every American boy who dies in this war will have died in vain.

It will not happen if Congress will enact tax levies commensurate with the present national expenditures.

The people of America are counting on the Members of Congress to preserve their liberty. Victory in this battle does not rest on our brave soldiers and sailors but on us at home. With you and me rests the final decision between solvency and liberty or inflation and slavery. Before the judgment seat of God each of us must some day answer for our actions during this critical hour.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, 10 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] who desires to offer an amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEWART: On page 39, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following: "Presbyterian College at Durant, Okla.: For 100 pupils, \$40,000; for pay of principal, drayage, and general repairs and improvements, \$7,000; in all, \$47,000."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to reinstate an appropriation for a college, the Oklahoma Presbyterian, a going institution heretofore supported by the Interior Department for the past 40 years. My own daughter attended this college.

To give you a little better background, my father came to the Indian Territory in 1894 as a Presbyterian missionary to the Choctaw Indians. Somehow, somehow this college failed to receive an appropriation 2 years ago. Yet it has produced some of the most outstanding Indian citizens in all America. I hope you will not forget that our very freedom which we enjoy today was brought about by the cooperation of the Choctaw Indians. In the Congressional Cemetery stands a humble monument to Pushmataha, an ally of General Jackson, who was the only full-blood Indian who ever rose to the rank of a general, and the only Indian statesman that was ever successful in getting all of the Indian tribes together. When the great war with England was raging in 1812, Tecumseh gathered many tribes, and it was the answer of this great general who brought the Choctaws over on the side of the United States, whom this Government gave military honors for his contribution to our very freedom today. Let us keep faith with our solemn agreements. I appeal to you to reappropriate this money. I am just as strong for my Catholic brethren, my Methodist brethren, and my Baptist brethren as I am of my own religion in this respect. Do not discriminate. I thought enough of this college that I sent my own beloved

daughter there. She attended this school. We are pioneer folks, and this school was one of the trail blazers of our civilization.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Was there a Budget estimate or request for the item involved in your amendment?

Mr. STEWART. I am sorry I cannot give you that information. I have never been able to have any information.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I regret to inform the gentleman from Oklahoma that there was no Budget request presented for this item, and that may be the principal reason why it was not favorably considered by the committee.

Mr. STEWART. Possibly that is so, but I am appealing to you as Members of Congress, because some ideologists went in there to shear the wings of a great institution—to prevent the appropriation for this school. The gentleman from Oklahoma, the chairman of this subcommittee [Mr. JOHNSON], knows the picture as well as I know it, and I ask him to express himself at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say I am very familiar with the history and the record of this school. It is one of the outstanding schools of the entire United States. It has turned out some of the finest citizens of the country, and as a member of the committee I opposed closing the school. That is still my position.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you for your contribution. I just wanted to get that picture before the Members of Congress. Sometimes the Members of Congress do not get a clear picture of the country as a whole. I feel I am as tolerant as any man in Congress. I would go as far for a man who opposes my religious or political views, if he were honest and conscientious in his convictions as I am in mine. I am going to ask you few Members who are here this afternoon to restore this appropriation.

I might add as I go along, I read in a trade journal that we had in one department here in Washington 2,700 attorneys, controlling the affairs of that department, and England was able to cope with 10 attorneys with a like branch of government. I want you to figure that out. I am appealing to you. I believe that you men will see that these cold-hearted experts, if you please, are in error. They would pass judgment on an institution that has served America for 50 years, and one man of Indian blood has served three terms in the United States Senate, Senator Robert L. Owen and two others, Charles D. Carter and Bill Hastings in Congress. Please do not pass judgment on this institution until you learn of the great good it has done. I hope you do not oppose me. I beg of you your support, because I believe we all see eye to eye. I hope that you recant and reconsider and forget the ideologists who are

trying to destroy one of the greatest institutions in the United States, even though it is a small church school.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BENDER. How large a body has this institution?

Mr. STEWART. It is a very small school—100 or 200. It has never had over 200.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that it is less than 100 today?

Mr. STEWART. It is far less, because no appropriation was made 2 years ago, and it has been carried on by public subscription.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that it is less than 25?

Mr. STEWART. I do not know what the number is.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I can give the exact figures.

Mr. STEWART. All right; go ahead.

Mr. CARTER. Somebody said just 16 students.

Mr. STEWART. I do not know, but he may be like some of these others. I want to restore the institution; that will take care of 100 or more and they will have the enrollment if you vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I regret to find myself in opposition to the genial gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART]. He has made a very fervent plea for this school, but his plea, with all due deference to him, comes a little too late. This committee held hearings for a number of weeks. Many Members of this House who were interested in various matters appeared before the committee. The gentleman from Oklahoma never appeared to present his case. We have no estimate from the Bureau of the Budget on this matter, and I say that this matter was called to the attention of the committee by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], who presented communications that had been written in behalf of the institution. The chairman of this subcommittee was very much in favor of the support of this school, and I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART], that when it came time to vote, although the chairman of the subcommittee favored it, the remainder of the committee was unanimously against it under the conditions under which it was presented. Had the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] gone to the Bureau of the Budget, or had he come to the committee and presented the matter with the fervor and devotion he has presented it here on the floor of the House, he might have appealed to us in such a manner that we would have put the school in, but I ask him now to withdraw his amendment so that we can get on with the bill.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wrote a letter to the committee asking for the privilege

of appearing on this matter and it is in your files. I wanted to make a clear case, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw his remarks and support this matter instead of opposing it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Was the gentleman notified to appear?

Mr. STEWART. I never had notice to appear. But I wrote a letter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand that the gentleman was notified to appear.

Mr. STEWART. If I was, it was missed in the mass of correspondence that comes to my desk.

Mr. CARTER. I am sure that if the gentleman wrote a letter to the chairman of this subcommittee or to the clerk of the committee asking to appear, that he would have received a prompt reply. I saw but two letters in connection with this school, neither of which was written by the gentleman from Oklahoma. I might say that we have taken pretty good care of the gentleman's district, so far as schools are concerned. We have provided for two other schools.

Mr. STEWART. The subcommittee chairman just left the room, but I wrote him a letter asking him the privilege of appearing before the committee and presenting this matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like to say that I think the gentleman was notified to appear before the committee. I am so informed by the clerk.

Mr. STEWART. I do not care what the clerk told the gentleman. I was not told.

Mr. CARTER. I do not yield further. If the gentleman applied for permission to appear before the committee and did not get it, that is regrettable and I say that I hope he will withdraw his motion, and that next year he will present the matter to the Bureau of the Budget and let it be brought up in an orderly way.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. A remark has been made here about one of the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations. If there is a group of men in this whole Capitol that is devoted to the office which they hold that group is the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations, with which I have been connected for a long time. They are most devoted to their duty, and I am sorry to hear anything said derogatory to any one of them. If a letter was sent to the committee, there will be evidence of it.

Mr. CARTER. I agree with the gentleman. The clerk of this subcommittee is most efficient and courteous.

Mr. RABAUT. And I hope that the evidence will be produced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time only for the purpose of making some remarks pursuant to what was said by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Bur-

FETT] a little while ago about national finances, and then to ask some questions of the members of the committee.

It is true of course that the only real cure for the problem of inflation is additional taxation. A nation cannot bring into balance the available supply of goods with the available purchasing power of the people, so long as it permits billions of dollars of new money in the form of deposits to be created by the banks and loaned to the Government at interest month by month.

As long as that condition prevails the attempt to control prices by means of O. P. A. will be of itself a most difficult and hazardous procedure. As a matter of fact, I have put into a short volume called *Out of Debt, Out of Danger* my own thoughts about this whole problem of our national debt and national financial structure. A copy of that book I am going to take the pleasure of sending to each Member of Congress in a day or two. I rise at this time only to say that one of the chapters in this book points out that in time of war the kind of financial policies that should be followed by a nation are quite the opposite of those that should be followed in peace-time and that the thing we need to do above all others is to have sufficiently courageous taxation including, if necessary, a compulsory savings program so that we can avoid the creation of a single dollar of new money by the banking system of this Nation.

I should now like to ask one or two questions of members of the committee. In the first place I should like to say that I saw recently a statement to the effect that the War Production Board had lifted its stop order against the completion of the Friant Dam in California and also the Madera Canal. I realize this action on the part of the War Production Board is somewhat late from the standpoint of this particular bill, but I should like to ask some member of the committee, perhaps the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], what effect that might have on future actions.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Gladly.

Mr. CARTER. While I have received no official notice, I understand that that is the case, that the stop order so far as the Madera Canal and the Friant Dam has been removed. This appropriation bill carries an item of \$11,500,000 in addition to the carry-over which was \$26,500,000; so there is a considerable amount of money with which to work at the present time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And could that be used on the Friant Dam or any portion of the Central Valley project?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; there may be a very small portion that is earmarked, but it would not in my opinion amount to more than \$3,000,000 which could not be used for these purposes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will a portion of it be used for the completion of the Shasta Dam and the installation of power units there?

Mr. CARTER. It will be used immediately and continuously until that power

is brought in which will probably be soon after the first of next year.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And how about the transmission of that power?

Mr. CARTER. There is plenty of money provided in this bill for the transmission line and it is the opinion of the committee that the only transmission line the Government should build is from the Shasta power house to the Shasta substation about 25 miles away.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It would have to be turned over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. unless the transmission line authorized by Congress were completed from Shasta Dam to load center at Antioch.

Mr. CARTER. There is no hope of having that done for many years.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But there is no prejudice against that being done as soon as possible?

Mr. CARTER. No; not if it is decided it should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we have been discussing a bill making appropriations for the Interior Department. During this time there has been some consideration of the question of food supply. I see on the floor the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] who has just returned from a visit to that great interior hinterland, Hot Springs, Va., where I understand he crashed the gate and was admitted to the food conference.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I want to make it perfectly clear that I did not crash any gates; as a matter of fact, I was welcomed very cordially, as I expected to be, by our former esteemed and distinguished colleague the Honorable Marvin Jones.

Mr. CASE. I am sure that the gentleman was treated nicely by Mr. Jones, who was a former distinguished Member of this body. If the gentleman at this time cares to elaborate on what he discovered, I shall be pleased to yield to him further.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I shall be very happy to tell the gentleman and the Committee what I found down there.

The United Nations Food Conference convened at Hot Springs, Va., last Tuesday, the 18th. As you all will remember, the Government originally ruled that the press of this country would be barred from covering the conference with the exception that they would be permitted to attend only the opening and closing sessions. In order that the American people would not be kept completely in the dark on developments at this conference, I introduced, on April 13, in company with our own Senator HOMER FERGUSON, House Concurrent Resolution 18. This resolution was designed to permit the Congress to have full knowledge of all discussions, all transactions, and all decisions which may be arrived at during the course of the sessions by having in

attendance a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives—to consist of three Members of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the majority party and one who shall be a member of the minority party; five Members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker, three of whom shall be members of the majority party and two of whom shall be members of the minority party.

This resolution further sought to permit the vitally interested people of this Nation to be kept informed of the happenings of this historic meeting through daily attendance of representatives of at least the three major wire-press services, namely, the Associated Press, International News Service, and United Press. It is provided in that resolution that the gentlemen of the press are subject to a reasonable amount of censorship to prevent the disclosure of military secrets which might bring aid and comfort to the enemy.

No action having been taken upon this resolution by the Rules Committee up to April 27, I addressed a letter to its chairman, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, urging the imperative necessity of prompt action immediately upon the reconvening of the House on May 3. I pointed out to the chairman that if, as we had been led to believe, nothing of a military nature was to be discussed at this conference, there should be no objection raised to the adoption of my resolution and further that if discussions are to be had and decisions arrived at or commitments made which might affect the post-war security and economy of this Nation, then by all means it was imperative that favorable action be taken immediately on this resolution.

I became concerned about what appeared to me to be an obvious muzzling of the press and I became worried about some possible deliberate attempt on the part of the sponsors of this conference to keep valuable information away from the people of the United States or from we Members of Congress, who are the duly elected representatives of the people. Consequently, I continued to push for action before the Rules Committee. Republican members on that committee caused our resolution to be brought up for discussion last Friday. I was not called in before the committee at that time but I was promised that I would be called before the committee to testify early this last week. Not having been called and no action having been taken on my resolution, immediately after Mr. Churchill finished speaking on Wednesday, I jumped into my car and drove 220 miles down to Hot Springs, Va., to look into this conference personally. I consider it my duty to my constituents and my country to keep myself as fully informed as possible on all matters which pertain to the general welfare.

Some newspapers have carried the story that I crashed the gate at this historic conference. Even though it be true that I was the first and only Member of Congress to go to the trouble of seeking entrance to this conference up to the third day of its sessions, nevertheless I was very courteously received. Here is what actually happened.

On my arrival I was, of course, stopped by one of the military police, of which there are some 200 posted very wisely all around to protect the safety and welfare of these hundreds of representatives of the 43 Allied Nations that have honored us with their presence at this historic international conference.

Upon presenting my official identification as a Member of Congress, I was promptly and courteously sent to the main guard desk at the front door of the famous and beautiful huge Homestead Hotel, where my credential were again examined and I was promptly escorted to the office of the secretariat, Mr. Michael J. McDermott, of the State Department, and was given a daily visitor's pass. I was permitted to register and fortunately able to obtain a room in the very much overcrowded hotel. Huge as it is, this hotel is not able to accommodate all of the delegates and some of them are of necessity occupying rooms in buildings nearby.

Following my assignment to a room, the captain of the guard was good enough to take me up to meet my former esteemed colleague—a Member of the House for 24 years and recently chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and now a judge in the Court of Claims, the Honorable Marvin Jones, duly elected chairman of this historic conference.

I talked with Judge Jones for a long while about the aims and purposes of the conference and was very pleasantly received indeed. Following that session, Mr. McDermott took me all over the building, through the various meeting rooms, and so forth, and later I went down to the press room for an interview by members of the press in attendance.

On Thursday morning I returned to Washington for the purpose of repeating to my colleagues in the House the warm assurances of Judge Jones that all Members of Congress were welcome at any time to attend any and all sessions of the conference and that nothing whatsoever will be kept from them. In my humble opinion, it is most imperative that the Members of Congress accept this invitation whenever their time permits and sit in on these historic meetings. After all, I have been told that this conference is but the first of a number of such international conferences that it is expected will be held between now and the peace to follow this devastating war. These conferences are looking toward the post-war period and it seems to me that we as Members of Congress are woefully remiss in the discharge of our duties if we fail to profit by our mute attendance at these conferences and get the viewpoints of the international delegates who are thus assembled. It seems to me this is a golden opportunity for the Members of Congress to interview these delegates—statesmen and economists—from all over the world and get their outlook on the post-war world, in order that we may be in a better position to pass upon the various questions that will be presented to us and thus render decisions which in our

humble opinion will be for the best interests of our Nation and the post-war world in general. Furthermore, we are more than remiss in our duties if we do not indicate by our presence that we are alive to our responsibility as the people's representatives by being willing to keep ourselves thus informed. Obviously, if we do not attend this conference in some numbers, it seems to me that it is perfectly logical for the administration officials, charged with the responsibility of arranging for the conference, to feel that Congress is disinterested and therefore there is no reason to issue any invitation to Members to attend any future conferences which may be held. In other words, this conference might well be regarded as setting a precedent and it is up to us in the public discharge of our duties to see to it that Congress is actively included—not necessarily as voting delegates—but certainly as observers in any and all of these future conferences.

Now, as to the aims of this particular conference, let me quote from the opening address of the since-elected chairman, Judge Marvin Jones:

The fact that representatives of 44 nations, from every part of the earth, have traveled long distances under wartime difficulties to be here bespeaks your earnestness and the importance of the subject we are to discuss. More important, it reflects a genuine desire on the part of all free peoples for a better understanding of our common problems and a united approach to their solution.

This conference has rightfully been referred to as a forerunner of other conferences which unquestionably will have a part in shaping the post-war world in which freedom will again rule.

Thinking people everywhere now realize that what we have called surpluses are, for the most part, not surpluses at all, but are the results of accumulations caused by defects in the systems of distribution and the inability of the masses to purchase the food they need. The peoples of the world have mastered the machinery of production to a far greater degree than they have mastered the machinery of distribution.

If by the exchange of views and a consideration of these questions we can produce a better understanding and promote the flow of farm commodities and the articles produced therefrom into the markets of the world; if we can leave the peoples of the world freer and more able to produce and secure the things they need; if we can make it possible for surplus products to be distributed and used and thus prevent them from overloading and overwhelming the distribution machinery of the countries in which such surpluses have been backed up for lack of a market, we will not only have achieved a great world-wide humanitarian objective, but each of us will have helped to promote the economic and social betterment of his own country as well.

Now, I earlier referred to the very justifiable indignation of the press at the original decision which was to bar them from all excepting the opening and closing sessions of the conference. Considerable modification has since been made in the initial regulations. Here is the actual situation as I saw it on my arrival Wednesday evening.

Press headquarters have been set up in the Hotel Casino, which is located about 100 yards distant from the hotel proper. In this rather spacious building, the many reporters covering the conference

have their work tables, their press wire outlets, and so forth. One of the major wire press services—International News—has set up an electrical printer. In another section of the city two blocks away, the news photographers have been provided with a temporary darkroom for developing their photographs. These boys, however, are operating under considerable difficulty in that they have to drive some 20 miles to Covington in order to get their pictures on the wire transmission services. This is no fault of the conference.

It is true that so far the members of the press have been denied permission to enter the hotel proper, where all the sessions are being held, for the purpose of either attending the various sessions or for interviewing the delegates. My own personal opinion is that the press should be permitted reasonable representation at all open sessions and should be given an opportunity to interview the various delegates within the hotel proper, if the delegates themselves are willing to be interviewed. Now, of course, this much is true: The conference has in no way whatsoever attempted to restrict the utterances of any of the delegates and has made it perfectly clear that not only can they step outside of the hotel proper to talk to reporters but they can also at their request call the reporters into a special press conference room which has been arranged in the hotel proper. So far—and the conference is only a few days old—it is natural to assume, and it is a fact, that some of the delegates—unaccustomed to American press procedure—are perhaps somewhat backward in accepting press invitations to be interviewed. On the other hand, it is likewise but natural to assume that these individual delegates desire and expect full press coverage back in their own nation and our American press stands ready to give them that coverage and can do it very quickly if permitted to thus promote international good will.

In all fairness, I think I should say that Judge Jones and Mr. McDermott, of the State Department, who has been designated chief press officer of the conference, are both hopeful that some method can be worked out to better the press relations with this conference. Both join me in very sincere regrets that there has developed an unfortunate lack of understanding of the press situation on all sides. Certain it is that we still have a free press in America—we are told we are fighting to preserve the freedom of speech—and certain it is that we do not have today at Hot Springs a free press. There still remains in America a power of the press and if this and future conferences are to be successful, then that power of the press to influence public opinion in America must be fully respected and so far as I am concerned, I intend to continue to exert every influence that I can bring to bear to see to it that the American people get freedom of the press at all times and on every occasion.

In conclusion let me just add one word of caution to any of the Members who may desire to attend the conference

sometime between now and its closing, which has definitely been set by resolution for June 3. Hot Springs is temporarily in the same position as many other cities in this country. It is woefully short of accommodations. The Homestead Hotel itself, headquarters of the conference, is overcrowded beyond its capacity—in fact, to such an extent that some of the delegates have had to be quartered elsewhere. Judge Jones, therefore, has suggested to me that I call the attention of the Members to the reasonably good rail accommodations which are presently available. One can leave Washington at 11:30 at night on the Chesapeake & Ohio pullman and arrive in Hot Springs early the next morning in plenty of time to attend the sessions, which generally start at either 9 or 10 o'clock and continue throughout the day and into the evening. Returning, one can leave there on the sleeper at 8 o'clock and arrive in Washington about 3:30 a. m. Of course, I appreciate this is an early hour to land here—and I understand it is a through sleeper for New York—but the fact remains, and I am sure the membership appreciates, that if one will go to bed early, as is the habit of the membership, one can still get a full 7 hours' sleep and upon arrival in Washington can go directly to the office and get in several hours of work free from interruption by telephone or presence of constituents.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan, and I ask unanimous consent that he may have permission to extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman to yield in these last few minutes of debate in order to secure opportunity for a word of commendation for the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee handling the bill. This is one of the most important of the annual supply bills and one of the most difficult. And in all the years I have been on the committee I do not recall seeing it disposed of with such dispatch and general approval, in the committee and in the House. That is all the more notable in view of the fact that the bill as reported has been reduced 60 percent below the current expenditures of the Department and 11 percent below the Budget estimates. It is a record which has not been equaled this year—if ever before in the history of the Congress—and I wish to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] who probably knows more about the affairs of this Department than any other man in the House, and with him the members of his subcommittee, including

especially the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] and the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle. The reductions in the bill are in keeping with the national program of retrenchment and the subcommittee in recommending them have contributed in that respect to the successful prosecution of the war program. I congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma, Chairman JOHNSON, and his committee on the conduct of the bill, throughout the hearings and particularly on its management and passage without amendment on the floor here this afternoon.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has just made, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the limit on time that has been given, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] may be accorded as much time as was used by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that time has been previously fixed by unanimous consent and can only be changed by unanimous consent.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, that is my request, that notwithstanding the fixing of time, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] may be accorded an extension of time equivalent to that used by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CARTER. Is that the desire of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I only want about 3 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given enough additional time to make up 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my word of commendation of the members of the subcommittee for the effective manner in which they have demonstrated in a realistic way how economy should be applied to the administration of the Federal Government. They have reduced the current year's budget by \$120,000,000, and, while I am sincerely interested in the Interior Department and the effect of its work in the development of the great West, I think that this same pattern of economy should be carried throughout other appropriation bills which will come before the House.

I want to call attention to the fact that last October some stop orders were issued by the War Production Board which affected most, if not all, reclamation projects which were then in process of construction.

I did not check the record, but I presume that approximately \$60,000,000 remains unexpended of the 1943 appropriations for various projects. I have checked the appropriation bill for the

current fiscal year, and I find that all of the amounts appropriated 1 year ago are to remain available "until expended," and that applies both to the reclamation fund and the general fund.

I simply want to make that observation because I believe that the House, having control over the purse strings of the Nation, will not transfer this control over the reclamation projects or various activities of the Bureau of Reclamation to the War Production Board or to any other wartime agency.

I believe that as soon as this war emergency shall have passed the House should demonstrate that it has control and insist upon seeing that neither the War Production Board nor any other agency shall bypass or divert the expenditure of funds which have been appropriated by the Congress for the various activities of the Department of the Interior, and particularly for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Reclamation projects throughout the West are contributing materially to the production of essential foodstuffs, and this important Federal program is proving its worth in this emergency. It is unlikely that many projects under construction can be completed until after the termination of the war, but then there should be resumption of the program directly controlled by the Congress, and no interference should be permitted by Federal agencies not charged with supervising this work.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman feel that if we continue to spend, as we are spending, until the war is over, we will have anything to conserve on?

Mr. DWORSHAK. We will have to take that chance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARBER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Duke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed, H. R. 2719.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CARLSON of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein certain data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an appeal issued by the United States Christian Council for Democracy for the passage of anti-poll-tax legislation.

I have been informed that this will exceed the usual two pages and will cost \$135.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor at this time because I feel the Members of this House are entitled to know exactly what happened last Monday during my appearance before the House Committee on Military Affairs, a proceeding which older and more experienced Members have told me was one of the most unusual hearings that any committee ever conducted in the history of our Congress. As you realize, I, as a Member of Congress, was recently charged by Drew

Pearson, radio and newspaper commentator, with intent to receive a bribe in connection with the sale of two boilers to the Aluminum Co. of America.

I testified before the House Military Affairs Committee on that matter, giving a full statement and showing that I had neither received nor was I going to receive any bribe, fee, or commission of any nature whatsoever, but did of my own free will attempt to assist one of my constituents who had purchased two boilers from the New Orleans Public Service at New Orleans and had got entangled in Government red tape here at Washington while trying to sell them to the Aluminum Co. of America.

Drew Pearson, the man who made the bribery charge over a Nation-wide radio hook-up, testified immediately after me to the Military Affairs Committee. He failed to produce the slightest support of his lies about me, but this is what I wish the Members of the House to know about the Military Affairs Committee and its chairman. Immediately after Pearson testified, the hearing was continued without ever calling the principal witness, namely, Mr. E. A. Jumonville, of Plaquemine, La., the man who was subpoenaed by the committee and came all the way from Louisiana with all his files to tell in detail this boiler transaction. Mr. Jumonville was told by the committee's attorney to go home, as his testimony would not be taken.

Mr. John P. Monroe, 2101 R Street, was charged by Drew Pearson as the one who purchased the boilers. I insisted that Mr. Monroe be subpoenaed, but Chairman ANDREW MAY refused to do so. I then asked Mr. Monroe for an affidavit, which I have given to the committee. In this affidavit Mr. John Monroe swears that he did not have anything to do with this boiler transaction, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. Jumonville, in a sworn statement and under oath, said that I was representing him as his Congressman, that I had received no fee nor was I to receive any fee in connection with the boiler transaction. Mr. Jumonville further swore that all he wanted was the price as set by the O. P. A. for those two boilers, which he knew he was entitled to, just as every other businessman in America today gets the O. P. A. price whenever he sells a commodity. This evidence I had to force into the hands of the committee, with the chairman refusing to accept it from the witnesses in person.

Mr. Drew Pearson, whom I defined as a claptrap, fly-by-night columnist, testified under oath to the committee that he received his first information in connection with this boiler transaction from an anonymous phone caller. The person who informed him of my alleged fee, Pearson said, was an alleged friend of mine, whose alleged name he refused to divulge, allegedly giving same to Chairman ANDREW MAY in executive session. It is my understanding that Chairman ANDREW MAY has refused to give that alleged name to the other members of the committee. Evidently Mr. May is

not very consistent, because information that he secured in another hearing approximately 2 weeks ago in executive session was given by him to every newspaper in America that would bother to ask him for it.

Personally, I know Drew Pearson lied on the radio and I know he lied on the witness stand, which, down where I come from, is perjury, and that the person's name he gave Chairman MAY was either manufactured and is fictitious, or else he conspired with somebody to agree to give this synthetic and bogus information.

I have had occasion to check into the record of Drew Pearson to see what kind of reputation he has for telling the truth. I find that United States Senators, Members of Congress, Cabinet members, generals, and even the secretary to the President have in no uncertain terms labeled him as a downright liar and garbage-can collector of filthy, manufactured, synthetic lies.

But Drew Pearson has not spent all of his time blackmailing, intimidating, and lying about public officials and Congressmen. His vocations describe a thwarted and frustrated man with a warped, twisted, and diseased idea of mankind and life. Among his minor contributions to society of which he boasts—and just ask him if you want to hear more in detail—was the illegal representation by the aid of an accessory or bag man, namely, a Mr. John Henshaw, of the Irish sweepstakes, which gave him a vile start in his obsessed, putrid craze for money.

I want the Members of this House to know that Pearson, who poses as a great liberal, is at heart a money miser and one of the greediest men for cash I have ever met anywhere any time. If he cannot get it honestly, look out for the blackmail. And as for his reputation for truth and accuracy, listen to this:

Congressman Martin Sweeney, of Ohio, who sued Drew Pearson in practically every court from coast to coast, branded Pearson as an unmitigated liar and a falsifier of facts. He said:

I intend to pursue the matter to the very end, because I believe all persons in public life are concerned with the extent to which the "free" press may go in attributing to public officials false acts or un-American motives.

He then brought against Pearson the longest, largest number of libel suits in American history, which I understand still to be in process of settlement.

Jesse H. Jones, a high-ranking Cabinet member and Secretary of Commerce, stated frankly that Drew Pearson was a liar.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull, in referring to Drew Pearson, said he is only one-third right one-tenth of the time.

Senator ROBERT REYNOLDS said of Drew Pearson and Robert Allen:

The truth is not in them.

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, said, "There was not an atom of truth in this libelous statement by Drew Pearson and Robert Allen," when in a broadcast Drew Pearson charged Sena-

tor TYDINGS had had the W. P. A. build a road and yacht basin on his private estate to keep W. P. A. workers busy. On another occasion, the Washington Post had to publish a two-column full apology and retraction of false charges Pearson made against Senator TYDINGS.

Here is what Representative HAMILTON FISH, of New York, in answer to an attack made on him by Drew Pearson in his column on October 6, 1942, said:

Drew Pearson in my opinion is the most contemptible, dishonest, and dishonorable smear propagandist in America, and by inference the most colossal liar in the Nation.

Senator GERALD P. NYE stated in answer to an attack on him in the Merry-Go-Round that it was a deceitful falsehood published by Drew Pearson.

Senator GUY GILLETTE, of Iowa, said a statement by Drew Pearson is absolutely without foundation.

Senator ROBERT REYNOLDS said on another occasion:

Unfortunately the only way a public official can avoid vilification by these two men, namely, Robert Allen and Drew Pearson, is to bow to their will and the will of those they serve.

Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, of South Carolina, stated that an article in connection with him by Drew Pearson falsely insinuated things and was without foundation and is maliciously false.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, stated Pearson had not only lied about him but had lied about Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, stating that Drew Pearson was a little black animal with a white stripe down his back—must be a skunk. WHEELER declared that this very crowd in Washington, meaning Drew Pearson and his crowd, had been taught to smear every Senator and Member of the House who does not agree 100 percent with the New Deal bureaucrats.

Colonel Harrington, former head of the W. P. A., proved a statement of Drew Pearson's to be an outrageous, unjustifiable and bold-faced lie. In a column by George D. Riley and Page Huidekoper in the Washington Times-Herald on January 10, 1943, it was stated that there was nothing true about Pearson's claim of President Roosevelt prevailing upon Ambassador Joe Kennedy to refrain from publishing a book.

Here is what Cordell Hull said about one of Drew's articles appearing in the Merry-Go-Round April 14, 1939:

Those parts of it of which I have knowledge are so thoroughly inaccurate and misleading that they could not, in my judgment, be substantiated by anyone.

Senator NYE said:

Pearson is a master of the half truth. When a direct lie does not suit his purpose because it might be too dangerous, he can lie by inference by merely leaving out qualifying remarks and explanation.

The gentleman from Alabama, Congressman FRANK BOYKIN, said:

Drew Pearson is the damnedest liar that ever lived.

The powerful Rules Committee of Congress branded as "a false, malicious lie" statements made by Drew Pearson about the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman COLMER.

White House Secretary, Stephen T. Early, described as a complete lie a story printed in the Washington Merry-Go-Round column written by Drew Pearson and Robert Allen on the recent slaying of an agent of the F. B. I. by two Army deserters in Virginia. "There is no truth in any detail of this story," said Secretary Early.

The gentleman from Oregon, Congressman JAMES W. MOTT, in a statement to the House Naval Affairs Committee, said:

Drew Pearson and Robert Allen are a pair of journalistic polecats.

The gentleman from Minnesota, Representative MELVIN P. MAAS, speaking of Pearson and Allen, declared:

Whoever gave out the scurrilous story is guilty of the grossest kind of contempt.

Here is what Drew Pearson said in a letter about General MacArthur which he himself manufactured:

DEAR GENERAL: You have done a great job and I am going to see that you are rewarded. When Congress convenes I am going to write my Congressman and have him take steps to give you another medal. This medal will have a ribbon on it down the middle of which will be a broad streak of yellow with a piece of baloney on the end.

Think of this, Members of the House, America's No. 1 hero, one of the greatest generals that ever lived, being subjected to this filth and abuse by Drew Pearson.

Drew Pearson, in an issue of Liberty magazine, said:

As the fierce battle around Manila neared a climax, an old friend of Douglas MacArthur's remarked, "Douglas may have to swim for it and he can still do it. But he will have to leave his medals behind, total estimated weight 13 pounds, 16 ounces."

The Washington Times-Herald, the largest newspaper in Washington, which ran Drew Pearson's Washington Merry-Go-Round for a long time, finally threw it out and stated:

We dropped the Washington Merry-Go-Round out of the Times-Herald because of the poisonous attempts Pearson and Allen have made, and are still making, to smear the reputation of a great soldier, and in our opinion one of the greatest Americans of all time, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Here is another crack that Drew Pearson made about General MacArthur, and I quote:

Wire pulling is one of the general's greatest arts. From his first days in West Point he learned how to get on in the Army.

Here is another quotation by Pearson:

But during the World War—

Meaning World War No. 1—

MacArthur won the confidence of Secretary Newton D. Baker, suddenly was promoted from major to brigadier general, was the only brigadier general below the grade of colonel to keep his temporary war rank afterward.

Here is another bit of slime from the pen of Pearson:

MacArthur got in wrong at the White House from the way he slid out of responsibility for the air-mail fiasco. Also the grand

jury investigating Army purchases smeared him for rowing with Woodring.

MacArthur was forced to sue Drew Pearson for libel, and if the Members of this House knew the way Pearson responded to that libel suit to get it dropped not one decent, self-respecting Member of Congress would ever speak to Pearson again.

And now, Members of the House, just let us see the contrast between the war record of General MacArthur and Drew Pearson. General MacArthur served in World War No. 1. General MacArthur is serving again in World War No. 2, having displayed such indescribable courage and ability that today he is unanimously acclaimed as America's No. 1 hero, who is still fighting, still giving his all for his country. Drew Pearson was not in World War No. 1. Drew Pearson, who was young, able-bodied, and single, waited until a few weeks before the end of World War No. 1 to join what—not the Army, but the "Saturday Afternoon Tea Club," which is a slang expression for Student Army Training Corps, one of those bomb proofs from the draft in World War No. 1, almost as popular as Government jobs are today. That was in World War No. 1. Drew Pearson therefore did not fight in World War No. 1, nor is he a member of the armed forces now, nor is he fighting in World War No. 2, though he is one of those who howled loudest for us to get in. But rather his contribution to the war effort is based on a low-down, degrading, cowardly, yellow, stinking pen to defame, to vilify, to humiliate, and to attempt to destroy America's No. 1 hero, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. And, incidentally, the man he is accusing in this boiler transaction, E. A. Jumonville, is too old to be in the armed service, yet he has one son in the armed forces and another son leaving in 1 week for the Army Air Corps. Drew Pearson has no sons in any service.

Now, my friends, I regret that I have had to take up this time in the House of Representatives, but as you know, I thought that perhaps I was the only person that ever had trouble with Drew Pearson until I checked his record. My only comment, therefore, is this: Seldom do I have the unpleasant task of skinning a skunk. I hope I have done the job well.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I made this afternoon in Committee of the Whole I may include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address by Hon. Jesse Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

To Mr. ROBERTSON, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. McCORD, for Friday, Saturday, and Monday, on account of official business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on investigation of civil-service policies and practices of civilian employment in governmental departments at 10 a. m., Friday, May 21, 1943, room 246, House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m., on Friday, May 21, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in room 356, House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, May 24, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Congressman HALLECK.

##### COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Thursday, May 27: Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill to be reported, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the existing war to provide sound flood-control projects and desirable public works. He will be followed by Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, who has previously advised the Flood Control Committee during hearings and who will also appear before the committee and submit his views and discuss generally the projects that have been favorably reported since the hearings were conducted on H. R. 4911, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, reported on June 19, 1941, which became the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Col. George R. Goethals, Chief of the Flood Control Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, will attend the hearings and will furnish to the members of the committee in detail any and all available information respecting the said projects on

which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

The district engineers and the division engineers have furnished to the Chief of Engineers data and information respecting major floods since August 18, 1941, and particularly with respect to recent major floods in the various drainage basins of the country, which will be submitted to the committee.

2. Friday, May 28: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects for the New England region including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers and the middle Atlantic region including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

3. Tuesday, June 1: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, and on projects of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

4. Wednesday, June 2: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

5. Thursday, June 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf, west of the Mississippi River, and in the Western Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

6. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

7. Tuesday, June 8: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

8. Wednesday, June 9: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

429. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned or noncommissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers, and enlisted men," approved July 28, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

430. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting budgets for the fiscal year 1944 for the military and

departmental activities of the War Department, containing estimates of appropriations amounting to \$59,425,586,500, and for the Office of Strategic Services in the amount of \$38,476,000, and proposed provisions affecting said estimates (H. Doc. No. 205); to the Committee on Appropriations.

431. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2745. A bill providing for the erection of a monument at Hammondsport, N. Y., in commemoration of the contribution of Glenn-Hammond Curtiss in the development of aviation; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2746. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work, made necessary by the flood of 1943, on the Missouri River between Pierre, S. Dak., and the mouth; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2747. A bill to amend the act to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2748. A bill to increase the maximum amount of any deposit or trust fund which may be insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 2749. A bill to authorize for the duration of the war the establishment of zones prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors around plants engaged in the production of war materials, and prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors on property of the United States, and to men and women in uniform, for the duration of the war, and prescribing penalties for the violation of any of the provisions of this act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2750. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2751. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of \$10 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from any funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to their credit; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 2752. A bill to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 2753. A bill making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2754. A bill to establish the Office of Power Administration for the coordinated administration of all Federal functions pertaining to the generation, distribution and sale of electricity and the regulation of electric utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. Gwynne:

H. R. 2760. A bill to amend an act approved August 26, 1842, relating to appropriation acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 2426 and Senate bill 971; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation authorizing the people of the Territory of Hawaii to form a constitution and state government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935, so-called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 2755. A bill for the relief of Howard H. Thamas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2756. A bill for the relief of Dr. V. H. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Margaret Hamilton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2758. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Higgins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 2759. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice E. Shinnick; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

828. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

829. Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Wilmington, Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

830. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Dressmakers Union, Local No. 22, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, urging the defeat of the Connally bill (S. 796); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

831. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Frances G. Teichmann, of Aurora, and 19 citizens of Aurora and Evanston, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

832. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Schluhafer, of Aurora, and 19 citizens of Kane County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

833. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Huntington, N. Y., in advocacy of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

834. By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois: Resolution of the Illinois House of Representatives, urging enactment into law of House bills 7 and 51, known as the poll tax and antilynch bills, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

835. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Mrs. Philip Maie and 53 other residents of Schenectady and Niskayuna, N. Y., appealing for the passage of House bill 2082, for by its enactment untold amounts of money, food, materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

836. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, urging the passage by the Congress of the United States of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

837. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mabel E. Eid and 79 other citizens of Canby, Oreg., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

838. By Mr. LANE: Memorial in the nature of a resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the amendment of the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935, so called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

839. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

840. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war

and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

841. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

842. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the East Bay Sponsoring Committee for Public Protest, of Oakland, Calif., against extermination of Jews and other minorities in occupied Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

843. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, Seventeenth Congressional District, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

844. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Rev. Elizabeth R. Choate and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

845. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Alice Girdwood, of Aurora, Ill., and 19 citizens of Kane County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

846. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., urging the Congress of the United States to establish a Chiropractic Corps in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

847. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of R. J. Bennett and 21 other citizens of the city of West Union, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

848. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of L. E. Armel and 72 other citizens of Holton, Kans., urging that the Congress of the United States pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

849. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from Wanda N. Gum, director of student employment, Southern Illinois Normal University, Carbondale, Ill., urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

850. Also, communication from Elizabeth Myrna, corresponding secretary, Business and Professional Women's Club, Harrisburg, Ill., urging the continuance of the National

Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

851. Also, resolution of Local Union No. 117 of the Progressive Mine Workers of America, Eldorado, Ill., signed by Wm. Gallagher, president, and Leonard Smith, secretary, urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

852. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of St. John, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

853. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Sharon, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

854. By Mr. RAMSPECK: Petitions sponsored by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Georgia, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

855. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

856. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the amendment of the Federal Motor Carriers Act, 1935, so-called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

857. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Perth Amboy Smelter and Refinery Workers Union, Perth Amboy, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

858. Also, petition of the Building and Construction Trades Council, Oakland, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House Joint Resolution 96; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Lord of life and power, we would not plead for ourselves alone, but for all who serve Thy cause by word and deed. In fashioning our conception of Thee, we pray that it may be resplendent of justice and august in truth; how much more bravely we would march forward, catching the light that is absorbing the shadow of doubt. In seeking the solution of our problems, give us to understand that calmness is might and candor is the nobility of labor.

With faith in Thy fatherhood as a blessed inheritance, we would have sacred access to Thee as a comfort in all trial and as guide in all wisdom, as an illumination in all darkness and as stability when we need rest. When men and nations live by envy and rivalry, by vanity and physical appetite, O Lord, have mercy on their pauperized souls. We praise Thee for the uncalendared and nameless millions of our country whose industry, sacrifice, and patriotism give abiding assurance to the glory of our common democracy. Spare our land from the selfish rich who disregard the poor and from the discontented poor who envy the rich. Deliver us from these vain tempers which disenchanted many a