for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURCH of Virginia: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2928. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 3020. A bill to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles; without amendment (Rept. No. 601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 262 Resolution authorizing the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to make an investigation of the plans for improvement of the Columbia River; with amendment (Rept. No. 602). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 82. A bill to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 271. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2975, a bill to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 604). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1388. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2922. A bill to further amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2697. A bill to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3050. A bill providing for the promotion of certain substitute rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 3054. A bill to amend the Expediting Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to cause an investigation and report to be made with respect to the existing petroleum situation; 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. FENTON:

H. R. 3051. A bill for the relief of Donato Forlin and Analia Gisella Forlin; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3052. A bill to correct the naval record of Carlo Sclone; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3053. A bill for the relief of the Realty Bond & Mortgage Co. and Robert W. Keith; 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:

1740. By Mr. JACKSON: Petition favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1741. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Oregon, asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1742. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of McConnelsville, Ohio, 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.

1743. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Monroe County, urging 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.

1744. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Cumberland, Ohio, urging 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.

1745. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communications from B. D. Gates, C. M. Hine, and Frank Durfee, all of Harrisburg, and Charley Lockwood, of Galatia, all representative farmers of Saline County, Ill., opposing the proposed subsidy and price roll-back on foods as being unfair to the farmer and additional expense to the taxpayers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1746. Also, communication from the Clay County Farm Bureau, of Clay County, Ill., opposing the proposed subsidy and roll-back on food prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1747. Also, communication from J. King Eaton, president, Sanitary Milk Producers, opposing the proposed subsidy and price roll-back on foods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1748. Also, communications from M. M. Land, Walter L. Clark, Ulla D. Given, and W. L. Miller, all representative farmers of White County, Ill., opposing the proposed subsidy and price roll-back on foods as being unfair to the farmers of the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1749. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of R. T. Kiersey of Franklin, Tex., favoring House bills 1119 and 1167; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1750. By Mr. MAGNUSON: Petition favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1751. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. Frank DeLashmutt and 59 other residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1752. Also, petition of 82 residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 26, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

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

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

Our Father God, we would be valiant in a day when the hearts of many turn to water in them. As we here seek a solution for the Nation's tangled problems, may we not be found unwilling to pay the price of better things. Teach us the vanity and futility of a quest for salvation which leaves ourselves unchanged. We mourn the misunderstandings and suspicions, the alienations, the strife between class and class, which weaken the Nation's strength and sap our vitality when in this age on ages telling we must be strong, for our own sakes and for the sake of the world's tomorrow. As we remember those of our own fellow countrymen who in far places are ready to lay down their lives for the preservation of our heritage of freedom, save us from lowering the shield of national solidarity just as the air is filled with the poison arrows of determined foes.

O Thou, in whose Holy Name our Nation was baptized at its birth, enable us to find that one highway along which we may march together to the promised land. Grant that we may be found among the shining company of prophets and forerunners who, amid the encircling gloom, have sought the mind and the will of God and who have known the time of his visitation and restoration and with faith and hope and love have prepared the way of the Lord. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 25, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hill	Reed
Ball	Holman	Revercomb
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Bilbo	Kilgore	Robertson
Bone	La Follette	Russell
Brewster	Langer	Scrugham
Bridges	Lodge	Shipstead
Brooks	Lucas	Smith
Buck	McCarran	Stewart
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McNary	Tobey
Chavez	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Moore	Van Nuys
George	Murdock	Wagner
Gerry	Murray	Walsh
Green	Nye	Wheeler
Guffey	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gurney	O'Mahoney	White
Hatch	Overton	Willis
Hawkes	Pepper	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate to attend a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent, having been directed by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as a subcommittee to visit the hospital ship which recently reached New York from Africa.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

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

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday when the vote was being taken on the reconsideration of Senate bill 796, the so-called Connally bill, following the veto message by the President, the Senator from Illinois was on the train returning to Washington. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF THE NEAR EAST RELIEF

A letter from the Comptroller of the Near East Relief, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Near East Relief for the year ended December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Printing.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, the Navy (3), Interior (2), and Agriculture; Federal Security Agency, United States Maritime Commission, Federal Power Commission, and the Civil Service Commission which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

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

RACIAL DISORDERS IN DETROIT—RESOLUTION OF THE TUTWILER (MISS.) LIONS CLUB

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Tutwiler (Miss.) Lions Club deploring the maltreatment and slaughter of Negroes in the city of Detroit, in the State of Michigan.

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

Whereas Lions International, and all local Lions Clubs promote peace, harmony, and the Nation's safety; and

Whereas the Tutwiler Lions Club is located in the heart of the Delta section of the deep South, where there are 8 or 10 Negroes to 1 white person; and

Whereas Delta planters and businessmen of this section are vitally concerned about the Negroes to the extent that they see to the matter of providing shelter, food, clothing, doctors, hospitalization, adequate schools, churches, and his general welfare; and

Whereas the Negroes of this section are well cared for, contented on the farms, rearing their families, and making money; and

Whereas we in this section have always lived with the Negroes and have in most cases found them to be faithful laborers and coworkers, with mutual understanding between the two races; and

Whereas it has come to our attention that there are serious racial clashes in industrial centers, and most particularly just recently in the city of Detroit, Mich., where over 25 Negroes were killed and the injured runs up into the hundreds. This condition, we believe, was brought about to a great extent by reason of persons or organizations making unwarranted inducements to colored labor from the deep South and agricultural sections to get them to the northern centers where the Negroes are neither liked nor understood; and

Whereas we desire good treatment, peace, harmony, and understanding of the Negro wherever he goes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we condemn such a program of enticing labor away from sections where they belong, are understood, and liked; and

We do not sanction, but rather deplore, the misunderstandings and maltreatment of the Negro race by the white people of the North, such as occurred in the city above mentioned; and

If the Negro cannot be understood in the North, we can employ him in the South where he is understood and well liked; and

That we send a copy of this resolution to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Hon. James E. Eastland, Hon. Theodore G. Bilbo, Hon. Jamie L. Whitten, the Commercial Appeal, the Jackson Daily News, the Press Scimitar, the Clarion Ledger, and the mayor of Detroit, Mich.

TUTWILER LIONS CLUB,
F. O. MARTIN, *Chairman*.
W. F. FLAUTT,
J. F. ALMOND,
Resolution Committee.

RESOLUTION OF CONFERENCE OF MIDWEST FARM BUREAUS, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION—CONTROL OF FOOD PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a resolution of statement issued by the conference of Midwest Farm Bureaus of the American Farm Bureau Federation recently held in Chicago and ask that it be printed in the RECORD. I am in hearty accord with the appeal made by this conference that the Honorable Chester C. Davis be given control over production and distribution of food including pricing and rationing policies. I think the record made by Mr. Davis in the position he now holds meets with the approval of the agricultural interests of all sections of the country. I ask unanimous consent to present the telegram embodying a statement or resolution of the conference and that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 24, 1943.

To United States Senators and Representatives from the Midwest States, Washington, D. C.:

At a conference of midwest farm bureaus, meeting in Chicago today, the following resolution was adopted: Immediate and positive action is required to meet the critical food problem in this country. In order to avert disaster on the food front, it is our considered opinion that all necessary authority over the food problem must be centered in one individual. A clear-cut, understandable,

and effective food policy in this country now is an indispensable factor, without which the war cannot be won. We therefore urgently recommend that all control over production and distribution of food, including pricing and rationing policies, be given our capable and courageous Food Administrator, Chester C. Davis. Continuation of the present muddled food policy will jeopardize the food supply and will incur the just condemnation, not only of farmers, but of all patriotic Americans.

CONFERENCE OF MIDWEST FARM BUREAUS OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.

CONSERVATION AND PARITY PAYMENTS TO FARMERS—TELEGRAM FROM M. W. THATCHER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received from M. W. Thatcher, president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, in regard to a controversial item in the agricultural appropriation bill. I hope the Senate conferees will insist on the retention of the Senate language relating to the use of the $400,000,000 conservation payments and also providing for parity payments on 1943–44 crops. I think the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives is standing for the best interests of the producers of the country, especially the wheat growers, and I hope the Senate will stand by the group which makes this appeal. I request that the telegram be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *June 24, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

The National Federation of Grain Cooperatives represents more than 1,500 interior cooperative elevator associations, with a membership in excess of 350,000 wheat producers. It is composed of 10 regional cooperative grain marketing organizations extending from the Canadian line to the Gulf of Mexico, and from the Pacific Northwest to Indiana. We have not often asked the Congress of the United States to consider our views. When it comes to wheat marketing and wheat prices, however, we feel that our experience and opinions may be of value to Congress. We are advised that the House of Representatives, in dealing with the current bill for agricultural appropriations, has rejected by voice vote the position taken by the United States Senate relative to soil conservation and agricultural conservation program payments. The House, while supporting $400,000,000 for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—which retains the $100,000,000 increase inserted by the Senate, as compared with the original House bill for $300,000,000—has restricted payments to be made out of the $400,000,000 to soil-building and water-conservation practices, thus eliminating the agricultural conservation program payments. As matters now stand, on the wheat crop produced for 1942–43 marketing agricultural conservation program payments were made last fall at 9 7/10 cents per bushel. Parity payments will be made on the crop marketed in 1942–43. But as to the wheat now growing, which will be marketed in 1943–44, the wheat producer this time is only eligible for 85 percent of parity through a loan program, and by way of comment, with the price of wheat on most cash markets now under the 85-percent loan price, it appears highly ridiculous for the Office of Price Administration to be considering ceilings on wheat at this time. The wheat farmers are not threatening a general walk-out. The House has failed to authorize parity payments, and has eliminated agricultural conservation program payments in 1944. This means that for the 1943–44 marketing of wheat the wheat farmer will receive only the support of an 85-percent loan. He has no assurance of any parity payments. Based on the House vote there will be no agricultural conservation program payments. As a matter of information to wheat Senators, wheat farmers during this current marketing year past received loans at 85 percent of parity, agricultural conservation program payments of 9 7/10 cents per bushel, which were made last fall, and such parity payments as you may provide by appropriations in the current bill. Wheat is the only basic commodity now below parity. Many people high in the Department of Agriculture apparently have come to the ridiculous conclusion that 85-percent of parity is all that wheat farmers should have, although relatively the cost of producing corn is much less than the cost of producing wheat in relation to parity prices. Rightfully we expect the wheat Senators to make a fight to enable wheat producers to collect full parity price. We also expect the statesmanship of the Senators who are not from the wheat States to accord treatment to wheat producers which would give them a price and income comparable to cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. The position of the United States Senate in all fairness to wheat producers would be that the Senate would not concur in the House language as regards the use of $400,000,000 by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration next year which earmarks soil-conservation funds only for "soil-building and water-conservation practices." Such a restriction excludes proper price consideration and income to the wheat producers. Specifically the Senate, by debate and by language in the appropriations bill now under consideration, must make certain that the wheat farmers will not only receive the benefit of an 85-percent loan, but that agricultural conservation program payments may be made out of the $400,000,000, and that the balance to bring wheat prices to parity shall be supported by authorization for appropriations to continue parity payments next year. The regional cooperative grain-marketing organizations which are members of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives maintain headquarters at the following marketing places: Indianapolis, Ind.; Amarillo, Tex.; Enid, Okla.; Hutchinson, Kans.; Kansas City, Mo.; Omaha, Nebr.; Denver, Colo.; Ogden, Utah; Portland, Oreg.; Spokane, Wash.; Great Falls, Mont.; the twin ports of Duluth and Superior at the head of the Great Lakes; and the twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. Repeating we seldom raise our voice on matters before Congress, but we do speak out of long-time experience in the field of the production and distribution and sale of grain and feed products, and we feel strongly the responsibility of representing more wheat producers than all general farm organizations combined. We are pressing to secure approximately 23 cents a bushel for the wheat producer, who is now producing more than ever without time and one-half for overtime and double time for Sundays. We do not ask for more than parity. This is what the 1938 Farm Act calls for. The wheat farmers have a right to expect parity. Because of their confidence in the good faith of Congress in enacting the 1938 Farm Act, Congress should either sustain this faith or rewrite this fundamental farm legislation to state whatever it determines ought to be a fair price.

Respectfully yours,
M. W. THATCHER,
President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 250. A bill to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife; with an amendment (Rept. No. 359).

By Mr. SCRUGHAM, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. Res. 161. Resolution authorizing an investigation with respect to the construction and maintenance of Federal-aid highways, including allocation of materials, equipment, and manpower; without amendment; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 25, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 219) to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 1273. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court for the district of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of residents of St. Georges, Del.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1274. A bill for the relief of Vodie Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1275. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1276. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nathan Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1277. A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to certain persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AMENDMENT TO SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. OVERTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3030, the second deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 10, after line 23, to insert the following:

"WAR DEPARTMENT—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"CORPS OF ENGINEERS—RIVERS AND HARBORS

"For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of projects heretofore authorized, including the objects and purposes and subject to the conditions specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, to be available until expended, $7,095,000."

VIEWS OF SENATOR VANDENBERG ON SMITH-CONNALLY BILL

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have received numerous letters from Michigan regarding the Smith-Connally bill, which, under the pressure of time, I have been unable to answer, but I presented my view of the situation in a letter to one of my labor union friends in Michigan, which is sufficiently typical so that I should like very much to have it printed at this point in the RECORD, if I may have unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

MY DEAR MR. ———: I greatly appreciate the open-minded spirit in which you have written me about the so-called Connally-Smith bill. I am indebted to you for your friendly candor; let me be equally frank in my reply.

In my humble opinion, the rank and file of organized labor has often been misled regarding this so-called antilabor bill. The bill has just one purpose, namely, to prevent interruptions in the production of war goods necessary to sustain our sons at the fighting front. Whatever may be the political consequences (to which you refer) of supporting such an objective, let the chips fall where they may. What happens to me politically is of no moment to me or to the country, but what happens to our fighting sons is of vital concern to us all.

Organized labor made a magnificent no-strike pledge after Pearl Harbor. A vast majority of organized labor has faithfully kept this pledge—to its everlasting credit. Unfortunately, however, there have been, and still are, serious crippling exceptions to this rule. The so-called antistrike bill will not affect adversely any labor union which keeps this pledge. It will affect only those who break this pledge. I confess that it seems to me those who keep their pledge should be the very first to welcome any efforts by the Government to prevent a small minority from breaking their pledge. It is no reflection on the former that we find it necessary to discipline the latter. Only a small percentage of our people ever break any of our laws, but they do not object—on the contrary, they are the chief supporters—when laws are passed to control crime. We need no laws at all to protect the great law-abiding majority. It is in their defense that they insist upon laws to curb lawbreaking minorities. In my view, the great labor-union majority will immensely benefit when the law assists in protecting it against these small minorities which, however unjustifiedly, threaten the repute of all organized labor.

This bill, by its own terms, expires when the war is over. It is exclusively a war measure. With great care and specific reference, it protects every collateral right of labor under the Wagner Act, the Wages and Hours Act, etc. It particularly protects every individual member of a union. The President himself has said that he objects seriously only to section 8, which, in the final analysis, guarantees to each individual member of a union the right to vote whether his plant shall be struck or not. It seems to me that is the very essence of democracy.

In my opinion, this bill is necessary to the war effort—and, if I may say so, to the long-range welfare of labor itself. In my view, it is necessary to the earliest possible victory with the least possible casualties. Frankly, I shall always put that objective ahead of all others, and I am certain that I do not offend labor's great rank and file when I do.

An unauthorized strike in Texas last week cost an oil production sufficient to carry 1,000 bombers into Germany. I do not believe that the great rank and file of labor has any remote sympathy with that sort of a contribution to the Axis. I certainly do not believe that the prevention of such a tragedy has any adverse effect upon the rights of labor unions in the United States—quite the contrary. Yes; this is an exception to the rule. The general labor record and the mass labor attitude is magnificent. But, in my humble opinion, that is all the more reason why labor itself should welcome any reasonable proposals devoted exclusively to the prevention of exceptions to the rule.

In many particulars this bill is far from satisfactory to me. But its assets—to the public welfare, to victory in this war, and to labor's own enlightened self-interest—far outweigh its liabilities, as I view it. The bill has been sustained by overwhelming majorities in both House and Senate—including the votes of many whom labor would readily identify as among its best friends. I submit that labor would do well to ponder this significant fact. In any event, if I have lost the labor vote on this account, as you suggest, I am at least at peace with my own conscience and with my sense of loyalty to our fighting sons.

I have wanted to make this complete statement to you so that you may know that I have been moved by a profound conviction in making this difficult decision.

With warm personal regards and best wishes,

Cordially and faithfully yours,

A. H. VANDENBERG.

AMERICAN NATIONALISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of American Nationalism, delivered by him on June 25, 1943, and the introductory remarks of the station announcer, which appear in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS D. BRANDEIS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address in tribute to the late Louis D. Brandeis, delivered by Senator LUCAS before the Memorial Association of Chicago, on June 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR GRISWOLD OF NEBRASKA AT GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Gov. Dwight Griswold of Nebraska at the Governors' Conference, Columbus, Ohio, June 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRANSPORTATION OF TROOPS, ETC.—ADDRESS BY COL. K. W. THOM

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Col. K. W. Thom, of the Port Transportation Division, New York Port of Embarkation, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. REILLY, PRESIDENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BANKERS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by John A. Reilly, president of the District of Columbia Bankers Association, at the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the association, on June 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPENING OF SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANT IN WEST VIRGINIA—ARTICLE BY ROGER WILLIAM RIIS

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Roger William Riis, entitled "Rubber—It's Coming at Last," published in the Reader's Digest for July 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENTS—LETTER FROM WILLIAM J. GOODWIN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by William J. Goodwin, of New York City, regarding international investments, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FOUR FREEDOMS FLAG—ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Four Freedoms Flag," by George E. Sokolsky, published in the New York Sun of June 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. LEWIS AND CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mr. Lewis and Congress," by Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of Thursday, June 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], as modified, to perfect the committee amendment, inserting section 5, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Chair calls attention to the unanimous-consent order providing for a vote on the amendment as modified at not later than 1 o'clock today, and for a division of the intervening time between the proponents and opponents, to be controlled respectively by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may desire to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not prepared to speak at this time. I may want only 2 or 3 minutes, but I have to wait for material to come from my office. If the Senate is ready for a vote on the Clark amendment, let us proceed to vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I am ready for a vote.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Bone	Butler
Andrews	Brewster	Byrd
Ball	Bridges	Capper
Bankhead	Brooks	Caraway
Bilbo	Buck	Chavez

Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Russell
Downey	McFarland	Scrugham
Eastland	McKellar	Shipstead
Ferguson	McNary	Smith
George	Maloney	Stewart
Gerry	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
Green	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Guffey	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Gurney	Moore	Tobey
Hatch	Murdock	Truman
Hawkes	Murray	Tunnell
Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Hill	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Holman	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	Wagner
Kilgore	Pepper	Walsh
La Follette	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Langer	Reed	Wherry
Lodge	Revercomb	White
Lucas	Reynolds	Willis
McCarran	Robertson	Wilson

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to occupy the floor for only a moment or two.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator going to address the Senate?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. For about 2 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like about 3 minutes after the Senator shall have concluded his remarks.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from J. C. Mohler, secretary of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, Topeka, Kans., in which he takes a strong stand against the subsidy and roll-back program. I regard Mr. Mohler as one of the best authorities in the West on agricultural matters. I ask that his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
State House, Topeka, June 23, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Perhaps there could be no more effective way to destroy democracy than to follow through the scheme of roll-back and subsidy, as inevitably it would lead to complete subjugation of the people.

The husbandmen with whom I have discussed this subject are vigorously opposed to Government subsidies as a solution of their problems, and I suspect their views pretty well reflect farm sentiment generally.

Sincerely yours,
J. C. MOHLER, *Secretary.*

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, yesterday I had occasion on this floor to question the accuracy of a statement contained in letters written by the Loan Administrator, Mr. Jesse Jones, to the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Georgia, and myself, and possibly to other Senators. I took exception to the accuracy of the statement in Mr. Jones' letter that definite commitments to the extent of $450,000,000 had been made for the payment of subsidies on meat, butter, and coffee. I did not believe that statement to be true.

Since yesterday, through the courtesy of Representative CURTIS of Nebraska, I have been furnished with a letter written by Mr. Jones just 2 days before the letter to which I have referred. The letter to Representative CURTIS completely demonstrates the inaccuracy of the letter read in the Senate Chamber yesterday, because in the letter to Representative CURTIS Mr. Jones adopted the same figure $450,000,000, and set that down, not as a commitment on the part of the Government which the Government would be bound to pay, but as the estimated cost of the whole program for a year.

Mr. President, it seems to me that Mr. Jones has been very much less than frank in his dealings with the Congress; because it would have been just as accurate and just as fair if Mr. Jones had sent here a letter in which he said that the Government had definite commitments of $4,500,000,000, the estimated cost of the program for the next 10 years, as it would be to say that the Government was committed to the extent of $450,000,000, because that was the estimated cost for 1 year; for, as a matter of fact, Mr. Jones and everyone else knows that if the Congress should see fit to adopt the pending amendment, the Government would not be obligated to the extent of the stated cost for the next year.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I understand that the President's directive putting the program into execution carried the figure $450,000,000 as the amount estimated for the cost of carrying out the program for 1 year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct; that amount was the estimated cost of the program for 1 year. If Congress stops the program, the Government is not obligated to the expenditure of $450,000,000.

Mr. HILL. That may be true; but I am sure that Mr. Jones in using the word "commitment" had in mind that, so far as he was concerned or so far as those who were responsible for carrying out the program were concerned, in using the figure $450,000,000, which was the amount for the program for a year's time, certainly so far as they were concerned, in giving out the press releases and other statements, they had a commitment for a year's time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if Congress stops the execution of the program, of course, the Government is not committed to that expenditure. What Mr. Jones was trying to convey in the letter which was laid on my desk and on the desk of the Senator from Georgia and on the desk of the Senator from Vermont and on the desk of the Senator from Colorado was that the program would cost $450,000,000 even if the Clark amendment were agreed to; and he was trying to fight the Clark amendment in that way.

Mr. HILL. Of course, everyone knows the program would not cost $450,000,000 if the Clark amendment were agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The purport of the letter is as I have stated.

Mr. HILL. But if the program were carried out under the President's program, as launched, it would cost $450,000,000; and the President in the program set out $450,000,000 as the cost for a year's duration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the program were carried out for 10 years, it would cost $4,500,000,000; but that does not represent a commitment which the Government is required to pay.

I yield now to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on any of the amendments, I should like to summarize what would be the result of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and myself.

The amendment would provide a third and a new price standard for maximum price ceilings on agricultural commodities, raw or processed, namely, the support price announced for an agricultural commodity by the Department of Agriculture.

The amendment, if agreed to, would eliminate immediately upon enactment the roll-back and subsidy program on butter and meats and the purchase-and-sale-at-loss program on cheddar cheese. We all know that 50 percent of the butter and cheese is now required to be set aside for the use of the United States Government, anyway.

The amendment, if agreed to, would make good the Government's promise to pay subsidies on butter and meat for the period from June 1, 1943, until the amendment became law.

The amendment would permit the continuation of incentive payments or subsidies to producers for the current crop season only on, first, the canning crops, such as tomatoes, corn, peas, beans, and possibly others; second, the specialty crops, such as dried peas and beans; and, third, on potatoes, hemp, sugar, and possibly other crops.

The amendment would permit the continuation of the Government's price support program on domestic vegetable oils and fats. It would permit the continuation of the Government's existing program on the sale of wheat for feed purposes. It would permit the inauguration of a subsidy program for the purpose of increasing production or for any other purpose upon first securing the approval of Congress. It would require orderly legislative procedure in procuring and expending public funds, in lieu of a blank check.

There are some things which the amendment would not do. It would not increase prices to consumers; it would restore the prices of butter and meat to the prices which prevailed 1 week ago. The amendment would not prohibit subsidy programs, but would only require prior congressional approval.

The amendment would not prohibit the payment of subsidies to secure strategic and critical materials, such as copper, lead, and zinc.

The amendment would not prohibit the payment of subsidies for increased costs of transportation. It would not prohibit carrying out to conclusion the

presently committed legitimate subsidies for the purpose of increasing the necessary production of war-essential food products; and it would not deprive the O. P. A. of any legitimate powers which have already been delegated by Congress to that agency for the control of prices.

Mr. President, I wish to say further that yesterday the House by an almost unanimous vote—not a sufficient number of Members of the House raised their hands to obtain a record vote on the question—adopted an amendment virtually the same as the amendment I have offered on behalf of the Senator from Iowa and myself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words on the pending amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator speaking in the time of the Senator from Missouri or the time of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I yield a part of my time to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, Mr. President; I desire to speak in the time of the Senator from Alabama. I shall say only a few words.

In view of the fact that the House in acting on this proposed legislation has agreed to an amendment which is substantially the same as the one proposed by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Iowa, the adoption now of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri would effectively close the door to any solution of the food problem, as I see it, in the conference. Since the Clark amendment would positively forbid the use of subsidies with respect to food, the result would be that there would be the roll-back upon the producer of food. We desire to avoid that.

All representatives of agricultural States realize how important it is that the producer of agricultural commodities shall be able to obtain the cost of production from the returns which he receives. If he cannot obtain the cost of production from the returns which come when ceilings have been fixed upon retail prices, he will be in a quite impossible position. But the will of the country is clearly supporting the war against inflation. Public opinion will support the control of retail prices. The inevitable result, therefore, of our closing the door entirely to the use of subsidies would be that the roll-back would go all the way down to the farmer, and we should thus have achieved the very thing we seek to avoid.

It is not necessary for me to add another word about the uncertainties which would be created by the Clark amendment with respect to mineral development in the West and elsewhere.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that the Clark amendment should be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], as modified, to the committee amendment, inserting section 5. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted on page 5, line 16, and extending down to and including the word "purpose" in line 10, on page 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

That on and after the date of enactment of this act no authority shall be exercised by the Price Administrator, the Federal Loan Administrator, or any other governmental agency or corporation with respect to the making of any subsidy payments under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and any authority contained in such section with respect to the making of subsidy payments is hereby repealed: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the rights or interests of any person who has acted in good faith in reliance upon any regulation or order issued prior to the date of enactment of this act with respect to such subsidy payments under the authority of such section 2 (e), and to the extent necessary to protect the rights or interests of any such person in connection with transactions heretofore made or entered into such subsidy payments may be made: *Provided further*, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and, through its subsidiary corporations, (a) to pay to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency and (b) to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the high cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof: *Provided further*, That in any case in which a commodity is domestically produced, the powers granted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by the foregoing proviso shall be exercised with respect to the importations of such commodity only to the extent that, in the judgment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the domestic production of the commodity is not sufficient to satisfy the demand therefor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent, having been directed by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as a subcommittee to visit the hospital ship which recently reached New York from Africa.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Assocation at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are unavoidably absent. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is unavoidably detained on departmental business.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—39

Aiken	Gurney	Shipstead
Brewster	Hawkes	Smith
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	McClellan	Tobey
Butler	McKellar	Tydings
Byrd	McNary	Van Nuys
Capper	Millikin	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ferguson	Reed	White
George	Reynolds	Willis
Gerry	Robertson	Wilson

NAYS—37

Andrews	La Follette	Overton
Ball	Langer	Pepper
Bankhead	Lodge	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Lucas	Russell
Bone	McCarran	Scrugham
Caraway	McFarland	Stewart
Chavez	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Maybank	Truman
Green	Mead	Tunnell
Guffey	Murdock	Vandenberg
Hayden	Murray	Wagner
Hill	O'Daniel	
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—20

Austin	Clark, Idaho	Hatch
Bailey	Connally	Johnson, Calif.
Barbour	Danaher	Revercomb
Barkley	Davis	Taft
Burton	Ellender	Wallgren
Bushfield	Gillette	Wiley
Chandler	Glass	

So the amendment of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, as modified, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has been in session practically every morning and afternoon this week, and I have been attending its sessions. Therefore, what I shall say on the vote which has just been had will be for the purpose merely of making my position plain, and I shall speak for only a moment.

I am opposed to subsidies; hence I voted for the Clark amendment. However, I do not feel that that vote barring subsidies from price fixing should be construed as putting the stamp of approval upon the present ratio existing between prices and wages.

Yesterday, when Mr. Brown of the O. P. A. appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, he stated that he had full authority to fix all prices on the farm or off the farm so as to create a fair relationship between prices and wages. I expect that to be done without any subsidies of any kind or description. That was why we supported the O. P. A. law in the first place, and there is no reason why it cannot be done now. What is needed is not more legislation or more money, but more "guts" in order to give squareness to the situation on both sides of the equation.

I believe that the farmer is entitled to no more than a fair price; and if prices for meat or anything else are higher than the fair price for such commodities they ought to be cut back without any subsidy. We cannot justify the payment of an agricultural subsidy any more than we can justify the payment of a wage subsidy. We ought to stay out of the subsidy business and go into this situation fairly and squarely. Give the farmer his comparable relative relationship on the price side of the equation and labor the same relationship on the other side of the equation. I do not intend to take the responsibility, either directly or indirectly, for any variation from that program.

Insofar as the law is concerned, technically a case can be made out for giving authority for the imposition of subsidies. But when we voted for the law subsidies were conceived to be useful only for critical material which could be produced only at an economic loss. That is not the situation for which subsidies are proposed to be used in the instant case. There is no evidence that these commodities are being produced at an economic loss, and therefore the subsidy principle has no justification. I wish to see the O. P. A. roll back any price which the farmer is receiving which is more than his rightful price, just as I expect it to hold the line on the wage situation. The working man is entitled to translate on a fair basis his earnings into food, clothing, and shelter. In my opinion that has not been done. He is entitled to have it done, and if the prices of certain agricultural commodities are too high, I expect the O. P. A. to adjust them so that they will be fair to the farmer and to the working man, just as I expect wages to be fixed at a level where they will be fair to the farmer as well as to the working man. That is the reason I cannot support this measure. I have asked for a few minutes to make my position known, so that there may be no misinterpretation of it. I do not intend to take the responsibility for failure in the price structure or wage structure when all the authority to deal with both has already been given copiously by the Congress.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield if I have not given up the floor.

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator is in favor of inflation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, that is like a baby crying for milk. Of course, I am not in favor of inflation.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, that is the effect of the entire argument which the Senator has made.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a minute. So long as the Senator has raised the question, let us see who is in favor of inflation. Let us consider the statement which I made. What did I say? I said that prices should be held down in relation to wages, which are being held down. I will ask the Senator if he is in favor of that.

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator may go ahead and state his position.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator a question.

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes; I am in favor of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well. Why does the Senator want to keep prices up by using the inflationary powers of the Government to keep them higher than they ought to be?

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator's point is not proved.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point is that the Senator is in favor of inflation. He does not know it, because he has not thought about it enough, but his own words condemn him to that side of the argument.

Mr. GUFFEY. I do not agree with the Senator's statement. He is in favor of inflation, and his entire statement proves that he is in favor of inflation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the question now pending before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the so-called Aiken substitute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would it be in order for me now to offer an amendment in the form of a new section to the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be in order to offer an amendment at the end of the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said a new section of the bill, an amendment to the bill itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be in order to amend the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Apparently I have not made myself clear. The committee has offered certain amendments. I desire to offer an amendment which would not deal with any of the amendments which have been offered, but would be a new section of the bill. Would that be in order at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would now not be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have discovered a typographical error in the printed copy of the so-called Clark amendment which has just been agreed to by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to correct the error. On page 2, line 13 of the amendment, I ask to strike out "(a)" and in line 14, after the comma, to insert "(a)."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention was diverted. What is the request which has been made by the able Senator from Colorado?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has asked unanimous consent that a typographical error in the Clark amendment be corrected.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question now recurs on the so-called Aiken substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the so-called Aiken substitute for the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment offered by Mr. AIKEN for himself and Mr. GILLETTE, to the committee amendment as amended is as follows:

On page 5, lines 16 through 25, and on page 6, lines 1 through 12, strike all of same and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 5. No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity or commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and its products and livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 as amended by Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof in the market place, the higher of, the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, or the support price therefor as heretofore or hereafter announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or

the War Food Administrator and which maximum price shall conform in all other respects to the provisions of section 3 of such act, as amended; nor shall any subsidy or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to the effective date hereof, be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, or (2) as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices already or hereafter established, or (3) to maintain any maximum price already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose, except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, with respect to which the Government or any agency thereof was committed to the payment of such subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943, or to Government-owned wheat sold for feeding purposes only if sold at not less than the parity price of corn, or to prevent such adjustments in the price supports and price ceilings on competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats as may be required to bring about or to maintain the necessary relationship in the prices of such products that is required to assure adequate production for the war effort: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use. The definition of the term 'person' in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 shall apply to the term 'person' as used herein."

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that the vote now being taken is on the Aiken substitute for the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. As amended.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a substitute for the committee amendment as amended by the Clark amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So that a vote in the affirmative on the Aiken amendment will be a vote to supplant the action on the Clark amendment just taken by the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No debate is in order. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent, having been directed by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as a subcommittee to visit the hospital ship which recently reached New York from Africa.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

I also announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are unavoidably absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is unavoidably detained on departmental business.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken	Bone	Capper
Andrews	Brewster	Caraway
Ball	Bridges	Chavez
Bankhead	Brooks	Downey
Bilbo	Butler	Eastland
Green	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Murdock	Tobey
Hill	Nye	Truman
Holman	Overton	Tunnell
La Follette	Pepper	Vandenberg
Langer	Radcliffe	Wagner
Lucas	Russell	White
McCarran	Scrugham	Willis
McNary	Shipstead	
Maloney	Smith	

NAYS—29

Buck	McClellan	Robertson
Byrd	McFarland	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Millikin	Tydings
Gerry	Moore	Van Nuys
Gurney	Murray	Walsh
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Kilgore	Reed	Wilson
Lodge	Reynolds	

NOT VOTING—21

Austin	Clark, Idaho	Glass
Bailey	Connally	Hatch
Barbour	Danaher	Johnson, Calif.
Barkley	Davis	Revercomb
Burton	Ellender	Taft
Bushfield	George	Wallgren
Chandler	Gillette	Wiley

So Mr. AIKEN'S amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would it be in order now to offer a substitute for the committee amendment as amended?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would not be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In that case, I offer an amendment as a new section to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first question is on the committee amendment as amended. When that has been acted upon, the Senator's amendment will be in order.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

The first sentence of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided further*, That the authority conferred by this subsection with respect to the buying, selling, storage, and use of commodities and the making of subsidy payments to domestic producers thereof, shall, in the case of any commodity used for food purposes, be exercised only by or under the direction of the War Food Administrator and only in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production of food in the quantities specified by the President to assure an adequate supply of food for the armed forces, for the essential civilian needs, for carrying out the purposes of the act of March 11, 1941, and for war relief purposes: *Provided further*, That no such subsidy payments shall be made unless the average price received by producers in the market place for such commodities meets the requirements of section 3 of the act approved Octo-

ber 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.): *Provided further*, That the amount of such subsidy payments shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount recommended by the President and approved by the Congress: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the payment by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other Government agency of subsidies which have accrued prior to the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment was thoroughly explained yesterday, and I do not desire to take the time of the Senate today to repeat any part of what was said then. The pending measure, in its present form, is in such shape that the conferees will have quite a task to work out a finally acceptable bill, and I hope that the amendment will be agreed to so that it may go to conference.

Mr. HILL. Will not the Senator briefly summarize his amendment?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it would be well to do that, because some Senators are now in the Chamber who were not present yesterday.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The purpose of the amendment is to transfer from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration to the War Food Administrator all the functions which, under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act, were vested in the Administrator of O. P. A. so far as food is concerned. It is therefore the first and only recognition of the desirability of having a Food Administrator which has been presented to the Senate for approval in the consideration of the pending bill.

The amendment authorizes the President to make recommendations to the War Food Administrator with respect to the maximum amount of food necessary to carry on the war effort, to determine how much food is necessary for the armed forces, for essential civilian needs, for the purposes of lend-lease, and for the purposes of war relief.

Representatives of the executive arm of the Government, in the Department of Agriculture and elsewhere, are doing everything in their power to outline a program for furnishing food to the occupied nations after the war shall have ended and when such nations have been recovered from the Axis. Programs are developing for sending food to our allies. It is recognized, for example, that Russia is in as great need of food as of guns. The amendment recognizes that important aspect of our war effort.

The amendment then contains a provision prohibiting the use of any subsidy payments for food "unless the average price received by producers in the market place for such commodities meets the requirements" set forth by Congress, and the Executive, when the Executive approved it, in the act of October 2, 1942. It provides for recommendations by the President and approval by the Congress, so that it preserves the power of Congress to approve all such payments.

Finally, it contains a provision that nothing in the act shall be construed to prevent the payment, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other Government agency, of subsidies which have accrued prior to the date of the approval of the act.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I notice that the Senator uses the term "War Food Administrator." Has this office been created by the Congress at any time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it was created by Executive order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Could it not be annulled by another Executive order?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It could be, of course, but this would be a statutory recognition which I think would have the effect of preventing such annulment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think I am very much in favor of the Senator's amendment, but I am a little disturbed by the situation of confusion which might develop. As I recall, in the basic law creating the O. P. A. we set up a dual food control, part of it under O. P. A. and part of it under the Department of Agriculture. Why does the Senator use the War Food Administrator instead of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Congress yesterday passed, over the veto of the President, the Connally bill. That bill contained the only statutory recognition, to date, of the War Labor Board. The War Labor Board, like the War Food Administrator, was established by Executive order, but when the Connally bill became law, as it did yesterday, recognizing the War Labor Board, in my opinion it fixed that Board, gave it a legal status and legal authority, and it could not thereafter be done away with by mere Executive order.

With respect to the War Food Administrator, the condition is exactly the same. I misunderstood the Senator's inquiry when he first stated it. I thought he was referring to the individual holding the position, but I feel that if the amendment shall be agreed to, it will be a statutory recognition of the office which cannot be changed except by statutory enactment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will yield further, I think a very bad practice was established in the Connally-Smith bill, so-called. In my opinion, Congress is making a very great mistake in recognizing agencies set up by Executive order instead of creating them by legislative enactment, and I do not see why it is necessary in this case to refer to the War Food Administrator when we might just as well refer to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My reason for doing so was to bring about coordination of the steps which have already been taken by the Executive with the step I am urging the Congress to take. I think the Senator's doubt can be settled, and I modify my amendment by adding in line 2, page 2, after the word "Administrator," the words "hereby created", so that it will read, "exercised only by or under the direction of the War Food Administrator, hereby created."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator's amendment as printed was an amendment of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. Since the amendment was offered, and since it has been printed, the Senate has agreed to the Aiken amendment. I should like to have the Senator summarize for the Senate what will be the effect of his amendment if agreed to now, in view of the action of the Senate in adopting the Aiken amendment. I should like to have him relate his amendment to the Aiken amendment, if he will.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this introduces a complication which in my opinion can only be settled by the conferees. The amendment gives the conferees the opportunity to work out a constructive bill. It does not modify the Aiken amendment, because it is not offered as a substitute for the Aiken amendment.

Mr. HILL. The Senator feels that it would leave the door open for the conferees?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I definitely feel it would.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] as modified. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

On a division, the amendment as modified was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the conferees will now have considerable latitude when they confer on the provisions of the bill, and I think it is only fair to the country and to the executive departments of the Government that the Congress unequivocally declare its attitude on the question of subsidies. If the Congress is not in favor of subsidies, if some effective plan of subsidies is not to be worked out, let us say so, and abandon the idea, and then put it right in the lap of the administrative agencies to do the things that Congress has required by its action.

If Congress wishes to take the responsibility for disturbing the whole present equilibrium in wages and prices, Congress has that right, Congress has that power; but let Congress take the responsibility before the country for doing it.

If I were in former Senator Prentiss Brown's place, I would consider the vote which the Senate has already cast as a vote against subsidies. He has already had the vote of the House. If I were in his place, I would not employ any subsidies, but I would follow along with the inevitable consequences of the policy the Congress has declared, let the consequences be what they may.

Mr. President, I am not saying which is the wiser course. I am saying only that the Congress seems to have spoken on the subject, and the administrative

agencies of the Government might as well recognize that that is the will of the Congress and of the country. If I were in their place I would not dally with the hope that there is going to be any other authority or funds conferred upon them to alter the course which they will have to follow in consequence of the congressional action.

I think that in view of the action of the House and the vote of the Senate, there is no use for us to entertain any delusion about this matter, in the hope that the conferees will be able to work out anything which will preserve the subsidy principle. The sooner we get down to bedrock in this matter and decide what we really want to do, the sooner will we make some substantial progress in the solution of the situation which is now confronting the country, because it is my personal belief that the whole thing is about to crack up. The sooner we discover whether it is or not the sooner we will find it possible to make some substantial progress toward the winning of the war.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, during the discussion of the bill, much has been said about inflation. I want the RECORD to show that I do not think the bill contains any remedy for inflation. I shall vote for it because in the administration of the law as affecting the price of food, an evil has arisen which, I think, requires a remedy. I also desire to state that there has been much fluctuation in administration to add to the general confusion, which is bad for the whole psychology of the country, the morale of the country, and also for the war effort.

Mr. President, the cost of living must be hitched to the price paid to the original producer of the raw material. The price paid to the producer of the raw material must be sufficiently high to insure production. When we get it high enough to insure production, then we can fix the cost of living on that basis. Had we followed that course it is my opinion that we would have avoided all the confusion and change which have brought about a situation which inspired a letter to me from a farmer in Minnesota in which he said "There is so much bum thinking in Washington that we do not know where we are going to land." He further said, "Things are out of joint, and we do not seem to be able to get them back in joint." He also said, "There is too much back and forth, and forth and back, and so we go from nothing to nothing."

Mr. President, it is my opinion that if the bill which was passed by the Congress at the request of the President on last Labor Day had not been vetoed, we would have had something to which we could anchor with some definiteness the price of farm products. And if we could anchor the price of farm products we could have a basis upon which to calculate the cost of living with equity all down the line.

Mr. President, this is not a complete statement of my position. At a more appropriate time I shall expect to address the Senate somewhat in extenso on the subject. But I do not want the bill to be passed without making my position clear that the problem of inflation has still not been met, and it is not going to be met by the passage of this bill. As I previously said, I shall vote for it, in order to deal with an evil which has arisen by the assumption on the part of the executive departments that they have authority to do things which has not been granted to them by Congress, and the passage of this measure will compel them to come back to Congress for permission to do what they think they ought to do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I assume the amendments to the bill have all been disposed of. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2869.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the House bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I now move to amend the bill by striking out all after the enacting clause, and substituting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2869) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KILGORE in the chair). Without objection, Senate bill 1108 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 2869, the one which was just passed, to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, be printed with the Senate amendment, so that we may have the bill showing the amendment as the Senate passed it a short time ago.

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

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2935 making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hill	Reed
Ball	Holman	Revercomb
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Bilbo	Kilgore	Robertson
Bone	La Follette	Russell
Brewster	Langer	Scrugham
Bridges	Lodge	Shipstead
Brooks	Lucas	Smith
Buck	McCarran	Stewart
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McNary	Tobey
Chavez	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Moore	Van Nuys
George	Murdock	Wagner
Gerry	Murray	Walsh
Green	Nye	Wheeler
Guffey	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gurney	O'Mahoney	White
Hatch	Overton	Willis
Hawkes	Pepper	Wilson

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a brief explanation as set forth in the report may assist in the consideration of the bill. The bill makes appropriations for the Labor Department of the Government and for Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1943–44. The amount of the bill as it passed the House was $1,086,059,499. The amount of the increase by the Senate committee is $52,963,311. The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate and now before the Senate is $1,139,022,810.

The amount of the appropriation for the current year, that is, the amount of the appropriation made in 1942 for the current year 1942–43, was $1,200,656,023.

The amount of the regular and supplemental estimates for 1944, that is, the amount coming from the Bureau of the Budget, was $1,249,031,110. The bill as reported to the Senate is under the estimates for 1944 in the amount of $110,008,300, and is under the appropriation for 1943, that is to say, it is less than the appropriation on which those agencies are now working, in the sum of $61,633,213.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the bill be proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary", at the top of page 4, to insert:

Salaries and expenses, Working Conditions Service, Division of Labor Standards (national defense): For salaries and expenses necessary to provide for the extension of advisory service to labor and management in national defense industries in connection with the promotion of health, safety, employment stabilization, proper working conditions, and amicable industrial relations, including items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriations under the Department of Labor for contingent expenses, traveling expenses, and printing and binding; and reimbursement to employees at not to exceed 3 cents per mile for expenses of official travel performed in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations, $700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau", on page 7, line 24, after the word "Act", to strike out "$200,000", and insert "$253,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maternal and Child Welfare", on page 8, line 9, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$378,000"; and in the same line, after the item just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any instruction, order, or regulation relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminates between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 22, after the name "Children's Bureau", to strike out "$4,000,000", and insert "$4,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Food and Drug Administration", on page 16, line 5, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$2,200,000" and insert "$2,323,580."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 25, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$94,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Howard University", on page 18, line 25, after the word "funds", to strike out "$591,240" and insert "$597,840."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education", on page 20, line 21, after the word "students", to strike out "whose technical or professional education can be completed in 1 year" and insert "who received loans during the fiscal year 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I find I have some difficulty in keeping up with the alacrity of the very able clerk of the Senate. On page 20, in line 21, as I understand, certain of the language has been deleted and new language has been inserted. I could not understand in a moment the reason therefor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not understand what page and line the Senator mentioned.

Mr. McNARY. Page 20, line 21. I assumed the chairman of the committee could keep up with the reading of the amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I did. But the amendment has already been agreed to, so I am required to go back.

On page 20, line 21, the committee struck out the words "whose technical or professional education can be completed in 1 year", and inserted "who received loans during the fiscal year 1943." That was done for the purpose of limiting the whole program so that it would come to an end with the expiration of the year 1944, because those who receive the loans in 1944 will receive them for only a limited period. In that respect the desire of the committee was definitely to put an end to the program. We made the loan provision in the 1942 appropriation act. Only a part of the amount which we appropriated has been used. There is a carry-over, and we sought to have that carry-over, and that alone, utilized, so that those who receive the benefit from it and who are carrying on may continue their program; but the whole program will come to an end in 1943.

Mr. McNARY. Was that the unanimous view of the members of the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. It was the view of the committee.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me ask the Senator whether this bill touches expenditures under the so-called Lanham Act in connection with the Federal Works Agency?

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 8, after the name "Commissioner of Education", to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That said unexpended balance shall be available for not more than 2,000 students and that this program shall end June 30, 1944."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Vocational education", on page 25, line 13, after the word "the", to strike out "Federal Security Administrator" and insert "Chairman of the War Manpower Commission."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, why was this change made?

Mr. McCARRAN. The change was made simply to do away with confusion, so that the head of the War Manpower Commission shall be the head of these various agencies, rather than calling him by a different name.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It is only a change in the language identifying the person. It is not a change in the person at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 25, line 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service", on page 31, after line 2, to strike out:

Training for nurses (national defense): For the cost, including subsistence, including cash allowances to trainees as provided by Public No. —— (H. R. 2664, 78th Cong.), of refresher, student nurses, and postgraduate nursing courses, including courses in midwifery, provided by public agencies operating public educational facilities and by hospitals and nursing schools in accordance with plans submitted by them and approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, at hospitals with recognized schools of nursing, and, where necessary, in the case of postgraduate courses at other institutions, for approved persons who have been licensed to practice as registered nurses under the laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, $3,500,000, payment thereof to be made through certification from time to time in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator and approved by the President, by said Surgeon General to the Secretary of the Treasury of the name of such agency, nursing school, or hospital to whom payment is to be made, and the amount to be paid, such payment to be made prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office.

Salaries and expenses (national defense): For all general administrative expenses necessary to enable the Public Health Service to carry out the foregoing program of nursing courses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, and printing and binding, $50,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at this point I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the item in the bill on pages 31 and 32, because it is a new item, and I think the Senate should have its attention drawn to it on account of the amount involved. The amount is $45,000,000 for the training of nurses.

On the 15th of June there was approved by the Executive a bill which passed both Houses of Congress, providing for an extensive program for the training of nurses during the war period. This provision sets the authorizing act in motion and appropriates $45,000,000 for the program. It will train 57,000 nurses. It will train 33,000 second-year nurses, 18,000 third-year nurses, and 6,000 first-year nurses. Young women who are now in training in the various

hospitals and nurse-training institutions in the United States, and who signify their willingness to give their efforts to the Government when called upon by the Government, will be taken into the program. Their subsistence, tuition, books, uniforms, housing, and the like, will be paid for out of this money; 33,000 of them are now in the second year of training, 18,000 in the third year of training, and 6,000 in the first year of training. We questioned the Public Health Service very closely as to what institutions, if any, would be favored in carrying out this program. It seems to me that the Senate should be interested in the matter. Hence I have called for a pause at this time so that questions may be asked. Let me say that every institution, whether it be a so-called sectarian institution, such as a religious institution, which conducts hospitals, or a public institution such as a county-sustained institution, which has a recognized training program for nurses, will receive money from this appropriation for the training of nurses.

In addition to the items of sustenance which I have enumerated, which the nurses in training will receive, they will receive a stipend of $15 a month. The cost of their subsistence, tuition, and the like is estimated at $45 a month for each nurse.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. The language proposed to be deleted from the bill as it came over from the House had a similar purpose, and carried an appropriation of $3,500,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. The $3,500,000 is included in the $45,000,000. The item as it came over from the House provided an appropriation of $3,500,000. An estimate came from the Bureau of the Budget, through the Public Health Service, to the Senate committee, and the entire presentation was made in the first instance before the Senate committee. The question was not presented to the House.

Mr. McNARY. That answers the question which I was about to propound to the Senator. I was wondering why the Senate took action on such a large increase without some similar attitude, so far as the record shows, on the part of the House.

Mr. McCARRAN. The answer is that the authorizing act was approved on the 15th of June. Immediately after the approval of the act, the matter was presented to the Bureau of the Budget, and the estimate for the new program, based upon the new law, which had just been approved, came before the Senate Committee on Appropriations in the first instance.

Mr. McNARY. Is there now a similar program—perhaps greatly diminished—covering the same objectives?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am unable to answer definitely, but from my present knowledge I should say no.

Mr. McNARY. Then, this is wholly a new venture.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is a new venture, provided for by a new law, approved on the 15th of June

Mr. McNARY. That was too late to have the estimate presented to the House committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was too late to be presented to the Bureau of the Budget, and too late to be presented to the House committee. It was presented to the Bureau of the Budget after the authorizing act was approved, and the estimate was presented to the Senate committee after that.

Mr. McNARY. Did the committee have hearings?

Mr. McCARRAN. The committee had quite full hearings.

Mr. McNARY. Was there any objection to the amendment on the part of members of the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. The question was gone into quite at length. The project was looked upon with much interest by members of the committee. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] gave considerable attention to it. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] was present during all the hearings. I will not say that the project was looked upon with skepticism, but it was considered with great interest, and it was felt that the program deserved our approbation.

Mr. McNARY. Are the nurses to be used primarily in connection with the war effort?

Mr. McCARRAN. Entirely so. They must sign an agreement placing their services at the direction of the Government.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is important to bear in mind that, in the first place, this appropriation is in pursuance of an act of Congress which is now on the statute books. In the second place, the nurses are to be trained in existing institutions. There is no question of the Government setting up its own schools.

The purpose of this provision is to increase the annual supply of new nurses. The number has risen somewhat in the past 3 or 4 years, but it is desired further to increase it. The training of nurses is in competition with the WAVES, the WAAC's, and a great many other organizations which are making an appeal to young women of that background and type.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does this supplement or invade the nursing training which has heretofore proceeded under the auspices of the Red Cross?

Mr. LODGE. So far as the Red Cross gives hospital training, it would merely supplement it. I believe I am correct in that statement. The purpose of the proposal is not only to encourage the training of new nurses but to insure that when a candidate is qualified and becomes a nurse the Government will have a call on her services.

Mr. McCARRAN. The first call.

Mr. LODGE. The first call. The Government is in a competitive situation insofar as these young women are concerned, and unless some provision of this nature is made the Government will not have first call on their services, and they may decide not to become nurses at all.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The point upon which I wish to be enlightened is whether or not the thorough and splendid nurse training which has been so ably developed under Red Cross auspices is in any degree herein being transferred from the Red Cross to the Government.

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think so at all. I do not think there is any possibility of that occurring.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is nothing in the amendment or in the appropriation bill now pending which contemplates anything of that kind.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I was not able to hear distinctly all that the Senator said; but if my understanding is correct, the committee was motivated first by an obligation to implement a direction of the Congress itself in legislation which was very recently enacted. I think we felt a very definite obligation to meet the requirements of that legislation, assuming that in so doing we were carrying out the intention of the Congress very recently expressed. Then we felt—and this was urged upon us—that this provision was necessary in order to increase speedily the supply of nurses which might be available to our own military forces.

Mr. McCARRAN. The necessity for more nurses was presented to the committee and is now being presented to the Congress. The vehicle by which the Corps of Nurses will be created was approved by the Congress and by the President. This provision is merely to afford the money to carry out the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning on page 31 after line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 6, to insert:

Training for nurses (national defense): For carrying out the purposes of the act of June 15, 1943 (Public Law 74, 78th Cong.), $45,000,000, of which not to exceed $650,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including printing and binding; personal services in the District of Columbia; maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; advertising in newspapers, magazines, and periodicals without regard to the act of March 4, 1921 (42 U. S. C. 33); and items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation for miscellaneous and contingent expenses for the Public Health Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital", on page 42, line 20, after the words "to the", to strike out "Superintendent upon his written request, either in advance or at the end of each month, all or part of the estimated or actual cost of such maintenance, as the case may be, and bills rendered by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments on the basis of the actual

cost of the care of patients paid for in advance shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon between the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the District of Columbia government, department, or establishments concerned" and insert "hospital monthly the actual cost of the care and maintenance of such patients, and bills rendered therefor by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, shall be subject to audit by the auditor of the District of Columbia semiannually, or in the case of any department or establishment concerned other than the District of Columbia, by the General Accounting Office."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wyoming to make a statement concerning the amendment which has just been read?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. President, this amendment was offered in the full committee as a result of some facts which were developed in the hearings upon the District of Columbia appropriation bill. Last year in the other House it became known that by reason of the method heretofore followed with respect to the payment to St. Elizabeths Hospital of the charges for the care of patients sent from the District of Columbia, there were several instances of payments being made for a long period of time after the patient had died. The language which is stricken out denies the District of Columbia an opportunity to make any examination of the charges before the payments are made. The purpose of the amendment is merely to provide that the auditor of the District of Columbia, in the case of the District of Columbia, or the General Accounting Office, in the case of any other Government department or agency which sends its patients to St. Elizabeths Hospital, shall have the opportunity of examining the accounts before they are paid. Under the present system the superintendent makes his demands, submits his bills, and they must be paid. Later on adjustments are made.

The records so far established clearly show that under this system adjustments were not always properly made. Otherwise, it would not be possible for the District to have paid for the care of persons long since dead.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator tell me if there are any other cases of District of Columbia officials being given authority over a Federal institution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not say there are. The Senator knows this amendment was offered in the full committee. I said then, as I now say, that the matter is of such importance to the District of Columbia that it ought to go to conference, and, in conference, a proper solution can be worked out. If the amendment is so drastic that it would do any injustice to the hospital, I would, of course, have no objection to its alteration.

Mr. LODGE. That arrangement is very satisfactory to me. It will mean that we shall have a chance to look into the matter more thoroughly. However, as applying to the subject under discussion, I should like to have a letter from the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1943.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I take the liberty of inviting your attention to an amendment which has been proposed by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate to H. R. 2935, the Labor-Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1944.

The language on page 41 commencing on line 15 and providing that the District of Columbia shall pay to the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital either in advance or at the end of each month all or part of the estimated or actual cost of maintenance of District of Columbia patients has existed in the appropriation bill for many years. It was approved this year by the Bureau of the Budget, by the Appropriations Committee of the House, and by vote of the House itself. The amendment strikes out the language after the word "the" in line 15 of page 41 through the word "concerned" in line 1 on page 42 and substitutes the following: "to the hospital monthly the actual cost of the care and maintenance of such patients, and bills rendered therefor by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital shall be subject to audit by the auditor of the District of Columbia semiannually, or in the case of any department or establishment concerned other than the District of Columbia by the General Accounting Office."

For the current fiscal year St. Elizabeths Hospital will expend approximately $4,950,000, of which approximately $3,200,000 is made up from reimbursements by the District of Columbia. The charges made to the District do not include at all the expense of capital outlay, but are merely for the actual cost of maintenance, including repairs. The District thus is better off financially than would be the case if it operated its own mental hospital, at least if it operated it on the same standard as here. For the latter half of each year the hospital is dependent almost entirely upon the payments from the District of Columbia to meet its necessary expenses, including pay roll and supplies. If bills for supplies cannot be met promptly discounts are often lost with resulting financial damage to the Government, and I am sure that you are familiar with the sort of publicity that would ensue if by reason of an act of Congress pay rolls could not be met promptly. The proposed amendment wipes out the provision for any advance payment and provides that the cost of care and maintenance must be figured in advance and that only the actual cost shall be paid for. As a matter of fact, at the present time if the District overpays the hospital reimbursements are made after the propriety of such reimbursements is shown by audit. The actual cost from month to month fluctuates and usually cannot be figured until at least a month or more has elapsed. If a bill were then sent to the District it might be held up for an indefinite period in the office of the Auditor of the District for Columbia for preaudit before it is paid. This would put a Federal institution at the mercy of the District authorities, a situation which is governmentally quite unsound. There would be no saving to the government of the District of Columbia ultimately but great inconvenience would be caused to the Federal Government and an additional force of bookkeepers would probably be necessary to figure the actual cost called for in the amendment. The amendment does nothing new as far as auditing by the General Accounting Office is concerned. All accounts of the Government are subject to auditing by the General Accounting Office and all accounts paid by other agencies to this hospital are audited by the General Accounting Office.

The amendment, to my mind, is an unfortunate one and I should appreciate any assistance which you can give in seeing to it that the action of your own subcommittee is sustained on the floor of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,
WINFRED OVERHOLSER, M. D.,
Superintendent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 42, line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Board", on page 46, line 5, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$34,000,000."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer as a substitute for the committee amendment the figure $37,328,502.

Mr. President, this is the item which provides the moneys necessary to pay the expenses in connection with Federal-State unemployment compensation administration. It is money which is utilized by the States to administer payments for unemployment compensation. The figure which I have offered is the Budget recommendation. I may say that this figure was arrived at after a most careful check made by the Social Security Board of the budgets made up by the various State agencies which enforce, carry out, and administer the unemployment-compensation provisions in the respective States. Before the estimate was submitted to the Congress it was cut by the Bureau of the Budget below the amount estimated by the various States. As Senators will observe, the House cut the figure to $30,000,000. Apparently they made the assumption that because benefit payments have declined substantially during the period of tremendously increased employment throughout the country, the administrative services of the States could stand such a drastic cut. I have been advised by those who represent the various State agencies that they believe this cut will impair the efficiency of the administration of this important activity in the various States. While it is true that the payments made because of unemployment have declined, certain other activities and labors made necessary by the act upon the part of various State agencies have increased as a result of increased employment. In other words, two phases of their activity have declined because of increased employment and decreased unemployment, but, on the other hand, because of increased industrial activity two phases of their activities have increased.

Mr. President, there has been no evidence presented before either of the committees which, in my opinion, would justify either the drastic cut made by the House or the cut proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. A

careful analysis of Mr. Altmeyer's testimony, in my humble opinion, justifies the Budget estimate for this amount.

Mr. President, I desire to be entirely frank about this matter. I am concerned that there be no drastic cut made which will impair the efficiency of the various State agencies that are administering this section of the Social Security Act. As many Senators know, in fact, I think as all Senators know, the Social Security Administrator and the Board have recommended the complete federalization of the Unemployment Compensation System. I personally am opposed to that, and I am apprehensive that if Congress erroneously cuts too drastically into the appropriations available to the various State agencies for the administration of the act, and, as a result of that cut, their efficiency declines, and their personnel is dissipated and disintegrated, it will be used as an additional argument for the federalization of the Unemployment Compensation System. For that reason, I urge upon my colleagues that they support the Budget estimate at least for the purpose of letting the matter go to conference, because already the House has cut $7,328,502 from the appropriation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the House cut the Budget estimate from $37,000,000 to $30,000,000. The hearings indicated that the House might possibly have looked upon it erroneously. The committee of the Senate thought that $34,000,000 would be sufficient to carry on, but, in order that we may make no mistake in the matter, I shall accept the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin and take the matter to conference.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Before yielding to the Senator from Maine, may I say that I appreciate very much the considerate attitude of the able chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations who has this matter in charge. I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was going to express my concurrence with what the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has just said. It is true that the House cut this appropriation to $30,000,000; it is true that the Senate committee feels a driving obligation to exercise every possible economy; but I have so much doubt as to whether we exercised wisdom in this particular instance that I hope the matter will go to conference at the figures suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin and be further examined there.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it so happens that I was one of those on the committee who felt that the Budget estimate should be restored. Initially it seemed to me that, with the falling off in unemployment, the work of the Unemployment Compensation authorities would be less; but I was convinced, after the figures had been presented to me by Mr. Altmeyer, showing the various paper work operations which the Unemployment Compensation authorities maintain, that, while the amount of work has decreased in some categories, it has increased in other categories. For instance, in the field of unemployment benefits, paid to unemployed individuals, the work has decreased, but in the field of registering new employees and in making the necessary records of new businesses which have come into existence the work has increased. So it seemed to me that the Budget estimate was proper, and I voted accordingly in the committee. I am hopeful that a disposition of this question may be made along that line.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the Senator's statement. I wish to state one further fact, because I hope the conferees will consider this matter very carefully in conference. I do not wish to leave the impression that the States have not already drastically cut their personnel. They have done so voluntarily. They have likewise lost personnel to the armed services and to higher salaried positions in other agencies and departments. I wish to point out that in my own State of Wisconsin, for example, there has been a 32-percent reduction in the personnel since January 1, 1940, until the present time. They hardly have a sufficient number of investigators of claims for unemployment compensation to ascertain whether the claims are valid or not.

I thank the Senators all for their very great assistance in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin is agreed to, and, without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator", on page 53, after line 17, to strike out:

> None of the moneys appropriated by this act to the Social Security Board or to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies, including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment in accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—National Labor Relations Board," on page 57, line 18, after the word "law", to strike out "$1,415,000" and insert "$1,715,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 14, after the figures "$600,000", to strike out:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been in existence for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on page 58 the Senate Appropriations Committee has eliminated a provision which was inserted in the bill by the House. I should like to offer, as a substitute for the committee amendment, the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read, to come in on line 14, page 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 58, line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor, copy of which has been filed with the Labor Department for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed by a labor organization.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this amendment is aimed to stabilize labor differences during this critical wartime period. At the beginning of 1941 the Government wanted to stabilize the shipbuilding industry because of the experiences of World War No. 1. Inasmuch as the American Federation of Labor had been well established in the Pacific coast yards for years, the Pacific coast was considered the best place to attempt stabilization first.

The American Federation of Labor, through its metal-trades division, undertook the job. Mr. John Frey, who was president of that organization, with all the Government officials concerned, went out there, and, after several weeks, a master agreement was worked out. It was signed by every shipbuilder on the western coast, with the exception of two small repair yards in southern California, which had working relations with the C. I. O.

The Government was a definite party to several provisions of this agreement governing wages, and so forth. It accepted the entire agreement, including the A. F. of L. closed shop, as the vehicle to bring about stabilization. Everyone knew about this agreement. Sidney Hillman, then Codirector of the O. P. M., publicly applauded it. The agreement was subsequently applied to the Atlantic coast, where the C. I. O. was recognized as the entrenched labor organization, subsequently to the Gulf and Great Lakes zones.

For more than 2 years 400,000 men on the Pacific coast have been working under that agreement; 90 percent of this coast's production has been carried out under it.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. The stabilization agreement has not been applied to the Atlantic coast or the Gulf coast. It is applied only on the Pacific coast.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not also true that this agreement does not apply to wages or to hours?

Mr. BRIDGES. It merely applies to the agreement in existence at the time, worked out between the A. F. of L. and

other labor groups and the management, in the Pacific coast yards.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment proposes, in effect, a statute of limitations—on what? On jurisdictional disputes? On wages? On hours? On working conditions? Or on everything? On some industries, or all industries?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think the situation will be clarified by understanding that the stabilization agreement on the west coast was worked out as the Senator from New Hampshire has indicated. It was subsequently incorporated into agreements between the various industries, shipyards, and others affected. The only additional stipulation that was not in the stabilization agreement was the closed-shop provision, which was forced by the Government upon the Bethlehem Steel Corporation on that coast after very serious difficulty. Mr. Kaiser cooperated completely with the suggestion of the Government that there be the closed shop, although it was not put into the stabilization agreement. As a result, this practice has gone on ever since. This amendment merely says that the agreements entered into in that fashion shall not now be reopened.

Mr. LODGE. Agreements regarding all topics?

Mr. BREWSTER. I repeat, the stabilization agreement covered wages, hours, and all working conditions. That was incorporated in the contract, the only additional clause being the provision as to the closed shop.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me, I have a high regard for Mr. Frey. I think he is really a statesmanlike man, and I admire his courage and frankness. I wanted to say that before I went any further. But I am somewhat mystified by the import of the proposal. We are asked to impose a 3-month limitation regarding action on complaint cases, and, as nearly as I can gather, such complaint cases do not involve the jurisdictional question. They can cover the whole field of hours and working conditions.

Let us take the case of the maritime union, with a man at sea on a ship. I am advised that it is in the record that it is a physical impossibility to obtain action on cases of that kind within 3 months, and if we enacted legislation of the kind proposed, we would in effect be putting in a freeze. Perhaps we want to put in a freeze, but if we do, let us go at it with open eyes, and understand exactly what we are doing, and the full implications of it.

My confusion in regard to this proposal is a good illustration of why matters of this kind should go to legislative committees, and not appropriation committees. I wish the Senator from Maine would comment on that.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it should be clear that the complaint to which the amendment refers will be filed by the labor organization. It is not necessary for a man at sea to file the complaint. It will be filed by his representatives who are on shore, if they feel that in any instance unfair labor practices have been entered into, or if they feel that the agreement is not properly representative of the majority of the workers on the ship or in the plant.

Mr. LODGE. But the maritime workers certainly have a right to have a voice in the decision whether a complaint is to be filed or not.

Mr. BREWSTER. This proposal proceeds on the assumption that the labor organizations are the parties moving. I think it is very rarely the case that individuals file. It is almost always their representatives.

Let us assume, in the case the Senator mentions, that there are two organizations concerned, the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. If for any reason the representatives of the C. I. O. are not satisfied with the A. F. of L. agreement which has been entered into in any case, all that is needed is to file a complaint, which will completely protect the rights of every member of their organization. Accordingly, I do not see any reason why the amendment of the statute in the manner indicated would adversely affect any individuals concerned.

Mr. LODGE. If the language is aimed at a special situation in the Kaiser shipyards, why is it so broad as to cover all kinds of situations, really not desired to be covered?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from New Hampshire made it entirely clear in his initial statement that the amendment is designed to stabilize labor relations. As a matter of fact, complaints have been filed or are pending in several other similar instances of considerable antiquity. This merely means that unless some stabilization policy shall be adopted, we shall throw the entire field of labor relations into chaos, because a complaint may be filed in every case, and immediately there follows what we found occurring in the Kaiser yards. The men spend an unfortunate amount of their time discussing whether they would join one organization or the other. Mr. Kaiser testified before us repeatedly that it was a very serious impediment to the war effort.

Mr. LODGE. That is what the Senator is trying to reach?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. A jurisdictional dispute? I am sure some arrangement can be made for that. But it seems to me we would be doing many other things which in some ways would be of much more importance.

Mr. BREWSTER. I know it has been suggested by my colleague from Maine that more happy language might be adopted. I hope this may go to conference. There careful consideration may be given to the phraseology; perhaps an amendment may be formulated which would be better than the language suggested.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to confirm what my colleague from Maine has said. One of the reasons which led me to approve the action of the committee was my utter inability to understand the impact and the import of the language of the House provision. I was completely confused about it, and am still confused about it, and I had hoped that if the matter went to conference, something could be evolved which at least my poor understanding would comprehend.

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment I have offered differs from the provision of the House, so that it would automatically go to conference.

Mr. TRUMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. In the condition in which the committee amendment now is, it will go to conference, and any change the Senator from New Hampshire might want may then be considered by the conferees. If the Senator's amendment shall be adopted, I am very sure it will not go to conference, and it is most dangerous to legislate in this manner in an appropriation bill.

I listened to my able colleague from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is on the special committee with me, and he stated the facts as they are, but I do not believe we should repeal the National Labor Relations Act through an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate, without any consideration of the committees of the House and the Senate having to do with labor matters. That is exactly what this amendment would do.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe in the stabilization of labor conditions?

Mr. TRUMAN. Of course I do, and we have been fighting for that right along, but this is not the way to get it.

Mr. BRIDGES. How would the Senator get it?

Mr. TRUMAN. As I have said, if the matter is allowed to go to conference and to be worked out there, we can get stabilization in a manner which will be entirely satisfactory to all concerned. I have very great admiration for Mr. Frey, I think he is one of the statesmen of labor, but I think he is somewhat peeved at the situation as it has developed on the west coast, I think the amendment is the result of that peeve, and I do not think it should be put through as an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate, without serious consideration. Like the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], I cannot see any result from this language but confusion, and I think that is exactly what it will create if it shall be agreed to. I hope the Senator will not push his amendment, because the matter is already in shape to go to conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not want any action taken by the Senate which would indicate that we are merely casting aside this amendment, and are not in favor of stabilization of labor conditions.

Mr. TRUMAN. Everyone is in favor of that.

Mr. BRIDGES. The National Labor Relations Board, in opening up these contracts at this time, are directly starting labor struggles during a very critical war period, doing injustice not only to labor, but to the Nation as a whole. This should be stopped.

Mr. TRUMAN. No one is quarreling with the Senator on that point.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator's view that the Senate should not permit the impression to be created, by its nonaction on this amendment, that it is opposed to stabilization. I think the Senator is correct in that respect.

I believe all Members of the Senate are in favor of stabilizing this condition. Speaking as one Member of the Senate, and as one who will be a conferee on the bill, I wish to say that I will deal with the subject in that spirit.

Mr. BREWSTER. The only point on which I cannot agree with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is with respect to what would go to conference. I do not understand why there would not be equal scope of action whether we adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire or the committee amendment. In either event, as I understand, the conferees will have complete latitude with respect to what formula they will finally adopt.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then, as I understand, the argument which is made by the Senator from Missouri is not that the matter would be in conference whichever of the two amendments is adopted?

Mr. TRUMAN. If the committee amendment is adopted, the whole thing will go to conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. And if my amendment were adopted, it would also go to conference, and all phases of the question would be discussed.

Mr. TRUMAN. No; that is not the case.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from New Hampshire is in error in that respect, because the Senator has adopted in his amendment the very language of the House amendment which the Senate struck out, except about three additional words.

Mr. BRIDGES. There are considerably more than three words.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will read to the Senate the House language proposed to be stricken by the Senate committee amendment. I wish the Senator from Vermont would compare his amendment with this language. This is the House language:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been in existence for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed.

The Senator added one or two, or perhaps three words thereafter, as I understand from hearing the amendment read at the desk.

Mr. BRIDGES. My amendment is as follows:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been filed with the Labor Department for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed by a labor organization.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am somewhat in error. The Senator has changed the language from the House language.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not hear the last part of the Senator's statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. I say I am in error. There is a change in the Senator's amendment from the language of the House.

Mr. LODGE. In each case, either way, the whole thing would be in conference and open to action.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the language remains as it now is, the entire subject matter and question will go to conference and there be worked out.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I wish to be understood with respect to the matter. I think the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, which he just read, is word for word the House language proposed to be stricken out by the Senate committee amendment, and there would be no way to consider that in conference for the purpose of rewriting it.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; the Senator from Missouri is incorrect in that statement.

Mr. TRUMAN. Is the Senator attempting to repeal the National Labor Relations Act?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it is not word for word the same as the language of the House bill. My amendment differs from it considerably. If the Senator has a copy of the House language, I will read my amendment, and he can check the differences.

My amendment is:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been filed with the Labor Department for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed by a labor organization.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to point out that this change, though only of a few words, is very important, and is a change which I would have made in connection with this amendment, because it definitely and specifically states that the agreement must be filed with the National Labor Relations Board or the Government agency——

Mr. McCARRAN. No; it says the Labor Department.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes; I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is different.

Mr. HAWKES. But it makes it incumbent upon the organization to see that the agreement is filed there. I personally believe the Government should not hold these agreements open for months and months, and hold them as a club over the head of any labor organization, no matter which side it is on. I am very strongly in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator that the object of the committee is to work out a comprehensive provision if it can be worked out. If we adopt language such as is offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, I fear that our hands will be tied and that we cannot work out a comprehensive provision. The Senate committee has identically the same idea that the Senator from New Hampshire has in many respects, but we do not in an appropriation bill propose to amend or alter or nullify a legislative act which has been passed by Congress and which has received Executive approval.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I understand the Senator from Nevada correctly, then, that he is in complete sympathy with the objective of stabilizing labor relations at this critical period?

Mr. McCARRAN. Absolutely. The entire committee is.

Mr. BREWSTER. And that any appropriate language designed to prevent the reopening of, let us say, somewhat aged contracts, would be in accord with the Senator's views?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, that is my view, because I think labor relations should be stabilized all over the country. A master agreement which was entered into on the Pacific coast constituted a stabilization for a considerable time. It has worked out very satisfactorily, and has been generally commended. It does not apply in other sections of the country. It does not apply to the east coast, and it does not apply to the Gulf coast. All members of the committee are in favor of stabilizing labor conditions, and if we could do so without destroying the Wagner Labor Relations Act, we would. At the same time, we do not want to destroy an act which has been passed by Congress after long debate and consideration.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator's statement of the case is exactly what the proponents of this amendment have had in mind. The situation on the west coast is not only very serious, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] agreed with me in pointing out, but I understand that a similar reopening of contracts on the Gulf coast and on the Atlantic coast is also imminent, and that nothing could be more disastrous at this time than to have such a situation develop.

Mr. McCARRAN. That was testified to before the Senate committee.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As a member of the committee which considered this amendment, I think it is probable, as the chairman has brought out, that by adopting the amendment in the committee it was not assumed that the wording was perhaps so all-encompassing as to do as much justice and fairness as was possible, and at the same time accomplish the desired result. However, the committee was not in a position to refine the wording at that time, but in adopting this principle it was assumed that when the matter went to conference—and it will be in conference—it could be considered more fully and any imperfections in it would then

be eradicted, and the principle of the amendment adopted.

I likewise should like to use this opportunity to say that I believe the chairman of the subcommittee, in referring to the support given to the amendment, inadvertently and unintentionally said that only a certain portion of the American Federation of Labor favored it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not say that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. No, I did not say that at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well. I am now advised that Mr. Green and other members of the American Federation of Labor do favor the principle of this amendment, but they all concede that it may have to be reworded to accomplish the desired result. Since that had not been brought out I felt obligated to bring it out.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I may have misunderstood the Senator who is in charge of the bill.. I understood him to say he did not think this matter was one which should be handled on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I said, or at least I intended to say, that I did not think an appropriation bill was the proper place in which to set aside the force and effect of a legislative act.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator think that in conference a satisfactory amendment could be worked out which would not do that, and yet at the same time would achieve a remedy for the situation?

Mr. McCARRAN. My wish will be the father of my thought, and I express my thought, and say I hope so. That is all I can say. But if the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire should prevail, I am confident it would tie the hands of the conferees.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Nevada will agree, I am sure, that the mere enactment of a statute of limitations would not be considered as vitiating the act.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; and that is just what we do not want to accomplish. We want to provide limitations which will be wholesome for the welfare of the country in this unhappy hour, but we do not want to vitiate the act.

Mr. BREWSTER. But if such an amendment were agreed to, it would not be possible for labor strife to continue.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my thought.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the American Federation of Labor was divided on the question. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. At the meeting of the Appropriations Committee, some members stated this amendment was supported by some officials of the American Federation of Labor, but did not have the support of Mr. Green, the president of the A. F. of L., and the general support of the American Federation of Labor. I believe these members were mistaken, and did not convey the correct information.

Mr. TRUMAN. No; the statement was made that it did not have the approval of the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. MAYBANK. That was exactly my understanding, that it did not have the approval of the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor, that the executive committee had not approved it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understood, as did the Senator from Maryland, that it had not only the support of the metal trades division headed by Mr. Frey, and including some 14 or 15 divisions, or national unions, but also the approval of Mr. Green and the American Federation of Labor; and when he speaks in favor of it he speaks on behalf of the whole American Federation of Labor. This measure has the support of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I did not so understand. I understood it had the support of the executive council.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am referring to Mr. Green, now; and I assume that when Mr. Green speaks he speaks for the American Federation of Labor as a whole inasmuch as he is president of the federation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order to clarify that particular phase of the question, let me read the record as made by Mr. Frey before our committee:

> Mr. WHITE. Am I to understand that the American Federation of Labor approves this House amendment?
>
> Mr. FREY. Yes. Before the amendment came in, Mr. Green authorized me to say that he was in full support of it and that it met with the policy of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is a clear answer.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the statement of the chairman of the committee, and not to force at this time the amendment I have offered, with the understanding that the problem of stabilization of conditions in labor relations will be considered, and that we shall have some settlement along that line.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator has used language with which I would not want to go along. I would not go that far. So far as the stabilization of labor conditions in the country at the present time is concerned, I think I speak for the entire committee when I say that we are in favor of doing anything and everything reasonable to stabilize conditions. But we cannot say to the Senator, and I will not say to him, that we will go so far in dealing with the subject as to set aside an existing statute. I would not be so unfair to the Senator as to say that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, would the Senator say that the establishment of some statute of limitations certainly would not vitiate the act?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think it can be worked out. I have answered the Senator from Maine that I think it can be worked out along the lines the Senator has just suggested.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. The procedure suggested is agreeable to me.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, inasmuch as we are on the subject of the War Manpower Commission, there is one statement which I should like to make for the information of the Senate regarding the work the War Manpower Commission has done toward solving the manpower problem insofar as labor shortages and labor surpluses in war industries are concerned. We have before us, in the form of a bill known as the Austin-Wadsworth bill, a measure which would provide for a compulsory draft of manpower. So far as I am concerned, I should not want to see legislation of that type enacted, except as an absolutely last resort. I should hope to see in this country a condition in which the labor surplus and its exact location and identity were so well known that it would be possible to make a voluntary appeal to the men to move into areas where there was a labor shortage. Of course, for the performance of that function we look to the War Manpower Commission; and the hearing before the Appropriations Committee on the pending bill gave us an opportunity to obtain the pertinent data. Part of the data is found at page 375 of the Senate hearings, and part of it was sent to me after the hearings had been printed. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the data be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION—CLEARANCE PROCEDURES

(The following letter and statements were filed for the record:)

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1943.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: Attached is the information you requested at the hearing last night in connection with our clearance procedures. Because of the space of time available for the preparation of this material it is necessarily rather sketchy in character.

I trust that if there is anything further that you would like to be provided with on this subject you will not hesitate to get in touch with me.

Sincerely yours,
ALBERT L. NICKERSON,
Director, Bureau of Placement.

OPERATION OF INTERAREA RECRUITMENT PROCEDURE

In many areas it is impossible to recruit a sufficient number of workers for employers in the area because of critical labor shortages. When such a situation develops, the local United States Employment Service follows what is known as interarea recruitment procedure.

This procedure involves recruitment of workers in areas of supply for employers who are located in areas of critical labor shortages. Before interarea recruitment will be attempted, certain conditions must be met.

These include that full utilization is made of all local labor, including the employer's present working force; that the need for workers is hindering, or in the near future will hinder, the war effort; that the number of persons requested by the employer represents his minimum needs; that the employer will follow a positive recruitment itinerary arranged by the United States Employment Service, or will delegate hiring authority to the United States Employment Service; that the employer will advance transportation for the worker in all cases where this is considered necessary to successful recruitment; and that there is housing available for the worker upon his arrival on the job.

Interarea recruitment is first tried in areas of supply within the employer's State and then, if necessary, within the War Manpower Commission region. If it is impossible to secure the needed workers within the region, a copy of the employer's order is sent to the Washington headquarters with a request that recruitment be extended to other regions.

The attached table entitled "Interarea Recruitment Results, April 1943" shows by States the number of workers recruited during April by the United States Employment Service for employers outside the area in which the recruitment was conducted. This includes interarea recruitment within each State, between States within each region, and between regions. April is the most recent month for which this data are available. Separate data are not available for April on interregional recruitment but it is estimated that of the 65,449 workers recruited on interarea recruitment, approximately 10,000 were recruited on interregional recruitment.

On May 1 a reporting procedure was established for results of interregional recruitment. The table entitled "Interregional Recruitment Results" shows by regions the number of workers recruited from May 1 to June 5 by the United States Employment Service for employers located outside the region in which the recruitment was conducted.

Attached also is a copy of a memorandum which was sent to all regional manpower directors concerning the introduction of revised program for interregional recruitment:

Interregional recruitment results, May 1 to June 5, 1943

	Number of workers recruited
Region I: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island	------
Region II: New York	5,156
Region III: Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware	1,375
Region IV: Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and District of Columbia	3,875
Region V: Michigan, Ohio, and Kentucky	------
Region VI: [1] Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana	343
Region VII: Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida	2,432
Region VIII: Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska	3,155
Region IX: Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma	1,687
Region X: [1] Texas, New Mexico, and Louisiana	244
Region XI: Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah	502
Region XII: Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, and Arizona	------
Total	18,769

[1] May 1–27, 1943, only.

Interarea recruitment results, April 1943

	Number of workers recruited
Region I:	
Connecticut	879
Maine	960
Massachusetts	331
New Hampshire	91
Rhode Island	10
Vermont	95
Region II: New York	9,232
Region III:	
Delaware	23
New Jersey	1,626
Pennsylvania	4,594
Region IV:	
District of Columbia	258
Maryland	489
North Carolina	1,879
Virginia	1,131
West Virginia	1,561
Region V:	
Kentucky	2,745
Michigan	712
Ohio	1,738
Region VI:	
Illinois	1,513
Indiana	186
Wisconsin	1,396
Region VII:	
Alabama	1,067
Florida	708
Georgia	1,477
Mississippi	1,196
South Carolina	676
Tennessee	1,740
Region VIII:	
Iowa	1,200
Minnesota	1,446
Nebraska	539
North Dakota	31
South Dakota	296
Region IX:	
Arkansas	781
Kansas	520
Missouri	2,070
Oklahoma	904
Region X:	
Louisiana	1,786
New Mexico	1,091
Texas	4,265
Region XI:	
Colorado	1,776
Idaho	320
Montana	204
Utah	512
Wyoming	83
Region XII:	
Arizona	68
California	7,609
Nevada	216
Oregon	596
Washington	823
Total	65,449

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1943.

To: All regional manpower directors.
From: Lawrence A. Appley, executive director.
Subject: Introduction of revised program for interregional recruitment.

At the conference of regional directors on April 30 it was agreed that a revised program for the interregional recruitment of workers should be adopted. This revision was recognized as necessary to the end that there might be developed a truly national approach to meeting over-all manpower problems.

Enclosed is the proposed pattern for interregional recruitment which was presented to the conference of regional directors. Specifically, the revised program for interregional recruitment provides for the following:

1. A careful review of all orders emanating from the various regions to insure that each of the 10 standards prescribed in United States Employment Service Headquarters Bulletin No. 4 have been met.

2. Each 30 days an exhaustive review of all available labor supply and demand data will be made. Based on a balancing of shortages and surpluses, by areas, within each region, quotas will be assigned to those regions showing net surpluses upon which net shortage regions may draw.

3. Monthly patterns will be issued which will indicate the quotas assigned to each surplus region and the orders to be directed from shortage regions against such quotas.

4. Each region whose clearance orders are authorized to be directed against the quotas of surplus regions will be expected to negotiate directly concerning arrangements for positive recruitment itineraries, controlled advertising, etc.

5. Reports will be required at frequent intervals which will reflect progress made in recruitment on specific orders. A simple reporting system will be devised and initiated in the immediate future.

There is also enclosed the interregional recruitment pattern which has been developed for the month of May. It has been necessary to supplement available labor market information by estimates of labor supply in certain unclassified areas. For this reason the pattern for the month of May is not as complete, nor perhaps as accurate, as will be subsequent monthly patterns. Arrangements will have been made prior to June 1 for more comprehensive coverage and for more exhaustive analyses than have been possible in the limited time available for the preparation of May figures.

The pattern for May will be supplemented as early in the month as possible by telegraphic instructions to direct additional orders against the unallocated portions of regional quotas reflected by the pattern for May. The incompleteness of the current pattern is due to the cancelations of all existing clearance orders, as of May 3, except those revalidated by regional office certification that they meet each of the 10 conditions precedent to clearance outlined in United States Employment Service Headquarters Bulletin No. 4, dated April 20, 1943. As such orders are certified, or as new orders are developed, appropriate advice to the regional offices involved will be issued.

It will be noted that civil-service requirements for west coast shipyards and for Pearl Harbor are included among the orders for which recruitment is to be conducted. It is to be understood that these orders for the navy yards are to be given priority in each region to which they are directed.

It will be highly important that the headquarters office keep currently informed of recruitment progress made within each region upon each order directed against its quota. This will be accomplished by the simple reporting system which has been mentioned above, and the purpose of such information is twofold:

1. It will permit adjustments of demand figures on a current basis and will be an integral factor in arriving at new recruitment patterns each month.

2. It will indicate localities where recruitment is not progressing satisfactorily or where progress in exceeding expectations. In either case headquarters attention and action will be indicated in order to maintain a proper balance of the national program.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of giving vigorous and immediate effect to this new approach to interregional recruitment. It has been prescribed in fairly broad, general terms and leaves much detail to be worked out by each regional director and his staff. Headquarters counsel and assistance will be given as needed or requested, and any points requiring clarification or alteration should be brought to my attention without delay.

I am personally confident of the practicability of this revised approach to interregional recruitment, based upon quotas assigned to regions and areas of relative surplus; I am equally certain of the necessity for so approaching the national responsibility of the War Manpower Commission. I earnestly enlist the active and continued cooperation of each regional director in carrying out his share of this over-all manpower job, which is Nation-wide in scope and transcendent of purely regional, State, area, or local considerations or provincialisms. I know that I may rely upon each of you to accomplish your apportioned segment of this vital responsibility.

For the executive director:

ALBERT L. NICKERSON,
Director, Bureau of Placement.

PROPOSED PATTERN FOR INTERREGIONAL RECRUITMENT

Recent developments enlarging the responsibilities of the War Manpower Commission for the transfer of workers between areas have resulted in an unprecedented volume of orders which cannot be filled except through interregional recruitment. Even after the cancelation of all existing clearance orders, except those meeting the standards prescribed in Headquarters Bulletin No. 4, there will remain an actual need represented by orders in hand for almost a half million workers. Further anticipated needs not presently supported by actual orders will more than double the volume of recruitment for the next 12 months. Current orders include demands for important shipbuilding establishments, aircraft plants, naval repair bases, major military installations, and construction work of strategic importance in Canada. The War Manpower Commission has the definite responsibility for meeting these demands and taking whatever action is necessary, no matter how drastic, for the complete fulfillment of this responsibility.

In the present state of the labor market the currently available unemployed labor supply has been largely exhausted. In most areas no great number of able-bodied men can be recruited from this group. Every region has areas where critical shortages have occurred or are imminent, as well as areas where more intensive recruitment would yield additional manpower. It is necessary to draw on the areas of supply to meet the needs of the shortage areas within regions and between regions. To accomplish this each region must undertake to meet its shortages within the region as far as possible and to provide its share of manpower from areas of supply to meet deficits in other regions faced with over-all shortage. This added responsibility for meeting out-of-region needs must be approached just as vigorously as though the demand to be met were a purely local one It is just as important to meet these labor requirements as it is for local selective service boards to meet their military induction quotas.

In order to distribute equitably the responsibility for these special recruitment efforts, a plan has been developed which attempts to place the greatest burden on areas of relative labor surplus. To this end, net labor shortages and surpluses are being established for all important labor-market areas. These calculations are based on labor-market reports prepared and transmitted to Washington by regional and area personnel. To the information on labor-market areas for which analyses are available will be added shortage or surplus estimates for the unanalyzed portions of each region. A national pattern will thus be set up which will indicate the relationship between our national labor requirements and resources.

From these estimates a balance of shortages and surpluses in various areas within each region will be derived. Some regions will clearly face an over-all labor shortage. Others will contain the labor reserves on which the shortage regions must draw.

These labor surpluses will be calculated on the assumption of active demand for male workers and will rely on the maximum utilization of potential reserves of women. Thus it may eventually be necessary to conduct special recruitment campaigns for women and to withdraw men from less essential activities in areas where purely local needs would not require such efforts. In some cases it may even be necessary to withdraw qualified men from essential activities if replacements from within the community are available.

The shortage regions will be allowed to recruit in other regions up to but not exceeding the number of workers equivalent to the net shortage. This limit will require intensive recruitment campaigns within the region to insure the full utilization of all of the region's labor resources. Otherwise the region's labor requirements will not be met, since clearance recruitment must be definitely limited.

The balance of shortages and surpluses will permit the establishment of quotas for the withdrawal of workers from surplus regions. At the present time only a fraction of the over-all national estimated shortage is actually in hand in terms of order. Moreover, the immediate requirements for the next month will place a relatively light burden on each surplus area. However, the establishment of gross quotas will permit adequate advance planning by regional and area directors against the requirements to be met later this year.

Each 30 days current demand and supply data will be reviewed and the ensuing month's program for interregional recruitment issued from Washington. This pattern will advise shortage regions where clearance recruitment may be conducted and will advise other regions of the quota which they will be expected to furnish.

This monthly pattern will be carefully developed, and when received in each region is to be considered as a positive instruction from the executive director to each region involved. It will be expected that, at least up to the quota established, each region will actively cooperate in the recruitment of workers for shortage regions. Positive recruitment itineraries will be developed and controlled advertising will be utilized to whatever extent is necessary.

The program outlined above is believed to represent the only basis upon which the national responsibility of War Manpower Commission can be completely discharged. The complete acceptance of this national approach is important to the war program, and the cooperation of each regional director is indispensable.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: During the discussion at the meeting of the Senate Appropriations Committee on Monday afternoon, you asked Mr. Haber for some information concerning the procedure employed in securing the transfer of workers from one community to another, and such information as we have dealing with the number of such transfers which have taken place.

You will recall that we indicated that a great bulk of the transfers which occur is voluntary and is in response to information made available by the War Manpower Commission and employers indicating the demand for workers in particular areas. A substantial quantity of transfers also takes place as a result of the direct stimulation by the local United States Employment Service offices of the War Manpower Commission. You will be interested in reviewing the attached memorandum which outlines some of the problems involved in transfers, and presents some statistical material indicating the activities of the Employment Service in this connection. You will note that on page 3, very substantial numbers of "clearance placements" were made during 1942.

I am sure that either Mr. Appley or Mr. Haber will be glad to discuss this matter further with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION—TRANSFER OF WORKERS

With the virtual disappearance of unemployment in almost all areas, we have become dependent principally on three sources of manpower to meet the expanding demands of the armed forces and war industries:

1. Young people, coming of working age;
2. Women entering the labor market;
3. Transfer of workers employed in industries not essential to the support of the war.

The direction of young people into war-supporting activities presents few problems. Many of the young men enter the armed forces soon after they become 18. The remainder, being relatively mobile, are drawn into essential work early, attracted by the many opportunities for inexperienced workers in war industries.

Similarly, the reserves of women have been mobilized in great numbers where they have been needed. The number of women workers increased from 22 percent of all nonagricultural employment at the beginning of the war to 34 percent early this year. During 1942, the Employment Service made 2,250,000 placements of women.

Early in the war program, employed workers also were drawn in great numbers to the expanding war industries. As a matter of fact, it would have been impossible to meet the mushrooming schedules of aircraft, shipbuilding, explosives, construction, and other war industries, without the transfer of large numbers of workers from less essential activities. During 1941 and 1942 the most mobile workers flocked to war employment, with the result that those who remained by the end of 1942 were the less mobile, who had personal reasons for not wishing to transfer. As a consequence, the recruitment of workers for transfer has become increasingly difficult and expensive in time and effort, and at the same time increasingly necessary.

In critical labor-shortage areas, where work opportunities were abundant, strenuous appeals have been made by the War Manpower Commission, through the Employment Service, to stimulate transfer of workers from less essential activities. Active recruitment, including public appeals through radio and press, have been used to bring applicants to the employment offices. Negotiations have been carried on with employers to persuade them to release workers needed in war industry. All of these measures, appealing to the traditional mobility of American workers, were fruitful for many months; but toward the end of 1942 there was evidence that the volume of transfers was slackening. When plants were forced to shut down, because of lack of materials, their workers were registered and offered opportunity for direct transfer to plants that were expanding. Employment-stabilization programs, designed to reduce turn-over in the essential activities, have been used also to facilitate movement of labor from the less essential.

The most direct evidence grew out of the experience of the Employment Service with the national occupational inventory of the

Selective Service System. As part of its campaign to recruit workers to meet local shortages, the Employment Service reviewed 39,400,000 occupational questionnaires returned to Selective Service boards by all men between the ages of 18 and 65. Men with needed skills whose records showed that they were not working at their full skills in essential industries were called to the employment offices and offered war jobs. At least 1,000,000 such men were interviewed between March and October 1942. The results were not encouraging: in a sample of 52 employment offices, only 30 percent of the men who were offered jobs were willing to be referred, and only about 1 in 6 was placed. The chief reason given for refusing to apply for war jobs was fear that seniority pension rights, or other formal or informal recognition of tenure would be jeopardized. Differences in wages were secondary. Inadequate housing or transportation to the job was a frequent cause for refusal.

This inertia has increasingly characterized the workers remaining in less essential activities in critical shortage areas. As a result, such areas have had to rely on potential reserves of women and, for work which women cannot do, on recruitment of men in areas of labor surplus. Orders for able-bodied men which cannot be filled locally (for example, in the shipyards of Norfolk or Seattle) are circulated in other areas where male labor is available.

As a result of the labor demand and supply analysis, the areas of labor surplus in each State and region are identified, and care is taken not to recruit in areas where local labor is needed for agriculture, lumber, mining, and war production. By these means, recruitment quotas are determined and orders are prorated.

To facilitate recruitment, arrangements are made to have a representative of the employer at the scene, in order that applicants may be referred directly and hired on the spot. Applicants are preinterviewed by the Employment Service, to avoid referring outside the community men needed locally for essential work.

Inertia is a barrier to interarea recruitment also. Many men are reluctant to leave their home communities—and frequently, their families—to take jobs sight unseen. In many cases, housing and other community facilities in the area of employment may be overtaxed, if not entirely lacking. The cost of transportation to the place of employment may be greater than the worker can or will bear. As a result, many possible sources must be canvassed to find relatively few who will accept the jobs and who are acceptable.

To discourage indiscriminate migration, the Employment Service carefully controls the interarea recruitment carried on through its facilities. No such recruitment is permitted unless local resources have been fully utilized; unless the employer has reduced his hiring specifications to a minimum; until provision has been made to transport the workers to the work site and to house them when they have arrived.

During 1942 more than 600,000 such clearance placements were made by the Employment Service. Workers from Maine and Vermont were placed in the machine shops of Connecticut and the shipyards of Massachusetts. Workers were moved from the depressed areas of northeast Pennsylvania to the war industries of Philadelphia and New Jersey; from the Virginias and the Carolinas to Baltimore and Norfolk; from Alabama and Mississippi to the shipyards in Mobile and Pascagoula; and from all over the West to the aircraft and shipbuilding centers of the Pacific coast.

Typical of the interarea recruitment for leading employers are:

	Workers
Richmond Shipbuilding Co. (Kaiser) Richmond, Calif. (6 months)	20,000
Oregon Shipbuilding Co. (Kaiser), Portland, Oreg. (6 months)	30,000
Alcan Highway contractors (12 months)	18,000
Dravo Corporation, Wilmington, Del. (12 months)	10,000
Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, San Diego, Calif. (6 months)	16,000
Aluminum Co. of America (west coast reduction plants) (6 months)	5,000
Clinton Engineering, Clinton, Tenn. (week of June 7-12)	1,000

Altogether, approximately 10,000 workers were placed by transfer between regions in May alone, and four to five times as many by transfer between areas within the regions.

Because of the increasing difficulty of recruitment and transfer, greater and greater emphasis is being placed by the War Manpower Commission on programs designed to stabilize employment and effect more efficient utilization of labor in essential industries. In a period of labor surplus, recruitment and transfer met most of the labor needs of war production. Now it is necessary not only to transfer workers from industries and areas where they can be spared, but also still further to reduce turn-over, improve training, lengthen hours, and otherwise increase the ability and productivity of the workers recruited and placed.

Mr. LODGE. I believe Senators upon reading the data will be surprised at how little has been accomplished. In my judgment, the showing has not been an impressive one. I received the impression that the War Manpower Commission, through its statistical agencies, has simply sought to follow the migration of labor and to see where it is going, but that the Commission has not really made a serious, earnest, well-considered attempt to induce the man who is living in an area where there is a labor surplus to go into an area where he is really needed. However, Senators can judge that for themselves. I simply wanted to direct attention to the fact that for the first time, I believe, in the hearings and in the document I am inserting for the RECORD the facts relative to what has been done for the treatment of our labor surplus are available to the Senate.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator's opinion of the work done by the Employment Service.

Mr. LODGE. I was one of those who voted to restore the Budget estimate for the Employment Service. I did so because it is the only hope we have, if the war continues and if our present economic situation continues, of avoiding compulsory manpower legislation. If we do not have an employment service that knows where people are, and has the information classified by occupation and by vocation, we cannot hope to make a voluntary system work, and we shall be driven that much closer to a compulsory system. I will say to the Senator that for that reason I supported the Budget estimate for the Employment Service.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to say that I am in thorough accord with the Senator from Massachusetts in his position regarding the Employment Service. Let me say that, so far as the Southeast is concerned, we are in an excellent condition.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know how good a job the Employment Service is doing, but I merely know the job is one which must be done and which cannot be done too well.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in thorough accord with the Senator's position, as he has expressed it; and I hope every consideration will be given.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, while we are talking about the confusion in the labor situation in the country I desire to say that we shall continue to have labor confusion, and the Manpower Commission and the Department of Labor will not be able to prevent it, so long as confusion exists regarding the number of men who will be taken into the Army and so long as conflicting statements are issued from time to time.

A few days ago I called attention to the confusion which exists in some of the departments, particularly with reference to the armed services. I now invite attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Star of June 24. It reads as follows:

CONFUSING STATISTICS CLOUD ARMED SERVICES' NEED OF MANPOWER—MCNUTT SAYS 1,900,000, BUT FIGURE IS HIGHER THAN OFFICERS ADMIT

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Revised estimates on the number of men required to meet the demands of the armed forces this year appeared likely today in the light of still unexplained conflicting statistics from the War Department, Selective Service, and War Manpower Chief McNutt.

Out of enough statistics to daze even the House appropriations subcommittees, which had to listen to them, confusion appeared to center on two principal points:

How big is the Army now?

How many men do we still need, or, how many fathers will have to be drafted this year?

SERVICES SIMPLY ASK

Actually the Army and Navy do the asking and Selective Service supplies on demand, but Mr. McNutt is supposed to have a running account of armed forces needs to budget his manpower.

And, to judge from the hearings on War Manpower Commission and Army supply bills, the manpower budget is going to stand revising.

Mr. McNutt told a House appropriations subcommittee that 1,900,000 persons would have to be inducted between July and December. Elsewhere in the same statement on the same day he knocked off 200,000.

About the same time another appropriations subcommittee was informed by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general of the Army Service Forces, and Army finance officers that the Army needed about 700,000 men between July and December. The congressional limit on the number of WAAC's made it necessary to do some revising and the Army finally settled on about 900,000.

We have a difference between the testimony of General Somervell and that of Mr. McNutt. First, there is a difference of 1,200,000, which Mr. McNutt revised to 1,700,000. Then a statement was

made by General Somervell, showing a difference of 700,000, which was later revised to 900,000.

The article continues:

CAN'T RECONCILE FIGURES

Earlier Navy testimony indicated the naval forces were counting on about 400,000 men to the end of this year.

Of course, there is always the question of replacements, but even manpower statisticians admit that what Mr. McNutt figured for replacements wouldn't account for the difference between what the armed forces said they wanted and what Mr. McNutt planned to give them.

Mr. McNutt estimated the armed forces would have a strength of 9,200,000 by July. However, a manpower official said the estimates prepared for Mr. McNutt did not include all the Army and Navy groups not in uniform and not receiving pay.

Then there was Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey's testimony. He said 7,800,000 men registered with selective service had enlisted or been inducted by April 30. His figures did not include those in the Regular Army when the Selective Service Act was passed, nor the National Guard men, nor the youths who enlisted before they had to register nor "some other individuals—how many I do not know."

No businessman can estimate how many of his employees are to be taken, or what is to be done about the manpower question. No man knows whether he will be taken into the Army tomorrow or next day. I have not been able to figure it out, and I do not believe anyone else can do so.

Continuing with the article:

SEVEN MILLION IN JANUARY

There were indications that the armed forces were nearer their contemplated goals than Mr. McNutt knew.

President Roosevelt told Congress early in January that the armed forces totaled 7,000,000 persons. From the first of this year selective service was called on to procure 4,300,000 men. The men were to go in at the rate of 400,000 men a month.

If that time schedule has been followed, selective service has added 2,400,000 men to the strength at the start of the year, not including enlistments of youths, men over 38, and women.

The Army told Congress it would have more than 7,200,000 men and women by the end of June. All the figures to reach that total were exact except for the enlisted male strength—a round figure of 6,500,000.

FIGURES NOT STANDARD

Manpower officials said Mr. McNutt's figures were compiled "some time ago" and there had been "some lag in information from the Army."

Several officials suggested that some of the estimates included women and others did not. Some included officers and others did not. Some included youths and specialists signed up for the Army, but still out of uniform, and others did not.

The story concludes:

How big is the Army and when will fathers be drafted? Ask General Somervell. Or General Hershey. Or Mr. McNutt.

I invite attention to a statement which appeared in the Evening Star of June 24, 1943:

LAUNDRIES CHARGE UNITED STATES AGENCIES WORK AT CROSS PURPOSES

Declaring that laundries and dry-cleaning establishments throughout the Nation virtually have broken down under the strain of insufficient manpower, officials of the two industries said today that they would ask Director Byrnes of the Office of War Mobilization, to appoint a special committee to coordinate the activities of several Government agencies in their relations with the laundry and dry-cleaning industries.

Representatives of six national organizations, who yesterday asked assistance of Director McNutt of the War Manpower Commission, indicated that some of the agencies were working at cross-purposes, in connection with their hard-pressed industries. They cited instances.

When laundries can't return a man's shirt within a reasonable time, he has to buy more. Housewives have had to increase their linen supplies. Infrequent washing, due to the slowness of laundry service, causes disintegration of material.

On the one hand, the officials contended, the War Production Board is trying to maintain its textile supply, while on the other hand, the Office of Defense Transportation is interested only in cutting down deliveries.

Again, on the one hand, the War Manpower Commission wants to help the laundries hold their labor, while on the other hand, the War Labor Board has been reluctant to grant the wage increases which would keep laundry workers on their jobs.

Edwin Wesley, of Washington, speaking for the American Institute of Laundering, said flatly that "the laundry service has broken down here."

Some plants are on a 10-day or 2-week schedule, and dry-cleaning plants here have been advertising that they could not take any dry-cleaning for a week or two at a time.

The industries' officials are hoping that Mr. Byrnes will appoint a coordinating committee, taking in the Office of Price Administration, the War Labor Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Office of Defense Transportation, the War Production Board, and the Office of Civilian Requirements.

The officials said they had been given assurances by the War Manpower Commission that all appropriate steps would be taken to recruit part-time workers, and use handicapped persons to prevent a break-down of the industry.

George Soukup, of Lincoln, Nebr., president of the National Association of Dyers and Cleaners, told reporters that today dry-cleaning plants in critical areas are forced to turn away as much work as they can accept. At one point, he said, his own plant had 7,000 dresses waiting to be cleaned, and 3 girls to do it.

In Washington, it was reported, there were at one time 3,500 mothers on the waiting list for diaper service.

Then we have Mr. Eric Johnston, who blames labor, the Government, pressure groups, and the people themselves. I read an article from the New York Times of June 25, 1943:

JOHNSTON DEPICTS THE HOME FRONT PERIL—HE BLAMES LABOR, GOVERNMENT, PRESSURE GROUPS, AND PEOPLE THEMSELVES FOR CRISIS

WASHINGTON, June 24.—Eric A. Johnston, a representative of management on the Economic Stabilization Board and president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, gave a sharp warning to the American public tonight, declaring that "our country is confronted by a crisis that daily grows more menacing, and of a nature so serious that its dangers cannot be overemphasized."

Mr. Johnston, who attended a meeting of the Stabilization Board earlier in the day, had never before made a speech in which he criticized labor, government, pressure groups generally, and even the people.

With his rapid rise to an influential position in Washington largely due to his reputation as a conciliator in striving to bring labor and management and government together in a program of wartime unity, his speech tonight over facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System expressed his loss of patience with causes which had brought crisis on the home front.

"The only good news the Axis is getting," he declared, "is the bad news from the United States home front. As our bombers shatter factories in the Ruhr, the headlines in Berlin proclaim a strike in Pennsylvania or Alabama, a conflict among high officials in Washington, or a riot in Detroit."

DECLARES VICTORY IS DELAYED

He said that "Washington is not winning the battle on the economic front," and that "confusion and inefficiency in Washington serve to delay the day of victory."

"Washington dilly-dallies, argues about the jurisdiction of Federal war agencies, plays politics, experiments with social measures, acts with indecision or not at all," he asserted.

"The threat of inflation hangs like the sword of Damocles over the Nation's head, the food shortage continues to get worse, we have failed to formulate a tax program adequate to help meet the astronomical costs of war and forestall inflation, a chaotic price policy provides fertile soil for growth of untold black markets," he declared, adding:

"The problem of manpower is still a mess."

He lashed out at pressure groups for engaging in "a civil economic brawl with the battle lines drawn on the home front instead of on the war front."

"Too much play for power among powerful men, lack of coordination and cohesion of effort, is causing Washington to spray its shots and miss the mark when the target should be high 16-inch artillery," he asserted.

He reminded labor that "strikes are on the increase despite labor's no-strike pledge—voluntarily given."

ASSAILS EVASION OF RATIONING

For the people generally he remarked:

"It is considered smart by too many people to evade rationing, to patronize black markets, and to violate other rules which must be promulgated in wartime."

He even deplored a lack of what he called adequate production, declaring that "our output of arms must be greatly increased in the next 6 months if we are to make up for the deficiency and adequately provide our fighting forces and those of our allies with the weapons essential to victory."

Calling for greater effort from all, Mr. Johnston said that those in business could manage better, those in labor could work even harder, those on farms could produce more, those in government, in executive and legislative branches could guide all their decisions "by one indelible rule—the war comes first."

Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary and treasurer of the Railway Labor Executives' Association. He states:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I am writing you to express my personal appreciation and congratulations on your splendid radio address which you delivered Friday, March 5.

I had about given up hope that any responsible Government official would have the courage and understanding to tell the people of this great country the facts concerning the war manpower problem and to explain the fallacy of attempting to build up an Army out of proportion.

During the past year I have served on several committees appointed for the purpose of discussing those subjects with General

Hershey, Mr. McNutt, and others, and it has been very disappointing to find there is such a lack of understanding with regard to the realities that confront the Nation in connection with many features that were covered in your radio address.

For example: the railroad industry has been robbed of manpower that will be sorely needed before the end of this year because General Hershey and others in authority seem to have failed to recognize that transportation is one of the greatest factors in promoting a necessary and successful war effort.

During the last war, the transportation problem was, as you know, simple compared to this one because we, in the railroad industry, were fighting what might be called a one ocean war. Today a large percentage of the products of war industries must be moved from the Middle East and eastern territory to the west coast.

Aside from these features, it seems to me we are in danger of losing the greatest and most important thing in America, and that is home life. It is discouraging, to say the least, that all we receive from the heads of departments in Washington is a bewildering medley of sounds over the air that result in confusion.

At the present time there is a tremendous hue and cry about absenteeism which is apparently going to be used by some racketteers to again promote prohibition. But not one word is said about the tremendous loss of time through accidents that could have been avoided.

I also received a letter from Mr. Tom Cashin, of the Railway Switchmen's Association, in which he said:

I am pleased that you have introduced a bill which, in my judgment, should receive support. As far as I am personally concerned it will be supported, although at the present time I am not in a position to speak for our Association (the Railway Labor Executives' Association), but I believe they will support your bill. I have written you at some length on this matter, expressing my personal feelings and indicating that so far as I am concerned I shall be glad to help you in any manner I can.

Again I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the conflicting statements regarding the draft, which have added greatly to the confusion of the registrants.

I have before me a statement recently issued by Charles P. Taft, Assistant Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, from which I read:

February 12: Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, said most draftees within the next two or three months will be chosen from fathers, "because there'll be no one else left to induct."

February 14: General Hershey and Manpower Director McNutt told the Nation nearly all able-bodied men of military age would be in the service by the end of 1942 except a small minority in essential jobs.

February 15: Chairman MAY of the House Military Affairs Committee said the committee would favor the Kilday bill to put married men with dependents at the bottom of the draft list.

February 16: Representative KILDAY (Democrat) of Texas, author of the Kilday bill, accused the Manpower Commission of "using the Selective Service as a weapon for the enforcement of administrative decrees."

February 21: The Bellamy Committee, in report to the President, urged tightening of deferments for Government employees and limiting such deferments to not more than 6 months.

February 24: President Roosevelt said an Executive order was in preparation to release able-bodied men from Government service for the armed forces. The House Military Affairs Committee ordered a special subcommittee to investigate draft deferments of Government employees and employees in plants under Government supervision.

February 27: General Hershey was disclosed to have told a Senate subcommittee he had grave doubts requirements of the armed forces could be met without drafting men over 38.

March 1: Secretary of War Stimson endorsed provisions of the Austin-Wadsworth bill to draft men and women for farms and war factories in a letter to Chairman REYNOLDS, of Senate Military Affairs Committee. Early passage predicted at Capitol for Bankhead bill granting blanket deferment to farm workers.

March 1: William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, opposed any unreasonable plan to strip industry of skilled workers to build up an excessively large Army.

March 3: Informed Government officials said drafting of fathers would begin about May 1.

March 8: All men over 38 ordered reclassified from IV-H (deferred for age) and returned to classifications on the same basis as younger men.

Recently a statement appeared in the press to the effect that fathers would not be called before October 1. Another statement announced that they might not be called before January 1, if at all.

So I say that the confusion continues to exist. Therefore, we should not wonder that there is confusion with reference to the subject of manpower. What married man between the ages of 18 and 38 will leave his home and seek employment when he does not know whether he will be called into the armed service? What unmarried man will arrange to buy a business or settle down if he does not know what his draft status is to be? If necessary, the married men of the country are perfectly willing to serve. A few days ago Chairman MAY, of the House Committee on Military Affairs, made a statement that at no time had any Army official appearing before his committee said that the Government needed more than from 7,000,000 to 7,500,000 men. I have read the reports of hearings held by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives. If Senators will read them they will see that they contain nothing but confusion. One statement will be to the effect that our armed forces will need not more than 7,000,000 men, while another statement will be to the effect that 8,000,000 men will be needed. Statements have been issued by Secretary of War Stimson, Chief of Staff Marshall, and General McNarney, and when we are through reading the statements of each of these men there is nothing but confusion.

I have repeatedly stated that, in view of the confusion existing throughout the country, the Congress of the United States should take a hand and say to the fathers of the country who have children, "You are not going to be called or sent overseas in the next year." Congress should definitely and positively tell them that they will not be taken, and it should pass a law to that effect. Congress should say to them, "If the time comes when the situation changes, and we find we can use you, then we will call you."

Mr. President, I have a large number of letters which have come to me with reference to this subject. I shall not place all of them in the RECORD, and I shall not read all of them. However, here is one from New York. It states:

May I add my voice to your movement to amend the Selective Service Act to provide for the drafting of all single men up to age 45. The disrupting of families by the taking of fathers, when there are available healthy bachelors is an outrage and against the best interests of the home—that last fortress of a democracy.

I read from a letter received from Omaha, Nebr.:

I read in last evening's World-Herald of this city that you are drawing up a bill which included taking all able-bodied Army men from desk jobs. I think this is the most commendable bill I know of. I have long been noticing this situation. At first I definitely thought that this was a job for the military to decide alone, but now I feel it is high time for Congress to take a hand.

Here in Omaha—

The writer then refers to something occurring in Omaha.

I will now read from a letter, which I have received from New Orleans:

It is a sad situation in life when children do not have a father for their guidance. The mother, then, has to go out and earn a living, leaving her small children to shift for themselves, the best way they can, while she is away at work. This has a tendency to destroy the American home.

I read from a letter written by an officer of the Navy, in which he says:

I went through World War No. 1 and returned home and raised a family of five boys. My oldest son was killed in action on board the U. S. S. *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor. The next oldest son is somewhere out there in the hellhole. Now that I am back in the service, I am trying to give everything that I have to win. I left an elective position to get back into the service. I am past the draft age.

He goes on to state that he feels that married men with children should not be drafted.

I think that the authorities in Washington owe it to the business interests of the country, to the fathers of the country, and to the people generally to make a definite statement, which may be relied upon, as to how large an Army it is intended to have, and stick to it, and then also issue a definite statement as to whether or not fathers are to be drafted in August or October or January 1. In view of the fact that we have had no assurances of that kind, I have been hopeful that the Committee on Military Affairs would report the bill which I introduced in order that we might pass upon the question on the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 58 is agreed to.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] had to say in reference to Army matters and the drafting of fathers or the drafting of youngsters before

the drafting of fathers or after the drafting of fathers, and the remarks which he made likewise in regard to the size of the Army, all of which I found interesting, as I find everything the Senator says to be very interesting. I desire to make a few observations, briefly, in regard to that matter, particularly in view of the fact that the subject thus brought to the attention of this body is of great interest to the American people.

I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that I am of the humble opinion that, as the Senator knows, it is very difficult for the Army leaders to decide exactly the number of men they want or will need now or in the future, which is entirely due to the fact, I dare say, that our Army leaders do not know what they will be called upon to demand of the American people in reference to contributions in the form of manpower. That is attributable, of course, to the chaotic condition existing throughout the world today. As a matter of fact, we have so much misunderstanding even on the home front that Americans do not know whether they are coming or going or whether they are going in a circle, and I rather imagine that Army leaders and the great military spirits of the world today find themselves in the same fix, because they do not know really what is going to take place. Even at this hour, the American people are confused; and it cannot be otherwise.

Our military leaders cannot tell the American people what they have in mind. Many people feel that, this year, with forces numbering millions of men, we should invade the continent of Europe in order to bring about the earliest possible victory. Of course, I am not only agreeable to an early victory, but I hope that, in some way or other, we may bring it about. Nevertheless, unless we are now prepared to bring about an early victory at the very minimum cost of American manpower, I am not inclined to recommend an invasion until such time as our military leaders are ready for it. That interests itself in the size of the Army.

Another factor in regard to the size of the Army is that we must have a tremendously large Army because, unfortunately and sadly and shamefully, in this country we are called upon to make utilization of several hundred thousand uniformed men exclusively for the purpose of guarding our own installations within the confines of the continental United States.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator tell the Senate how many men there are in the armed forces at the present time?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not know the exact number, but it is approximately 7,500,000.

Mr. WHEELER. Can the Senator tell the Senate how many men we can possibly transport abroad in view of shipping difficulties?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, as the Senator knows, the number is limited. I do not know that I ever had the information as to the number of men we could send abroad. As a matter of fact, I am rather inclined to think that if we had such information it would not be well to provide the public with it, because of the fact that it might be of some advantage to the enemy.

Mr. WHEELER. The facts have been testified to and have been published.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not think the exact number that can be sent abroad has been testified to or published. It is a question how many we could supply with food and munitions on foreign fields.

Mr. WHEELER. Statements of the number have been made on the floor of the Senate, over the radio, and published generally throughout the country, and I was wondering if those in charge had changed their opinion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure the figure has not been changed for a long time. The figures have been placed on a chart in the Marble Room, and they have not been changed at all. The total number that can be shipped to December 31, 1943, is 2,700,000 and the total to the end of 1944 is 4,700,000. It is a matter that cannot very well be changed from day to day. It is arrived at by the total tonnage which is available to supply the men abroad, and the total supplies which have been ordered. That is a matter which must be arranged a long time in advance, and it cannot be changed from month to month.

Mr. WHEELER. Can the Senator tell me how many men are in the Army at the present time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There are somewhat over 7,000,000 men now in the Army at the present time.

Mr. WHEELER. So that if we do not take another man into the Army, by the end of 1944, if we should send 4,700,000 men abroad, there would still be left in the United States at the end of 1944 an Army of 2,300,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. If we should not take any more men into the Army than we have up to this moment we would still have left in the Army in the United States in excess of 2,000,000 men.

Mr. WHEELER. There would still be over 2,000,000 members of the Army in the United States at the end of 1944. So I say that if 2,000,000 men of the Army will be left in the United States at the end of 1944, what excuse is there for taking more men into the Army, and what is the excuse for breaking up American homes and taking fathers away from their children, and sending the children out on the streets?

Bills have been introduced increasing the allowances to be paid to the wives and families of soldiers, but even if we give them a $15 increase or whatever is being asked, that is not going to settle the problem. If the father is to be taken away from the home the wife will be compelled to go to work for a living, and the children will be driven into the streets or put into institutions. When that happens, as was pointed out a few days ago by Mr. Hoover, and as has been pointed out to me in letters from various public officials who have written from various sections of the country, it contributes to the increase of crime among children. It seems to me that steps should be taken to prevent such a condition.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I did not rise particularly to enter into an argument with the Senator. I merely wished to give him information upon the matter about which he was speaking.

Yesterday the Committee on Military Affairs were provided an opportunity to go to the city of New York to extend greetings to some of the wounded from the north African war zone. I wanted to go and see the hospital ship which was to arrive and visit some of the boys in the hospitals, but, after all, I am rather glad I did not go, because I would not like to go through the painful experience of seeing the maimed and the wounded and the blind soldiers.

Mr. President, it was concerning that matter that I rose to make a remark. As I look around the galleries of the Senate, I see men in uniform, I see several who have been through foreign service, and some who have been wounded. What I am thinking about today is not whether we are to win the war, for there can be no doubt that we are going to win the war. If we desire, we can bring about an unconditional surrender. We have the power with which to do it. As to whether or not our Allies are going to insist upon an unconditional surrender, or whether there will be some sort of negotiation before long, I do not know. Many people are commenting upon the fact that there has not been much activity between the Chinese troops and the Japanese troops lately. Others comment on the fact that there has not recently been much gunpowder wasted on the Russian front between the Germans and the Russians.

What I am interested in is the care of these 11,200,000 men and women of the Army and Navy after the war shall have ended. I am interested in cutting down expenses, as is the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and other Members of the Senate, for that I do not want to give away everything we have in this country and have nothing left for the heroes of World War No. 2 when they return to our shores.

What I am exercised about more than anything else is how under heaven we are to be able to take care of the veterans of this war when the war shall have ended. In passing, I make this observation, that I noticed in the columns of the press of yesterday that up to the present time the American forces have experienced casualties numbering about 80,000 or 90,000 men, having lost 18,000 men in the north African campaign. During our entire participation in World War No. 1 52,000 of our soldiers were killed and 250,000 were wounded. If there is to be an invasion of Europe this year and next, and if and when we retake the territory which the Japanese have taken,

as we will, we will have as a result of this war hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of men killed in actual battle, and there will be millions of wounded. What I am interested in is conserving all that we can in this country in order to utilize it in taking care of the veterans of World War No. 2.

In speaking of that, I wish to remind the Members of the Senate that just before we entered this war, in December 1941, 25 years after the close of World War No. 1, we did not have enough beds in our hospitals to take care of the veterans of that war, which closed 25 years ago.

When the boys from this war come back they are going to ask for a bonus. They are going to deserve a bonus, and I am going to vote for such a bonus.

Mr. President, when our boys return armless and legless and blind, their usefulness in life destroyed, they are going to deserve attention, and insofar as I am concerned, I shall vote all the money necessary, if we still have it, for the care and protection of those men who have gone forth at this time; for the second time in a generation, to save the world. What I am interested in is saving enough money here and cutting down expenses so as to take care of the boys who come back, for we will need billions upon billions of dollars, because we will have to care for and hospitalize millions of boys who will be wounded or stricken with tropical diseases in the several portions of the world where we have men in uniform today. Furthermore, we are going to have to pension the men and pay pensions for 50 years to come.

Mr. President, my purpose in rising was to say this much in the interest of the men of World War No. 2.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Can the Senator advise what the total cost of civilian operations of the Federal Government is at the present moment?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I cannot.

Mr. BONE. Can any Senator here advise us what the total amount involved for civil operations may be? The Senator from North Carolina was speaking of saving some money, and in contrast with whatever savings might be achieved, I wondered what percentage of possible war costs those savings might represent. That involves a very practical question. If we save $500,000,000 a year, or $100,000,000 a year, it would be a drop in the bucket compared to war operations.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Such economy would represent hardly a drop in the bucket, so far as total appropriations are concerned.

Mr. BONE. I am trying to think it out in very practical terms. A $71,000,000,000 bill is about to come before the Senate, and I imagine that because of the grim necessities wrapped up in that appropriation, there will not be much debate about it. The debates here are over saving a little here and there in the civil operations of the Government, which are, as the able Senator points out, but a mere drop in the bucket.

Mr. McCARRAN. May we proceed with the bill, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—National Mediation Board—National Railroad Adjustment Board", on page 60, line 15, after the word "services", to strike out the colon and the following: *"Provided,* That not more than $2,500 shall be paid during the fiscal year 1944 to any person for services as referee."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VI—Railroad Retirement Board", on page 60, line 25, after the word "law", to strike out "$1,706,769" and insert "$2,030,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 23, after the word "another", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$490,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I must leave the Senate Chamber in a few moments to attend a committee meeting. I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], in charge of the bill, if at this time I may offer an amendment on page 62, in line 25, to increase the amount from $9,994,800 to $12,177,000?

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 62, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "$9,994,800" and to insert in lieu thereof "$12,177,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to state the reason why the amendment is offered. The Senate has added a considerable amount of money to the bill. The item in question is for general administration. In all we have added approximately $60,000,000 to the bill. I know it is more than $50,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. $52,900,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House reduced the amount asked for in this item on the theory that it had cut off a number of items in the bill and had otherwise reduced the amount carried in it, and therefore it reduced this particular item along with others. In the Senate we have added an additional item for administration. In view of the evidence before the committee that the purpose of increasing this item for general administration was in order to deal more directly with the States themselves, I hope the Senator from Nevada will accept the amendment and permit it to go to conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this matter was brought before the subcommittee as well as the full committee. It was voted on in the full committee. The amendment, as now offered, failed of adoption in the committee. Matters have been brought to my attention since the hearings before the committee which make me feel it might be worth while to take the item to conference. I am willing to take it to conference, and see what can be done with it.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. Both in the subcommittee and the full committee I voted against the proposed increase, but since that time I have obtained further information on the subject, and I believe the Senator from Tennessee is correct, and that the item should be taken to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the amount proposed in the Senator's amendment conforms exactly to the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it is the amount the Bureau of the Budget estimated. There was a difference of opinion in the subcommittee and in the full committee, and by a tie vote the amendment was defeated in the full committee.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Missouri has said, additional information establishes that the amount provided by the Senator's amendment is necessary if we are to carry out the functions provided for in other items.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may the Senate be advised what the additional information is to which the Senator from Alabama has referred?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I stated it a moment ago. As the Senator from Massachusetts, who is a member of the committee, knows, the House cut down various items in the bill. Some of them were cut very drastically. This is one of the items the House cut very drastically. It is an administration item. The House reduced the item a little over $6,000,000 under the Budget recommendation, and below what the House committee had agreed to, as I understand. The Senate has added about $52,000,000 to the bill. Of course, the additional administration made necessary by reason of the additional appropriation must be provided for. All I am asking is that the matter be taken to conference. The Senator in charge of the bill has said that he is willing to take it to conference and work it out there. The Senator from Massachusetts will be a member of the conference, and, of course, can be helpful in working it out.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that there were some items to which the committee did not agree, and to which I would not agree in conference if they were brought up again. But the amount requested in addition to what the committee allowed, it seems to me, might well go to conference under the Senator's amendment. For that reason I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have great faith in the statements made by the Senator from Nevada, and, of course, also in statements by the Senator from Tennessee, and I found myself in harmony with them I think on almost all the questions which came before the subcommittee. I believe the record will

show that I have been fair and nonpartisan, and have tried to consider all these matters on their merits. I voted to increase the amount for the apprentice training service, for the administration of unemployment compensation, and for the employment service, and I was under the impression that when we made those increases we were increasing the amount of personnel, and that such personnel would administer the work for which we made the appropriations. I am not at all clear as to why it is necessary to appropriate any more under this general heading. I feel that the War Manpower Commission so far has not made a broad, general record which justifies this increase. We have provided all that was asked for the employment service, for unemployment compensation, for the apprentice training service. Those are specific services in which I happen to believe. But I have seen nothing which leads me to believe that the increase now proposed is justified.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may add that in my time of service in the Senate I have never served on a committee with a Member who has taken hold with such zest and zeal and ability as has the young Senator from Massachusetts in the Appropriations Committee. The manner in which he deals with subjects which come before him has won for him the approval of every member of the committee, and I commend him heartily for the interest he has taken. What he has said up to this point is entirely true.

In taking this item to conference I do not commit myself to press for its adoption, but I do think it might be taken to conference and a further study made of it there. Since the committee passed on this bill it has been stated to me by Mr. McNutt—and I want to be frank about it—that if we retained the cut in the bill, it would result in seriously impeding the progress of his program. With that in mind, I wish to make a further study of the matter, and that is why I am willing to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on page 62, line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that will necessitate a change in the item for printing and binding in line 23, and the item for travel expenses in line 24. I have two amendments dealing with those two items. All three items can be taken to conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will accept those amendments, and the matters can be worked out in conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 62, line 23, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$160,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$193,400."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think it would be ungracious for me not to express my appreciation for what the Senator from Nevada has said about me, and without in any way desiring to appear as though I were paying a perfunctory compliment, I should like to say that it is not hard for a member of the subcommittee to make his best efforts when the committee is well presided over and its business is conducted in so orderly and efficient a manner as it is by the Senator from Nevada. I appreciate what he has said about me. But I still say we have not had presented to us a single fact to show why this is necessary; and I am still opposed to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not offer the other amendment. The two amendments would simply go along in the same way if the full amount is appropriated. But as the one amendment has been rejected, I shall not offer the other one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VII—Executive Office of the President—Office for Emergency Management—Apprentice Training Service," on page 63, line 6, after "(not to exceed $100,000)", to strike out "$465,500" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 13, after "(not to exceed $161,000)", to strike out "$550,000" and insert "$650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Employment Office facilities and services", on page 64, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,980,000" and insert "$2,275,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 2, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$45,500,000" and insert "$50,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment which I offer, and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, before the amendment is read, let me say that a number of Senators are interested in the amendment, and before it is read I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and yield to me?

Mr. TRUMAN. Very well.

Mr. DOWNEY. I desire to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada if he will tell me what was the purpose of the committee in striking out a certain portion of the provision beginning on page 8? Let me say that I have consulted with a number of Senators who were instrumental in having that action taken, and they gave me their impression, which is opposite to the one I obtain from reading the provision. It seems to me that the provision which was in the bill was designed to prevent the use of any money of the Federal Government to propagandize for a medical policy in the separate States. Senators on the committee with whom I talked thought that provision was stricken out for the opposite reason.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the provision was inserted in the House and was stricken out by the Senate committee because as it came from the House it would mean that certain cults and practitioners of certain schools of medicine should not be the recipients of public moneys in obstetrical cases. In other words, there are what is known as chiropractors and osteopaths and similar groups who seek to operate and to practice under the Federal money and to receive the benefits of the Federal moneys who are not permitted by State laws to practice in obstetrical cases. It is the view of the Public Health Service that only those who are permitted to practice in obstetrics should receive the benefits of the public money. In other words, they want to limit the practice of obstetrics under the public authority and public aid to those who are qualified in obstetrics.

Some States in the Union permit chiropractors, osteopaths, and others to practice obstetrics; but those States also screen out, as I choose to use the term, those who do not graduate from schools where obstetrics is taught. Those in chiropractic work and osteopathic work who graduate from schools and who receive the full course in obstetrics may, under some State laws, practice obstetrics. In other States they may not practice obstetrics.

The object of the Senate committee in striking out the provision was to provide that only those who are qualified obstetricians shall be the recipients of the public money.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if I may intrude further upon the time of the distinguished Senator, let me say that at the present time in California there is such a great shortage of doctors of every kind that many sick people find it difficult to secure medical attention and sometimes women are dying in childbirth because they are not able to have the services of any kind of a physician.

Under those conditions we are utilizing every kind of medical talent, and I think we must continue to do so.

I may be entirely mistaken, but I believe the provision which was in the bill as it came from the House was meant to provide that none of the money appropriated under the bill could be used by any medical association to propagandize persons in the effort to change the rule of a State as to what should be its policy. Having talked with several Senators who voted on the matter in the committee, and having heard them express the opinion that what I have just stated was exactly what they wanted to accomplish, that they did not want the Federal Government to interfere in the

set-up of the States, it does seem to me that the provision and the matter should have further consideration in conference; and I shall deeply appreciate it if the provision is reviewed.

Mr. McCARRAN. We are dealing with a committee amendment, and of course it will go to conference and will be reviewed in conference.

Mr. DOWNEY. Then I express the hope that it will be reviewed in the light of the interpretation which it seems to me should be made.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator is not trying to cast any doubt on the legislative history of the amendment as it goes to conference; because I do not want any doubt cast which would justify the Senate conferees in receding from the amendment. The amendment would justify the use of the money to provide care for the wives of men who are serving in the armed forces of the United States and are fighting on the battlefields all over the world. So far as I am concerned, I want their wives to have as good medical care at the time of childbirth as there is to be had in the United States, and I do not want the Children's Bureau to be put in such a position that it could not bar incompetents from professing to take care of women at the time of childbirth. I want the RECORD to show that the Senate and the Members of the Senate committee knew what they were doing, not that they did not know what they were doing.

The committee was advised that various agencies now practice, or may practice, obstetrics. Those agencies include midwives, as well as some cults which attempt to practice obstetrics. The object of the Senate amendment is that those who receive the benefit of this money, which is public money, shall be of the very highest class so far as obstetrical practice is concerned, as recognized by the group of physicians in the United States who are obstetricians. This does not attempt to prevent, nor would it prevent, the practice of obstetrics by anyone who could get a case in obstetrics. We do not go into that field at all. We are dealing with public money, and we say that it shall be paid only to those whom we judge to be best fitted to carry on the work.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am sorry to have evoked so much heat from the Senator from Wisconsin. What I am contending for, and what I shall continue to contend for, is that in the State of California, under all the conditions existing there, we are certainly capable of judging the qualifications reasonably to be required of any physician who practices in childbirth cases. This rule, as apparently interpreted by the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Nevada, would allow some bureau in Washington to say to the State of California, "We cannot agree with the rules of medical practice set up by your legislature and your medical boards. We are going to impose some other rules upon you, and say that none of this money may be used unless your standards are acceptable to us."

Perhaps my interpretation of what the distinguished Senators said is erroneous, and perhaps my understanding of this language is erroneous. I do not desire to prolong the controversy. This is not the proper time. I was not present when the amendment was under consideration, or I should have discussed the question then. In view of all the circumstances, I hope that the question may be reviewed.

While it may very well be that in various States of the Union a certain medical standard may be upheld, our standards may be very different from those in other States. In California, weekly, hundreds of people are dying without any medical care at all.

Recently I was in one of the defense centers in the State of California. I knew a man who lay dying in agony for 24 hours. He died, without a single physician in that community to come to his aid. I may say, incidentally, that in that same community there is one of the finest military hospitals in the world. At that very time one-third of the beds were unoccupied, and a large number of trained nurses and physicians were doing nothing. They would have been glad to offer succor to the dying man, but under military rules they were not allowed to do so.

We are in extremis in the State of California; we are desperate. Our workmen cannot have their teeth properly attended to. Frequently our women are giving birth to children under most unhappy conditions. All I am attempting to say is that I think it would be most unfortunate if the provision in this bill were used by any medical association to attempt, through a bureau in Washington, to impose upon any State a different medical standard than that which the people of the State and the legislature of the State want.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from California that it is furthest from the minds of members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to say which is the best of any groups of practitioners of medicine. However, we are dealing with public money. Congress has the right to say how public money shall be expended, and if the Congress wishes to say that it shall be expended for those who are equipped to practice along certain approved lines, that is the business of Congress. That is what the Congress is seeking to do by this amendment. It does not seek to pass on the qualifications of osteopaths or chiropractors. They may be qualified, and they may practice obstetrics. We pass on the qualifications of no one. We simply say how public money shall be expended, and that is all.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor. I offered an amendment, and was about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I now suggest the absence of a quorum before the amendment is stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hill	Reed
Ball	Holman	Revercomb
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Bilbo	Kilgore	Robertson
Bone	La Follette	Russell
Brewster	Langer	Scrugham
Bridges	Lodge	Shipstead
Brooks	Lucas	Smith
Buck	McCarran	Stewart
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McNary	Tobey
Chavez	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Moore	Van Nuys
George	Murdock	Wagner
Gerry	Murray	Walsh
Green	Nye	Wheeler
Guffey	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gurney	O'Mahoney	White
Hatch	Overton	Willis
Hawkes	Pepper	Wilson

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

The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. TRUMAN to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, viz: Strike out all after line 20, on page 65, down to and including line 13, on page 66, and insert the following:

"PAR. 1. Youth work: For all expenses necessary to enable the National Youth Administration, which is hereby extended to and including June 30, 1944, under the supervision and direction of the War Manpower Commission, to provide employment and work training for young persons of the ages of 16 to 24, inclusive, on workshop and other projects approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as needed in the prosecution of the war in furnishing work experience and work training preparatory to employment in occupations in which there is a present or potential shortage of labor, $35,000,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for youth work, National Youth Administration, 1943. This appropriation shall be available for the payment of project supervisory employees; the procurement and maintenance of project facilities by contract or otherwise, including the purchase of materials, supplies, and equipment; purchase of 215 passenger-carrying automobiles; operation of resident facilities; travel expenses (not to exceed $918,000) for travel of supervisory employees in the performance of their official duties, and transportation of trainees to, from, and between projects, including the transfer of trainees to induction projects for the purpose of placing such trainees in war production industries; and the examination of applicants for training to determine their physical fitness for subsequent employment.

"PAR. 2. To provide continuance of part-time employment for needy young persons in colleges and universities, to enable such persons to continue their education, $4,000,000, together with not to exceed $1,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for part-time employment of students, National Youth Administration, 1943.

"PAR. 3. Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary for carrying out the general administration of the programs set forth in paragraph 1 and paragraph 2, including not

to exceed $250,000 for travel expenses, $2,750,000.

"PAR. 4. Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the National Youth Administration, $50,000.

"PAR. 5. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration shall, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, fix the monthly earnings and hours of work for trainees engaged on work projects financed in whole or in part from the appropriation in paragraph 1, but such determination shall not have the effect of establishing a national average labor cost per trainee on such projects during the fiscal year 1944 substantially different from the national average labor cost per such trainee on such projects prevailing at the close of the fiscal year 1943. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is hereby authorized to fix monthly hours of work for uncompensated trainees who are employed in and whose wages are paid by private industrial concerns but who receive training through use of project facilities as authorized in paragraph 7 hereafter.

"PAR. 6. Funds appropriated under paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period ending June 30, 1944, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished during such period for the purposes set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2.

"PAR. 7. The National Youth Administration is authorized to receive reimbursements from other Federal or non-Federal public agencies for the use of facilities and for the cost of materials, and contributions for the operation of projects from Federal or non-Federal agencies in the form of services, materials, or money; any money so received to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States. Such contributions shall be expended or utilized as agreed upon between the contributing agency and the National Youth Administration and such reimbursements shall be available for the purposes of this appropriation. Workshop facilities and personal services of project supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration may be made available for training of individuals who are employed in and whose wages for such training are paid by private industrial concerns engaged in the production of war materials or equipment: *Provided, however,* That individuals receiving such training shall not be entitled to wage or salary payments from any funds appropriated herein.

"PAR. 8. The facilities and services of the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission shall be utilized wherever possible in the selection and referral of trainees for employment and work training on projects of the National Youth Administration.

"PAR. 9. No alien shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 and no part of the money appropriated in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit that he is a citizen of the United States, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship. This paragraph shall not apply to citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines or to persons who have been honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

"PAR. 10. No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, and no compensated or uncompensated person shall receive assistance in the form of payments, training, or otherwise from the United States for services rendered under the National Youth Administration, under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 unless such person before engaging in such employment or receiving such assistance subscribes to the following oath:

"'I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God.'

"Par. 11. Compensated and uncompensated administrative and supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration, designated for the purpose by the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representative, shall have the general powers of notaries public in the administration of oaths required by paragraphs 9 and 10 and the execution and acknowledgement of other legal instruments, and all forms of notarial acts determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary for the effective prosecution of the National Youth Administration programs. No fee shall be charged for oaths administered by such employees.

"PAR. 12. No person who refuses prior to employment to agree that he will accept employment in industry related to national defense if and when offered in good faith shall be eligible for employment on any project of the National Youth Administration. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to uncompensated trainees who are employed in and who are paid by private industrial concerns.

"PAR. 13. No portion of the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

"PAR. 14. No portion of the appropriations in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee, except persons so appointed who are already employed by another agency of the Government and are assigned or detailed to the National Youth Administration.

"PAR. 15. In carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representatives, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; to appoint and compensate officers and employees without regard to civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to utilize, with the consent of the head of the Federal agency by which they are employed Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State or local government, State and local officers and employees at such compensation as shall be determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary without regard to other laws governing the employment and compensation of Federal employees.

"PAR. 16. Appointments in any State to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the appropriation in paragraph 3 shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

"PAR. 17. In making separations from the Federal service, or furloughs without pay to last as long as 3 months, of persons employed within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of paragraph 3, the appointing power shall give preference, as nearly as good administration will warrant, in retention to appointees from States that have not received their share of appointments according to population: *Provided, however,* That soldiers and sailors and marines, the widows of such, or the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines, who themselves are not qualified, but whose wives are qualified to hold a position in the Government service, shall be given preference in retention, in their several grades and classes, where their ratings are good or better.

"PAR. 18. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits, shall apply to persons receiving compensation from the appropriation in paragraph 1 for services rendered as employees of the United States: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death: *Provided further,* That for carrying out the purposes of this paragraph there shall be made available to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission from the appropriation in such paragraph 1 the sum of $86,000, or so much thereof as such Commission, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, estimates and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury will be necessary for such purposes.

"PAR. 19. The funds appropriated by paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for emergency hospitalization and medical care, by reimbursement to Government hospitals or by contract with other public or private hospitals, in cases of critical illness or injury, of compensated trainees, who are full-time residents of projects involving the maintenance of trainees in camps or other resident facilities under the supervision of the National Youth Administration.

"PAR. 20. If the death of any trainee, employed and compensated from funds provided under paragraph 1 hereof, occurs while such trainee is in transit to or in residence at such camp or other resident facility mentioned in paragraph 19 hereof, or while undergoing hospital treatment except for injuries sustained under conditions which are covered by the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act as provided for in paragraph 18 hereof, the funds appropriated under paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for the payment of necessary expenses of preparation of the body for burial, interment or cremation (not to exceed a total of $100 in any one case), and for transportation of the remains, including round-trip transportation and subsistence of an escort, to the home of the decedent, or to such other place as relatives of the decedent may designate if the distance to such other place be not greater than the distance to the home of the decedent: *Provided,* That when the expenses of the preparation and disposition of the remains, or any part of such expenses, are paid by individuals, such individuals may be reimbursed therefor.

"PAR. 21. The National Youth Administrator, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from the appropriation in paragraph 1 any claim arising out of operations thereunder accruing after June 30, 1943, on account of damage to, or loss of, privately owned property caused by the negligence of any employee of the National Youth Administration, while acting within the scope of his employment. No claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of $500 or which is not presented in writing within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof. Acceptance by a

claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

"PAR. 22. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any project authorized in paragraph 1, or diverts, or attempts to divert, or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of the appropriations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, or 4 or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives, or attempts to deprive, or assists in depriving any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under such appropriation, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of this paragraph shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

"PAR. 23. All training or educational programs other than work and training on the project location incidental to the supervision of a work program being conducted thereon for youth employed by the National Youth Administration on work projects shall be under the control and supervision of the State boards for vocational education of the several States and shall be paid for out of appropriations made to the Office of Education and expended by the States pursuant to plans submitted by State boards for vocational education and approved by the Commissioner of Education.

"PAR. 24. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase with funds appropriated for the National Youth Administration when the aggregate amount involved in such purchase does not exceed the sum of $300.

"PAR. 25. Whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine that the facilities of any shop project of the National Youth Administration can contribute more effectively to the prosecution of the war if operated by another department or agency of the Government, or by another public agency, he may direct the transfer of such facilities to such department or agency.

"PAR. 26. Property and facilities which are declared surplus to the needs of the program as provided in paragraph 1 may be transferred, upon such terms as may be approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, but without cost to the United States for transportation or otherwise, to school districts, municipalities, counties, States, or other non-Federal public agencies, without regard to other Federal law or regulation."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the able junior Senator from Missouri is quite long. It will involve considerable discussion. The appropriation bill for the military activities of the Government has been reported to the Senate, and it should be considered at once.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri be printed, and that after I shall have offered one more amendment to the pending bill, House bill 2935, that it go over until Monday, so that the Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation bill for the military establishment, may discuss the bill this afternoon.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to agreeing to the suggestion which has been made by the able senior Senator from Nevada, providing the Department of Labor appropriation bill will be the pending order of business when the Senate convenes on Monday.

Mr. McCARRAN. I would include that in my request for unanimous consent.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not favorable to taking up the Military Establishment appropriation bill for final vote until Monday. The hearings have not been printed. The proposed appropriation is for $72,000,000,000. I should not want to attempt to pass the bill this late in the afternoon. I should have no objection to taking up the bill this afternoon if it will go over until Monday for final vote. I thought we could pass the Department of Labor appropriation bill today.

Mr. McCARRAN. The discussion on the matters involved in the Truman amendment will consume considerable time of the Senate. I believe the amendment should be printed so that the Senators may know what they are discussing and what they will vote upon. The amendment is a vital one. It is what is known as the N. Y. A. amendment. It would set aside the amendment of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and of the Appropriations Committee of the House, and would provide for the appropriation of approximately $46,000,000.

Mr. TRUMAN. The amount would be approximately $47,000,000. The college part of the program was increased at the suggestion of several Senators by more than $4,000,000, so that instead of being $43,000,000, the appropriation would be $47,800,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. In excess of $47,800,000. This is the N. Y. A. controversy all over again on the floor of the Senate. I know that a number of Senators, including some who are not present at this time, will want to be heard on the amendment. For that reason, I suggest that the entire matter go over, and that the amendment be printed so that Senators who wish to discuss it may have it before them and will know what they are voting upon when they vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McNARY. I should have no objection to that arrangement if it were coupled with the understanding that not until Monday will we vote finally on the very large bill providing for appropriations of approximately $72,000,000,000 for the Military Establishment. I am willing to consider the bill and discuss it, but I want the final vote on the bill to go over until Monday, so that in the meantime we may have an opportunity to read the hearings, which as yet have not been printed, and to study the measure.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the appropriation bill for the military establishment is taken up for consideration today we will be able to make such progress as we can on the bill; and, if objection is made to the taking of a vote, I believe that no Member would insist upon having the vote on the bill taken today.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to make the objection now, and have it understood. I do not want to have any contingency about it, such as that we might not vote today. I want it clearly understood that we will not vote today.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, let me make a suggestion. Several Senators are very anxious to make a record on the N. Y. A. amendment. I can see nothing to be gained by preventing those Senators from having their say on the amendment this afternoon, if they want to speak on it, and then we can postpone the vote on both bills until Monday. I think the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon is entirely proper.

Mr. HILL. That is what I was going to suggest. I think the distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is, of course, most anxious to have the appropriation bills disposed of as soon as possible.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I do not believe we would be justified in laying aside the pending bill at 3 o'clock in the afternoon without at least putting some of the debate behind us. Would there be an objection to allowing Senators who may wish to speak on the N. Y. A. to do so this afternoon, so that some of the debate may be behind us?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my only object is that all Senators, those who are absent from the floor and those who are present, may have a full opportunity to know what the amendment is. The amendment has only just been presented. I think it should be printed and should be in the hands of every Senator before he votes on it. It involves $47,000,000. That is not so very much, but it is something, just the same.

Mr. TRUMAN. I should like to say to the able Senator from Nevada that the bill he is suggesting that we vote on has to do with $71,000,000,000 and not $40,000,000.

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

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

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It not only involves $47,000,000, but also involves overturning the action of the House of Representatives and the action of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate.

Mr. TRUMAN. There is no reason why we should not discuss it first this afternoon.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oklahoma how many amendments there are to the War Department appropriation bill? Does the Senator have any idea as to how long the consideration of that bill might take?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, let me make a very brief statement, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for that purpose?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The House Committee on Appropriations received from the War Department estimates which totaled some $59,000,000,000 of new money and requests for some twelve and a half billion dollars reappropriation of funds which were unallocated, making a total request of some $71,500,000,000.

The House committee held extensive hearings, embracing some 600 pages of testimony. The bill was considered in the House and on a yea-and-nay vote was passed unanimously, no Member of the House voting against it, although a large majority of the Members of the House were present.

The bill came to the Senate on Tuesday. Anticipating the arrival of the bill, the Senate Committee on Appropriations commenced hearings Tuesday morning, before the bill actually reached the committee. We had asked the War Department to submit recommendations for changes, pursuant to the policy of the committee, according to which when a bill comes to the Senate the chairman of the committee requests the department having to do with the bill to submit recommendations for eliminations or for additions or changes. The Secretary of War replied that he had no suggestions to make; that he recommended that the bill be passed in the form it was passed by the House of Representatives. No doubt the recommendations were based upon the desire that the bill should pass before the 30th day of this month. Under our policy the fiscal year ends on the 30th day of June, and if this bill is not passed and signed by that date, on July 1 there will be no money for some phases of the War Department's activities.

The Senate committee held hearings forenoon and afternoon during this week, commencing Tuesday morning and closing last night. It is true the hearings have not been completely printed. They will be printed, of course, by Monday.

As I have said, there were no requests for changes made by the Secretary of War, but in the subcommittee we considered changes suggested by Members of the Senate, Members of the House, and by some officials of the War Department, who made the suggestions in their individual capacity. As the result, the subcommittee recommends only four changes in the bill. I can outline the changes very briefly. They all involve limitations on the expenditure of funds.

The first amendment has to do with the renegotiation of contracts made by the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation. Under the existing law, as I understand, War Department contracts are subject to renegotiation, Navy Department contracts are subject to renegotation, Maritime Commission contracts are likewise subject to renegotiation; but contracts made with the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation are not subject to renegotiation. The House committee placed an amendment in the bill by way of limitation providing that contracts made by the Defense Plant Corporation and by the Defense Supplies Corporation should be subject to renegotiation the same as in the case of the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission. Because our committee did not have time to go into the subject, because we thought that it was a matter for the legislative committee to consider, the committee voted to eliminate that provision from the bill. We did not have time to go into the matter. We could come to no satisfactory conclusion regarding it, and we thought it was in the bill unnecessarily. So the subcommittee and the main committee recommended that this limitation be removed from the bill and be handled by the regular legislative committee. That is amendment No. 1.

Amendment numbered 2 provides that no part of the funds appropriated shall be used in any way to supervise conscientious-objector camps. The evidence shows that there is a great number of such camps throughout the country, which are provided and maintained by church organizations. The Selective Service Administration has assigned Army officers to supervise such camps. These officers have a very small staff, and if the limitation should remain in the bill the funds appropriated could not be used to pay the salaries of these officers, and a few employees, to supervise these conscientious-objector camps.

We thought it only reasonable that the War Department should have some supervision over these camps. We, therefore, struck out the limitation which would prevent the payment of any salaries or the assignment of any Army officers to this class of work. That is limitation No. 2.

Limitation No. 3: The War Department has employed and assigned a number of painters and artists to go abroad and depict on paper and on canvas outstanding war scenes. That is pursuant to a policy which has been followed for a long time, although perhaps authorization for it cannot be found in the law. We all have in mind many famous paintings of war scenes and war incidents. An artist painted the picture of Custer's Last Stand; an artist painted the picture of the Battle of Gettysburg; and in the Rotunda of the Capitol there are some very famous war pictures painted in the days of the Revolution. The War Department thought it advisable to have this class of work done. It thought it advisable to select outstanding artists and painters, commission them in the Army, let them wear the uniform and become a part of the Army, and send them abroad to do this class of work. This bill provides that none of the funds appropriated may be used to pay the salaries of such painters and artists.

The objections to this activity came about because of an incident wherein some of the painters were ordered to paint the portraits of generals. That is perhaps a questionable public activity. Had it not been for that, I think this issue would not have arisen; but, anyway, this bill provides that painters and artists engaged in this activity may not be paid. They are now in various parts of the world, some in the Aleutian Islands, some in northern Africa, some in the South Sea Islands, and some in other places.

It occurred to the committee that in any event it would be necessary to appropriate money to return these men to the United States, if their services were discontinued, and, inasmuch as again there is involved a question of policy and the Appropriations Committee is not primarily a policy-making committee, we thought that limitation was not proper on this bill. So the committee recommends that the limitation whereby no part of the funds appropriated by the bill may be used to pay the expenses and salaries of these painters and artists be eliminated. That is No. 3.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for the able and distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, but the measure which he is discussing is probably not going to be reached this afternoon. I have the floor, and have an amendment pending to the bill under consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If I may make one more point all four of the limitations will be covered. It will take but a moment.

Mr. TRUMAN. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The fourth limitation provides that no part of the funds appropriated in the bill shall be used to pay the expenses of training medical students for more than 2 years. Under that provision the War Department could train medical students at existing colleges except for 2 years, which means the 2 last years of their college training. So that premedical students and first- and second-year medical students could not be trained with money appropriated by this bill. Inasmuch as this would disarrange the programs of the medical schools of the country, and as it is another matter for a legislative committee of Congress, we thought that limitation should not remain in the bill.

Those are the only four suggestions the committee makes for amendments.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nevada withdraw his request?

Mr. McCARRAN. In view of the suggestion made by the acting leader, I withdraw the request for a unanimous-consent agreement at this time.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Missouri to yield to me so that I may offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield for that purpose, provided no controversy ensues.

Mr. McCARRAN. If controversy arises, I shall withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 62, line 25, after the figures, insert the following: *"Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the

President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, that provision is a part of the law at the present time. I am merely offering it as an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the amendment which has been offered by me to the pending appropriation bill. It is the same amendment which was presented by the subcommittee of the House of Representatives to the full committee and which was voted down in the full committee, except that the college appropriation is increased from $3,000,000 to $4,000,000, at the suggestion of several Senators.

The amendment calls for the appropriation of $48,800,000 to continue the National Youth program. Thirty-five million dollars of that is to be used along with reappropriation of some $5,000,000, under the same set-up now in existence, for the training of men for war industries, and for the customary college courses. The high-school course and the course which interferes with the national program have been eliminated.

Much testimony was taken before the House committee and before the Senate committee. I think nearly every Senator is familiar more or less with the workings of the National Youth organization in his own State. It is doing work which, in my opinion, is absolutely essential to the war program.

I have numerous letters and telegrams from such men as Andrew Jackson Higgins, of New Orleans, and Henry Kaiser, on the west coast, and several others of the great production managers in the war effort, that the National Youth Administration is of indispensable value to them.

Those who are familiar with its workings in their own States I think will find that a good job has been done in the training of the young men, and I think the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, California knows well the immense contribution that N. Y. A. has made to the war industries of our great State. Had it not been that thousands of workers, including many N. Y. A. trainees, had come to California at the outset of the war, we would never have been able to produce the vast amount of war material it has been our privilege to contribute to the winning of the war. Oftentimes overlooked, but a point of vital importance for the present and for the future, is the fact that the vast migration of labor made necessary by war brings with it very grave social problems, and if N. Y. A. had done no more than to provide the safeguards it has provided for the youth it has transferred, that one fact alone should cause us to place our stamp of approval upon it.

California is not alone in having a youth problem today—every State and every large city has that problem, and it is becoming graver. As more and more workers, and in particular youthful workers, migrate in order that the needs of war industry shall be served, we may be thankful indeed that we have an agency in existence which can help to keep the evils that are inherent in the situation from getting out of hand. There is no thoughtful person in the country who can do otherwise than view with alarm the growing tide of youthful delinquency. What does this portend for the future, and if, as it is now proposed, we throw N. Y. A. out the window, what agency have we that can take its place as a stabilizing force for youth? Perhaps we can destroy N. Y. A. and think we save fifty million, but if in doing it we harm the war effort, as I think it would be harmed if N. Y. A. were destroyed or disrupted, and if all youth were left on their own in this hectic war period, I am inclined to believe that we shall find the saving was entirely illusory.

True economy consists not only in preventing waste, but in wisely using money in the present, and it is my unshakable conviction that true economy warrants us in spending this money on behalf of the Nation and its youth.

In connection with the foregoing, I should like to introduce for the RECORD a letter from the citizens committee for Latin-American youth. It is of particular interest because this letter was written as far back as January 13 of this year. It bears eloquent testimony to the stabilizing influence which N. Y. A. has exercised. I think Senators will agree with me that young men and young women who are willing to undergo training in hard and dirty work, as N. Y. A. youth do, are not likely candidates for street brawls. Let me read the letter:

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR
LATIN-AMERICAN YOUTH,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 13, 1943.

Mr. AUBREY WILLIAMS,
National Administrator,
National Youth Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The citizens' committee for Latin-American youth was appointed by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County to plan a constructive approach to the problems of our Latin-American group in this community, following a visit to Los Angeles made by Mr. Cranston of the Office of War Information.

This committee has taken note of the outstanding program of shop training that the National Youth Administration has provided to the young people of California without regard to race, creed, or color. A large group of young Americans of Mexican descent have taken advantage of the programs offered and are now contributing to the war effort by serving in our local defense industries.

At its meeting of January 4, 1943, the committee unanimously commended the National Youth Administration program as demonstrated in California and ordered its secretary to express its appreciation to you as National Administrator.

May I take this opportunity of saying that I personally concur with the sentiments expressed by the committee.

Very truly yours,
STEPHEN J. KEATING,
Secretary.

There is no man in this Chamber who can view with equanimity the rising tide of youthful delinquency, and I say that if N. Y. A. were making no contribution to the war effort whatever, but were rendering the Nation this one service alone during the present times, we would be fully justified in making the appropriation requested.

However, important as this aspect of N. Y. A. activities is, it is a byproduct at the present moment of a much greater product—and that product is the skilled workers whom the N. Y. A. places at the disposal of war industry. The great State it is my honor to represent is favored in many ways, and in this particular hour of the Nation's crisis it is particularly proud that it is able, through its war industries, to make so vast a contribution to the war effort. And to this war effort N. Y. A. youth have made a large contribution. In the 10 months to April 1 of this year over 6,100 youth were given training, a large part of which was concerned with those skills that are indispensable in the building of planes and of ships. As in other sections of the country, N. Y. A. youth in California learn to produce by producing, and in this fiscal year, to May 21, 199,366 pieces and articles were produced, principally for the benefit of the various armed forces.

The firms who have employed these youth read like the blue book of war industry—Douglas Aircraft, Lockheed Aircraft, North American, Vultee, Kaiser Shipyards, Bethlehem Steel, California Shipbuilding, and others too numerous to mention.

The approval of N. Y. A. voiced by the Kaiser Shipyards is well known. That approval is typical of the attitude of industry generally.

Judged solely by its contribution to the war effort, I am glad to give my approval to this agency. I hope the Senate will not destroy it.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is on the desk of the clerk a conference report and the papers on the agricultural appropriation bill. I should like to have the report taken up at this time, if it is agreeable, in order that the bill may go back to conference early next week. There are a number of items which have not as yet been settled.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 8, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 53, 63, 64, 65, 66, 72, 74, 75, 101, 102, 108, and 109.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 9, 23, 24, 50, 54, 68, 77, 89, 90, 95, 96, 110, 111, 112, 113, and 115, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,498,-184"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,898,-184"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed $9,100 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$658,843"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,127,-236"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,481,-502"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,826,-649"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$149,595"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,787,-876"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$282,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,170"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$223,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$165,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$113,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,767,-340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$620,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$257,128"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$822,829"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$472,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$169,657"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$416,131"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,978,-537"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$940,-280"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,531,-897"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

"To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 563b), (not to exceed $496,011) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,100), of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567-568), and Acts supplementary thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resource, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, not to exceed $101,357; in all, not to exceed $746,168, of which not to exceed $44,110 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase of reference books and technical journals; not to exceed $30,000 for the construction or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation which is available for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and sections 4 and 5 of the Act approved June 7, 1924, shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or individuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than three fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such new nurseries."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$24,678,-065"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1, 1941 (Public Law Numbered 147, Seventy-seventh Congress): *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity

substantially deteriorated in quality or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the extraction of peanut oil, or commodities sold to farmers for seed or for new or byproduct uses: *Provided further*, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquires or supplying of information to individual farmers"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,675,136"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,069,391"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the sum of $1,278,649 where it occurs in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$177,520"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$364,070"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 78, 79, 80, 81, 84, 86, 87, 88, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 107, 116, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, and 134.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ELMER H. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

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

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2481, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
June 23, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 78, 79, 80, 81, 86, 93, 94, 100, 118, 124, 125, and 134 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the said amendment insert: "$14,198,950."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the said amendment insert: "$14,857,793."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the said amendment insert: "$24,623,443: *Provided*, That the appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority: *Provided further*, That all obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out all after "individuals," down to and including "amended" in line 12 and insert "including not to exceed $10,000 per annum for an Administrator, other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and compensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, including not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows:

In line 11 of the matter inserted by the said Senate engrossed amendment strike out [, expansion,]; and

In line 17 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment after "consumption" insert "but no part of such funds shall be available to defray the expenses of any activity heretofore carried on by the Work Projects Administration."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

"To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the War Food Administration, $20,000,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

"In making any grant payments under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the Act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

"For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $60,000,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 per centum of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine: *Provided*, That no loan shall be made out of such funds except loans which have first been offered and refused by other lending agencies (including the Emergency Crop and Feed Division of the Farm Credit Administration, the Production Credit Associations, and private lending agencies) customarily engaged in making loans of a similar character at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have out-

standing at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this Act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

"None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation') shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, promotion or management of homestead associations, land-leasing associations, land-purchasing associations, or cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or (4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or (5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative association (except for medical, dental or hospital services) or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary for the production of agricultural commodities.

"The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation,' shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"FARM TENANCY

"To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said Act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said Act, $1,326,070.

"Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 per centum per annum and which sum shall not be used for making loans under the terms of said act for the purchase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit of 30 acres and more in the county, parish, or locality in which such purchase may be made, which value shall be determined solely according to statistics of the farm census of 1940: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of two times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation, institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes or approves or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee of the Department or of any such bureau, office, agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to make or approve, (1) any loan or advance under the provisions of food production financing bulletins F-1 or F-2, issued by the Farm Credit Administration operating under the Food Production Administration, Production Loans Branch, as heretofore or hereafter amended, unless (a) the applicant represents in writing and it is administratively determined that credit sufficient in amount to finance the production of the crops or livestock specified in the application is not available to him from sources other than the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation or is available from other sources only on such terms and conditions that he could not use the other credit available to the extent necessary to produce the entire quantity of such crops or livestock specified in his application and (b) the person authorized to approve the loan or advance on behalf of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation finds that a greater quantity of the crops or livestock specified in the application would be likely to be produced if the loan or advance is made than would be produced otherwise, or (2) any loan or advance under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148), as amended (other than loans or advances under bulletins F-1 and F-2 made or approved on the conditions specified in this section) except (a) in regions in which loans or advances had been made under said section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 within one year prior to December 1, 1942, or (b) in any region which the Secretary of Agriculture shall have designated as a region in which the making of such loans or advances is necessary in order to finance the production of crops or livestock that otherwise would not be produced in such region: *Provided*, That none of the limitations provided for by this section shall apply with respect to any loan or advance made or approved before the date this Act becomes effective, or to the disbursement either before or after such date of any part of the proceeds of any loan or advance theretofore made or to any loan or advance made or approved at any time for the purpose of financing the completion of production undertaken before such date or for the purpose of protecting or preserving the security for or assisting in the collection or liquidation of any loan or advance made or approved before such date."

That the House insist upon its amendments to Senate amendments numbered 12, 14, 19, 84, 107, 126, 127, and 128; and insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 87, 88, 92, 97, 98, 99, 116, 120, 121, 122, 123, 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133 to said bill and ask a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that amendment No. 128 deals with the R. A. C. C.?

Mr. RUSSELL. It has to do with the R. A. C. C.; yes.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 14, 84, 107, and 128. Amendment No. 128 is the one to which the Senator from Nebraska has just referred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With respect to amendment numbered 128, I wish to say that when the measure was before the Senate the item in question was debated fully on the floor, and a vote was taken relative to the question of restoring the language of the House in section 2, page 95, of the bill. Considerable debate was had with respect to the Senate amendment which deleted that language. In view of the fact that during the debate on this subject, considerable discussion was had concerning the question of whether the proposed amendment should go to conference, and there accomplish the purpose of the original provisions, and in view of the form in which it has been returned from the conference, I wish to make a few comments.

During the debate suggestion was made that the R. A. C. C. be continued in operation without the extension features now operated by the Department of Agriculture. There were certain suggestions that an attempt be made to correct the situation, if the extension features were not to be continued, and the R. A. C. C. restricted to the position it occupied as originally intended by the act. As the amended section No. 128 comes back from conference, the proposed revision has not been made. I feel that the provision is broader now than it was before it went to conference.

The first part of the amendment provides that the applicant shall represent in writing and it shall be administratively determined by the chairman of the county war board, whether the applicant is eligible for a loan. That is all the applicant has to do now in order to obtain funds from the R. A. C. C. Let us say that a farmer comes in to make application for a loan. The chairman of the triple A board is in 75 cases out of 100 the chairman of the county war board. All the applicant has to do is to

state in writing that he cannot borrow the money elsewhere. The chairman then administratively determines that the applicant cannot borrow the money elsewhere and makes the loan to him. There is no restriction placed on making the loan. It is a nonrecourse loan.

The second part of the amendment goes beyond the purposes of the act entirely. The act establishing the R. A. C. C. provided that it should deal with drought situations. It was an act providing for an emergency. As the amendment comes back from conference it provides that money can be loaned to anyone; it does not make any difference who the applicant is, what his credit is. The loans can be extended to cattlemen, to anyone to whom the chairman of the local war board desires to make the loan without any restriction. This is now being done on a wholesale basis, so that the R. A. C. C. will become so firmly entrenched that it cannot be terminated. I am receiving hundreds of letters from all over the country telling of loans being made to applicants without any restriction whatever. We are simply setting up another Government lending agency in direct competition with 19 other Government lending agencies, and with 15,000 private lending agencies.

Much is said about holding the line and about spiraling inflation. We have debated these subjects for nearly 2 weeks in the Senate. Yet here an organization is set up which, without any restriction at all to loan money, can pyramid loans up to $500,000,000 under the new provisions of the act.

In view of the fact that after due deliberation and debate with respect to section 2 of the bill, and that the bill and the conferees did not adopt the Senate amendment, went to conference, and now has come back to us in its present unsatisfactory form. I shall not further oppose the conference report, because in reality the issue was settled last week by vote of the Senate. I do wish to say to the Members of the Senate, however, that later on in the session I expect to bring up for consideration proposed legislation, which contains provisions to terminate this type of agency outright. In connection with the agricultural appropriation bill I attempted to do what should have been done in other cases, that is to cut off the agency entirely, but I agreed that it be continued with certain restrictions, for the period of 1 year. The conference committee has not seen fit to carry out that proposal. Its action is a broadening of the provisions of the act itself. So I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I cannot accept this provision of the conferees' report, but shall not make objection further at this time. I think the Senator from Georgia has done everything he agreed to do to accomplish what I wanted done in the way of restricting the provisions of the act, but I feel now that the only way to accomplish what I wish done, is not make a further attempt to restrict the R. A. C. C. by legislation in an appropriation bill, but to proceed in the alternative and deal with the question in direct legislation affecting it, on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his kindness and what he has done. The conference committee has broadened the act, instead of restricting it, and the adoption of the conferees' amendment would now authorize the R. A. C. C. to make loans which heretofore were illegally made. I cannot accept the report but will immediately ask for consideration of Senate bill 914 and by direct legislation ask the Senate to terminate R. A. C. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, is the amendment with respect to the Farm Security Administration contained in the portion of the report now under consideration?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Farm Security Administration amendment is not contained in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I now move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 126, and 127, and that the Senate further insist on the Senate amendments. I might say to the Senator from Virginia that this motion embraces the Senate amendment relating to the Farm Security Administration. The effect of the motion would be to carry this matter back to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I now move that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move, Mr. President, that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 87, 88, 92, 97, 98, 99, 116, 120, 121, 122, and 123, agree to a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. McNARY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thought that if it were agreeable, we might now temporarily lay aside the pending bill, and take up the War Department appropriation bill, and make as much progress as possible on it, with the understanding that we would not reach a final vote on it today, and that when the Senate meets on Monday, the bill now pending will automatically come up as the pending business. In other words, I suggest that the Senate temporarily lay aside the pending bill, and take up the War Department appropriation bill; that on Monday the bill now pending shall be the pending business, and that this afternoon we simply make as much progress as possible in the consideration of the War Department appropriation bill. I make the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have it distinctly understood, Mr. President, that when the Senate meets on Monday, House bill 2935 will be the pending business.

Mr. HILL. I say to the Senator that is the understanding. If under a unanimous-consent agreement we temporarily lay aside the pending bill, the Senator from Nevada, or any other Senator, can at any time demand the regular order, and automatically the pending bill will be brought back before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. McNARY. With that perfect, precise understanding, that the pending bill would go over until Monday, and that then any Senator could consider any amendment which has been written into the bill today, I shou'd be very glad to agree to the proposition.

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

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2996.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, does the Senator request that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2996?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2996.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Military Activities—Expediting Production", on page 3, line 12, after the name "President", to strike out the colon and following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That section 403 (a) of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (Public, 528, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), as amended, is further amended to include the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, and to provide that the term 'Department' also shall mean the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, respectively, and, in the case of such corporations, that the term 'Secretary' also shall mean the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, respectively."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, inasmuch as a vote will not be had on the bill today, I ask permission at this point to submit a statement giving a rather broad interpretation of the bill and its several provisions, and to have the statement printed in the RECORD. I do not think it is worth while to take the time of the Senate to read the statement.

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

The Military Appropriation Act for 1944, which your committee now presents for consideration, provides for the largest single appropriation in history, by this or any other Government. This bill, as passed unanimously by the House of Representatives and as recommended to the Senate by your committee, contemplates total obligations during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943, of approximately $71,500,000,000, consisting of $59,000,000,000 to be newly appropriated and a carry-over of $12,500,000,000 from the fiscal year 1943.

Previous military budget programs have been directed largely to the construction of our defenses, the building of a powerful wartime Army, and the production of weapons of war sufficient to permit us and our allies at least to hold our own with the enemy, which had the advantage of such a substantial head start on us. Those previous budgets, even including the current 1943 budget, might well be called "Defensive Budgets," even though Guadalcanal, Tunisia, Attu, and other scenes of our battle successes, including the almost world-wide aerial combat of the Army Air Forces, strongly attest to the fact that the funds appropriated for 1943 have not been devoted exclusively to defense.

But let no one, certainly not the Axis Powers, make any mistake about this budget for 1944. This budget is for the purpose of maintaining a powerful American Army aggressively on the offensive against our enemies on the far-flung battlefields throughout the world; and also to assist the armies of our allies in pressing forward toward the complete and utter defeat of the Axis Powers, which is our common goal. I do not believe we can give it a more descriptive name than that suggested by the Deputy Chief of Staff, General McNarney, who calls it The Decisive Budget.

HIGH LIGHTS OF PROPOSED BUDGET

I will outline for you briefly what it is intended to accomplish with the money which you are now asked to appropriate. The very fact that we are in a position to undertake this program will indicate how well we have accomplished our previous objectives, but I will also include a few illustrative examples of our accomplishments thus far, of which I feel we can all be justly proud.

ARMY AIR FORCES

The largest single item, representing one-third of the entire budget, is $23,700,000,000 for the Army Air Forces. By far the greater part of this amount, or twenty billion, six hundred million is for the procurement of airplanes, including spare engines and other spare parts. These funds will provide for the procurement of 100,000 additional airplanes, including 38,000 fighters, 36,000 bombers, and 21,000 transports and trainers, and will permit us to maintain 273 fighting groups.

Not long ago we might have doubted our ability to achieve such an ambitious program; but it does not seem too ambitious when we realize that we have produced 60,000 airplanes in the past 12 months, making a total of more than 100,000 since we began our war production program. Actually, this program is stepping up the pace, for now that we are on the offensive we must have a higher proportion of bigger airplanes—heavy bombers and long-distance fighters—in place of the defensive fighters and light bombers of our earlier programs. In fact, the average weight of planes produced this year will be nearly double the average weight of those produced as recently as January 1942. During the calendar year 1943, 911,000,000 pounds of air frames will be produced, and this will be stepped up to over 1,400,000,000 pounds of air frames during the calendar year 1944, or approximately 5 times the production during the calendar year 1942.

Over $2,700,000,000 of the $23,700,000,000 for the Army Air Forces is for operating expenses. Two hundred and thirty-one million is included to provide for the training of the personnel to man and maintain our vast air armada. The program for 1944 contemplates an output of 302,000 officer and enlisted technicians and 110,000 pilots, navigators, and bombardiers. Also, the college-training program calls for a continuously operated 5-month course, contemplating the matriculation of 14,000 cadets each month.

Although relatively small, it is worthy of mention that $99,000,000 is included for research and development which has been so effective in keeping our aircraft not only abreast but ahead of the enemy's in performance in all theaters of operation and under all conditions.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

The second largest portion of this Budget is for the Ordnance Department, which is responsible for the production and maintenance of the Army's weapons and ammunition. Approximately $15,000,000,000, or 21 percent of the Budget, is for this purpose. More than half of this amount, or nearly $8,100,000,000, is for ammunition, ranging from small-arms ammunition to 4-ton block busters.

Most of the remainder, or approximately six and three-tenths billions, is for the procurement of ordnance matériel, ranging from the M 1 Garand rifle to the M 4 tank, not to mention certain secret weapons which have already given a good account of themselves and others which will give the enemy many unpleasant surprises. Included in this $6,300,000,000 for ordnance matériel is over two billions for the procurement and maintenance of all automotive equipment, which function was transferred to the Ordnance Department from the Quartermaster Corps during the past year.

Among the other Ordnance projects, requiring relatively smaller amounts but nonetheless very important, is $81,000,000 for research and development so that we can continue to provide our boys with more powerful ammunition and new weapons superior to any with which they are challenged by the enemy. Nearly $10,000,000 is included for training of Ordnance soldiers, over one hundred and forty-eight millions for preservation of Ordnance matériel, and $494,000,000 for current operating expense, including Ordnance activities in the theaters of operation.

If anyone, and particularly Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito, have any doubt as to the ability of the Ordnance Department to accomplish such an ambitious program, a few illustrative statistics as to what has already been accomplished should dispel such doubts. Since Pearl Harbor, Army Ordnance has produced 1,000,000 machine guns and 14,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition, to mention only 2 representative items. Last month alone, we produced 3 times as many pieces of artillery as in the whole of World War No. 1.

FINANCE SERVICE, ARMY

To continue with this summary of what the Army intends to accomplish with this $71,500,000,000, the third largest amount is $12,800,000,000 for Finance Service, Army, which represents 17 percent of the entire budget. The great bulk of this amount is for "Pay for the Army," for which $11,500,000,000 is requested.

This money will provide pay for an Army of more than 8,200,000 officers and enlisted personnel, which strength is to be attained by December 31, 1943. Have no doubt that this strength can and will be reached on schedule, considering how we have already built up our Army since September 1939, when Great Britain and France declared war on Germany. At that time we had fewer than 200,000 officers and enlisted men, plus 200,000 in the National Guard. When the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, our Army strength was only about 1,600,000. Even last year at this time the Army stood at approximately 3,000,000, only partially trained and equipped. Yet, today we have an over-all strength of 7,000,000, including the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, properly trained and equipped.

The only other relatively large item under Finance Service, Army, is $720,000,000 for "Travel of the Army," which the House of Representatives reduced 10 percent from the $800,000,000 originally requested.

SUPPLIES AND TRANSPORTATION

It is going to cost $2,500,000,000 to feed our 1944 Army. The delivered ration cost for next year is estimated at 72 cents per man per day, a small increase over this year. Clothing and equipage will account for another $2,400,000,000, to maintain our troops wherever located and to furnish appropriate battle dress for practically every climate.

Over $1,500,000,000 is required by the Army Transportation Corps to transport our troops and supplies both within the United States and all over the world. During the first year of this war, the Transportation Corps transported two and one-half times as many troops and six times the volume of supplies as in the first year of World War No. 1. This record is even more significant when it is considered that the average round trip today is 15,000 miles as compared with 6,000 miles in the First World War. Yet the volume must be trebled in 1944; hence the need for one billion five hundred million for transportation. In all, seven billion five hundred million are provided for supplies and transportation.

SIGNAL CORPS AND CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Signal Corps will obligate five billion six hundred million to provide our Army with the finest communications equipment possible. Approximately 80 percent of this amount will be spent for the procurement of radar and radio equipment. The Army Air Forces alone will use $3,700,000,000 worth of this signal equipment.

The Corps of Engineers requires four billion, of which one billion six hundred million is for construction. However, only $500,000,000 is for construction in the United States, as the vast Army construction program in the United States, involving more

than 10,000 projects at a total cost of more than $9,000,000,000 is already 92 percent in process or completed. The construction program included 4,500 posts, camps, and stations, 900 airfields, hospitals with total capacity of 700,000 beds, and internment camps for over 300,000 prisoners of war.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

The $1,100,000,000 budgeted for the Chemical Warfare Service will enable our Army to return with large dividends any gas attacks which the Axis Powers launch. About half of its output is for bombs for the Army Air Forces.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

The approximately $600,000,000 for the medical and hospital department will enable that service to continue to maintain the remarkably high health record and low casualty rate which it has maintained thus far during this war, both at home and on the far-flung battle fronts.

CONCLUSION

Of the remaining $1,700,000,000, $1,200,000,000 will be used to expedite production by constructing a few new facilities, by converting certain existing facilities to changed requirements, and by providing necessary machine tools where needed. The remainder of the appropriation will be used for several small but important activities, such as the United States Military Academy and the service schools.

I trust that the data I have given you are sufficient to indicate what we intend to accomplish with the money in this appropriation. The objectives can and will be accomplished. A fine job has been done by the Army with the support it has received from the Congress, from industry, and from the people. The one ultimate accomplishment for which we all strive is the unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Department—Finance Service, Army", on page 8, line 5, after the word "accounts", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for obligation or expenditure or for any expense whatsoever, directly or indirectly, for or on account of any person in a civilian status listed as a conscientious objector, pursuant to the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (except as may be incident to induction into the Army of the United States), including compensation of military and civilian personnel, transportation on any kind of conveyance belonging to or operated by or at the expense of the War Department, and instruction, education, or training of any kind."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Quartermaster Corps and Transportation Corps—supplies and transportation," on page 15, line 21, after the figures "$30,556,162", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for payment to or expenditure on account of any military or civilian personnel employed outside continental United States to paint or otherwise reproduce war scenes except by means of photography, or to paint portraits, or for payment to or expenditure on account of any military personnel within continental United States who engage in decorative art projects or painting portraits to the exclusion of regular military duties."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 9, after the figures "$262,965,473", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That appropriations in this act which are available for any expenses incident to educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or dentistry shall be available only when such persons can complete instruction in degree-granting colleges or universities as students in such professions within 2 years, provided also that such students must be enlisted in the Army of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency appropriations bill, which was temporarily laid aside, so that the bill will automatically be before the Senate when the Senate convenes on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis L. McNamee, of Pennsylvania, to be Regional Manpower Director, at $8,000 per annum, at the Philadelphia regional office.

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

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

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

That completes the calendar.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL REVENUE — NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably two nominations for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Norman D. Cann, of Atlanta, Ga., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to say a word or two in explanation. In the last tax bill a provision was inserted creating assistants to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in lieu of a deputy to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Both the appointments are of men already in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. They have been there for a number of years and both are in actual service. We changed the law by abolishing the Office of Deputy Commissioner and simply creating positions of assistants to the Commissioner. Mr. Cann, whose nomination has just been read, is at this time serving as the deputy commissioner. In the consideration of the tax bill by the committee the statement was made that he would be appointed as one of the assistants.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue advises me that he is most anxious to have the nominations confirmed at the earliest possible moment, so that he may make certain necessary arrangements personal to himself, as the Commissioner, with respect to recent legislation passed and with respect to his own duties.

Therefore, he asked that the matter be brought before the Senate at the earliest possible time. Since the appointments are those of men who already are in the service, performing substantially the same duties, and who, if the nominations are confirmed, will merely serve under a new title, a mere change of name, I should like to have immediate consideration of the nominations.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, while the nominations have not reached the calendar, in view of the statement of the Senator from Georgia, I have no objection.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold N. Graves, of Jacksonville, Ill., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

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

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all confirmations of nominations made today.

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

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 155.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, just a moment, please. I think a measure similar to the one referred to was agreed to sometime ago. I think it later was reconsidered on motion of the able senior Senator from Montana. It provided for the appointment of a committee by the Vice President. I believe it now is desired to have the committee appointed by the chairman of the committee having jurisdiction.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 155), which was read.

Mr. WHEELER. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, lines 1 and 2, it is proposed to strike out "a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate" and insert "the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the adequacy of the supply of hydroelectric power generated in Government plants; (2) whether such supply is properly allocated and distributed for war purposes and civilian uses; (3) whether the distribution of such supply is made under proper conditions and safeguards; (4) the relation between the generation of hydroelectric power at Government plants and irrigation; and (5) whether plans for future development of Government hydroelectric plants provide for full utilization of such facilities for both development of electric power and providing water for irrigation. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $3,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes, p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 28, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Francis T. Spellman, June 30, 1942.
Charles D. Leffler, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Alan R. McCracken, January 1, 1942.
George L. Menogal, June 30, 1942.
Burton Davis, June 30, 1942.
Robert M. Morris, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Rufus L. Taylor, May 1, 1941.
Roger M. Keithly, January 1, 1942.
Harry A. Barnard, Jr., May 19, 1942.
Charles M. Holcombe, June 30, 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942:

Eli B. Roth	William G. Kornahrens
Robert C. Barnes	Charles Holovak
Clarence W. Becker	David G. Bryce

The following passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Arthur W. Eaton, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Stephen E. Flynn, June 30, 1942.

The following assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Howell E. Wiggins	Robert O. Canada, Jr.
Robert B. Greenman	Vernon E. Martens
William F. Queen	

Passed Assistant Dental Surgeon James H. Connelly to be a dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942.

Assistant Dental Surgeon Edward V. Barth to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy to rank from the 9th day of June 1943, to conform with the change in name effected prior to graduation from the Naval Academy:

Richard J. Kroth
Jonathan J. Crowder

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942:

Franklin M. Haines, Jr.
William F. Babcock

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Chester J. Kurzawa to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 1st day of June 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 6th day of June 1940:

Louis N. Saunders, Jr.
Robert R. Wooding

Ensign John F. Tynan, SC-V (G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 19th day of November 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Norman D. Cann	Harold N. Graves

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Francis L. McNamee, of Pennsylvania, to be regional manpower director, at $8,000 per annum, in the Philadelphia regional office.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE SURGEONS

Joseph G. Pasternack	Robert H. Onstott
Waldemar J. A. Wickman	John L. Wilson
	George G. Van Dyke
Llewellyn L. Ashburn	Leslie McC. Smith
Leland J. Hanchett	Alfred B. Geyer
Thomas B. McKneely	Oliver C. Williams
William G. Workman	Austin V. Delbert
Victor H. Vogel	Richard C. Arnold
Robert H. Flinn	Donald W. Patrick
Robert K. Maddock	Marion K. King
Roy E. Butler	Thurman H. Rose

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

William A. Miller	David B. Wilson
Robert L. Smith	Ralph W. Pagel
Joe M. Chisolm	Leslie W. Knott
Kenneth M. Endicott	Evert A. Swensson
Malcolm J. Ford	Robert J. Anderson
James W. Hawkins	Jesse D. Harris
Glen E. Ogden	Frederick H. Hull
Rudolph F. Sievers	Raymond S. Roy
Samuel S. Spicer	James L. Southworth
William H. Stimson	William G. Budington
William B. Wiley	Gabriel P. Ferrazzano
Clarence L. Hebert	Stanley E. Krumbiegel
James A. Finger	Donald W. McNaughton
George E. Parkhurst	
John F. Oesterle	James B. Donaldson
Frederick K. Albrecht	James A. Smith
Edwin N. Hesbacher	Milton W. Gwinner
William S. Baum	Vernon W. Foster
Arnold B. Kurlander	George F. Ellinger
William F. Powell	Verne C. Waite

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

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

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

Our Father God, conscious of the faults and failures which mar and stain the past, we are grateful that each new week brings us to the land of beginning again. Troubled by the record of remembered yesterdays when, under the pressure of these momentous times, we fell short of our best, we are beckoned to better things by the assurance of the angel of the dawn, "Each night I burn the records of the day; each sunrise