PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 3098. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. H. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 3099. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Claud; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3100. A bill for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3101. A bill for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3102. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eva M. Delisle; 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:

1828. By SCHUETZ: Resolution of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to afford a reasonable opportunity to every member of the military forces of the United States to cast a ballot in national elections, at least insofar as candidates will be voted for by an entire State; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

1829. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of Lena L. Jones and 320 other citizens of Clark County, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1830. By Mr. GILLETTE: Resolution adopted by City Council of Williamsport, Pa., favoring the continuance of the National Youth Administration center in Lycoming County, Pa.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1831. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Nettie Haworth and 44 other citizens of Tonganoxie and McLouth, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, for by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1832. By the SPEAKER. Petition of Hiram A. Spry, of Munith, Mich., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to compensation in connection with the loss of his leg due to causes arising out of service in the United States Navy in 1918; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1833. Also, petition of the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1834. Also, petition of the American Stock Yards Association of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the price of livestock and the ceilings of meat; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1835. Also, petition of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to our country in defense of their flag and all it represents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1836. Also, petition of Lucille J. Butler, of Payson, Utah, petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 2, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

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

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

Our Father God, in the dedication of this quiet moment at the beginning of the day we would that all voices be stilled that Thine may be heard. Show us the false glamour of things that too often deceive with their gaudy glitter. O Thou who art the life and the light, dawn upon our darkened minds; make us pure in heart, in motive, in thought, in action, that we may see God and the godlike everywhere.

Save us from being driven by the logic of our minds to a mere belief in Thee and yet living our days in spiritual poverty, oblivious to those deep streams of eternal help where the soul is refreshed and made sufficient for the evil of the day. As servants of the Commonwealth may we be diligent enough to seek the truth, honest enough to follow the gleam wherever it may lead, brave enough to proclaim it and defend it even though men may revile us and persecute us and say all manner of evil against us falsely. May all life, private and public, be to us as a sacrament. Make Thou our bodies Thy temples and our hearts Thy altars where the sacred flame is ever burning. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, July 1, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 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; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to the bill; and concurred therein with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendment to Senate amendment numbered 19; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24 and 30 to the bill; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARE, Mr. TARVER, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the bill (S. 832) relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

DEFICIENCY ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 90)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1943, in the amount of $70,916.86 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. WHITE:

The petition of Floyd Poland and sundry other citizens of Round Pond, Maine, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, by members of the First Christian Church, of Ottawa, Kans., praying for the adoption of measures to protect members of the armed forces from vices around training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition signed by members of the Woodland Methodist Church, of Wichita, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted at Detroit, Mich., by the executive board of the Dairy, Bakery,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Cereal, and Food Workers Division, United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, favoring retention of the Office of Price Administration as a unit to control the rationing and prices of all commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., favoring the stabilization of food and commodity prices so as to halt the rising cost of living; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the mayor and council of the city of Dearborn, Mich., favoring the taking of such measures as may be necessary to reduce the price of food and commodities to the September 15, 1942, levels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the Michigan Stream Control Commission, protesting against the enactment of pending legislation to create a division of water pollution control within the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution of the Council of the city of Dearborn, Mich., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to provide a permanent means of aiding civilian defense workers who are war casualties; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted at Detroit, Mich., by the executive board of the Dairy, Bakery, Cereal, and Food Workers Division, United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, protesting against the use of the Little Steel formula as a basis of wage increases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the City Council of Lincoln Park, Mich., favoring amendment of the Social Security Act allowing municipalities if they so elect to participate in Social Security benefits for the benefit of their employees who are working in utilities or for the different phases and functions of municipal governments; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Coldsprings Township, Mich., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to eliminate poll taxes in the election of Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Elks Lodge No. 544, of Benton Harbor, Mich., favoring the release of Jews from Axis territories; that Palestine be kept open to Jews, and that a sanctuary be established for refugees in allied and neutral countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of sundry citizens of Charlevoix, Mich., praying for the enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Kalkaska County, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing Federal aid for snow removal programs in Michigan in what is commonly known as Snow Belt; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution by members of Detroit (Mich.) Local No. 295, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, favoring the enactment of legislation to pay substitute employees in the Postal Service a graduated scale of pay commensurate with the hourly rates of pay of regular employees based on length of service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution adopted at Detroit, Mich., by the executive board of the Dairy, Bakery, Cereal, and Food Workers Division, United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, endorsing the Presidential veto of the so-called Smith-Connally labor bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for fair play and not persecution of civil servants and endorsing the integrity and work of Goodwin B. Watson, an analyst for the foreign broadcast intelligence service under the Government; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

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

"Senate Resolution 72

"Whereas for the second time within the past month the Missouri River and its tributaries in the great State of Missouri have destroyed homes and places of business, laid waste to growing crops, flooded fertile farm lands, demolished important bridges, and washed away long stretches of valuable Missouri highways; and

"Whereas this destruction has brought great financial losses to this heretofore prosperous and energetic people who live in these fertile valleys and in the cities adjacent to these important streams; and

"Whereas unless some prompt and concerted effort is made to restore and rehabilitate these homes, these places of business, and these important highways, and unless some aid is given in the replanting of the crops in these fertile valleys, this State and this Nation will suffer an enormous loss: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Missouri*, That we call upon the Members of Congress and those in high places in Washington, D. C., to act at once in this emergency by throwing the great resources of our National Government behind a substantial rehabilitation program, making it possible for these homes to be rebuilt, these places of business to be restored, these farm lands to be recultivated, and these highways and these bridges to be replaced; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be, and he is hereby, instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Director of the Office of War Mobilization, to Missouri's Senators and Members of Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Commissioner of Public Roads, and to the Chairman of the War Production Board, urging their prompt and individual attention to this most important matter."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF HAWAII

Mr. TYDINGS presented copies of reports of committees of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on various bills and resolutions pending before those two legislative bodies, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

CONTINUATION OF CROP-INSURANCE PROGRAM—TELEGRAM FROM JAMES G. PATTON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I hope the Senate continues to insist upon continuation of the crop-insurance program. I regard it as one of the most important features of the national farm program and one which should not be abandoned until the program has had a fair chance to show what it can accomplish.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks and to have properly referred, a telegram from James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, also urging continuance of the crop-insurance program.

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

DENVER, COLO., *June 30, 1943.*

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

The National Farmers Union urges you to protest and requests that a protest from our organization be made on the floor of the Senate against the unreasonable position of a majority in the House of Representatives on crop insurance, and that full responsibility for making next year's increased wheat production goals unattainable be placed upon the groups and individuals assassinating crop insurance and crippling other farm programs. It is fake economy to abolish crop insurance now. It will be impossible to attain the 16,000,000-acre increase needed next year in wheat if farmers are denied insurance protection and asked to gamble the economic security of their families. The assassins of crop insurance know what they are doing and must stand in public judgment for it. National Farmers Union has always supported crop insurance as needed protection for the people who supply the Nation's bread. The war now makes it essential to national interest and more urgently needed than ever before. It is desired by everyone except greedy interests who are willing to disregard national welfare to expose small people to economic ruin and enthrone themselves high on the corpses.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

RESOLUTION OF WATERBURY (CONN.) LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the Waterbury (Conn.) Lithuanian-American Council, embodying a resolution adopted at a mass meeting held on June 27, 1943, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERBURY LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
Waterbury, Conn.

Senator JOHN DANAHER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a mass meeting held at Waterbury, Conn., on June 27, 1943, under the auspices of the Lithuanian-American Council, Inc., an organization newly created by the union of all Lithuanian groups anxious for a free and democratic Lithuania, with the purpose of lending all possible aid to the United States toward the successful prosecution of the war, and with the added aim of fostering a just and lasting peace amongst nations, the following resolution was passed by the unanimous vote of the 1,500 delegates and members there assembled.

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania is the struggling victim of an unprovoked invasion and occupation at the hands of Nazi tyrants,

"Whereas, the people of Lithuania have persevered and remained loyal to the principles of freedom and democracy upon which their nation was built; and still resist every attempt made to subjugate them or to assimilate them into a foreign state; and

"Whereas the loyal hearts of our relatives and countrymen again appeal to the leadership of the United States and her allies for inspiration and deliverance from the heavy oppressor's yoke: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That we affirm our complete support of the cause of the United States

and the policies of its leaders in their efforts to restore a world of free peoples; and

"Resolved, That we favor a peace wherein Lithuania, and the other peoples comprising the Baltic States, will be granted the territorial integrity and the freedoms promised them under the tenets of the Atlantic Charter, and

"Resolved, That we unite in our efforts to establish the Lithuanian state, restoring her to her place as a free, democratic, and independent nation safe from the hands of the Axis aggressors.

"Be it finally resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to the Connecticut Members of both Houses of Congress."

CLARENCE V. BALANDA,
Chairman.
MARCELLE ANDRIKIS,
Secretary.

RELIEF OF FOOD INDUSTRY

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have a telegram which I desire to read into the RECORD. It is as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *July 2, 1943.*
Senator ED. H. MOORE:

Before taking your well earned vacation please help relieve food industry of present chaos. It cannot continue under present death-dealing restrictions until you reconvene.

WATSON ROGERS,
Oklahoma Retail Grocers Association.

I read my answer to that telegram, as follows:

JULY 2, 1943.

WATSON ROGERS,
Oklahoma Retail Grocers Association,
Oklahoma City, Okla.:

Your telegram states the positive truth. This Congress should not recess until there should have been established definitely a program for food administration. To quote Senator VANDENBERG, "The food program needs a Baruch committee" like the one that functioned in rubber. Continued chaotic operation will have repercussions that will be unbearable. It is dangerous to leave the situation as is.

E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate.

COMMITTEE REPORTS FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 1st instant,

Mr. MALONEY submitted the following reports of committees during the last recess of the Senate:

From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

H. R. 1294. A bill to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 381).

From the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2207. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; with an amendment (Rept. No. 382).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1279. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 383); and

S. 763. A bill exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 384).

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

H. R. 1940. A bill prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings; without amendment (Rept. No. 385).

MARKETING OF BURLEY AND FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday I was advised that House Joint Resolution 144 which passed the House without opposition, and had come out of the Agricultural Committee of that body in the same way, had been messaged to the Senate. I was mistaken. The joint resolution has now been sent to the Senate by the House, and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, through its chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], has authorized me, in his name, to report the joint resolution to the Senate and to recommend its passage. I, therefore, report the joint resolution, without amendment, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will state, if any Senator desires an explanation of the measure, that it applies only to burley and flue-cured tobacco. It is approved and recommended by the growers and by the Department of Agriculture, and is necessary in order that the quota system may be continued and made applicable to the crop of 1944–45. In view of the efforts which are being made to increase food production, in some respects that might interfere temporarily with the growing of tobacco in the States affected. As I have said, the measure is recommended and desired by the tobacco interests, and by the Department of Agriculture, and it is really a very essential measure.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Kentucky if this is the same joint resolution to which he referred and which in part he explained yesterday?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the same joint resolution. I was then a little premature in trying to have it considered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I did not quite understand the explanation. Does the joint resolution refer to tobacco alone?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all, and there are only two classes of tobacco which it affects.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is the Senator from Kentucky requesting a consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am asking unanimous consent for its present consideration upon the unanimous report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TAFT. I only suggest that it seems to me, if we are to undertake legislation, there should be a quorum called.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no opposition to the joint resolution, and, if it is agreeable to the Senate, I thought we could dispose of it.

What I should like to do as soon as we can get a quorum is to call the calendar; there is nothing else ready for consideration, although I see the Senator from Tennessee is present with a conference report. I am merely trying to facilitate business while we are waiting.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on July 1, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 495. A bill to establish a Women's Army Corps for service in the Army of the United States; and

S. 1026. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1299. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Selma Lamkin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1300. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1301. A bill providing an exemption, in the case of certain motor vehicles, from the use tax imposed by section 3540 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. O'DANIEL introduced Senate bill 1302, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. SMITH introduced Senate Joint Resolution 71, which was ordered to lie on the table, and appears under a separate heading.)

COMPILATION OF LIST OF TAXPAYERS RELIEVED FROM LIABILITY UNDER CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, for several weeks we have been feverishly working on appropriation bills, and have been so busy considering the many details involved that we may have lost sight of the shocking totals of all the bills. The over-all total is considerably more than $100,000,000,000. That is an enormous sum of money. All of it is money that the Government does not possess. Congress will have to find all of that money somewhere, sometime, and with the present tax rates almost to the point of confiscation, it is going to be no easy job for the Members who sit in future sessions of this Congress to provide funds to liquidate the enormous debt which we are passing on to ourselves and our posterity.

After this appropriation fever subsides and Congress comes to the sobering task of beating the barren bushes in vain search of revenue I can visualize some perservering Member with a good memory prying open the Ruml-plan tomb for the purpose of recovering that $6,500,000,000 of accrued income taxes that were canceled when this Congress enacted the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, commonly known as the Ruml tax cancelation plan, or the Ruml Santa Claus act. When that Ruml plan was under discussion there was much difference of opinion on various provisions of the bill, and especially the tax cancelation or tax-forgiveness feature. While I favored that part of the bill which provided for withholding tax payments at the source on wages and salaries, yet I vigorously opposed the provisions which canceled income taxes due the Government. I did not consider the cancelation of taxes to be necessary, economically sound, practical, equitable, or even desired by the rank and file of our taxpaying citizens. Some argued that the bill would be of most benefit to the large masses of our low-income citizens, but to me it looked like the bill provided for handing out large gifts from a deep debt-ridden Treasury to a group of political contractors and war profiteers, and thus be far more beneficial to large-income groups than to small-income groups.

But, Mr. President, the argument is over, and it will not be necessary for any of us to be in the dark much longer regarding who will reap the greatest benefits from the Ruml tax cancelation law, because it is now in operation and the reports are coming into the Treasury and the facts are being recorded. Many of our men in military service have asked me to look up the record and get the facts for them in order that they may scan the list of beneficiaries to find out how the canceled taxes of those who stayed safely at home and made enormous war profits compares with the meager benefits accruing to the boys who were forced to give up their business careers and go forth to risk their lives on the battlefields of the world to save this Nation and preserve our profit system of business enterprise. These soldier boys know that they were included in the tax cancelation plan, but they want to compare their meager gains with the gains of the war profiteers who stayed at home and reaped enormous profits while our boys were fighting and dying to protect this country. In order to obtain this information for these soldiers, and others who may be interested, I am today introducing a bill which will authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to compile and publish a public document listing the names, addresses, and amounts of all individuals who had their income taxes canceled under the terms of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943. I am of the opinion, Mr. President, that when our full citizenship becomes entirely familiar with the true facts regarding the cancelation of an estimated $6,500,000,000 of income taxes due the Government at a time like this when our Government is in such urgent need of money that many of our good citizens who did not know the facts at the time the law was passed will not want to become beneficiaries of such useless public generosity and they will demand repeal of the law. Also when our people encounter the red tape and complicated system of reports which they must fill out and file periodically, I anticipate many of them will be further inclined to ask repeal of the law.

But, Mr. President, if no great public demand does develop for repeal of the tax cancelation part of the Ruml tax plan, I anticipate that as our public debt continues to increase and our tax revenue begins to dwindle, that in the not far distant future a tax-troubled Congress, frantically searching for revenue, will dig up the records on this tax cancelation bill of 1943 and enact legislation designed to recapture this estimated $6,500,000,000 of canceled taxes, or as much of it as then can be located. At that time the information which will be contained in the public record provided for in the bill I am today introducing, will be useful to Members of Congress. Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk for reference to the appropriate committee and ask consent that it be received and printed in the RECORD immediately following these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Texas will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1302) to provide for the compilation and publication of a list showing the names and addresses of taxpayers relieved from liability for the payment of taxes under the provisions of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 and the amounts of taxes from which such taxpayers are relieved from liability for payment was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to provide for the compilation and publication as a public document, at the earliest practicable date, of a list containing the names and addresses, listed alphabetically by names, of all taxpayers who, under the provisions of section 6 of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, are relieved of liability for the payment of any amount of tax. Such list shall contain, opposite the name of each taxpayer listed, figures showing the amount of tax from which, under the provisions of such section, he is relieved from liability for payment.

SEC. 2. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940—AMENDMENT

Mr. DANAHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMERICA'S POST-WAR PLAN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and myself, I ask consent to submit a concurrent resolution and request that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That this Congress favors (1) the prosecution of the war to conclusive victory; (2) the participation by the United States in post-war cooperation between sovereign nations to prevent, by any necessary means, the recurrence of military aggression and to establish permanent peace with justice in a free world; (3) the present examination of these aims, so far as consistent with the united war effort, and their ultimate achievement by due constitutional process and with faithful recognition of American responsibilities and American interests.

RELOCATION CENTERS FOR JAPANESE

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 166), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the President of the United States is respectfully requested to issue an Executive order (1) directing the War Relocation Authority to take such steps as may be necessary for the purpose of segregating persons of Japanese ancestry in relocation centers, whose loyalty to the United States is questionable or who are known to be disloyal, from those whose loyalty to the United States has been established, and for the purpose of establishing additional safeguards against sabotage by such persons; and (2) directing the appropriate agency of the Government to issue a full and complete authoritative public statement concerning conditions in relocation centers, and plans with respect to future operation of centers and the movement of persons of Japanese ancestry interned therein.

INSPECTIONS OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 167), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 65, agreed to January 28, 1943, authorizing inspections of the Military Establishment in the Western Hemisphere, is hereby increased by $7,000.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MALONEY AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF ST. JOSEPH COLLEGE

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him during the commencement exercises at St. Joseph College, West Hartford, Conn., on June 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOBEY TO HAMPTON BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address to the Hampton Beach Chamber of Commerce, delivered by him at Hampton Beach, N. H., on June 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon on June 15,

1943, at the annual meeting of the Kansas Institute of Inter-American Relations which appears in the Appendix.]

PROHIBITION—EDITORIAL FROM THE STARS AND STRIPES

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Prohibition" published in the May 20, 1943, edition of the Stars and Stripes, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRITICAL CORN SITUATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on April 7, last, I took occasion to detain the Senate for a few moments to call the attention of its Members and that of the country to an alarming situation in respect to the corn which was frozen on the farms in the cribs and bins and warehouses. I said at that time that I was extremely alarmed with respect to the condition existing and asked that something be done about it by those in governmental agencies in Washington who had control of the situation. On June 18 I again discussed the same question before the Senate, and once more called attention to the seriousness of the situation with respect to the failure of the corn refineries of the country to obtain corn with which to produce many things necessary for the war effort.

Mr. President, on June 29 I am advised that the American Maize plant at Roby, Ind., has closed; the Corn Products plant at Pekin, Ill., has closed; the Clinton Starch plant at Clinton, Iowa, has closed; the Anheuser-Busch plant at St. Louis, Mo., has closed, and that four more plants will close by the end of this week if they are unable to obtain corn, namely, the Kansas City plant of the Corn Products Co., the Hubinger plant at Keokuk, Iowa, the National Starch plant at Indianapolis, Ind., and Penick and Ford, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

In the New York Times of June 29 I find the following:

Executives of two major corn refining companies said today the industry probably would have to close completely the latter part of July.

Their comments were made as Midwestern States awaited supplies of corn requisitioned in elevators last week by the War Food Administration, supplies which they said were only one-fourth the 20,000,000 bushels originally believed available.

DWINDLING OUTPUT

George M. Moffett, president of Corn Products Refining Co., whose big Pekin, Ill., plant closed last week because it lacked corn, said the approximately 5,000,000 bushels taken would have to be divided among the segments of his industry, the dry (breakfast food, etc.) processing plants and eastern livestock feeders.

Moffett said he expected "complete exhaustion" of corn supplies of the industry—including requisitioned grain—by about July 17.

Theodore Sander, Jr., president of American Maize-Products Co., said that while his plant at Roby, Ind., had been promised 675,000 bushels of corn and hoped to resume operations the morning of July 7, that would mean at best a 3 weeks' run.

"For the long term," Sander said, "we will find ourselves in the same position as last week." The Roby plant was forced to close last week and has received none of the requisitioned corn so far, he added. Also closed is the Clinton Co. factory at Clinton, Iowa.

On June 17, Mr. C. W. Kitchen, the Deputy Director of the Food Administration, wrote the Senator from Illinois a letter, in which, among other things, he said:

Corn is not flowing to market but is being kept on the farm and is being fed to hogs and other livestock. This is only natural, as the corn when sent to market is worth $1.07 maximum (Chicago price), whereas it is worth anywhere from $1.35 to $1.60 when fed to hogs.

This situation places all of the commercial users of corn in a position of competing, without success, for corn in the hands of the farmer.

In these circumstances the proper balance between animal production and industrial or commercial uses of corn is not maintained. The problem is of serious concern to the Administration and every effort is being made to work out a solution which will permit these essential industries to continue to operate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator think there is any solution except by restoring the balance between the price of corn and the price of meat?

Mr. LUCAS. That certainly must be done, and it can be done in only one of two ways: The Administration must either increase the price of corn to the farmer or it must roll back the price of meat.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, I admit that it has the plenary power to seize the corn on the farms in the hands of the farmers, but if anyone has an idea in his mind of doing that I hope he will get rid of it quickly because, in my opinion, nothing more unfortunate could happen than that such an effort should be made.

Mr. LUCAS. I heartily concur in the remarks made by the Senator from Wisconsin with respect to the requisitioning of any corn on the farms. It is my understanding that the Administration did requisition some 20,000,000 bushels of corn in the terminal elevators.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. And it was agreeable to the industry which owned the corn that such be done, but if the Administration has any thought of attempting to requisition the corn on the farms, binned there, which now belongs to the farmers, I hope it will forget about it, and the sooner it forgets, the better.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What I cannot understand is why this situation is permitted to drift day after day and week after week, with essential and important industries threatened with shut down, or actually shutting down, when every one admits the problem is present, but no one does anything about it. I think it is symptomatic of the entire confusion in the conduct of the war on the domestic front.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, my only reason for rising is once more to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the deplorable and desperate situation in which we find ourselves as a result of the failure to do something with respect to the release of this corn. I have made the argument before, and I make it again, and I challenge any one on the floor of the Senate or any one in the departments to show me that if the producer of corn was given an additional price incentive, so far as the market is concerned, it would be inflationary. They just cannot do it. The price of corn stands in a peculiar and respectable position of its own so far as inflation is concerned, and it is a tragic error to say that raising the price of corn would be inflationary in its effect, thereby causing other people to ask for higher prices in connection with other commodities.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. First, let me say that I am in entire agreement with the thought just expressed by the Senator from Illinois. At the moment the ceiling price of corn, interpreted in connection with the price fixed on pork, $13.75 Chicago, would normally reflect a price on corn approximately 25 cents a bushel higher than the ceiling price on corn.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. It certainly could not be inflationary, as the Senator has said, to admit that the price of corn as reflected in the price of pork is reflected on the same basis in the prices of some other commodities or manufactured products.

Mr. LUCAS. It cannot be inflationary in the case of pork, it cannot be inflationary in the case of beef, it cannot be inflationary in the case of poultry, it cannot be inflationary in the case of lamb, because all those commodities are so far beyond parity that a substantial increase in cost will in nowise bring on inflation.

Mr. BUTLER. It simply amounts to this, that a farmer with corn to sell can net approximately $1.35 for it, basis Chicago, if he sells it in the form of pork, and he is being asked to sell it at $1.07 in some other form.

Mr. LUCAS. The letter from the Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration says that the minimum the farmer can get for it by turning it into pigs is $1.35, and the maximum is $1.60. That is the situation we find, and under those circumstances we cannot blame the farmer for holding the corn.

Mr. President, a message came from the Department of Agriculture, issued by the War Food Administration, urging farmers to market the corn. I wish to read the message into the RECORD. It is as follows:

The War Food Administration today urged farmers to market promptly corn they would not need to carry their livestock until the 1943 crop is available, and at the same time took steps to remove any fears that such prompt marketings might result in financial sacrifice. The action was designed to make more corn available to essential war industries and to feeders in deficit areas. The volume of corn still on farms is probably over 800,000,000 bushels but farmers with surplus corn have been hesitating to market it.

To remove any hesitancy by farmers to market corn, the War Food Administration today announced that any farmer who, between July 1 and August 10, inclusive, sells

and delivers his corn to a country elevator acting as agent for Commodity Credit Corporation, would be eligible to receive immediately the applicable ceiling price, and later, if ceiling prices are increased on or before October 31, to receive a supplementary payment equal to the difference between the price ceiling in effect at the time he sold and the highest applicable ceiling price between the date of such sale and October 31.

Officials pointed out that the new offer does not imply any impending change in corn price ceilings. The action was taken, they said, solely to offset the effect of widespread rumors that corn ceilings will be raised. These rumors have contributed to the current holding back of corn by farmers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator from Illinois know who dreamed that one? [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know who is responsible for it, but it may be, Mr. President, that I am one of those responsible for spreading the rumor that there was hope the ceiling on corn would be removed and that the price of corn could go higher.

Mr. President, this is not anything new. As I stated a moment ago, I have been discussing this matter for the last 3 months. I have been agitating this problem for 6 months by requesting that something be d ne to remove the ceiling on corn.

Mr. MOORE. Does the Senator think that would move the farmers to market any of their corn?

Mr. LUCAS. From the standpoint of the war effort, I hope that it will, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma. I am in favor of any kind of an order which will induce the farmers to move the corn, any type of persuasion which will induce them to move it, because I see in these industries a great loss of manpower, a great loss of food, and a great loss of effort toward the winning of the war so long as their supply of corn is held down. Candidly speaking, I do not think this order will have any serious or material benefit toward the moving of the corn from the farms.

Mr. President, I wish to take the time of the Senate to read into the RECORD some telegrams and letters which are coming to my office from my State. The corn-products industry alone in the State of Illinois employs 9,000 persons. They are very well paid employees. Many are technical men. These agencies advise me that their inventory of corn will absolutely be gone, used up in the grinding, sometime before the 1st day of August, unless they can obtain some relief somewhere. Everything that has been done so far toward getting the farmer to move the corn from the farm to the local elevator has failed. The calling of loans was one thing which was tried. The farmer at the present time has plenty of money. He does not have to sell the corn if he has a loan on it. He is in a position to go to his bank and borrow sufficient money to pay off the Government loan, and thereby keep his corn.

The requisitioning of corn in the terminal elevators was discussed awhile ago, but that would mean only a drop in the bucket in keeping the mills grinding corn steadily as they have over a period of years, and especially since we went into the war.

I read a telegram from Otto Beich of Paul F. Beich Co., of Bloomington, Ill.:

Our plant, which produces 30 percent to 40 percent for the Army and Navy and 25 percent for war industry workers is threatened with shut-down due to lack of corn at various corn-sirup refining plants. Please use your influence to have ceilings set that will again encourage farmers to deliver corn to elevators.

Mr. President, the Beich Co. is a very responsible institution, located at Bloomington, Ill. From 30 to 40 percent of the product which it makes is candy bars which goes to the boys in the Army and the Navy. The armed services are vitally interested in this product. I have had the matter up with the Quartermaster General. The boys at the front would rather have candy bars which are made in this country than almost anything else which is sent over to them in the way of foods.

I read a telegram from the Allied Mills, Inc., Chicago, Ill.:

Present price ceilings corn continues to freeze corn movement from farms. Complete removal corn ceilings would move corn from farms into consuming channels and thus largely relieve the critical corn situation. Much of industry dependent upon corn is threatened with complete shut-downs which also includes our corporation engaged in the production of mixed feed for livestock and poultry. These suspensions of operations will result in pyramiding feed shortages. Hopeful that Congress will not adjourn until some action taken.

And so forth.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I should like the Senator to make an estimate of the time the present probable supply of corn would last if the ceiling price were raised, so as to supply the industries which need it, together with the present consumption of feed to livestock.

Mr. LUCAS. In answer to that query let me say to the able Senator that at the present time there are from 800,000,000 to 900,000,000 bushels of corn in cribs on farms.

Mr. DAVIS. Nine hundred and fifty million bushels.

Mr. LUCAS. A moment ago I read a statement from the Food Administrator who said there were 800,000,000 bushels. I have heard there were 900,000,000 bushels. It is only an estimate which can be obtained from the men in the field. We are safe in saying that close to 1,000,000,000 bushels of corn is now in the cribs on the farms. Any appreciable amount which could be immediately moved would take care of the situation between now and the time when the next corn crop is harvested, which will begin sometime around the middle of September or first of October. It is estimated that all it would take is approximately 200,000,000 bushels of corn to tide us over in the emergency before the next crop comes along.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. MOORE. Does not the Senator think that the proper thing to do is to raise the ceiling price on corn?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have been trying to get the ceiling price of corn raised for months, I will say, because, as I have said time and time again, and I now repeat, the rise of the price of corn is not an inflationary movement at the present time.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the Culinart Products Co. which is interested in this question. I have also a letter from the Williamson Candy Co., of Chicago, which is interested in it. I have also a letter from a very responsible citizen in the State of Illinois, who writes as follows:

The corn products industry, as you know, is essential to the productivity of the textile manufacturers, papermakers, aluminum and steel foundries, bakeries, sirup mixers, confectioners, baking powder manufacturers, and others. I have been advised that a large part of the corn products industry will be compelled to suspend operations in the near future due to inability to obtain corn. The shortage of corn is said to have been brought about by the high price of pork. I am advised that corn fed on the farm is priced at $1.40 a bushel, while the ceiling price on corn, when sold on the open market, is $1.05. Consequently, very little corn is moving for industrial purposes.

These statements seem to present urgent reasons for careful inquiry into the problem presented by the corn products industry. It is suggested by good authority that if the Government would release corn held in the cribs and take steps to suppress alleged black markets in corn, the situation would be alleviated to some extent.

Mr. President, I wish once more to call to the attention of the Senate something concerning the corn program about which the farmer knows, but which the country in general does not know. The price of corn has been pegged by Executive order below parity. It cannot be raised to parity unless through legislation. It does not make much difference what Senators say; apparently corn is not going to parity price by regulation. On the other hand, the Congress passed a law, which the President signed, in which it was provided that the corn which was taken over by the Commodity Credit Corporation on defaulted loans would not be sold to processors for less than parity price. As an example, let us say 1,000 bushels of corn belong to farmer A. He cannot sell that corn to the corn processor at other than the pegged price, which is under parity. There is another lot of a thousand bushels of corn, let us say, which has been taken over on a default loan, and which is located in the same yard around the little elevator in my section of the country. The Government owns that corn. It cannot be sold for less than parity. That is the irony of the situation in which we find ourselves. The Congress is doing one thing under the law with respect to corn refiners and the executive branch by decree is doing another thing with respect to the corn which the farmers own. This wholly indefensible position is one of the roots of the trouble.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. What is the parity price of corn?

Mr. LUCAS. Information from the Department of Agriculture is that the parity price of corn as of June 15 was $1.05 per bushel. The price of corn today under Executive order is under parity. It is a few cents below.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Did the Senator receive notice today that the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the War Food Administration—as I recall, it was the Commodity Credit Corporation—had made the suggestion and offer that it would pay the difference between the present price ceiling and any subsequent higher price ceiling that might be fixed?

Mr. LUCAS. The answer is yes. I received that notice and read it into the RECORD a few moments ago, before the able Senator arrived in the Chamber.

Mr. GEORGE. I was interested to know whether the able Senator had received the notice.

Mr. LUCAS. The notice is now a part of the RECORD. I said I hoped that such a plea to the American farmer would have results, but I feared it would not. In other words, I want to see the corn moved into marketing channels under any kind of persuasive methods the departments can use; but careful reading and analysis of the order lead me to believe that very little corn will flow into the market, although I am told by the officials of the Department of Agriculture that they have had their men in the field and they have made inquiries along that line, and they believe the order will produce some corn.

The thought I desire to leave with the Senate is—and I hope I am wrong; I hope the order will produce the desired results—that the processors and refineries cannot operate much longer with the temporary measures which are being used in connection with the attempt to alleviate the shortage of corn on the market. It is necessary to begin to plan to do something drastic and constructive now if the processors and refiners are to continue to obtain the corn they need in order to keep the giant industry going.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, certainly some of the processing industries and some of the refineries are actually closed down.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I presume the Senator has the notice from Mr. Vinson stating that maybe and perhaps the price of corn would be raised. He did not promise that it would be raised, but indicated that if the farmers would release the corn, perhaps the price would be raised, and therefore he hoped the farmers would release the corn.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. He said the one reason why he did not promise any relief was that he was afraid the farmers would hold the corn until the price was advanced. But, although he left the matter open, he thought perhaps there might be some increase in price. Does the Senator recall just what the parity price of corn is?

Mr. LUCAS. Information from the Department of Agriculture is that, as of June 15, the parity price of corn was $1.05 a bushel.

The argument I have made from the beginning is that the price of corn is pegged a few cents below parity. That is the point. I read into the RECORD a moment ago the article to which the Senator has referred, and I had a colloquy about it with various other Senators.

Mr. SMITH. I have received letters every day this week calling attention to various industrial plants which have closed down their operations for lack of corn. Unless something is done in the next 10 days, or earlier, it will be too late.

It seems to me this body should take some action to authorize the relief to which the farmers are entitled. I think the Senate should take some action in reference to corn. It has come as a surprise to me and, I know, to other Senators that all the industries that are engaged in the use of corn or its byproducts are essential to the welfare not only of civilians but of the war effort. Instead of relying on the action of the bureaus, I think it is up to Congress to take some action which will relieve the situation.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to know if the Senator has any suggestion as to what would relieve the situation. I, myself, am interested in the corn problem.

Mr. LUCAS. As I said at the beginning of the debate, in answer to the able Senator from Wisconsin, we have to do one of two things: Either roll back the prices of beef and hogs and sheep and poultry, or increase the price of corn. The ratio is all out of proportion, and it has been from the beginning. I have never been able to understand, let me say to the Senator from Delaware, why it has been necessary to have this impasse on corn all this time.

The feeders of poultry want corn. The feeders of hogs can buy it at $1.35 and still make money on their hogs; and so it goes. The processers are crying for it at the present time. Unless they get it their plants will have to shut down.

As I said a moment ago, corn stands in a peculiar and very respectable position of its own. The defense-plant worker will never ask for an additional increase in pay if the price of corn is raised. The man who receives a straight salary and the white-collar man, who is hit harder than any other group because of the war, cannot ask for additional pay because the price of corn is raised. The prices of the commodities he now buys, in the production of which corn is used, are fixed at far above parity, and no logical reason can be supplied for an increase.

Therefore, as I view the situation, a rise in the price of corn could not in anywise affect any of the prices which now are fixed by the Government for the various necessities of life.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Commodity Credit Corporation has practically no corn of its own, as I understand.

Mr. LUCAS. It has no corn at all, to speak of. The last time I made inquiry there, they had approximately 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 bushels on hand. That amount can be ground almost overnight.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand they have moved it.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is correct; I doubt if they have any corn at the present time.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator have any idea of the amount of corn required to complete the development of the cattle and hogs now partially developed? Are any figures on that subject available?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know about that, let me say to the Senator. At the moment, I am primarily interested in the corn refineries that cannot get the corn they must have. The hogs are getting the corn they need. In other words, the farmer takes the corn, for which he can get only $1.07 in Chicago, and feeds it to the hogs. Through this method the farmer gets a minimum of $1.35 for the bushel of corn that is used to feed the hogs, the maximum reaching as high as $1.60 a bushel.

Mr. TUNNELL. The farmer has to feed the hogs no matter what the price is.

Mr. LUCAS. Corn is being fed to the hogs because of the price of hogs.

Let me say to the Senator that I live in the heart of the Corn Belt. I have farm lands. There are no hogs to speak of on the farms, except a few the tenants raise for their own home consumption. We in that section are strictly commercial producers of corn, and we dispose of the corn through the elevators. We do not feed the corn to the hogs on the farms. We dispose of the corn to the elevators. The corn is then transported to other sections where it is fed to hogs and cattle.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, I judge, there are no hogs to speak of in the Senator's section; is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. No; the section where I live and the several counties surrounding are not considered hog country.

Mr. TUNNELL. Are the farmers there holding their corn now, or has it been sold?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot tell the Senator what individual farmers have done, but I know that 800,000,000 bushels of corn are now being held by the farmers in the commercial corn producing areas of the country.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to know whether there is any way to ascertain how much of the corn is held by the men who have to feed it to their hogs and poultry.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that 800,000,000 bushels of corn are available for marketing purposes. Whether it would go to the feeding of hogs or what not, if it got into the marketing channels, I do not know, but all that is needed to

enable the corn refineries to continue operating until the next crop of corn comes on the market is between 160,000,000 and 200,000,000 bushels of the 800,000,000 bushels of corn now held on the farms.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand, the Senator's solution of the problem would be to raise the ceiling price of corn.

Mr. LUCAS. Absolutely.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I entirely agree with what the Senator from Illinois has said on the subject of corn refineries. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to read into the RECORD a telegram which states an even more outrageous case, evidencing the idiotic mismanagement indulged in in handling this situation. I refer to the matter of processing corn for human consumption. Corn meal is one of the most nutritious and beneficial elements of food for human consumption that the mind of man can conceive of. I have received a telegram which I should like to read into the RECORD, if the Senator will permit me to trespass on his time. It illustrates the whole problem.

The telegram is from the Staley Milling Co., of North Kansas City, Mo., which is across the river from Kansas City, in one of the richest corn producing areas in the whole civilized world.

The telegram states:

Our plant for manufacture of corn meal for human consumption will shut down July 2 for lack of white corn. We have twice telegraphed George D. Bradley, regional director, Commodity Credit Corporation, Chicago, for supplies, but no response.

This concern produces corn meal strictly for human consumption.

The Government seized last week approximately 33,000 bushels white corn or about 9 days' supply at Stratton Elevator, St. Joseph, Mo., which was then and is now owned by us. Against much of this we had made sales of corn meal. Now we have to default on contracts and shut our plant for want of supplies while our customers go without corn bread. What is the good of tieing up that corn while people go without food? The corn can go out of condition very readily if left in storage and if it goes bad who is going to stand the loss, the Government that seized it or Staley Milling Co.? Deterioration can occur quickly at this season. We have asked Bradley, Commodity Credit Corporation, Chicago, to release that corn to us immediately. We can guarantee that we shall grind and ship every pound of it within 10 days after we receive it. We have asked him otherwise to furnish us 3,700 bushels white corn daily for manufacture of corn meal for human consumption. Will you please use your influence that we may be allocated white corn from our own inventory in Stratton Elevator, St. Joseph, Mo., and against which we hold warehouse receipts or that we are supplied 3,700 bushels daily from other sources?

This is the reason I am trespassing on the Senator's time to read the telegram:

This corn situation has now been in an unpardonable mess for months and it is time that errors are acknowledged and corrected. Corn values are out of line and should be brought into balance without further delay or the corn ceiling should be removed. Everything here at home seems to be going from bad to worse. Please act.

STALEY MILLING CO.
THOMAS W. STALEY.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the facts are inescapable. The handling of this whole situation is one of the worst botches in recorded history. To any reasonable man, to undertake to fix the price of corn without at the same time fixing the prices of live hogs and of every other possible use of corn would necessarily involve the situation which has developed. It seems to me that there is absolutely no excuse for indulging in such practices in the O. P. A., and possibly in some of the other governmental agencies which do not know any more about corn than to create a situation of that kind. The situation which has developed is what any reasonable man could have foreseen.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a letter which I received from the Consolidated Biscuit Co., of Chicago, Ill.; also a letter from the Union Starch & Refining Co., of Granite City, Ill., in which it is stated:

It is our understanding now that some corn will be released to our industry, of which we will receive our share in proportion to our grind, and that enough corn will be available to keep us grinding until about July 17.

I have received a letter from the Paisley Products Co., Inc., manufacturers of adhesives, in Chicago, Ill. Among other things, the letter states:

It is apparent that the various Government agencies are attempting to obtain corn for industrial processors, but the methods employed at the present time are makeshift, and we do not believe any permanent settling of this important matter can be had until a long-range plan is perfected which will equalize the differences in prices between the corn markets and meat prices.

I have also received a letter from Confections, Inc., of Chicago, Ill. Among other things, the letter states:

This situation is becoming far more serious than it was when we wired you on June 11. The large corn products plant in Pekin, Ill., closed on June 23, and it is reported that other refineries will probably be closing this week or the early part of next week. There is no question but what, if some quick action is not taken, it will result in the closing of many cookie, candy, and other food manufacturing plants. Even if the plants should close for only a short period of time, it still would be extremely serious, because if labor should be laid off for short periods of time because of these shut-downs there is no doubt but what it would be extremely difficult to replace a lot of these workers that might not report back for work.

As you know, a very large percentage of confections are being consumed in various camps by the servicemen, by certain governmental departments, and in defense plants throughout the entire United States.

You can also appreciate that this situation is particularly serious so far as the State of Illinois is concerned because Illinois produces approximately 33⅓ percent of the entire tonnage of confections.

Mr. President, the situation with reference to corn has become so acute that telegrams on the subject continue to pour in on me. Even while I have been speaking a number of telegrams from important industries in my State have been placed on my desk. They emphasize the necessity for prompt action being taken. The first, a telegram from W. D. Walker, president, Arcady Farms Milling Co., of Chicago, Ill., reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 2, 1943.*

Hon. SCOTT LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Our corn supply very low; will be exhausted in week or 10 days. We must buy and use corn if we are to continue making feeds for chickens, turkeys, hogs, dairy cows, and cattle, which form a vital part of the food-production program. Recent Commodity Corporation requisitioning of corn in terminal elevators has made none available to us, as all stocks so required are being given to wet and dry corn processors and no corn is being offered or sold by farmers. Latest War Food Administration guarantee price to farmers to October 31 will not move any corn off farms. We urge you to work for and insist on removal of ceiling price on corn as only possible adequate way to handle this critical situation. Any other action will only afford small temporary help.

W. D. WALKER,
President, Arcady Farms Milling Co.

Another one is from the Advance Aluminum Casting Corporation, of Chicago, and reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 2, 1493.*

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senator,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your assistance in bringing to an early and satisfactory conclusion the critical position confronting the corn-products industry will enable us as a user of corn products in the manufacture of essential aluminum castings for all branches of the armed forces, more especially aircraft, to fulfill these vital Government orders which are now seriously threatened because of the lack of corn made available to all corn-products producers.

ADVANCE ALUMINUM
CASTINGS CORPORATION.

Another, from James Moore, of Mount Vernon, Ill., reads as follows:

MOUNT VERNON, ILL., *July 2, 1943.*

Senator SCOTT LUCAS,
Washington. D. C.:

Corn situation terrible. Relieve pressure by removing ceiling. Very necessary.

JAMES MOORE.

Another telegram is from Joe Schafer & Sons Seed Manufacturers, of Springfield, Ill., and reads as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *July 2, 1943.*

Senator SCOTT LUCAS,
Washington. D. C.:

We urgently request relief from serious prevailing corn shortage. Please do all possible to force corn into distribution.

JOE SCHAFER & SONS
FEED MANUFACTURERS.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Do any of the Senator's correspondents suggest a remedy for this very critical situation? Do any of them suggest suspending the ceiling price on corn for a certain period of time, until sufficient corn can be obtained for industrial and other uses?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know that any of them have made any concrete suggestions as to what should be done. Two or 3 weeks ago I made the suggestion on the floor of the Senate that if the ceiling price of corn were suspended for a certain time, say until September 15, when the new crop comes in, with the understanding that it would then be placed back at parity price, there would be no question that plenty of corn would flow through the regular channels. That is in line with what the Senator is now suggesting.

Mr. OVERTON. I think it would be a very wise policy to pursue, in view of the fact that the situation is becoming far more critical. I am receiving telegrams and letters on the subject, but I am making no progress whatever in obtaining relief.

Mr. LUCAS. I am making just as much progress as is the Senator from Louisiana; but I intend to continue to talk about the corn situation until we can have something constructive done through the various agencies of government which are handling the problem or through proper legislation by the Congress.

While I am on my feet, let me say that I regret very much that a man of the fine character, integrity, and ability of Chester Davis should have resigned from the position of Food Administrator. He has unusual administrative qualifications. His successor is Judge Marvin Jones. While I know that Mr. Jones is new at the job, I also know that he has a wide range of knowledge of agricultural problems. He has unusual sympathy with the farmer. I hope he will use his vast knowledge to take the corn situation in hand. I know that he realizes the great emergency which exists. The agencies of government which are handling the problem should not leave it for a single moment until it is solved. I hope that the order which has been issued will solve the problem, but I fear it will not. In the meantime, I implore the agencies of government to lay down some fundamentals in connection with this problem between now and July 17, which will solve it once and for all.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator has just referred to the appointment by the President of Marvin Jones, of Texas, to succeed Chester Davis. The Senator has referred to Mr. Jones in highly complimentary terms. The Senator will recall that for 6 years both he and I were members of the House Committee on Agriculture, presided over by that distinguished Texan, Marvin Jones. I wish to endorse what the Senator has said about him. If I know a real man, it is Marvin Jones. His understanding of agricultural problems is exceeded by that of no other man in the country today. In addition, he is a practical man, with an understanding heart. He is a humanitarian. He wants to do the right thing in the right way. If any man can help to solve the corn problem, and has the purpose in his heart to do so, it is Marvin Jones. More power to him.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate very much the Senator's statement, as I know Mr. Jones will, coming from the Senator from New Hampshire, good Republican as he is. That is the kind of spirit which we ought to have in the Senate. Such a spirit would perhaps aid Federal administrators such as Mr. Jones to cooperate with us in solving this problem.

There are many men here who, in my judgment, know agriculture. They are men who have served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for many years. There are men who have served on the Agriculture Committee of the House who know agriculture. They know the problems of agriculture in their own sections of the country. If these gentlemen would once in a whole sit down with the best minds in agriculture in both the Senate and the House and get their viewpoints on the subject, perhaps we might get a little further along in the solution of these problems.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to make a comment, which I think is typical. Looking at the whole matter of the war effort as it exists now, and in its broad national aspects, the greatest thing which could happen to the country would be for each of us who is charged with the responsibility of legislation to keep in mind the doctrine that the whole is greater than any part thereof.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I would go all the way with the Senator from New Hampshire on that excellent statement. During the great emergency through which we are passing I have tried to do the very thing which the Senator from New Hampshire has said. I have tried to overlook the small things which occur in the Congress in order to go along and keep down the quibbling and the quarreling which we constantly see.

The people back home, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire, do not like the results of what we in Congress are doing. It is sometimes difficult to compromise, to give and take, and on tremendously important problems I do not believe in it. I think we should not do so on great and fundamental problems. However, there are too many little things on which, it seems to me, we spend too much time in the Congress, working against one another and creating confusion and chaos, but I have tried to go along as harmoniously as possible in the war effort, to the end that we close this ghastly war as soon as possible. I know that is what everyone wants.

I have before me a letter from J. R. Short Milling Co., cereal millers, of Chicago, Ill., in which they say:

> The situation is a serious one, of course. The problem is how best to secure a movement from the farms so as to protect the important industries which are being affected. We know that there are many difficult points involved in correcting what appear to be serious mistakes in the earlier handling of the situation.

I have here a telegram from R. M. Field, president of American Feed Manufacturers Association, Inc., a letter from Wagner Baking Corporation, and a letter from Container Corporation of America, Chicago.

Here is a letter from the W. T. Rawleigh Co., of Freeport, Ill., in which, among other things they say:

> It seems there has been a great deal of discussion in Washington and making suggestions as to how to correct the corn situation, but the fact remains that nothing which will correct the situation has been done about it.

I also have before me a letter from the Pilsen Brewing Co., as well as a letter from Dixie Mills Co., East St. Louis, Ill. So it goes, Mr. President.

In conclusion, I wish to apologize to the Senator from Tennessee for taking all this time, because I know he has an important conference report which he desires to submit. But the corn situation is just as important to the war effort, to the industries, to the laboring man, and to the farmer, as are many things which we have been discussing during the past few days. I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate these facts, these telegrams, and these letters. I appreciate the cooperation of the many Senators who have joined with me in the debate, and I thank the Senate for listening to me.

Mr. DAVIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the senior Senator from Illinois in the discussion of the farm situation as it relates to corn. I have received a very large number of telegrams and letters from business and professional men in every section of the State of Pennsylvania petitioning Congress to do something to relieve the present corn situation.

Mr. President, at this time I desire to urge the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to consider this question, and report back to the Senate a plan to enable those who so desperately need it an opportunity to buy corn so that they may continue with their business.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the action of the Senate and House of Representatives, insert the following: *"Provided,* That no part of such fund shall be available after June 30, 1943, for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-eighth Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by

the Senate and House of Representatives or by the Committees on Appropriations of both bodies"; 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: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other Act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement Senate amendment No. 61.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on important public business.

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

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

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

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether, in all good faith, he thinks that the conference report he has just submitted changes in any essential degree whatever the issue which has already been three times decided by the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, it does not; so far as the three alleged Communists are concerned, it is not changed at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad the Senator from Tennessee used the term "alleged," because that presents, in the Senator's own statement, the whole issue in this matter. They are not convicted Communists, they are alleged by a subcommittee of a committee of the House of Representatives to be Communists. I simply wanted to make the issue clear that, after the Senate has three times—an unprecedented procedure, so far as I know, from such investigation as I have been able to make—rejected three conference reports from the great Committee on Appropriations on an essential question of principle, the conferees have come back with exactly the same thing on which the Senate has three times expressed itself.

Mr. President, if the Senator prefers to proceed and to have me take the floor later in my own time, I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose I explain what the committee has done, and then I shall be glad to yield the floor so that the Senator may argue the matter again.

Mr. President, this is the fourth conference report which has been made on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill carrying salaries for various officers and employees of the Government. There are only two items remaining undisposed of, as all Senators know. The first one is amendment No. 5, on page 3, line 16, of the bill, and the conferees have agreed on the following language in reference to the President's fund of $83,000,000:

No part of such fund—

That is unexpended balances and an appropriation of $25,000,000 of new money, making in all $83,000,000—

No part of such fund shall be available after June 30, 1943, to finance a function or project for which function or project a Budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-eighth Congress, and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives, or by the Committees on Appropriations of both bodies.

Mr. President, the conferees believed that no one could reasonably object to this proviso. If a budget was sent in and denied either by both Committees on Appropriations, or by the Congress itself, surely no money otherwise appropriated by the Congress should be used for this purpose. I am quite sure the President himself would not use his fund for any such purpose anyway after the Congress had turned a bill down which had been submitted by the Budget Director, and I urge Senators to vote for this report. It seems that many Senators whether friendly to the President or unfriendly to him could vote for this limitation or restriction.

After very careful consideration the conferees unanimously adopted the provision. In my judgment, it does not injuriously affect the appropriation, except to a limited extent. Let us take, for instance, the National Resources Planning Board, for which a Budget estimate was sent to Congress and rejected by both Houses; none of the money could be used for that Board. Let us take almost any case in which an appropriation has been asked, and the Congress has refused it. Under the provision, money would not be available, and should not be available, for such a purpose. I do not believe the President himself would think it should be made available when an application has been made to the Congress for the money, and the Congress has refused it, or the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses have declined to grant it. I am sure that under such circumstances the President would not want to use the fund for a purpose for which the Congress had already denied an appropriation.

Mr. President, I need not say anything further about that. The provision has been agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I correct in my understanding that the agreement reached by the conferees prohibits transfer of funds from any source to an agency for which the Congress itself has refused directly to make appropriations?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, except for the words "from any source." It applies only to the $83,000,000 carried in the pending bill.

Mr. WHITE. It would prohibit the transfer of funds from that source to a

governmental agency when Congress had refused to make appropriations for such agency?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I feel that when a Budget estimate has been made for an appropriation and Congress, as a Congress, has refused to make the appropriation, no President would deliberately fly in the face of the Congress by transferring funds for that purpose from his general fund.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that to be absolutely true.

Mr. BARKLEY. I not only have no ground for believing that the present Chief Executive would do that, but I have a very distinct belief that he would not. But there is some ambiguity in the language at the end of the provision. I read:

> No part of such fund shall be available after June 30, 1943, for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-eighth Congress and such appropriation dened after consideration thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives—

It is perfectly clear to that point. But now comes the phrase "or by the Committee on Appropriations of both bodies."

Could that be interpreted to mean that even when the two Appropriations Committees had denied an appropriation of a budget estimate, or any such item, and the Congress afterward appropriated the amount, or increased the amount, notwithstanding the subsequent action of the Congress as a whole, if the committees had turned the matter down, the payment could not be made?

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand what the House meant by that language, it is that if someone on the floor offered an amendment which had been submitted and turned down by the two committees, it would apply to that also, That is their purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, then, it is the Senator's interpretation that both the Houses of Congress might override their Committees on Appropriations and insert an item in a bill and make it a part of the law, but the President would be denied the right to transfer such funds if the committees had turned it down, notwithstanding the action of Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my understanding of the language. The House was adamant in the matter and would not take it out of the bill. Every Member of the conference, both on the part of the Senate and on the part of the House, has agreed to it, and, therefore, it is before us. The Senator knows as much about the insertion of language as anyone else does.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not quarreling with the Senator from Tennessee; I am trying to find out what the provision means. If the Senator's interpretation of the intent of the House be correct, it makes the Committees on Appropriations superior to Congress, because it makes it impossible for the President to use a fund which the Congress would have included, overriding the Committees on Appropriations, under that language, if the committees themselves refuse to report an item, notwithstanding that Congress put it in.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is a very far-fetched construction of the language. The Senator may attempt by some ratiocination with which I am not familiar to make it mean something different from what it says, and that it means to put the two Committees on Appropriations of the Congress above the Congress. I do not think it does, and if it does, then the Senator is responsible for it, because it referred originally to the "appropriate committees of the two Houses," and the Senator asked that it be changed to refer to the two Appropriations Committees of the two Houses.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is incorrect in that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator told me so. I do not know whether I am incorrect or not. I understand language ordinarily.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I asked was, and if the Senator's memory serves him correctly he will recall that I asked, that the last clause be eliminated entirely

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator came to me afterwards and asked that that be done, but at first he said he supposed it meant the two Appropriations Committees. My recollection is that he put a memorandum on the copy I had to that effect, and I did what he suggested, thinking it would probably lead the Senator to withdraw his opposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Budget Bureau makes no recommendations to any committee except the Appropriations Committees, and the use of the words "Budget recommendations made to the appropriate committees" would have no meaning, because we know that no other committee receives Budget estimates except the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House inserted this language, and we either have to accept it or reject it. That is all there is to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that and I am not arguing against the conference report, I am not urging any Senator to vote against it, but I think it is a preposterous situation when the House insists on language which can be interpreted to mean, according to the Senator's own interpretation, that if the two Appropriations Committees of the two Houses have turned down a recommendation of the Budget, and the two Houses subsequently insert it in a bill, what is provided for cannot be done because the two committees have previously turned it down.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, the Senator can make any interpretation of it he desires, but this report has been brought here for the fourth time. I do not believe the President of the United States would object to the provision, I do not believe any real friend of the President would object to it. I think it is a perfectly proper limitation, and when the two Houses have voted against a provision, the President should not think of attempting to override them by using a secret fund that is given to him for certain purposes.

Mr. President, I now come to the next part of the program, in which every Senator is very much interested. As we all known, the House has made an investigation of certain men, now working for the Government, who entertained, or were believed to entertain, communistic principles.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Tennessee will recall that during the debate on this question on a former occasion it was asserted that the investigation was a star-chamber proceeding, that there was no trial, that the Bill of Rights was ravished——

Mr. McKELLAR. That every word in the Constitution was ravished.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that these men did have a trial, that they were brought before the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A subcommittee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, a subcommittee. They had a hearing, and testified, and made their attitude known, and the matter was investigated, then the committee believed they should be removed from the roll. Is that true?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, and a part of the evidence is the evidence of the three men themselves. There are 380 pages of the evidence. I hold a copy of it in my hand.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. This discussion has now reached such a point that I wish to ask the Senator whether he would object to a quorum being called.

Mr. McKELLAR. We just had a quorum call.

Mr. HOLMAN. But observe the attendance in the Senate, I believe that if the Members of the Senate were present and should now listen to what the Senator is saying, we would be able to dispose of this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much, but there is quite a fair attendance of Members of the Senate at this time, and I am willing to proceed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are the Senator's "boys" here?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know. I have not counted them. I hope there are enough Senators present to agree to the conference report, and I now propose to tell why I believe we should agree to it.

Mr. President, at the very beginning, when the question was first argued on the floor of the Senate, I said that I did not approve the method adopted by the House.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator when other Senators on the floor cease to debate other subjects long enough to prevent me from continuing. I cannot give the facts of the situation with so much noise in the Senate. I regret the present situation very much.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ANDREWS. The salaries of how many employees of the Federal Government are affected by the pending measure?

Mr. McKELLAR. Several thousand employees are affected. I hope the Senator will wait a moment and I shall tell him who some of them are.

Mr. ANDREWS. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. The second amendment, the one now in question, denying funds to Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett was agreed to by the conference in exactly the same language that has been before the Senate heretofore.

Mr. President, I fear in the previous conferences I have not been able properly to defend this part of the report, and I am going to try with my colleagues to defend it at this time.

There were two objections raised heretofore to it and they were the principal objections and which objections cannot now be raised. The first of these was that the House had never voted on it by record vote except the first time when the vote was more than 5 to 1 in favor of the amendment. Since the last conference the House has voted on it and the vote was 301 to 71 and thus for a second time the House has overwhelmingly voted to sustain its amendment. That, Mr. President, shows that the House is adamant with respect to the question, and that we are not going to get a bill unless we yield to the House.

The other objection heretofore raised was that the House acted on secret testimony, and therefore the men were being condemned without a trial. We have arranged very carefully that these men shall be tried when their names come to the Senate for confirmation in the regular way. That fact, of confirmation by the Senate of their nomination, guarantees them every right. I should be willing to have the Senate pass on my fitness or my qualifications, whether I were guilty or not guilty of some charge made against me. I think the Senate is an honest, upright body, and I think even a Communist would obtain a fair trial from the Senate.

I may say that the House has had published the evidence and I have asked that a copy of the hearing or evidence be laid on the desk of every Senator. It will be seen that the whole matter was gone into thoroughly by the House committee and upon that evidence this amendment was adopted by the House. These three men were called before the committee and each had an opportunity to defend himself. Dr. Watson was charged by the Dies committee, as shown in these hearings, with having belonged to many subversive organizations, beginning with the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, and going down to Social Work Today.

Representative POWERS asked:

> Do you specifically deny having any activity or sympathies as charged in this letter with any or all of these organizations, beginning with the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, and going down to Social Work Today.
>
> Dr. WATSON. I have had some contact, I think, with each of these organizations.
>
> Representative POWERS. With which ones?
>
> Dr. WATSON. With every one of them, in that I have joined with them in some enterprise or other.
>
> Representative POWERS. Knowing the character of the organizations at the time you joined in with them?
>
> Dr. WATSON. Ordinarily not.
>
> Representative POWERS. My question is, In any case did you know the character of the organization?
>
> Dr. WATSON. Yes; in many cases I knew the character of the organization and did not judge it to be a subversive organization.

Again, Representative POWERS:

> As to all these 13 organizations the Committee on Un-American Activities has branded as either Communist or front organizations for the Communist Party, did you ever publicly repudiate any of these organizations after you had had any connection with them?
>
> Dr. WATSON. I do not think I either endorsed or repudiated them.

I shall not go into all the testimony, but I will say that the testimony shows that Mr. Watson belonged, as I recall, to 13 Communist or subversive organizations or clubs. He associated with Communists. He admitted that he associated with Communists. He admitted that he belonged to communistic organizations, and it was upon his evidence, I recall, that the committee based its findings, for there is no other evidence in the hearings except that of the three men—Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Lovett—together with exhibits to their testimony. They themselves made their cases. They were heard, and upon their own statements the House adopted this provision.

The two other accused persons were just as bad or worse. Mr. Dodd said his home was used for a Communist meeting and he was present. Dr. Lovett joined so many Communist and subversive organizations that he hardly knew them all. I think there were probably 50 or 100.

The proof—and it is their own proof too—shows that all three of these gentlemen are much more interested in communism or communistic teachings and associations than they are in the American Government, and I frankly say from my examination of the testimony that I think all three are wholly unworthy to be working for our Government. On the other hand, I have heretofore stated I think it was unfortunate that the House pursued the plan of getting rid of them it has followed, but the House pursued that plan honestly and fearlessly and it will not agree to the bill without that provision being included in it. The House has modified its original position by inserting the language:

> Until November 1 they can stay where they are but they cannot be paid out of this fund after November 15 unless the President shall send their names to the Senate and they be confirmed by the Senate.

Certainly that will give these men every fair opportunity to be justly dealt with.

I may say that Mr. Watson holds a very important place in one of the departments. I think he takes part in the handling of some of our foreign mail.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In respect to the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee that Mr. Watson belonged to 13 communistic organizations, I call attention to page 10 of the hearings, which the Senator from Tennessee has just handed me, and which I have seen today for the first time, and read from Mr. Watson's testimony as follows:

> I think there is no organization in the list which has been charged by the Department of Justice as a subversive organization. I certainly have never been a member or sponsor of any organization known by me to be Communist in origin or control.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. According to his own testimony, he was simply an innocent person who joined these communistic—or shall I call them something else?—well, I will call them what the committee called them—communistic organizations, subversive organizations. He was simply an innocent person who was brought into them without knowing what they were. There were 13 of them.

I call attention to what was said on page 13:

> Representative POWERS. As to all these 13 organizations the Committee on Un-American Activities has branded as either Communist or front organizations for the Communist Party, did you ever publicly repudiate any of these organizations after you had had any connection with them?

And this is Mr. Watson's answer, Senators:

> No. I do not think I either endorsed or repudiated them.

That was Mr. Watson's testimony. I shall not go into the testimony of the others. Mr. Dodd, however, did the same thing. He belonged to such organizations without knowing what they were. A meeting was held in his own house in New York City, where a great number of persons gathered, and the Communist Party paid for the food and the drink and the other expenses.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course, I am interested in what the Senator from Tennessee has to say. He holds a brief, apparently, for the House committee on the action it took, and is trying to defend it, and to urge upon us the principle and the duty to support the conference report in its present form.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. TOBEY. But my memory goes back to the other day when the distinguished Senator stood on the floor of the Senate and at the beginning of his remarks said dogmatically—and he pounded the desk when he said it—"I do not

approve of this method of handling the matter."

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not.

Mr. TOBEY. And yet the Senator is now using his best offices, his forensic talent, his histrionic talent, and his attractive personality——

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. To seduce us to vote for this "stuff" here.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy to answer the question. I will tell the Senator why I made that statement. It was argued here by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], whom I love very dearly, that these men had not had a fair show, that they were being condemned without hearing, that we were cutting them off without a trial. It developed that a trial had taken place, or a committee had investigated them, and then the Senator from Missouri said that it was a secret matter, and that the House had published the hearings only a few days ago.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in a moment. Let me finish my answer to the question of the Senator from New Hampshire. It had been argued here that these men were not Communists. As I understood, it was argued here that so far as the record shows they were pure and undefiled.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator, when he mentions my name, certainly does not mean to say that I ever argued that they were pure and undefiled?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I said there was no evidence before the Senate which justified us in overriding the Constitution of the United States by bringing a bill of attainder against men in an unconstitutional manner.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a second?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The words "pure and undefiled" intrigue me. I have a little knowledge of the Scriptures, gained in my earlier days—

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is to be congratulated.

Mr. TOBEY. I think so. The Scriptures say:

> He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone * * *.

I apply that to all of us when it comes to saying "pure and undefiled."

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. President, as I have said, the fact, as brought out in the hearing, is that Dr. Dodd was associated with many organizations, that he entertained communistic or subversive organizations in his own house in New York and the parties were paid for by the Communist Party.

When it comes to Dr. Lovett, as I have said, Dr. Lovett belongs to so many Communist organizations and so many Communist-front organizations that he could count only about 100 of them. That was all he could count. If there were any Communist or Communist-front organizations that Dr. Lovett did not belong to, it was by accident, not by design, because he found all that could be found, so the committee said.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Since the Senator has completely shifted the issue from the position he originally took on the matter and now is proposing to try de novo in the Senate the merits of the proposition, I will answer that in my own time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But on the statement the Senator made a moment ago about bridge and cocktail parties, let me say I have a very low opinion of young Dodd, and have an even lower opinion of old man Dodd, the recently deceased former Ambassador to Germany.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not know either of them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The most I know of them is newspaper hearsay; but, even so, does the Senator contend that if any individual, any citizen of the United States, chooses to give a cocktail party or a tea party or a dinner or anything else for a man, the mere fact that the man for whom the party is given has had charges preferred against him indicates any subversive intention on the part of the person providing the entertainment? It does not seem to me to be fair to say that a man advocates subversion of the sovereignty of the United States, which is the charge brought in this case, because he gave a cocktail party for a man such as Harry Bridges. So far as I am concerned, I adhere to the belief that Harry Bridges should be deported.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let us not get into the Bridges case. We have enough cases before us now.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have enough "bridges" to cross.

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed so, Mr. President.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I believe Harry Bridges should be deported. I think there are technical grounds on which deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges can be well founded. However, a number of persons in the United States for whose judgment I have great respect hold the contrary view.

To say that a man is guilty of a crime for which he should be subjected to a practical bill of attainder because he entertained the contrary view on the Harry Bridges case seems to me to be absolutely unfair.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. In just one moment. I am undertaking to make an explanation of the committee's report. I shall ask Senators to wait until I make the explanation, and then I shall answer any questions which may be asked by Senators.

Mr. TOBEY. The only reason why I desire to ask the question I have in mind is because the discussion has now reached Dr. Lovett, and the Senator is making serious charges against him. What I have to say is very pertinent to that part of the Senator's address.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well, Mr. President; I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate the gracicusness on the Senator's part.

Let me point out that this morning, about half an hour after the opening of the session, I approached the Senator from Tennessee and asked him if the matter in connection with the three alleged Communists was to be brought up. He assured me it was. Then, in his zeal for converts, he passed to me the 380-page booklet I now hold in my hand.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not put it that way. I am here representing the Senate Appropriations Committee. We have had four conferences about this matter. Our committee has acted as honestly, as fairly, and as justly as we knew how. I am not interested in these men. I do not know them.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no zeal about that.

Mr. TOBEY. Certainly the Senator gave me this booklet to convince me; did he not?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can be convinced or not convinced, as he likes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if I may address my remarks to the Senator from Tennessee for a moment, in connection with the booklet he handed me, let me say that I opened it by chance. I could not have gone through it all in half an hour; but, merely by chance, I opened it at page 183. I call the Senator's attention to the testimony appearing at the top of the page. Representative KEEFE was questioning Dr. Lovett. The testimony is as follows:

> Representative KEEFE. You were a member of that, were you not?
>
> Mr. LOVETT. I was; yes—Friends of the Soviet Union.

I read further from the testimony:

> Representative KEEFE. Well, let me call your attention to this, which perhaps will recall—a meeting which was held at the Ashland Boulevard Auditorium on Tuesday, March 5, 1935. This document is headed "Call to Action. War Threatens the Soviet Union. Militarist Japan and Fascist Germany Forging Robbers' Ring to Attack. Defend the Soviet Union," and so on and so on. "Come Hear Robert Morss Lovett."

What for? To hear him defend the conduct of the Soviet Union. I read further from the testimony:

> Representative KEEFE. You felt that the Soviet Union was going to be attacked by the Fascist states in Europe: Germany, Japan, and Italy?
>
> Mr. LOVETT. It seemed probable at that time.

He anticipated it. I point out that what he did was to foresee coming events; he saw them casting their shadows before. He saw better than some of the rest of us did.

I read further from the testimony:

Mr. LOVETT. * * * I believe that the existence of the Soviet Union, as proved today, is of enormous importance in determining the history of the world and in directing that history to the ultimate benefit of mankind, and I am not ashamed of any action that I have ever taken in defending the Soviet Union.

Now, I say to the Senator from Tennessee that the point I make in my comment to him is that Mr. Lovett is only one of about 130,000,000 people. He was a little ahead of the rest of us. He defended the Soviet Union. He foresaw that Germany and Italy would attack the Soviet Union, as they have.

Today we are defending the Soviet Union. Only the other day I was in the Emanuel Episcopal Church, in Boston, and side by side in the chancel of the church were the flag of the United States and the flag of the Soviet Union.

Today, Soviet Russia is our ally. Perhaps history will reveal Soviet Russia as our best defender.

I am as opposed to communism as any other Senator can be. I am in no sense defending it; what is in my heart is a deep aversion to this branch of Congress sanctioning the procedure proposed in the conference report, a procedure which some of our best legal minds hold to be a bill of attainder in essence and effect at least.

What is the crime in Mr. Lovett's faith in the Soviet Union as a buffer to Fascist influence if he believes in it? This is a free country, and he is following the dictates of his own conscience in those matters.

I do not think the Senator is correct in his position against a man who is defending the Soviet Union against the Fascist states and point out that today the American people are defending the Soviet Union and praising the great fight its armed forces are making against the Axis Powers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may go on, unless there is something very unusual which Senators wish to ask, I hope I shall be permitted to present the committee's side of the matter for a moment. Every time I get started, I am interrupted by some other Senator before I can proceed. I am sure Senators will feel it is fair to let me make my statement.

I say the House had a basis for what it has done. It had so much basis that it voted on the matter twice, and the last time was just a day or two ago. On the last vote the House voted 4½ to 1 in favor of retaining its position.

The question in which I am interested is not one of the guilt or innocence of the men. I do not know anything about whether the three men are guilty or innocent. But I do know, from having read the testimony, that the statements of the three men, as given by themselves, justify the House in the position it has taken to get rid of them. I do not think men having such views——

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator to wait for a moment, please, until I can complete the statement of my thought. I will yield to the Senator later; I shall be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has requested that he not be interrupted.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House had before it the statements of the three men. After reading them, if I had my way, if I were their employer I certainly would not retain them as servants of this Government. I still do not agree with the method the House has used; but the House has taken that course of its own accord, and the matter was in conference.

I am merely saying that the House had a reason for what it did. No Senator can read this pamphlet of 380 pages without coming to the conclusion that the House had a pretty sound reason for its action in not wanting them to work for the United States Government.

That brings me to another aspect of this matter. Here are three men, charged by the House of Representatives, a body coequal with this body with various of subversive principles and practices. Some have said that they are not subversive. Why belong to all these subversive organizations if there is not at least to some extent a kindred feeling? All of us have heard, ever since we were children, that "birds of a feather flock together." These men have been flocking. They have been members of those organizations. The Dies committee has reported that they belonged to such organizations, and it has never been denied. The three men do not deny it.

They hold important positions. One is Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands. Another holds a very important position as translator of documents coming here from foreign countries. I do not know what the duties of the third are. But, be that as it may, here are three men. Some Senators call them the Three Communists. Others have called them the Three Black Crows. Some Senators have asked me about the Three Musketeers, and others about the Three Privateers. Whatever may be said of them, I am not condemning them. They may come before the Senate for confirmation if their nominations are submitted. I wish to give them a fair deal. I am impressed with the idea, from their own testimony under oath, that they have been going in very bad company. No wonder the House has taken the position which it assumes.

Mr. President, those are not the only three persons involved in this bill. The very first provision in the bill is for the pay of the House and Senate pages. We have deprived them of their salaries up to this point. Why have we deprived them of their salaries? In order to prevent three alleged Communists from being let out of the Government service on the basis of their own admissions.

Let me say to the Senate that the pages are as fine a group of young boys as I have ever known. Even if only one of them was involved, I would vote to give him his salary, the three Communists to the contrary notwithstanding; constitutional questions notwithstanding. I believe that what the House has done is perfectly constitutional. I repeat I think it is the wrong way to reach the objective; but if the House has no right to deny an appropriation to pay the salary of any officer of the Government, I do not know what the Constitution means. However that may be, here are these page boys, and the page boys in the House of Representatives. We are denying those boys their pay, while we are protecting three Communists who are holding Communist meetings, one of them in his own house.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Alleged Communists.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator says "alleged Communists." I intend to use the word "alleged" in each instance, although they themselves were not particular about using the word, if the Senator will read their testimony.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I have tried to observe the Senator's injunction against interruption, but the Senator says, "If the Senator will read their testimony." I should be glad to read it, if I were given an opportunity to read it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to furnish the Senator with a copy of the testimony [handing a document to Mr. CLARK of Missouri].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am called on to vote now.

Mr. McKELLAR. The testimony was sent to the Senator several days ago at his office.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It has never been sent to me, and I have never seen it. I refuse to vote on the basis of evidence which I have never seen.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is not asking for any evidence to vote against the pages. He is simply telling the pages, "We are not going to appropriate for you." He is not asking for evidence about them. He is asking for evidence about three alleged Communists.

Mr. President, I would rather vote for any one of these boys, who are as fine a group of young men as I have ever seen, than to preserve some right or alleged right of three Communists.

I should like to say one thing further about the three alleged Communists. Every right they have under the law is preserved to them, because they are to be appointed by the President, and this body will pass on them. I know that the Senate will pass on them fairly.

Whom else are we voting against? It is not a question merely of voting for Communists. Some Senators seem to be determined to vote for the three Communists. It is not only proposed that we vote for Communists, but that we vote against the page boys in the Senate, and the page boys in the House of Representatives.

Whom else are we asked to vote against? We are asked to vote against the pay of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. We are asked to vote against the fund of $83,000,000 for the President of the United States when we vote against the conference report. He has no fund today. Why? Because the conference report has not been agreed

to. He would not have a right to use a dollar of the $83,000,000 appropriation carried in this bill, because the fund expired on June 30.

We are asked to vote against the War Production Board in the Office for Emergency Management, the appropriation for which is $4,597,000. The War Production Board is handling the production of war materials in America. We are asked to turn it down. Why? Because it is desired to protect three alleged Communists. We do not give a hang about having the War Production Board function for the benefit of our country if it interferes in the slightest degree with supposed right under the Constitution of three alleged Communists.

That is not all. The War Shipping Administration is one of the most important functions of the Government. It is necessary to provide the money in order that shipping activities of the country may be carried on. But no; to Hades with that part of our war effort if we can save these three at-heart Communists. Throw it out the window. We refuse to approve the conference report, and, therefore, it gets no money. Why? Because it is desired to protect the positions of three alleged Communists.

We are asked to vote against the Office of Price Administration. The bill carries an appropriation of $3,000,000 for that activity, whose purposes are so worthy that both Houses of Congress have several times agreed to appropriations for its maintenance. But while the Office of Price Administration may be a war effort, we are to turn it down. Why? Because, forsooth, three alleged Communists, flocking with Communists and subversive organizations, are not treated exactly as the Senate thinks they ought to be treated.

I do not know how we ought to go about solving the problem under the Constitution and laws of this country. I am in doubt. The House has gone a long way. I do not approve of the action of the House, but it has taken action under its constitutional right to allow or withhold appropriations. It does not make any difference about the Office of Price Administration. That can go out of the window. We want to save the jobs of three alleged Communists. If we save them, to Hades with the others.

Another important function of government against which we are asked to vote is the Public Health Service, under the Federal Security Agency. What is more important to the civilian population than the Public Health Service and the training of nurses? That goes by the board.

The next is an appropriation—a small one, it is true—for the Freedman's Hospital. It may be said, "Oh, well, a hospital has no place against three alleged Communists. Oh, no. Let us save the Communists, but let the hospital go to Hades. Let us save the three Communists. Let us save their jobs. It is not a question of Communists themselves, but the saving of their jobs. Let us save their jobs."

I come next to the appropriation for Howard University. Howard University is a very worthy colored institution in Washington. I believe it is the largest of its kind in the world. There is an appropriation in this bill for $229,500 for a power plant to be constructed this summer so that those associated with Howard University may keep warm next winter. However, in effect it is said, "Oh, no; kick these citizens—the pupils and teachers in this great university—out of the window, or kick out the appropriations?" Why? Because we must protect the jobs of three Communists—alleged Communists, excuse me—alleged Communists in the employ of the Government.

I next come to the Federal Works Agency—Public Buildings Administration, for which an appropriation is provided of $1,203,800. Shall we appropriate for it? It is being said that we should appropriate for it if it were not that these three alleged Communists must be considered. Unless we cut out the provision with respect to these three alleged Communists these other institutions can go by the board. We do not care. Why should we worry about such things as the Public Buildings Administration, or Howard University?

I come next to what is even of more importance, it seems to me, namely, the Veterans' Administration. An appropriation is recommended of half a million dollars to be used as a revolving fund. The veterans who fought our battles need it. But we are told, "Oh no, you made a mistake. You got into the wrong groove. We must turn that down, of course." Why?

In another part of the bill is a provision which requires a fair and just investigation and ruling on three alleged Communists. My heavens, when something is proposed to be done with respect to three alleged Communists, it does not make any difference about the soldiers who fought for us! Oh, no. What comes of the appropriation for them? Pitch it out the window. That is what we have done already. Three times we have pitched it out the window.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Four times.

Mr. McKELLAR. Four times. And this is an attempt to get through these appropriations. Much is said about being prejudiced against these three men. I am not prejudiced against them. I am talking about the facts concerning them as disclosed by their own evidence. What I am interested in are the university, in the veterans, and in faithful employees, and various governmental agencies.

I now come to the District of Columbia. Here in our midst are 3,500 school teachers in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, whose salaries are being denied. Why? We could not allow the salaries of school teachers to be paid unless we keep three alleged Communists in office. We must keep them in office. Does that make sense to anybody here?

Mr. TOBEY. Is the Senator asking me whether the argument which he is making makes sense?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Not to me. I think it is a splendid example of reductio ad absurdum, if the Senator asks me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. I think his statement would apply to the arguments made in favor of keeping the three men in office, however.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I was a little bit worried over the position taken by the Senator who said that these men had a right to their opinions. He said also that our Government was honoring the Soviet Government. I wonder if the implications were that these men were attempting to substitute communism for our form of Government in America, and that our friendship for Russia meant that we would adopt the Russian form of government?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know what was meant. I am astounded at the arguments which are made by some Senators who seem to favor three alleged Communists, and to turn their backs on worthy people and institutions. I am frank to say that it does not make any sense to me.

In the District of Columbia there are 3,500 school teachers, and 2,000 others who are to be deprived of their salaries. They are right here in our midst. Why are they to be deprived of their salaries? Merely because charges have been made by the House of Representatives against three alleged Communists, who are to be turned over to the Senate and the President to be tried.

Mr. SMITH. I do not like the implication that because Russia is helping us in this war, we are therefore accepting Russia's government. That is what I am protesting against.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is exactly right. I am proud of the position Russia is taking in this war.

Mr. SMITH. So am I.

Mr. McKELLAR. I admire what she has done. But, as God is my judge, I am not in favor of Russia's communistic government, or any other form of communistic government.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Then the Senator from Tennessee and Lovett are thinking exactly alike, because on page 186 of the hearings, Mr. Lovett said:

> I don't know that. In the letterheads, let me say, that represent these various organizations there will be found many persons like myself who were not Communists but who participated in the organization along with Communists for a common object.

That is exactly what the United States is doing now in this war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well, Mr. President. Every man may have his own views about it. I am not complaining about any view which has been stated here.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we should look for a moment at the wording of this amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. It does not say the Senate is to pass upon whether the occupants of these three positions in the Government should in good faith be made subject to confirmation by the Senate. If the Senate in good faith should desire to make these three positions such that in the future their occupants should be confirmed by this body, that is one thing. But Senators will note that the wording of the amendment is that no money shall ever be paid from any appropriations to these three men for any services except—and near the end of the amendment there is a provision as follows:

> That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services as a member of a jury.

And so forth. This body is asked to go on record in saying that these three men may be jurors in the United States and receive payment for such services.

Mr. McKELLAR. If a lawer who had a Communist client should wish to have Communists on his jury, I could easily see how he would like to have on the jury men like the three alleged Communists whom we have been discussing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator believe that the Senate should vote to allow these men to serve on a jury but not allow them to serve in some other capacity in the employ of the Government?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know why the House did it, but I see no reason why the Senate cannot aid the House in enacting a law providing that three men who are charged with offenses against the Government itself—subversive tendencies and subversive acts—I see no reason why the Senate cannot look into that and give them a fair deal. I am sure from the votes already had it would be very much inclined to give them a fair deal.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I see this situation, it is not at all a matter of defending three men; it is a question of whether the method we are asked to adopt is correct, democratic, and constitutional. If we in good faith decide these three positions to be such that those who hold them should be confirmed, then I would favor such legislation, but we know why this provision is put in this particular bill. There are provisions in this bill and in other bills to the effect that an employee must make an affidavit that he is not a Communist and does not advocate overthrowing the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true; both Houses of Congress have adopted such a provision, but in spite of that, it is contended that the Senate should not pass on the qualifications of these three men, their ability, and whether they make good servants of the people.

Mr. President, I want to say that the next appropriation is for the Health Department of the District of Columbia, and for the courts.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I waited until the Senator yielded to other Senators, before interrupting him. I have listened with the utmost interest to the very eloquent argument of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee in presenting the reasons why the Senate should recede from its disagreement to the House amendment. He stated that he was representing the Appropriations Committee in making his very able argument. I hope the Senator before he sits down will take a few minutes to tell me and the other Senators here who have voted with the majority on at least three different occasions what arguments he used in the conference committee room to convince the House conferees that the Senate was sincere in taking the position it has taken at least three times?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not only I, but every other member of the conference committee on the part of the Senate used every argument which was possible. One of our arguments was that Senators did not believe that this was the proper method of attacking this particular problem; that it might be attacked by impeachment.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did the Senator take the time to call to the attention of the House conferees the classic and eloquent argument of one of their own members, Hon. SAM HOBBS, who on the floor of the House, in support of his contention that this is a bill of attainder, made an argument which, in my opinion, is unanswerable? Did the Senator call that to the attention of the House conferees?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed, the Senator from Tennessee did. I did not agree with Mr. HOBBS, but, as the Senator has stated, he made an eloquent appeal to stand by the Constitution. I admire and respect him, but I do not agree with him in his argument that this amendment is unconstitutional. When we want to make an argument in favor of something we want very much to do it is a good thing to stand by the Constitution, but occasionally I think the Constitution is used a little carelessly. There is no constitutional question here.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sure the Senator knows SAM HOBBS; I am sure he knows the ability of SAM HOBBS as a lawyer. Does the Senator believe that SAM HOBBS is the type of man who would argue the unconstitutionality of a proposition unless he was thoroughly convinced of the soundness and correctness of his position.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I think Mr. HOBBS is one of the most sincere and one of the finest men I know. He is a fine lawyer. I do not think he is always right. I think the Senator from Utah is a sincere, upright, and splendid Senator——

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. But I do not always believe as he does and he does not always believe as I do, and he does not believe as I do on this matter.

Mr. MURDOCK. I always regret when I have to disagree with the able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I reciprocate the Senator's statement, but when it comes to a question of whether we are to pay employees of the Government who have committed no act hurtful to anyone, or are to deny nearly $143,000,000 of appropriations in order to save three salaries, argument along the lines of constitutional interpretation under the circumstances of this case, do not particularly appeal to me. As everyone knows, I am a sticker for the Constitution, but I do not believe this report violates that great instrument in any way. If I did, I would vote against the report.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. My position on this question is that when we violate the Constitution of the United States, when in this body we vote a bill of attainder, then, in my opinion, we hold at naught that for which American boys on the battlefronts of the world today are fighting. We do America, and we do American citizens, an irreparable damage when we violate the Constitution, and if for a few days or a week or I may say even 6 months, the page boys to whom the Senator referred, and all other employees of the Government were denied their salaries, it would be better, in my opinion, to do even that than to cause the irreparable damage which would be brought about by violating under the dome of the Capitol the bill of attainder clause of the Constitution. By agreeing to the House amendment we do just that, in my humble opinion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course if I believed that this was a bill of attainder, or if it was violative of the Constitution of the United States, I would vote against the conference report just as the Senator has done. I am not complaining of that vote. I would vote that way, too, if I believed as the Senator does; but I do not believe that this is a bill of attainder. I do not believe that the two Houses of Congress have not a right to deny salary to any employee if they want to do so. I think it is a bad method, but I do not think it is unconstitutional at all. If I did think it was unconstitutional, I would stand by my oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, and if the Senator from Utah puts it on that ground, then he ought to vote against the conference report. I do not think it is unconstitutional.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the Senator read the Supreme Court citations in the Hobbs speech?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator, after reading those citations, could come on this floor and tell the Senate that this is not a bill of attainder, I should be very much surprised.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator might be surprised; all of us are surprised at times; it is now too late to examine these citations, but I think that this is not a bill of attainder, and I do not think it is unconstitutional. I think it was an unhappy way of disposing of the matter until the provision was put in that these men should be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. That was a complete protection to them.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to refer briefly to some of the others affected by the appropriations in this bill. There are a number of insane people provided for by the bill. Insane people do not amount to anything in the eyes of the Congress; we should turn them down because we want to protect the jobs of three alleged Communists.

Next is the militia. Well, of course, we do not need the militia in this war. We will merely tell them to go to grass—I could use another word, but I will not do so—and tell the old soldiers to go to Hades, and tell all the others, "You cannot contest with the jobs of three men who are charged with being Communists. We will uphold any point, we will vote against anybody, even the worthy pages here, in order to preserve three positions for three alleged Communists."

Mr. President, I am about through, but there are some more employees affected by this bill.

Next is the Department of Agriculture. They have an appropriation. The Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Geological Survey, salaries and expenses of agricultural experiment stations, vocational schools in the Virgin Islands, where one of these men is employed. We are undertaking to appropriate money for them, but we cannot do it, we cannot approve a conference report which gives a fair deal and a fair trial to three men charged with communism. Oh, no; we should rise above it, we should give these three alleged Communists preference over probably 100,000 of our own citizens who do not believe in communism. We prefer to aid and support and keep in jobs the alleged Communists rather than serve our own people.

Next is the Department of Justice. We must not give anything to the Department of Justice. That will never do in the world, because these Communists come first. They come before judges, they come before the salaries and expenses of the Land Division, salaries and expenses of district attorneys, salaries and expenses of marshals, salaries and expenses of bailiffs. Oh, we will not bother with them, we want to protect the jobs of the three alleged Communists.

Next is penal and correctional institutions. We would not want to appropriate for them. One of these three men might get into one of these penal and correctional institutions one of these days, and we want to save them.

We come next to the Post Office Department. It makes no difference whether our boys get letters or not; oh, no, turn them down, disregard them, we have to save the places of three alleged Communists. And there is the office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General.

The Department of State: We should not bother about the Department of State when we have the jobs of three alleged Communists to deal with.

Treasury Department: Of course, the Treasury Department has nothing to do anyway. We should not want the Treasury Department now. There is no necessity for bonds—oh, no. We are in a war it is true, and we need all the money we can get, as it looks to most people, but not now. Oh, no, we must protect these alleged Communists.

Next is the judiciary, then the executive offices of the President, the National Board of Economic Welfare, the Selective Service System, grants to States for the Employment Service. We must not take care of that. We must look after these three alleged Communists. We must see that they are tried in a way peculiar to them.

Salaries and expenses of the War Planning Power Commission, War Production Board, independent establishments, Civil Service Commission. Oh, no. What do we need with the Civil Service Commission? These three men are probably under the civil service already, and we do not need to give them any more money.

Federal Communications Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, National Labor Relations Board: Well, the National Labor Relations Board does not need any money. At any rate, whether they need it or not, we will not give it to them, as long as these places of three admitted, alleged Communists are at stake.

Veterans' Administration: Listen to this, Veterans' Administration, $6,775,000. Oh, we will not give it to them; oh no, no, no. To Hades with the Veterans' Administration. We will not give it to them.

Federal Security Agency, Howard University, Federal Works Agency: Oh, we will give them nothing. Turn them down. Vote against this report, and turn it down, send it back to conference for the fifth or sixth time, whatever it is. Of course, the members of the Appropriations Committee have nothing to do but to go to conference. They have nothing to do but to work. That does not make any difference. Turn them down, let them go.

Salaries and expenses, Public Buildings and Grounds in the District of Columbia—total, work agencies, $3,812,000. Do not give them money. They are home people, they are people against whom, so far as we know, no charges have been brought. Why give them anything? Save the money, save the jobs for three alleged Communists.

I believe that takes in most of the appropriations, $143,000,000 for all the departments of the Government, or virtually all of them.

Mr. President, with this presentation I wish to make a plea to the Senate to ratify the report. These appropriations will not be made otherwise, because the House has just voted on the matter again—4½ to 1—and unless the report is agreed to, we will have no bill. I leave the matter with the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I think that nearly everyone who knows the Senator from Tennessee and myself is aware of the deep affection which has existed between us for lo these many years, since the Senator from Tennessee first came to the House of Representatives and I was a little boy.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will concede that was a long time ago, I imagine.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was a long time ago, when I was a little boy and when the Senator from Tennessee first entered on his long and invaluable service in the Congress of the United States. The Senator remembers me as a small boy, and I remember him as one of the most brilliant prospects for legislative service to enter the House in many, many years.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was not the Senator from Missouri parliamentarian about the time I served in the House, a good many years ago?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what I thought.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. However, I feel it incumbent on me to say that, with all my affection and respect for the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I think we have just listened to the most specious, the most illogical, the most outrageous argument from his mouth that it has ever been my pleasure, or my burden, to hear on the floor of either branch of Congress.

Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has undertaken to make an issue between the page boys on the floor of the House and the Senate, and the violation of the whole theory and principle of the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights. I do not yield to the Senator from Tennessee or anyone else in my affection for the boys who serve as pages in the Senate or the House. When I was a small boy myself I knew intimately some of the pages, who have since risen to great heights, but I do not think the question of the continuation of the pay of the pages in the Senate or the House of Representatives for a day or two is any justification for the application of lynch law in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

Then the Senator from Tennessee undertakes to say that if one believes to any extent whatever in the principle of the education of colored people, as has been heretofore evidenced by Federal support of Howard University, he must then agree to violate the Constitution of the United States by bringing in a bill of attainder.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator does not want to do me an injustice. I have never said anything like that. I said quite the contrary. I said that if I believed that the provisions in the pending report were violative of the Constitution, I should be opposed to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator did say that, but let me say to the Senator that he has out-Magellaned Magellan. Magellan is supposed to have circumnavigated the globe only once. In connection with the very bill we are considering, the Senator from Tennessee has gone twice around the globe.

The Senator started out by making the best speech made on the whole controversy in the Senate, when he presented the amendment of the Senate committee to strike out this House provision. Then the Senator came back to the Senate to obtain consent for a provision which he said was necessary in order to obtain agreement on the conference report. Then he came back with another conference report. We have had so many of them that, although I have a very accurate memory, I have almost lost track of them. The Senator from Tennessee really has not only gone around the globe twice; he is back on the other side of the globe now, because he is asking the Senate to sit as a jury or as a court of judgment on matters which have never been presented to it.

Let me say before I pass on to something else, that the Senator from Tennessee a moment ago held up a pamphlet which I had never before seen. He claims it contains evidence to sustain the position taken by the House. I have never before seen it. The Senator never sent it to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I asked that a copy be sent to every Senator, and I have been advised since that a copy was sent to every Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have never seen the pamphlet to which he refers; and if I had seen it, I would not pay the slightest attention to it, because I would not convict a dog unless I had an opportunity personally to hear the testimony.

Mr. McKELLAR. The document contains the testimony of the three individuals themselves.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me a moment, I will say that I should like to have the opportunity of reading the evidence, and hearing the testimony, and asking any questions I may desire to ask. I will say that I have never had the opportunity of reading this bulky pamphlet to which the Senator has referred. It must contain 175 pages.

Mr. LANGER. Three hundred and eighty pages.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; 380 pages.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It would take me at least a day and a half to read it. I have never seen it before. But if I had, Mr. President, it would not change my view in the very least. I would not convict a dog on that sort of testimony.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. It contains the testimony of the three men themselves. They did the testifying. The Senator says that he would not convict or pass upon a case presented by the three men themselves and by nobody else. They are the only ones who testified, the only three witnesses who appeared.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, when the Senator in charge of the bill made the motion that the committee amendment eliminating the House provision be agreed to, he himself said—I do not think I misquote the Senator from Tennessee, though I do not have the RECORD immediately before me—that he did not believe in such star-chamber proceedings; that nothing had been presented——

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That nothing had been presented to the Senate committee which would justify him in arriving at such a conclusion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; I said that I did not believe that the method pursued by the House was the best method to be pursued in reaching this result, but I did not say that I——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say that the Senator is conducting himself as a witness. Let me ask the Senator, at the time the appropriation bill was first considered in the Senate, had the Senator seen any evidence which justified him in excluding these men from office?

Mr. McKELLAR. I had seen this very document.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then the Senator made one of the most eloquent speeches against the inclusion of the House provision I have ever heard in the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; my position is the same as it has been all the time, all the way through. The Senator did not hear me when I spoke before.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I heard the Senator speak, and I backed him up so far as I could.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator would not want to do me an injustice, but he is doing me an injustice, because I took the position that in view of the fact that the Senate had stricken out this provision, I would not agree to the conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a minute. I am referring now to the time when the Senator himself proposed that the Senate disagree to the House provision. He made that proposal in his capacity as acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was my duty to do so. The Senate had stricken out the provision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator made a very eloquent speech on the subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would not yield on the proposal until I had brought it back to the Senate, but when I found that there was utterly no chance to have any bill, that all other persons and institutions provided for in the appropriation bill would be injured and deprived of that which was justly coming to them, when the House was adamant on the subject, I took the position I did. I have been in enough conferences with the House to know something about them. I see one of the House Members standing on the floor of the Senate now. He is one of the finest Members of the House, Representative RABAUT, and he will verify what I say—he cannot say it on the Senate floor, but he knows it to be true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I happen to have the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator yielded to me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator wants to pay a tribute to LOUIS RABAUT I will be very glad to join in it, although I think as a singer his services are much better than they are in his capacity as a conferee on this particular matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not like the way he stood out for the House provision, but not only Representative RABAUT but every other conferee on the part of the House stood out for the House provision, and if we are to have a bill the only way we can have it is to agree to the conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Tennessee very courteously asked me not to make a speech in his time, and I now ask him not to make a speech in mine.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the whole argument which has been made in this boxing of the compass, this double boxing of the compass——

Mr. McKELLAR. Make it fivefold or tenfold.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. This circumnavigation of the globe in which the Senator from Tennessee has been indulging—the only justification the Senator has offered for a change in his own position is that he says it is an issue between three individuals whom the Senator does not like very much and whom I do not like any better——

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a minute. I do not either. I never saw any one of the three. The Senator says that the issue is between them and Howard University, or the Veterans' Bureau, or the little page boys in the House and Senate.

Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee knows that he now has under consideration, and his committee has under consideration, a second deficiency bill which will be considered by the Senate before this session ends, and must necessarily be considered before this session ends, and when that second deficiency measure comes before the Senate every item in the urgent deficiency bill, except controverted legislative provisions, will be in order on the second deficiency appropriation bill.

I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that it is my full intention when he brings before the Senate the second deficiency appropriation bill, to offer all the bona fide appropriation provisions of the pending bill to the second deficiency appropriation bill, and if that should be adopted by the Senate, these outrageous,

infamous legislative provisions would be subject to a point of order by any Representative or Senator in either House of the Congress.

So the Senator is absolutely unfair in my opinion—I do not mean that in any opprobrious sense—the Senator is absolutely erroneous when he states that to provide funds to pay the salaries of the page boys in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States, or to provide funds for Howard University, or for the Veterans' Administration, or for any of the other functions which the Senator in his long speech enumerated, it is necessary for us to yield to the House of Representatives on a great constitutional point, a matter of fair trial for anyone, as provided by the Constitution of the United States. I say that when he says that, the Senator is talking beside the point.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator in a moment. If the House of Representatives is so insistent in its attitude that these three men, for none of whom I hold any special brief whatever, have been guilty of subversion, the House has a process provided by the Constitution of the United States, cumbersome to be sure, but nevertheless deadly in its effect, of instituting a procedure by impeachment, and if the House of Representatives feels strongly enough to institute impeachment proceedings, and such proceedings come to the Senate, I will hear them as a judge; I will be sworn on my own oath, not my ordinary oath as a Senator, but my special oath as a judge of the court of impeachment, which I have taken several times.

When that happens, I will listen to the evidence and make up my own mind according to my oath as a judge. But I am not willing, and I will never be willing, either now or hereafter, to vote to convict a man practically on a bill of attainder, without giving him an opportunity to appear before me, not before some subcommittee of the House, and to have an opportunity to hear the evidence and cross-examine the witnesses against him.

Mr. President, when this matter first came in, the Senator from Tennessee very frankly admitted there was not any difference between the present issue and the issue which has been presented several times before the Senate, except for the insistence of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate has to yield because the House is insistent.

I have pointed out the way in which the Senate can act, in which event the House could not refuse to act without taking the responsibility for defeating all the items in both the urgent deficiency bill and the second deficiency bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I greatly regret that the Senator from Missouri is not a member of the conference committee, as it is so easy for him to tell us how the matter could be handled. Let me say that the very matter the Senator has presented has been thoroughly considered on all sides, and we were informed by the committee that no bill would pass that did not contain——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if that be true, I am in favor of meeting that issue head on, and letting the House of Representatives take the responsibility.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have met it head on, all the time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I have listened today to the eloquent defense of the Senator from Tennessee of Howard University and the Veterans' Bureau and the page boys, I have wondered who actually presented the case of the Senate in the conference. Of course, I was not there.

Mr. President, let me say further that I was present night before last when the Senator from Tennessee attacked the majority leader and the minority whip on the theory of not standing behind the Appropriations Committee. I thought my memory was correct at that time, but I did not wish to inject myself into the debate to the extent of asking the Senator from Tennessee about the matter. However, it seemed to me that I remembered that just a few days before, when the matter of the National Resources Planning Board was before the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee himself led the raid on the position of his own committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator should be fair.

The committee was evenly divided in that case; and under the circumstances I gave notice, in accordance with the rules of the committee, of the position I would take. But the vote in the committee was evenly divided. The matter was lost on a tie vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. President, yesterday it was necessary for me to be absent from the Senate for several hours because my oldest boy was leaving to report to the Marine Corps, in which he had enlisted sometime previously. Consequently, I was late in reaching the Chamber for a vote, and was not permitted to participate in the debate.

What was my shock and chagrin and surprise to learn that my dear friend the Senator from Tennessee, who had lectured us all, and who has lectured us so often on the theory of standing behind the Appropriations Committee, and who had repudiated the majority leader and the majority whip, not to mention such small fry as myself, because we do not always stand behind the Appropriations Committee—what was my surprise, chagrin, and shock to find out that during my absence—and I would have called attention to the matter if it had been possible for me to be on the floor at that time—my distinguished friend the Senator from Tennessee had not only participated but was one of the ringleaders in the attempt to ride over the Appropriations Committee on the matter of the O. W. I.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say this matter is not one which involves the prestige of the Appropriations Committee. I believe in standing by the Appropriations Committee when it is right. I believe in riding over it when it is wrong. I believe that as to any other committee.

Mr. President, I say the Senate has acted on this same question on four different occasions, and that as a matter of decent self-respect, not to mention respect for the constitutional processes which have made this Government great, the Senate should adhere to its position, and should reject the conference report. If the House wants to take the responsibility of denying the page boys and Howard University and the Veterans' Bureau and the other agencies mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee, it should have the responsibility for doing so placed right in its lap.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I say it is not necessary to pursue even such a policy as that; because, if the Senate will put in the second deficiency bill, which the Senate will have to consider before the session ends, every item of appropriation contained in the urgent deficiency bill which is not subject, in the House of Representatives, to a point of order as an original proposition, the House will not be able to get away with the position it has taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

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

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. TOBEY, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the President has just vetoed the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, and the message has been read in the House of Representatives.

Serious differences regarding the inflation-control problem between the Executive and Congress, as well as between various executive departments, threaten a break-down of the entire program so necessary to success on the home front. Since there is no difference as to the end sought, it should be possible to reach some agreement on methods. In the passage of the Commodity Credit bill Congress did not prohibit subsidies, but simply provided that a program involving the expenditure of vast sums of money should not be undertaken without first securing authorization from Congress. The President has seen fit to veto this bill, but from a reading of the message it seems to me that he does not insist upon any right to expend unlimited sums without constitutional restraints, for in the message itself he says:

> I sincerely hope that if the Congress cannot agree before its recess on legislation which will remove the serious defects in this bill it will pass a joint resolution continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and providing the increase in borrowing power until the Congress has time to agree upon an appropriate measure. The officials of the executive departments will welcome an opportunity to furnish information and be of assistance.

It seems to me that, regardless of the action the House may take on this veto message, the Senate should postpone immediate consideration of the bill and defer consideration, at least temporarily, pending an immediate attempt to reach an agreement at least on a temporary program for the remainder of 1943. I feel convinced that an agreement could easily be reached before Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, when the Congress will probably take a recess. I think it is extremely important that we make an attempt to do so. It seems to me that we should undertake a conciliatory move to agree with the executive department for the purpose of avoiding an irreparable breach.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senate that we cannot tell yet what the House of Representatives will do with the veto. It is now preparing to vote on it. If the House sustains the veto, I am satisfied that a continuing resolution will be presented with respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I have every reason to believe that we can come to an understanding with reference to the situation discussed by the President in his veto message. That would take care of the situation until the recess is over, if one is taken.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I am advised that if present he would vote as I have voted. I therefore allow my vote to stand.

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

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

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on important public business.

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

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who, if present, would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], who, if present, would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

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

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—48

Andrews	George	Revercomb
Austin	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Holman	Scrugham
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Lodge	Stewart
Butler	McCarran	Taft
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Moore	Walsh
Danaher	Nye	Wherry
Davis	O'Daniel	White
Eastland	Reed	Wilson

NAYS—32

Aiken	Chandler	Guffey
Ball	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Barkley	Downey	Kilgore
Bone	Ferguson	La Follette
Burton	Gerry	Langer
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Truman
Maloney	Overton	Tunnell
Mead	Radcliffe	Wagner
Millikin	Shipstead	Wallgren
Murdock	Thomas, Utah	Willis
Murray	Tobey	

NOT VOTING—16

Bailey	Gillette	Pepper
Barbour	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Green	Wheeler
Bushfield	Hatch	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	
Ellender	McNary	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, in explanation of the vote which I cast a few moments ago on the conference report, and in explanation of similar votes which I cast when this matter was previously before the Senate, I desire to quote one sentence from the constitution of the State of Wyoming. It reads as follows:

> Absolute, arbitrary power over the lives, liberty, and property of freemen exists nowhere in a republic, not even in the largest majority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the clerk of the committee tells me that there is no validating clause in the bill which will reach back to the 1st of the month, and that the last amendment which was agreed to should have been insisted upon. I ask that the vote by which the Senate receded be reconsidered, and that the Senate further insist on the amendment.

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

DESIGNATING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read a letter.

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

> UNITED STATES SENATE,
> PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
> *Washington, D. C., July 2, 1943.*
>
> *To the Senate:*
>
> Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.
>
> CARTER GLASS,
> *President pro tempore.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House adhered to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 98 and 99 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.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1109. An act 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;

H. R. 2349. An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 3026. An act relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; and

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

CONFUSION IN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to say that the recent resignation of Chester C. Davis as War Food Administrator has once again brought to light the serious and inexcusable confusion which attends the food-production effort of this Nation. Any concerted continuation of the administrative chaos which now marks this program can serve only to undermine the confidence of our people, leave our food-production program in a state of intolerable disorganization, and bring immeasurable damage to the war effort of this Nation and to that of our allies.

On all sides we see a multiplication of regulations and restrictions often inconsistent with each other. To meet new situations we have seen new boards, agencies, and departments piled up. This type of regulation can only foster uncertainty and encourage violations, willful or otherwise, of laws and orders.

Admitting for the moment that prosecution of the present war involves vastly more details and consequences than did the last war, and that there must inevitably be a greater degree of regulation, it does not follow that administration must be inefficient. It has been one of our sources of national pride that the business and other organizations of the country knew how to handle quickly big jobs. Certainly in the midst of our most critical war we must not lose this ability or permit it to be taken from us by default.

It is only too true that the present administrative machinery is cumbersome, wasteful, dilatory, inefficient, and confused. The net result has been less domestic production, and more acute shortages of necessities. First, we saw gasoline and fuels run low. Next we saw rubber practically disappear. Now we are witnessing an increasing food shortage. We must be vitally concerned that proper steps are taken quickly to alleviate these situations.

Early in the war the administration realized that manufacturers could not be permitted to bid against each other for raw materials and resources without restraint. We also realized that consumers must not be permitted to hoard or use foods and other necessities to the detriment of other consumers. We also realized that the needs of the armed forces must be met first.

On these premises, agencies were set up to devise regulations along functional lines. Control of production was centralized; control of distribution was centralized; control of prices, labor conditions, imports, and transportation likewise was centralized. New and untried agencies were reared to exercise such controls.

In remarkably short time, these agencies came into conflict with one another. This was inevitable because there was no perfect, no consistent administrative plan. Men newly given administrative powers inevitably tried to operate a segment of government with the complete disregard of other segments, in much the same manner as they had been accustomed to operate an independent business. It is probably only fair to add, that these men operated with the best of intentions and patriotism, as they understood the functions of their agencies.

However, the lack of a plan of administration has become more evident at every turn. Each agency now realizes that it cannot accomplish its purpose because some vital bit of authority has been withheld, or else it exists in an unrelated independent agency. Effective liaison between the agencies is now practically nonexistent.

As drains on manpower and resources became increasingly severe, so shortages were accentuated. Where a few shortages became most critical, the administration created still further agencies. We saw the creation of a few commodity czars. Mr. Ickes was given the unpleasant task of trying to straighten out the fuel mess. I might add that I think Mr. Ickes is a very fine administrator. Mr. Jeffers was given the less attractive job of producing more rubber. More recently, Mr. Wickard, Mr. Davis, and now Mr. Marvin Jones have been given the more spectacular, though inevitably more complex assignment of increasing production of food.

While these appointments seemed necessary to some persons at the time, we are now faced with the realization that their creation is inconsistent with existing agencies. To use a hackneyed illustration, administrations which had been set up functionally along horizontal lines were suddenly upset by organizations set up along vertical lines. Each new czar cut squarely across the maze of existing agencies.

These appointments are but further evidence of poor preceding organization and the lack of understanding of proper administration. They are intrinsically inconsistent and must create increasing confusion the longer they are in operation. The preceding agencies were set up to coordinate; the czars are set up to break coordination. This hit-or-miss makeshift adoption of expedients can lead but to one of two results. If the czars do not operate ruthlessly and without regard for other programs, their programs will be submerged by the existing agencies. If they do operate ambitiously, their programs throw out all coordination and wreck the work of the functional agencies. Both results mean more confusion, more waste and delay.

The administration must have a wiser plan than this. A saner approach must be taken toward simplification. And this must be done quickly.

In the case of food, as Mr. Hoover pointed out, there are at least nine different independent agencies operating, competing, I might say, in the fields of production and distribution. With regard to other commodities, there may be more or less. A commodity czar has, therefore, an almost impossible assignment, unless the administrative set-up is efficient and effective.

The confusion and overlapping among the present agencies is just as bad domestically as it is in foreign fields. However, since the volume and type of materials produced abroad which we now need is much smaller than domestic production, this field offers the easier area of first simplification of administration.

The controversy between my good friends Mr. WALLACE and Mr. Jesse Jones points clearly to me the need for simplification and consolidation of administration in foreign fields. Anyone familiar with functions performed by several other agencies in the foreign field must realize that there are many other fundamental differences of opinion, and operations at cross purposes, which, fortunately, have not burst into the open quite so violently.

I am convinced that the dispute between Vice President WALLACE and Mr. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, must be resolved by giving one or the other right of way. But I am just as convinced that this is only a partial answer to the muddled situation in foreign production and procurement. Allowing either one supremacy of operations does not, in the least, tend to reduce friction with other agencies. For instance, it would not at all aid foreign production of foodstuffs, which is now being purchased through an entirely different procurement corporation, in the Department of Agriculture, and is not related at all to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation group of corporations under the control of Mr. Jones.

Considering for a moment longer the various administrative agencies concerned with foreign production, procurement, and distribution of food, the number which I can call to mind is absurdly high, and many have apparently inconsistent interests and policies.

There are at least 19 different departments, boards, or agencies actively engaged in promoting or regulating foreign production. The mere recital of their names will be sufficient to illustrate the cross purposes and confusion which attend their efforts. There is the Department of State, 4 divisions of the Department of Agriculture—Foreign Agricultural Relations, Commodity Credit Corporation, Committee on Foreign Importation and Subcommittee of Combined Food Board; Combined Food Boards, Army, Navy, Department of Commerce; R. F. C. subsidiary corporations; Office of Price Administration, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Lehman's Post-War Rehabilitation, War Production Board, material czars—Ickes, Jeffers, and Jones—and Board of Economic Warfare.

I am not certain that I have included all of the more important agencies presently functioning in foreign procurement or production or for other purposes. At any rate, the illustrations I have cited

are sufficient to prove my point, which is that there is abundant operation at cross purposes, and it is likely that foreign production and flow of materials is thereby falling far short of what could be expected.

Mr. President, you and I and all the rest of the American people are paying extravagantly for this situation; generations yet to come will still pay. We owe it to ourselves and those who follow us to bring order out of this chaos.

Mr. President, the American people in all walks of life are growing restive and disturbed at the spectacle of the administrative chaos which I have just outlined. Only yesterday the two outstanding farm organizations in my State—the Pennsylvania State Association of Cooperative Organizations and the Pennsylvania State Council of Farm Organizations—went on record as demanding the concentration of all regulatory powers in one authority in Washington, the abandonment of social experimentation at the expense of agriculture, and the abandonment of any program of subsidy-financed roll-backs on agricultural food prices. Pointing to the mismanagement, the ill-defined administrative program of the Government, the divided authority and responsibility which now attend this program, these organizations flatly stated that this Nation will be faced with a great shortage of food next winter.

Mr. President, it is a cardinal principle of public administration that authority must be commensurate with responsibility in a given position. This principle is conspicuous by its absence in nearly all the programs of the present administration. The letter of resignation submitted to the President by Mr. Chester Davis, War Food Administrator, made specific mention of this fact, and only yesterday another example of conflicting authority and divided responsibility, to which I have previously referred, caused a not inconsiderable disagreement between two men well up in the administration's policy-making hierarchy.

These concerted denials of the fundamental principles of public administration by this Government can only lead to further bickering, further tension, and further chaos, and since nearly all these governmental programs are directly related to the prosecution of the war, and to the welfare of our armed forces and our civilian population, a wholesome respect for the millions of people who support the Government demands a realinement of these administrative programs on the basis of recognized principles of public administration, which, incidentally, are also the principles of efficiency and economy.

Mr. President, there is no more vital program now confronting this Government than the program of food production. It is imperative and urgent that that program be reorganized and set properly in motion on the basis of recognized administrative principles. The immediate need, therefore, is to place the entire food program—production, rationing, marketing, and every other aspect of that program—under a coherent and clearly defined administrative set-up, and, what is more, to give to the administrators concerned all the authority necessary to meet the responsibilities which their respective positions entail. If this step is not immediately forthcoming, no man can say what proportions the impending food crisis may attain.

Mr. President, there are a number of capable and experienced men who could bring order out of the chaos which now surrounds the entire food program, if they could but be assured of appointment on these sound and necessary bases. Probably the most outstanding man for this particular job is former President Herbert Hoover. In view of my long association with the man, I hesitate to inject his name into this picture, but it is a widely recognized fact that Mr. Hoover commands a broad knowledge of the food-production problems not only of this country but of the rest of the world as well. The broad experience which he has achieved, both as Food Administrator during the last war and as a public servant for a great number of years, eminently qualifies him for this all-important position. I call upon the administration to make use of the ability and experience of such men as Mr. Hoover in this hour of peril to our Nation's food-production program and to our Nation's over-all war effort.

Mr. President, I call attention to an editorial which appeared in the June 30 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer as an indication of the widespread public resentment which has grown up in protest to the present administrative arrangement of our Government, and as an indication of the widespread public acceptance of those reasonable and reliable methods of overcoming these shortcomings which have been put forward by Mr. Hoover and other qualified observers, and I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

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

CONGRESS MUST END FOOD CRISIS

When Chester C. Davis was appointed 3 months ago to head the new agency of War Food Administration, the Inquirer remarked that it was by no means sure that the answer had been found to the grave national problem.

Under the terms of the new set-up the danger of divided authority was evident. This has now come to pass. With declining production, faulty distribution, prices soaring beyond reason, conflicting official policies, and a bunch of Government agencies working at cross purposes, the food situation has gotten into such a muddle that Mr. Davis has been impelled to throw up his hands and quit.

Mr. Davis' letter of resignation, it is now belatedly disclosed, had lain on the President's desk ever since June 16, and was still awaiting acceptance, unknown to the Senate, on the very day that body was discussing and voting an end to the administration's program of future food subsidies and decreeing that existing subsidy payments should be put under Mr. Davis' control.

In this letter Mr. Davis declared that he could no longer assume a great public responsibility while the actual authority for food policies was "being exercised elsewhere."

His other strong reason for resigning was his conscientious inability to support and carry out the program of broad general subsidies instituted by President Roosevelt. He doesn't believe that such subsidies will control inflation unless accompanied by tax and savings programs to curb excess buying power "and by tight control and management of the food supply."

Mr. Davis is not alone, among food experts, in opposing such broad, general subsidies, for rolling back prices, as the administration advocates. His insistence, also, on unified food control, possessing authority fully commensurate with the vast responsibility, is backed up by an impressive body of informed opinion.

In renewing his forceful plea for consolidation of existing conflicting agencies into an adequate, over-all food administration, Herbert Hoover, whose expert knowledge will not be questioned, pointedly remarks that we need neither a "food czar nor an Angel Gabriel. We need a manager, not a dictator."

As for subsidies, Mr. Hoover declares that the Nation's gravest problem on the home front can be solved without them "and all the sins and faults that lie in them." He impressively warns that the continuation of "this administrative chaos threatens the food to our cities, the food to our armies, the food to our allies, and the relief of post-war famine—in fact, the whole war effort."

This ominous threat can and must be averted. It will not be averted if the administration continues to depend on a maze of agencies, pulling in various directions and getting farther and farther from the goal of abundant food for all the people at fair prices.

There is no hope of improvement through the change of Food Administrators that took place yesterday, if we are to judge from the inaugural remarks of Marvin Jones as Mr. Davis' successor.

Mr. Jones states that he assumes office with no new or additional powers. He merely expects to do the best job he can "with the tools at hand." And they are pretty poor tools, as experience has shown.

It is now doubly evident that if the food muddle is ever to be cleared up it will have to be done by Congress. The way is opened by the Fulmer bill, which would give the Food Administrator control of prices and rationing as well as of production and distribution of food.

If this puts the noses of the Office of Price Administration and half a dozen other departments or agencies out of joint, that will be just too bad. But such centralization of every factor in America's food problem is imperative if our home folk, our fighting men, and our allies are to get enough to eat.

Let's have some action before an intolerably bad situation becomes immeasurably worse.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I sincerely trust that the present administrative programs will be overhauled, in the public interest and in conformity with recognized administrative principles. If these necessary steps are not voluntarily taken by the administration I shall not hesitate to recommend that the Congress undertake to achieve these necessary improvements by law.

ACQUISITION OF CORN BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the question of the corn supply has become so

acute that I have had a joint resolution prepared which I ask consent to introduce. Whether the Senate will consent to its immediate consideration or whether it shall be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I should like to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and the clerk will read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 71) relating to the acquisition of corn by governmental agencies, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, or of any regulation, order, or directive, imposing limitations upon the acquisition of corn by any governmental agency, all such agencies which exercise any functions with respect to the buying, selling, storage, or use of corn are hereby authorized to acquire corn, wherever obtainable, at any price not to exceed $1.40 a bushel.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield, I think a resolution of that importance probably should not be taken up on the spur of the moment.

Mr. SMITH. My only reason for asking for immediate consideration is that there is not a more acute question before the American people today than the corn question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that; I am familiar with it not only in my section but in other sections, and it is a question which should have attention, but it is very easy to do the wrong thing hastily in seeking to correct a situation which should be corrected. I think the joint resolution should lie on the table for the present, and a little later in the day perhaps we may better be able to determine what should be done with it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator from South Carolina will agree to that, because I should like to get through the matter I have risen to take up.

Mr. SMITH. I have done what I can to get this question settled. We talk and talk and talk while people suffer. We just pour out gas, and that is about all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina desire to have his joint resolution referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. SMITH. No, let it lie on the table, to be taken up later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay consideration of the conference report on the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency bill, but before proceeding to consideration of that report I wish to say that the Senate has much unfinished business before it, including appropriation bills, and I desire to find an opening today, if possible, for a call of the calendar, so that we may dispose of unobjected-to bills. I hope Senators who desire to make speeches on extraneous subjects which are not before the Senate will refrain from making them until we shall have disposed of necessary business.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN 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. 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, 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 2, 12, 15, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21, and 22, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment with the following proviso inserted at the end thereof: ": *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$595,340"; 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 matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That this program shall end June 30, 1944"; 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 "$35,328,000"; 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: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"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 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."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,000,000"; and the Senate agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,093,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert $47,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committe of conference report in disagreement amendments numberd 19, 24, and 30.

PAT McCARRAN,
KENNETH McKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

BUTLER B. HARE,
M. C. TARVER,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nevada whether the Senate is considering the report on House bill 2935.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is, Mr. President. Let me say that there are three divisions which will be taken up separately. First there are the items as to which there was no difference between the House and Senate conferees, and which were adopted by the House.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am concerned with several of the items, but I am particularly concerned with what I understand is the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and called the Virginia amendment, because it originated in the State of Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not know why the Senator calls it the Virginia amendment. It was simply offered by a representative from Virginia. Of course, Virginia is for the amendment, but a number of States are very much interested in it.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I did not mean to be offensive. I said that I call it the Virginia amendment. I thought Virginia might have some pride in it.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator seems to infer that it relates only to the State of Virginia. A great many States are interested in the same amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to say that it relates not only to the State of Virginia but to every State in the Union, including my own. That is why I am particularly concerned with it.

Will the Senator from Nevada tell what happened with respect to that particular amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. It will be recalled that the Senate struck out the language on page 53 of the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; I made that motion myself.

Mr. McCARRAN. And in conference the Senate conferees agreed with the House conferees to restore the language, but to strike therefrom the parenthetical clause "in accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act," and we did so because that language was purely redundant and was not necessary to give force and effect to the whole amendment. The spirit of the amendment and the spirit of the law are carried out without that clause. The Senate conferees agreed that the clause be stricken.

Let me say further that that matter was before the Appropriations Committee, and the action which was taken was urged in a note received from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who has not been able to attend the meeting. The note of the Senator from Virginia was presented by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. It is proposed in the report to restore the language of the House, minus the parenthetical clause "in accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act."

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the pending motion.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wanted the Senate to understand that the pending motion is that the Senate adopt the report.

Mr. MALONEY. I understand that.

Mr. McCARRAN. The conference report must either be adopted or rejected as it stands.

Mr. MALONEY. I understand that. The vote the Senate is about to take deals with this particular amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. And because I do not clearly understand what the purpose of the amendment is, or what it would do, I wish to discuss it briefly for the RECORD. I want the RECORD to be clear, and to try to reinforce what seems to be the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee who has the bill in charge.

The Social Security Act now requires State agencies administering child-welfare services, public assistance, and unemployment compensation to establish systems of personnel administration on a merit basis. This requirement seems to me to be desirable. I should not like to see it changed. I believe the public interest is better served if public employees are under a merit system.

During 1939 when revision of the Social Security Act had careful and thorough consideration, Congress, wisely, I think, extended the merit principle which applies to Federal employees, to employees of State agencies administering child-welfare services and the social-security programs, by requiring these State agencies to establish and maintain merit systems.

Also, and wisely I think, Congress provided that the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor and the Social Security Board, which agencies are charged with the Federal responsibility of these programs, should have no jurisdiction over the appointment, tenure of office, or compensation of individuals appointed by the States in accordance with their merit systems. The judgment of the State officials who are responsible for the administration of these programs, rather than the judgment of Federal officials, is thereby made to govern in the application of their merit system to individual State employees. I should not like to see this provision changed.

Without much consideration, so far as the record of the hearings discloses, it was proposed by the House that language be included in this appropriation bill, which reads as follows:

> 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 and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure of 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.

I must say that I do not know what was intended to be accomplished by this language. It might be construed as not changing but merely as emphasizing the provisions already in the law. If that is so, I think the language is surplusage, and should come out of this appropriation bill. It can only serve to confuse the administration of the present law, which was enacted after mature consideration, and may result in a modification of the present operation of the merit systems, and may further accentuate the loss of many of the nonpolitical professional and technical persons who are so necessary in the operation of these programs, and who stay in the public service largely because of a feeling of security.

These programs touch the lives of millions of our people in times of distress. If the proposed language was intended to relieve the State agencies from the requirement of actually maintaining a sound merit system, if it was intended that the Federal Government should have no power to withhold Federal funds, regardless of the methods used in the selection of personnel by these State agencies, whether in accordance with this merit system or not, this language, in my opinion, should be taken out of the appropriation bill.

The Social Security Act gives the Children's Bureau and the Social Security Board the power, and imposes on them the duty, to see that such merit systems are not merely established but that they are actually maintained. So long as State personnel are employed, paid, and dismissed in accordance with the State's own merit system, these Federal agencies are already specifically denied, under existing law, authority with reference to the appointment, compensation, or tenure of office of individuals. This seems necessary, but sufficient to guarantee the integrity of State administration. It does not seem proper or desirable to say to these Federal agencies, "You may not withhold funds appropriated for grants to States, even though the States fail or refuse to select or pay their employees in accordance with their own merit system." If that is what the proposed language means, it seems to me to be clearly undesirable, and, in my opinion, should be taken out of the bill.

The Social Security Board has the responsibility for certifying grants to the States in amounts which the Board finds necessary for the proper and efficient administration of these programs. If the proposed language is intended to permit the payment of salaries for personal services on any scale which is fixed by the State in its merit-system plan, the Social Security Board could not discharge the responsibility which the basic Social Security Act places on it. It would have to certify, for example, if the State should so provide, that salaries of $5,000 per annum for typists are necessary for proper and efficient administration of the State law. If that is the intention of the proposed language, the whole basis for the grant of administrative funds for unemployment compensation under Title III of the Social Security Act, which are paid 100 percent from Federal funds, would be destroyed.

I have seen no evidence from the record of the hearings that either the Children's Bureau or the Social Security Board has failed properly to administer the laws for which it is responsible, nor have I seen any evidence that any action on the part of either of these agencies in that regard has adversely affected the States' administration of child-welfare services, public assistance, or unemployment compensation. On the contrary, I am informed that these merit systems are the product of agreements reached as a result of joint Federal and State action, and that generally they are operating satisfactorily, and have the support and approval of the State agencies administering the programs. It seems unjustified to me that such a major decision as this should be taken by the Congress without giving full and free opportunity for a public hearing at which various interested groups may express their opinions upon the operation of the present law, the

proposed amendment, and the desirability and effect of the change.

It appears that some friction has arisen in one State. I do not believe that the inclusion of the proposed language, the possible change of the substantive national law, without hearing or thorough consideration of the implications of the change, is the way to meet the difficulty, if any difficulty exists.

I am opposed to any change which would weaken the application of the merit principle to public service, and particularly to any action which would weaken its application to these social-security programs. The best administration possible is none too good for these programs which deal with human misery, and in my opinion there is no better assurance of good administration than the assurance that the merit principle will be applied, established, and maintained in dealing with hiring, firing, and compensating the people who administer them.

The 1939 merit system amendment to the Social Security Act has resulted in greatly extending the application of the merit principle to the public services in the States. In my opinion, it would be an unfortunate and backward step for Congress now to pass any law which would be likely to reverse that trend. The provision included in the appropriation bill, if interpreted broadly, may result in giving States complete latitude to inject political considerations into the administration of our social-security laws. The administration of social security has been kept free from partisan political influences, and should be kept free from such influences.

If the proposed language does not change the present law, it is not necessary, and may confuse the administration of the present law. If it does change the present law, it changes it, in my opinion, by weakening it, and perhaps even nullifying it. In either event, I am opposed to the inclusion of the proposed language.

VISIT BY VETERANS OF NORTH AFRICAN CAMPAIGN—EXTENSION OF LEAVE

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HILL. I yield briefly to the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there are now in the Senate gallery some 36 soldiers, veterans of the north African campaign. Most of them come from the State of New Mexico. There are some from the States of Tennessee, Washington, Pennsylvania, Kansas, and California. They have done their duty overseas; and they are temporarily in the country, and are visiting the Senate.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the announcement which has just been made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, I move that all Senators in the Chamber rise and pay tribute to these veterans of the north African campaign.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I second the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and all Members of the Senate present and all other persons in the Chamber rose and applauded the north African campaign veterans in the gallery.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that I understand these boys have leave for only 4 days. Some of them will not be able to see their relatives, and they will be in the Army for quite awhile. I wonder if Senators will not write to General McNarney, who I believe has charge of the matter, to see if their leave cannot be extended.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say that I learned only this morning that the boys have been given a 4-day furlough to visit their relatives. Everyone who knows the geography of the United States must realize that a boy from California cannot go to California and return in 4 days, that the 28 boys from New Mexico cannot go to New Mexico and return in 4 days. These boys were inducted into the service on the 6th of January 1941 and have been in the service ever since. They have been in Europe, doing their duty and following orders. If they are ordered aboard ship tomorrow, they will go, and will make no complaint. However, I feel it is only reasonable that they be allowed more than a 4-day furlough. If we are to lose the war because 28 boys from New Mexico are not in northern Africa, we are in bad shape. I believe it is proper, and I hope other Members of the Senate will join me in a reasonable request that a reasonable extension of their furloughs be granted. If the request cannot be complied with, I assure the Senate that the boys will not complain.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I join the Senator from New Mexico in his tribute to these members of the American expeditionary force to north Africa; and with him, I express the hope that the War Department may be able to permit them to have sufficient time to visit their homes and their loved ones.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

NEED FOR POST-WAR PLANNING AND ACTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, our immediate duty today is to win the war in the shortest possible time and with the least possible loss of life. Our immediate duty is to win the war, to do the job in the shortest possible time, and enable the boys who are our guests in the gallery at this hour to return home to stay. Our lasting obligation is to make sure that peace, the fruit of victory, is not lost. It cannot be endured that all in vain our finest and our bravest shall molder in the jungle or lie buried beneath the burning sands.

The victories of war will be barren if we fail to win the peace. Last time our failure to win the peace brought tragedy to us and to millions of others. This time such a failure might well prove the end of our civilization and the death of all our race.

If there is to be hope of peace there must be a collective world security system, with an organization of the peace-loving nations with power to adjudicate and enforce its decrees. To this end, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and I introduced on March 16 last Senate Resolution 114, to advise the President to take the initiative in summoning representatives of the United Nations to meetings, to form an organization, and set up machinery for settlement of international disputes without resort to war, to provide for United Nations military force for the immediate suppression of any future attempt at military aggression by any nation, and to require every member nation of the organization to commit itself to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

There are some who say that we should wait and take no steps at this time looking to the establishment of such an organization. Wait for what? For war weariness and disillusionment, economic rivalry, nationalistic feelings and pressing domestic problems to make impossible the formation of an association of nations to secure an enduring peace? Wait for the return of that isolationism which allowed us to be swept into two terrible wars?

There is a time for all things—for planting and for harvesting, for planning and for execution. Ideas and plans need time to grow and be nurtured, just as crops need time to grow and to ripen. Deliberate and well-considered plans have a far better chance of success than hasty and ill-considered schemes. If we wait until peace comes to plan for peace, our plans will be found wanting. If we take no forward step until we have a perfect plan we shall make no move at all; the rush of events will overwhelm us.

The men who drafted the Constitution of the United States did not have a perfect constitution in mind on the day of their assembly. If they had waited upon that miracle, our present form of government would never have come into being.

We must plan and build the machinery and organization for peace, or peace will catch us unprepared.

The United Nations await America's decision. We cannot afford to delay in giving it. The consequences of delay are too dreadful. This horror of war, this fate of death for our youth, of broken bodies and disordered minds, must not face us again.

The Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Ohio, and I do not criticize the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate for having taken no action upon Senate Resolution 114. We appreciate how momentous is the purpose and import of the

resolution, and that it has required time properly and wisely to consider the transcendent question the resolution presents.

We do feel, however, that when Congress reassembles in September after the recess the committee should act upon the resolution. We feel that the Senate has a right to look to the committee for leadership and advice in the matter. We feel that the Senate must begin now to chart its course and make its plans to play its part in the building of a just and enduring peace. Action by the Senate on the resolution would remove the doubts and uncertainties in the minds of the other United Nations as to what part, if any, the United States will take in an organization for peace, and would clarify the situation and keep open and unimpeded the pathway to peace. Such action by the Senate would remove any doubts that failure on the part of the Senate to act might cause the Chief Executive to entertain, and would greatly fortify and strengthen his hand in all his efforts toward the building of an orderly world.

During the recess of the Senate my associates and I will endeavor to carry to the people of the country the message of the resolution and the compelling need for its passage by the Senate. We shall do this in the hope that the people will make definite and clear their desire for favorable and expeditious action by the Senate on the resolution and their determination to sustain and support the Senate in such action.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to join in the expression of the Senator from Alabama.

It is now nearly 4 months since Senate Resolution 114 was introduced and shortly afterward referred to a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. The resolution seeks to have the Senate define the kind of post-war foreign policy it is prepared to support.

That is a subject of vital importance to every one of the 135,000,000 people in the United States, for American foreign policy in the next decade may well determine whether we are now fighting the last World War or whether this conflict is merely a prelude to a greater and more destructive World War No. 3.

We four who introduced the resolution, realizing the tremendous importance of this subject and its many ramifications, have not pressed the Foreign Relations Committee for action. We do not intend now to reflect in any way on that committee. We believe that all the time necessary should be devoted to this subject by the committee.

However, we believe that 6 or 7 months should be sufficient time for the committee to deliberate, and it is our purpose today simply to serve notice on the individual Members of the Senate that a month after the Senate reconvenes, following the recess this summer, about mid-October, we intend to press for action on this subject by the Foreign Relations Committee and by the Senate.

Too long delay can be as fatal on this issue as too hasty action. The peace also can be lost because of too little, too late.

Mr. President, all of us recognize the all-important role which the Senate plays in determining American foreign policy under our Constitution. The people of America realize it, and they are looking to the Senate for some indication as to what its position on this issue is now and is likely to be when a peace treaty is presented here for ratification.

Next to winning the war itself there is no more important task facing the United States today than the doing of all we can do as a nation to make the peace after this war a permanent peace. I know I need not dwell on that fact in a Senate which has just finished appropriating the staggering sum of $100,000,000,000 to finance our war effort in the next year.

I do not believe there is any controversy in America or in the Senate over whether the United States should and will collaborate to maintain peace after this war. We are unanimous on the objective. Our differences arise over the methods and machinery for our collaboration, over the question as to just what kind of post-war program the United States, with its great influence and power, should support.

Shall our support be thrown behind a United Nations organization with authority and power to stop future aggressions, or behind another League of Nations depending on action by individual nations to achieve its objectives? Or shall we seek the sort of tri-partite alliance recommended by Walter Lippmann in his recent book? Or shall our policy be simply one of cooperation in such joint attempts of the nations to maintain peace as we may approve at the time, but without any binding commitments?

Those and similar questions are being asked today by the American people. The officials in our own State Department charged with responsibility for post-war planning must be asking themselves the same questions.

Mr. President, there is only one body that can furnish the answers. That body is the United States Senate.

There are many reasons why a full and free debate in the Senate upon this entire subject is needed and would be helpful. I should like to mention only one.

The President conducts all negotiations with foreign powers. He certainly is preparing now, and may, if fortune favors our cause, have to proceed soon to negotiate some sort of peace settlement in Europe. Any settlement that he negotiates will have to be submitted to the Senate. Yet, today the President has not the slightest indication of the degree of American participation in peace-maintenance machinery which the Senate might approve. If today he had to enter upon such negotiations, he would do so under a fearful handicap, operating always under the nagging fear that while he might propose or accept certain lines of action, the Senate might refuse to ratify them. That fear also would operate upon our allies in such negotiations, inevitably leading them to give less weight to American suggestions than they otherwise would give.

The most tragic thing that could happen after this war would be for the President of the United States to collaborate in working out a peace settlement which the Senate subsequently refused to ratify. Nothing else would deal such a blow to the hopes of all mankind, and nothing else would be more likely to set the stage for World War No. 3.

Mr. President, we in the Senate owe it to the people, to future generations, and, above all, to our gallant fighting men to make clear to the Executive, to our own people, and to the world the general direction in which we believe international machinery to maintain peace should proceed, and how far we are willing to proceed in that direction.

The home front is in bad shape today because Congress and the President have not thus far been able to agree on several basic domestic war policies. How much more tragic if the same sort of disagreement should wreck our chances of a lasting peace.

This one reason alone, in my opinion, is sufficient to make it imperative that the Senate debate this issue fully, and that it record its approval or disapproval of various methods and varying degrees of collaboration after the war.

I realize that the past 6 months have been extremely busy ones, but I hope the Members of the Senate will find time during the recess to discuss with the people and to think through their own positions on the all-important question of what America's post-war foreign policy shall be.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, at this time I wish to join with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], in saying a word in support of Senate resolution 114.

I am glad that there are in the gallery men from the front line who I believe have an interest in precisely the subject now being discussed.

To those who fight and win this war, whether they die in it or live through it, the Senate owes one special duty.

It is our sacred duty not only to do all we can to help them win the war but also to make sure that their efforts, their sacrifices, and their victory shall not be in vain. Without their victory, complete in both hemispheres, there can be no lasting peace and no independence of opportunity. Equally, without a just and lasting peace, their victory will be futile.

Nations can blunder into war. They cannot blunder into peace.

Much more, they cannot blunder into a just, a lasting, and a living peace. By a living peace I mean a peace with machinery to modify its terms from time to time to meet changing conditions. The establishment of the peace the world deserves calls upon this Congress, at once, for hard work, high courage, and well-planned, determined, constructive action.

Let us, therefore, dedicate the coming recess and the weeks following it to this

duty. Those on the firing line are doing more than their full share to plan and win the war. We cannot ask them also to plan and build the peace. They have the right to expect us to plan and build a peace worthy of their success in war.

To this end, I suggest three lines of thought and a course of procedure:

Congress is a trustee for the interests of the United States of America, both in war and in peace. Today those interests depend directly upon the military, economic, social, political, and spiritual progress of both America and the world.

First, we must, therefore, establish stability, prosperity, and freedom of opportunity within our borders. Each government in the world owes a similar duty to its own people. The success of these internal efforts is, in turn, important to all who have external contact with them.

Second. Likewise the nations in each natural region of nations, such as the region of the Americas or of central Europe or of the Far East, have a special responsibility for stability, prosperity, and freedom of opportunity within their respective regions. The interests of the world will be well served by reserving as many issues as possible for settlement within the respective regions.

Third. Finally, procedures must be established by which world-wide and interregional issues can be brought to reasonable conclusions without war and those conclusions can be enforced without question.

At the same time that we thus seek peace and independence, we find that science, business, agriculture, labor, education, the professions, art, and religion offer to civilization greater economic improvements than man has ever known. If there be post-war peace and opportunity for private initiative, the production of new wealth can be comparatively unlimited. Examples are the measureless advances being made in transportation by aviation, in communication by radio, and in medicine by sulfa drugs. Other examples are electric power, Diesel power, automotive power, electric welding, plastics, wood, glass, soybeans and other agricultural products to be grown for industry as well as for food.

It remains for man to end wasteful destruction and to encourage constructive initiative and fair competition. It remains for man to secure peace, provide stability, open the door of independent opportunity and attract the investment of private capital with all possible assurance of integrity and fairness in relation to competition and the protection of public interests.

This calls for prompt personal conferences among representatives of private as well as public enterprise at home and then abroad. It calls for laying the foundations before blueprinting the superstructure, and there should be no delay. It calls especially for study and agreements on principles and procedure.

Within the field of Government there is now, and there has been for some time, a need that meetings be initiated by the Government of the United States, first between its legislators and the leaders of its executive departments, and then among the leaders of industry, labor, and agriculture. These should be followed by meetings with like leaders from the United Nations. The need calls now for the meeting of minds not only as to the production and distribution of wartime and post-war food, but also as to monetary problems, aviation, raw materials, relief and rehabilitation of occupied territory, temporary administration of occupied territory, the increase of post-war industry and agricultural production, distribution, and consumption, the private financing of enterprises and the employment of labor with special attention to the period of conversion from a governmentally financed economy of war to a privately financed and freer economy in time of peace.

Our Nation and all nations will benefit if each of us will seek frankly and vigorously its full and fair share of post-war opportunity—no less and also no more. Each is entitled to prompt substantial justice secured by orderly peaceful procedure.

As nations and individuals, we all are endowed with certain talents by the same Divine Power. It is for us neither to bury those talents nor to fight over them; it is for us to serve ourselves and each other by developing them. That is the golden rule of international law and the golden opportunity of international understanding.

To this end, I commend respectfully to the Senate during the coming recess and the weeks to follow it the terms of Senate Resolution 114—a resolution to win the peace, introduced on March 16, 1943, by Senators BALL, HATCH, HILL, and myself. I hope that, based upon its terms, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will soon report a resolution of national policy

The Nation is doing its full part on the firing line, the production line, the farm, the financial, and the home front. It is time for the Senate to do its full part to lead the way to a constructive, positive, constitutional American policy of internal, regional, and international action based upon the experience of the past and the facts of the present, designed to safeguard America against further wars of the world and to lead the way to a just, a lasting, and a living peace.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, due to the fact that I had to be on the floor of the Senate during the debate on the war agencies bill, I was unable to attend the conference on the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency appropriation bill, the conference report on which, I understand, is now before the Senate. I am very sorry that there was this unavoidable conflict, because there are several matters in this bill regarding which I have strong opinions.

I particularly wish to call attention to amendment No. 5 which added these words to the bill:

> *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of a practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with.

That provision is added to the appropriation for the Children's Bureau and relates to the care of child-bearing women with funds which are appropriated by the act. The effect of the amendment is to make it possible for child-bearing women who are treated under the provisions of the act to have the services not only of obstetricians and of osteopaths but of chiropractors and midwives.

Mr. President, I fully appreciate the place of these various practitioners in our scheme of things, and I am saying nothing whatsoever in criticism of them. In general, I will be found to be a believer in the rights of the States and opposed to trespassing on them; but I submit that in cases where Federal funds are being employed the Federal Government has a right to impose a precept or standard without being accused of violating the rights of the States.

In this particular case the Children's Bureau desires to give the women who need care the very best possible care. I have in my hand a memorandum prepared by Dr. Martha M. Eliot, of the Children's Bureau, and I should like to read a few words of it to the Senate. This is what she says:

This proviso, which was stricken out by the Senate, has been reinserted by the House and a second proviso added along the same lines. This proviso will require the State health agencies responsible for maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of servicemen to pay Federal funds to any practitioner licensed to practice obstetrics in the States.

I interrupt the reading at this point to say that the statement has been made in good faith that this provision did not open the way to chiropractors and midwives. It was thought that it was limited entirely to osteopaths, but this is what Dr. Eliot says:

This means:

1. In 19 States chiropractors are legally permitted to care for women in childbirth though they are not permitted to practice surgery and usually may not give drugs.

2. In 19 States untrained midwives are licensed to practice midwifery though none are permitted to give drugs or practice surgery. By definition in Webster's New International Dictionary obstetrics and midwifery are synonymous.

3. In 11 States osteopaths are permitted to practice obstetrics and yet are forbidden to administer drugs or practice surgery.

Chiropractors are not permitted to practice in any hospital approved by the State health agencies to conduct obstetric service. Osteopaths are accepted as members of the staffs of less than 5 percent of hospitals that care for women in childbirth.

The modern practice of obstetrics requires skill in the use of drugs to save life, such as the new highly effective sulfa drugs for the treatment of infection, pituitrin, or ergonovine to control hemorrhage, or anesthetics or analgesics to relieve pain.

It is not our desire to prevent any woman from going to any practitioner she wishes to go to, but in the expenditure of Federal funds under this program the Federal Government should not permit its funds to be used to purchase care for wives of our men in the armed forces which is of inferior quality. If this proviso goes through, the Federal Government will have, for the first time, gone on record as in favor of preventing a Federal agency from setting standards of medical care purchased by Federal funds. Has the Congress considered what such action may mean with respect to the standards established by the Army, Navy, Public Health Service, and United States Civil Service Commission?

Finally, this is a matter obviously that should not be decided by the Congress until after public hearings have been held. It should not be included in an appropriation act.

(It is expected that approximately 200,000 wives of servicemen will be provided care during this coming year.)

In many cases the State laws relating to the licensing of doctors of medicine do not specifically mention obstetrics, yet such doctors of medicine are legally permitted to practice obstetrics. The same holds true for osteopathy and chiropractic in many States. The fact, therefore, that chiropractors are not specifically authorized to practice obstetrics does not mean that they are not legally entitled to practice obstetrics under the general provisions of their license. As a matter of fact, they are legally practicing obstetrics in many States.

Mr. President, there is no question here about denying to any woman the right to have any kind of medical care she wants with her own money, but when we are administering a Federal program, with Federal funds, I believe the same Federal standard that is applied with regard to medical care in every other branch of the Federal service which concerns itself with medical care should be applied to the women of the Nation, particularly to the wives of the soldiers. In my opinion, it would not be right to expose them to a degree of medical care which is inferior to that which is received by their husbands.

Mr. President, I am very sorry the amendment was agreed to, and I realize that if I had been here perhaps some of the Members of the Senate might have listened to me on this subject, but I could not be present because of the conference to which I have referred. I merely want the RECORD to show that I believe this is a harmful amendment in the form in which it is now written.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the very able statement on this amendment which has just been made by the Senator from Massachusetts. In my opinion, this matter obviously should not have been decided by Congress until public hearings had been held on it, and it should not be included in an appropriation act. I realize the difficulties involved in attempting to defeat a conference report because of this matter, but it is important enough to do so if the Senate feels as I do about it.

In the discussion on the floor of the House yesterday it appears that an effort was made to undertake to differentiate between the practice of midwifery and the practice of obstetrics, and to show that the proviso would not apply to the practice of midwifery. But the definition in Webster's International Dictionary indicates that the terms are synonymous, that there is no difference between them.

All of us are anxious that the soldiers' wives be given the best possible treatment, and all of us are anxious to permit the wife of a soldier, or any other woman in the United States who is assisted by Federal funds, the right to select her own doctor, but in many States, as indicated by the Senator from Massachusetts, the men whom they may select are not permitted to use drugs or perform surgical operations, and in my opinion, the provision in question would do irreparable harm to the services performed by the Children's Bureau, and their fine work in saving the lives of little children.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that if this provision goes into the law a great many women will be in a position to receive medical care below the present State standards, because the practice in many of the States is not specifically to authorize certain persons to practice obstetrics, but providing Federal funds, with this provision attached, would practically constitute a directive to force obstetrical cases into the hands of persons who do not now take them?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator's statement is correct. I think this is a bad amendment. When this matter was before the Senate, the Senate struck out the provision originally contained in the House bill. In that action the Senate was correct. I regret exceedingly that our conferees permitted the House conferees to cause them to reinsert the language. It is my definite conviction that it will cause very great harm to child welfare work in the States, and to the State health bureaus, and that some bill should be passed forthwith to clarify the situation. It should be handled carefully, after public hearings, and with a clear understanding of the problem. An appropriation bill is not the place for such a provision. Perhaps we can clear the matter up before it is too late, and before too much harm is done.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the Senator will recall, the Senate struck out this proviso. The motion now is that the Senate recede and surrender its position, and thus agree to the proviso?

Mr. CHANDLER. No; I think there is no such vote to be taken by the Senate. I think the question will come before us in the vote on the conference report itself, on the motion to adopt the conference report.

Mr. HILL. No, Mr. President.

Mr. McCARRAN. The motion is to agree to the conference report, and the Senate will either vote it up or vote it down.

Mr. HILL. There are three separate amendments to vote on, are there not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. But this amendment is not one on which a separate vote is to be taken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that the Senate conferees yielded with respect to this amendment, and it is a part of the conference report. The House language remains in the bill.

Mr. HILL. How many amendments were there in the bill, does the Senator recall offhand?

Mr. McCARRAN. About 30.

Mr. HILL. And all but three are included in the report?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. The motion now is to adopt the report as it comes from conference.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with respect to two matters contained in the report. First, I wish to associate myself with everything which was said by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] with regard to the so-called Virginia amendment. As one of those instrumental in helping to secure the original provisions in the Social Security Act, I think it would be an unfortunate step backward to strike down the merit principle in the administration of the various phases of the social-security program which have to do with the unfortunate persons who are in need of assistance.

I am not prone to criticize all State administrations, but, on the other hand, Mr. President, it must be clear to any person that they are not in all instances

above reproach, and if by any chance political machines get hold of the personnel dealing with the unfortunate in this country, they wield an enormous power, and there is great temptation to abuse it. There have been instances of that kind, some of which are probably fresh in the minds of Senators. So I think it is a step in the wrong direction and a false application of the so-called doctrine of States' rights to say that the Federal Government, when it is putting up a large portion or all the money for administrative costs, should not at least be enabled to say, as the Government is now able to say, that persons employed in those services should be appointed as the result of the application of the merit principle.

There is ample safeguard in the present statute against any undue exercise of power by the Federal agencies over any of the personnel, over their tenure of office, or other similar matters, but when it comes to the question, pure and simple, of saying whether those employed shall be selected on such a basis as to be sure that they are properly qualified to be in charge of the programs and to be ministering to the unfortunate people who are to be the beneficiaries, I do not think it is a sound or proper application of the principle of States' rights to deny the Government the right of selection.

Mr. President, I trust that I shall be proven wrong, but I fear that the enactment of the proposed legislation repealing, as I view it does, the merit principle in the administration of the so-called security laws, will lead to situations which will be unfortunate, and for which the Congress will some day have to hang its head in shame.

I also wish to associate myself, if I may be permitted to do so, in what has been said by the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] with regard to the legislation affecting the administration of the child-welfare and obstetrical programs under the Children's Bureau. The unfortunate situation which would be created if we yield on this proposition will be that in some States persons who are not permitted under statutes of those States to practice in the welfare hospitals will, as a matter of right, be entitled to minister to the wives of servicemen who are to receive the benefits of this statute during the period of their pregnancy and delivery. We will then have the anomalous situation of persons who are denied by State laws the right to administer drugs which are essential in the modern practice of obstetrics, as a matter of right ministering to the wives of ex-servicemen. We will have such a situation, Mr. President, that persons who are denied the right to practice surgery will, as a matter of right, be enabled to assume charge of the wives of servicemen, and other women, and every Senator who knows anything about modern obstetrics knows that surgery is often essential in order to save the lives of both mother and child at the time of delivery.

Mr. President, I say that to yield on this matter is a step backward in modern practice of obstetrics, and it is unfair to the servicemen, who are preparing to give their lives for their country, if necessary, that their wives, who are pregnant, and who are to be delivered in their absence, shall not have the benefit of the finest standards and the finest care that money can procure.

Yet in this false application of the so-called doctrine of States' rights such a situation will be created that the Congress will have done that very thing. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I want no part of it. I want no father of a child born while the father is overseas fighting for his country to point his finger at me and say, "You are responsible for the death of my wife and child in my absence, because a man was permitted to minister to her at her time of need who was not properly equipped, who was not licensed to use drugs, who was not licensed to practice surgery."

Mr. President, I say that such a thing would be an outrage.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I simply wish to impose upon the time of the Senator to express myself as being in complete agreement with the statement he has just made and with the views earlier expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Kentucky.

I had supposed that when we struck out this provision in committee the matter had been disposed of, and, because so much emphasis was laid on the matter in committee, I very deeply regret that the conferees on the part of the Senate have brought this language back to us and have made it necessary for us to vote the entire report up or down in order to meet the situation.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to find out what there is in the proposed legislation which undertakes to authorize a person in the State of Vermont, for example, to practice obstetrics who does not qualify under the State requirement? Is there anything in the bill which would permit that to be done?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No, Mr. President. What happens is that in 19 States, for example, persons who secure licenses to practice certain of the healing arts, or cults, may, without its being contrary to State law, minister to a woman who is to be delivered of a child.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But in many of those States the same person is barred from using or administering drugs which now are recognized to be required in the usual practice of modern, scientific obstetrics, and in most of the States such persons are barred from practicing surgery; whereas, as every Senator should know, surgery often is necessary in order to save the life of the mother or the life of the child, or of both.

But with this provision in the law, the patient may say, "I desire to have this person take care of me," and the language would prevent the Children's Bureau from setting up any standard which would prevent such person from taking care of the woman, even though barred by State law from using drugs or practicing surgery.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand that the proviso concerning which the Senator is addressing the Senate reads as follows:

> *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with.

Is that the language?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is the proviso to which I am referring. It will create the confusion I have mentioned. In other words, there was a very legitimate and, I think, sincere misunderstanding about the facts. The statement was flatly made on the floor of the House that this proviso would not permit unqualified persons to practice. But I am informed that view is not correct, because of the situation I have stated.

In other words, certain of the State laws forbid certain types of healing-art practitioners to use drugs or practice surgery; and yet their license under the State law pertaining to the healing arts will permit them to practice obstetrics.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to say that if I vote to support the conference report, I shall do so on the theory that this proviso does not attempt to regulate the practice of medicine or of obstetrics at all, but relates only to, and bears upon, the option of the patient to have the benefit of the grant, provided the patient does not thereby set in force a violation of the standards of the State.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator can vote for it on any grounds he chooses. I simply want to make it clear that so far as I am concerned, when the Federal Government is furnishing the money to take care of the wives of servicemen who could not otherwise take care of themselves, I do not want to see created a situation whereby the wives of servicemen during pregnancy and childbirth may be administered to by persons who are forbidden by the States to use drugs essential to modern obstetrics, and are denied, under State laws, the right to practice surgery which is often essential in order to save the life of the mother or of the child, or both.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator agree with me that the proviso does not add anything; gives no extra protection and does not cure the situation in any way whatsoever so far as the language the House put in the bill is concerned?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; it does not.

Mr. HILL. It does not help the situation in connection with the objection which we feel toward the language which the House inserted in the bill. It does

not help anything. If anything it makes it worse.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In my opinion it makes it worse.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator; if anything, it makes it worse.

Mr. President, in reference to what the Senator from Vermont has said, let me say that in 11 States osteopaths are permitted to practice obstetrics; yet they are forbidden the use of drugs and the practice of surgery. Modern obstetrics requires the administration of certain drugs and, in many cases, requires the practice of surgery. What the Senate sought to do, and the position the Senate took in striking out the language, was to make sure that the wives of veterans who are now in our armed forces would have the proper kind of medical care and properly accredited physicians when they were in pregnancy and when obstetrics had to be practiced.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in order to let me respond to the last remark of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his remarks. They clarify the issue for me; and I judge from them that the purpose is to raise the standard above the public policy which is declared by the State in each of the 11 States to which the Senator referred. I could not try to do that as a legislator of the United States.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The question is not one of raising the standard insofar as it applies to the people of the States for whom the States have assumed responsibility. To illustrate the matter as I see it, let me say that we have veterans' hospitals throughout the country. They are located in the different States. In many of those veterans' hospitals the standards are different from those the State might have in, let us say, a charity hospital within the State.

When the Federal Government is paying all the expenses, when the Federal Government assumes the entire responsibility and obligation in the matter, and when the persons involved, as in the case under consideration, are the wives of veterans who are now in the armed forces of our country, I do not think there is any reason why the Federal Government should be bound down by the law or standard of a State which does not meet the needs, as we know them to exist. That is what we are doing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is confusion, it seems to me, in the thinking on this question. The language referred to will not have anything to do with the standards of the States. The program is a Federal program. It has been determined by the Federal Government that it will extend aid to the wives of ex-service men who otherwise cannot afford proper care when they are pregnant and are to be delivered. All the Federal Government has been seeking to do is to make sure that the wives shall have the best possible type of care.

So far as I know, there is no requirement in any State that any person shall go to a physician to be delivered of a child. A pregnant mother could attempt to deliver herself, if she sought to do so, without violating the law. She might be delivered by a friend or a neighbor. She would not violate any law if she did so.

All that is sought is to make certain when we are extending care in the name of the Federal Government to the wives of ex-service men that only persons who are in a position to utilize the finest possible standards and to give the best possible care shall be permitted to administer to those women. In other words, we want to say that if in the State of X, some person who by State law is not permitted to use drugs or practice surgery, is entitled under the State law to administer to women in pregnancy who may wish to come to him for delivery, he shall not be permitted to do so in the case of the wives of servicemen who are being treated at Federal expense.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am heartily in accord with the idea of high standards in this excellent undertaking. Of course, the Senator is aware of the fact that in many localities in various States there is a great scarcity of practicing physicians and surgeons. They have gone into the armed forces. I should like to ask a question for my own information. What would be the situation in such a community in the case of the delivery of a child if a physician were not available and the expectant mother should call in a midwife? Would she be entitled to that service at the expense of this fund?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Under the present law the Children's Bureau has the right to set up standards for persons who are eligible to be paid out of Federal moneys so far as this program is concerned. Personally I believe that the dearth of physicians and surgeons has been seized upon as a means of striking down the standards which have been established. I am satisfied that those who are administering the program are just as determined as is anyone else to see that women are afforded proper service, and they will see that they get it. I do not think there is a scintilla of evidence before either of the committees to show that any person eligible for obstetrical care under this program has been denied proper care because of these standards. There has been considerable general talk about the scarcity of physicians, which everyone knows is true; but, so far as I know, not one scintilla or shred of evidence has been presented to show that because of the high standards required, any service has been denied to any woman eligible for it.

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

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

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps I can contribute to the reply to the question of the Senator from West Virginia. It is my understanding that under the present arrangement the Director of the Children's Bureau may take cognizance of those areas where there is a great shortage of licensed physicians. I have not the record before me, but I have been told that in sparsely settled areas where there are very few physicians some of these funds have occasionally been made available for that purpose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is my understanding of the situation. Let me ask the Senator from Massachusetts, who is a member of the subcommittee, if his recollection does not bear me out, that no evidence was presented to show that these standards had resulted in the wives of any ex-servicemen, or other persons who might be eligible, being denied proper care?

Mr. LODGE. I know of no evidence to that effect.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Whether there was such evidence before the committee or not, I think it is a matter of very general knowledge, particularly in States where there are small towns and counties remote from railroads, that there is a great scarcity of practicing physicians. Thousands of them have gone into the armed services. Whether there was any evidence before the committee or not, we know that to be a fact that there is a scarcity, and that there may be cases—I have been told of such cases—in which doctors are not available at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is one thing to say that doctors are not available and it is another thing to say that any person eligible for care under the Federal program, which is all we are concerned about, has been denied assistance.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is what I want to get at.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is what I want to get at. I think the burden of proof is upon those who wish to tear down the standards and who wish to say, by an explicit statutory provision, that women entitled to assistance and care, including the wives of ex-servicemen and others, are to be denied the highest standards of service. The burden is upon those who are advocating this proposal to show that there has been any lack of attention to the particular group which is involved. Everyone knows that there is a shortage of doctors.

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

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

Mr. BARKLEY. If I correctly understand the language of the proviso in the House bill, it would prevent discrimination among persons who are licensed within the State to practice obstetrics. It has no relationship to those who are not licensed. So, if a woman wished to do so she could employ a midwife who is not licensed in the State, if that were the course she desired to pursue. So far as the proviso is concerned, it would not prevent the use of these funds for the employment of any person whom a woman wished to have administer to her,

provided there were no discriminations among those who are licensed in the State.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that I do not think this touches anyone outside those who are licensed within the State. There is no provision that the money may not be expended in cases where midwives, who may not be licensed by the State, are employed. A midwife may be subject to some State law. All this provision does is to prohibit discrimination among those licensed within the State.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Apparently the Senator feels that I am opposing the purpose which he is advocating. I am not. I am trying to find out what the practical results may be. The able Senator from Kentucky has enlightened me very much. I am trying to find out what the result of the scarcity of doctors might be. As I understand what has been said, if a midwife may act upon an occasion of that kind, she may act for the soldier's wife under this provision. Is that correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. She would not be permitted to do so without a special exception to the standards which have been established.

Mr. BARKLEY. She might be prohibited by regulations of the War Department; but, as I understand, this prohibition does affect that situation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If a doctor were not available would this provision prevent a woman from receiving help?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not if she wanted to obtain help from any other person; but, under the present regulations, a person who did not meet the standards which had been set up could not be paid any money out of this fund unless an exception had been made.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If a doctor were not available, and the wife of a soldier had to resort to a midwife, she could not have that help, or rather, the midwife could not be paid. Is that correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. She could not be paid unless the woman herself paid for the services.

The Senator must understand that this program is being conducted through the State agencies with Federal money. The program has been in operation for some time. A large number of persons have been given this aid. There is not one scintilla of evidence that I know of that any person has been denied aid; but now it is proposed that these standards shall be torn down by statute, and that the regulations shall be set aside. The resultant situation will be as I have outlined it. At the present time, even those who are denied by State laws permission to administer the drugs which are now recognized as a part of modern obstetrical practice may practice indiscriminately, including even persons who are denied the right by State law to practice surgery. Under the language of the conference report the Children's Bureau would be helpless in denying those persons the right to serve in the cases for which they are responsible. I say that the result of such a situation would be unfortunate. Women might be crippled for life. I do not wish to be responsible, even in part, for it.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the proposed action is taken—and I insist that it ought not to be, because it would be a very great mistake—it would put the Federal Government on record as using these sums to purchase care of an inferior quality for the wives of our men in the armed forces. The child welfare and maternal care which have been afforded during the past 7 years have changed the United States from a country with one of the highest death rates in childbirth to a country with one of the lowest rates in the world. It would be a grievous backward step to accept this proposal. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I certainly do. I think it is very unfortunate that the Senate should even consider yielding on this proposal, because I think we should live to regret it. We should have cases presented to us which would bring tears to our eyes.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Federal Government maintains high standards in its Army hospitals, Navy hospitals, Public Health hospitals, and veterans' hospitals.

The Federal Government maintains high standards in all instances in which it is in any way responsible for medical care or service. Why make an exception of the wives of the men in our armed forces, and adopt a low standard which would permit incompetent and unqualified persons to practice on the wives of our men?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would the Senator even think it possible to consider for a moment that the Congress would provide that persons who may not administer drugs and who may not practice surgery should be permitted to take charge of the wounded soldiers when they come back from the front?

Mr. HILL. Of course, no Senator would agree to that; yet it is proposed to apply that same principle to the wives of the men.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is proposed to apply it to the wives of those who are not financially able to buy the highest type of service for themselves.

Mr. HILL. Not only to their wives, but to their helpless children. I wish to associate myself with all the Senator has said concerning this provision. So far as I am concerned I will not vote to go along with this proposal. I will vote against the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So will I, Mr. President.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was not present in the Chamber when the Senator began his remarks, but I have listened with a great deal of interest since I returned to the Chamber. It is my understanding that if the conference report is adopted it will mean putting our Government on record in favor of lowering the standard of treatment and medical care for which the Government agrees to pay for the wives of the men in our armed services.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In my opinion it can have no other result.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to endorse what I have heard the Senator say. When the time comes I shall vote against the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator desire me to yield, or does he wish to obtain the floor?

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to have the Senator yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has a misconception of the whole proposal. The language in question provides, with regard to the qualification of those who may practice obstetrics, that State laws which license physicians or others engaged in the practice of obstetrics shall apply, and that no one not licensed by the State shall practice obstetrics or receive any money under the terms of this bill. That is the provision in the bill. That is all it does. It refers the matter to the States. If the Senator wishes to say that by their statutes the States of the Union have lowered their standards, then I have no argument. As a matter of fact, the States have been solicitous and meticulous to assure that the standards for practicing physicians are maintained.

With regard to a practicing physician who is an osteopath, no osteopath may practice medicine or obstetrics in any State of the Union unless he shall have first been licensed by the State to practice obstetrics; and he could not have been licensed by the State to practice obstetrics unless he could administer drugs, and perform the necessary surgery attendant upon an obstetrical case.

Before an osteopath may be admitted to practice in any State of the Union he must have taken the required training in medicine. There are 19 States which license osteopaths. No State in the Union licenses chiropractors to perform obstetrical services.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not understand——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, allow me to finish. I shall take but a moment. I do not like Senators to be misled in this matter.

The Census Bureau reported to me today that it has no case on record in the United States in which a birth certificate has been issued by a chiropractor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I disagree with the analysis of the situation as made by the Senator from Nevada. My information comes from Dr. Elliott, who has been administering this program for many years. The Senator's statement is true so far as actual licensing is concerned. However, the fact is—and there has been much beating of the devil around the stump in this debate—that in many States there

is no legal prohibition against the practice of obstetrics by persons who are unable to administer drugs or perform surgery. Under the terms of the House provision and the proviso, such persons would be entitled to participate in this program.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. In the first place, in no State of the Union may an osteopath be admitted to practice obstetrics unless he can administer drugs or perform the necessary surgical operations which may be attendant upon an obstetrical case. That is the first point.

Secondly, when he is licensed to practice obstetrics he has complied with the State law, and falls squarely under the proviso that no one not licensed under a State law may practice obstetrics.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, 19 States permit midwives to attend women at the time of childbirth. Under the dictionary definitions, midwifery and obstetrics are interchangeable and synonymous terms. Those who will have to interpret the law, if the provision in the conference report is enacted, are convinced that they will be forced to permit such persons to attend cases which the Congress had said should have consideration because the husbands of the wives are in the armed forces. There is no use in quibbling over words. These are the facts. These are the interpretations which have been placed on this language by those who will be charged with the administration of the law.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I gladly yield to the able Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know of no State which by its laws permits a midwife to practice obstetrics. She may attend and minister in an obstetrical case, but I know of no State which by statute permits a midwife to practice obstetrics.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, unfortunately those who would have to administer the law take a different view from that taken by the Senator from Nevada. They feel that as a result they would be forced to allow persons who cannot practice surgery, and who cannot administer the drugs which are required in the modern scientific practice of obstetrics, to minister to the wives of ex-service men who may be in need. In the light of those circumstances I say that the Senate should not go on record in favor of taking any such action.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am unable to state with any authority the facts applicable to any State other than the State of California. It has been represented to me that not one State in the Union permits the practice of obstetrics by chiropractors or midwives. I was so informed by a person in authority, but I cannot vouch for it. As I understand the issue which will arise in California should this proposal be enacted into law, it is the desire of the people there who will administer the law to prevent osteopaths from practicing obstetrics.

Mr. President, I have made some investigation of that question. I am informed, and I believe authoritatively, that in order to become an osteopath one must have had 6 years of medical and surgical training, and that in the opinion of practically all medical men osteopaths are well qualified to practice obstetrics.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my friend the Senator from California permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does my friend realize that in 11 States osteopaths are permitted to practice obstetrics, yet they are forbidden to administer drugs or practice surgery? Osteopaths are accepted as members of the staffs of less than 5 percent of the hospitals in the United States caring for women in childbirth cases.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not know whether those statements are correct or not.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that the statement of the Senator from Kentucky does not conform to the facts regarding the administration of drugs. When an osteopath is admitted to practice obstetrics under a State law, I know of no State which does not require that he pass the tests to administer drugs, or perform the necessary attendant surgical operation.

Mr. CHANDLER. I quote the statement of Dr. Martha Eliot, of the Children's Bureau, and she says that is the fact.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know that.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am told very positively that it is the desire of those who will administer this law to have the provision so framed as to enable them to prevent the practice of osteopathy in obstetrical cases. I am convinced from personal conversations with physicians in California that osteopaths can successfully and properly perform that service and should be allowed to do so.

As I stated in a prior address upon the floor of the Senate, there is not a sufficient number of doctors of any kind to care adequately for the women in child birth in California, and if the law were so framed as to allow its administrators to prevent the practice of obstetrics by osteopaths in the State of California it would be an unparalleled calamity for us. While I do not speak with any degree of authority about other subjects, as I read this proposal, the rules of safety and well-being will be well preserved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Brewster	Butler
Andrews	Bridges	Byrd
Austin	Brooks	Capper
Ball	Buck	Caraway
Barkley	Burton	Chandler
Chavez	McFarland	Scrugham
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Shipstead
Connally	Maloney	Smith
Danaher	Maybank	Stewart
Downey	Mead	Taft
Eastland	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Moore	Thomas, Utah
Gerry	Murdock	Truman
Guffey	Murray	Tunnell
Gurney	Nye	Tydings
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Hill	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Holman	Overton	Wagner
Kilgore	Pepper	Wallgren
La Follette	Radcliffe	Walsh
Langer	Reed	Wheeler
Lodge	Revercomb	Wherry
Lucas	Reynolds	White
McCarran	Robertson	Willis
McClellan	Russell	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was on the conference committee which agreed to the provision now in controversy, and I am unwilling that a vote should be taken without stating to the Senate, as briefly as I can, my understanding of the propositions involved and my reasons for giving support thereto.

As has been pointed out by previous speakers, there are two provisos. One has been discussed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and I think he pointed out a fact with respect to the first proviso which has been generally overlooked.

The proviso merely states, paraphrasing it, that no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to carry out any instruction, order, or regulation relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminates between persons licensed to practice obstetrics in any State and under any State law.

So far as I am concerned, I am opposed to giving to any agency of the Federal Government authority to embark upon a campaign directed against any authorized practitioner of obstetrics in any State of this Union, for I believe it is a legitimate and proper function and responsibility of the several States to determine the qualifications of those within their borders who are to practice upon the bodies and the health of the citizens of the several States. So I have no difficulty with the first proviso.

The second proviso is as follows:

Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with.

There again is recognized the authority, the responsibility, and the obligations of the several States of this Union to fix their standards and to require that anyone who undertakes to practice within those States shall comply with the laws of the States.

As a very practical proposition, what confronts us? The evidence before the committee, I think, was not directed to this particular point, but it has a bearing on the point. The evidence before the committee was that there are many sections in this country where there are not to be found today persons with medical training.

The evidence before the committee was that there are many sections of the

country where persons with medical training are today not to be found. I suspect every Senator has had come to his desk in recent days appeals from hospitals, from public health services, from practicing physicians protesting against what they thought was a provision that civilian doctors could be moved about from the centers to the rural sections of the United States. That fear, in my opinion, sprang from the fact that there was introduced and presented to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee a proposal that the Public Health Service and the military authorities might move the doctors in their services wheresoever they pleased within the United States, and it also sprang even more from a part of that proposal which was that the authorities might enter into contracts with civilian doctors under which civilian doctors would be paid $250 a month if they would move out into areas not now enjoying medical service, as these areas might be designated. That is the testimony before the Appropriations Committee, and that is a fact which is corroborated by the correspondence which I believe comes to every Senator.

Throughout large parts of the country there are insufficient doctors; there are not a sufficient number of doctors to attend to disease, to attend to injuries, to serve in obstetrical cases.

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

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator not recognize local self-rule to be an ancient practice in our several States and a part of the policy which has been recognized for over a century?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Vermont that Maine stands with Vermont in support of that principle.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment further?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. And is not that principle carried out to the very twigs of the tree of democracy by having a good old town meeting vote the necessary appropriation to invite a doctor to come to the town and serve it, sometimes only a part of the time, and sometimes to come there and reside?

Mr. WHITE. I agree with the Senator.

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

Mr. WHITE. I will yield to the Senator, but I shall not yield again because I wish to conclude, for I know Senators desire to vote on the question.

Mr. MALONEY. I cannot see that the viewpoint of those who are opposed to this amendment is any indication that it is the purpose of the amendment to trespass upon States' rights. Our view is that we should not contribute toward the lower standards of States which will not comply.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, I understand the Senator's view.

Mr. MALONEY. In no way do we propose to trespass on the rights of the States.

Mr. WHITE. I understand the Senator's views.

Now what confronts the Senate as a practical proposition? We shall have obstetrical cases, not of the wives of the soldiers of the country alone, but of womenkind scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land—in our urban centers and in our rural communities. There is no prohibition in Federal law against the choice by a woman of the practitioner she desires to have attend her. She may employ a midwife, she may employ a chiropractor, she may employ an osteopath. The result of the defeat of this proposition would be that she will pay the expense alone, and she will receive no contribution from the Federal Government unless she selected an attendant approved by Washington.

Mr. President, if the result in treatment is the same, why are we going to deprive a woman living in a rural community of the financial aid which she will sorely need in these days which lie ahead of us? That seems to me to be the real issue here, and it is because of these considerations that I propose to vote for the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senate realizes the full significance of the vote which is about to be taken. The motion pending is to adopt the conference report. The conference report presented to the Senate cannot be amended. If the Senate votes to reject the motion it throws out the entire conference report; it throws the whole matter back into chaos, if I may so call it, or confusion for days again. The vote is not a vote on the amendment alone. A yea vote or a nay vote at this time does not affect the amendment alone; it affects the entire conference report, consisting of some 27 amendments, which have been agreed to after long hours of conference, which were voted on and agreed to by the House, and now are before the Senate. I hope the vote on the question will be "yea," because the vote is on the conference report as a whole, and not on amendment numbered 5.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am somewhat confused about the Army regulations with respect to the practice of obstetrics in connection with the wives of servicemen. Can the Senator inform me whether the regulations, if there are any now in force, require that the laws of the various States shall be complied with, or that only those who are licensed by the States may administer to women in obstetrical cases?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot give definite information on the subject. I do not think the Army now recognizes chiropractors or osteopaths.

Mr. BARKLEY. I read the amendment awhile ago and undertook to interpret it. I read only the House language, which has been modified by the conferees to provide in effect, it seems to me, that whatever is done about the matter, the State laws shall be complied with.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would mean that if a woman went to someone not licensed within the State, while she would have a perfect right to do so, and might pay for the service herself, none of the money appropriated by this bill could be used to pay such an obstetrician.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a correct interpretation.

Mr. President, let me say again that Senators should remember that they are not voting on the one item alone but on the whole conference report, and if they vote to reject the whole conference report they throw it back for consideration by the conferees, or back into the House, as the case may be.

Just one more expression and I shall have concluded. If the amendment does anything, it emphasizes that the greatest care will be taken because certainly the States of the Union and the medical organizations in the States have seen to it that the greatest possible safeguard shall be thrown around women with respect to those who under the laws of the States may practice in confinement cases.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few words in conclusion. This is not an issue of States' rights. The program is a wholly operated and paid-for Federal program, so far as the obstetrical care of the wives of the men in the armed forces of the United States are concerned. It is a joint Federal and State program, so far as maternal care generally is concerned. No State has to accept a dollar of this money if it does not desire to do so. All that the Children's Bureau has sought to do in the administration of this program is to assure the indigent mothers, on the one side, and the wives of men in the armed services of the United States, on the other, that they shall in their time of trial, at childbirth, have the best possible care that modern science can afford and money can buy.

Mr. President, I say that it is a shocking thing, even in order to secure the adoption of a conference report, that the Senate of the United States should go on record in favor of lowering the standards of care for the wives of the men who are on the battle fronts. I say we can afford to reject this report. I say we should send it back to conference. I say the time has come when the Senate of the United States should assert its rights as a coordinate branch of Government. Our conferees have been doing nothing in the last 24 or 48 hours but coming in and telling us that they cannot do anything because the House is adamant. Is the House the only legislative body? Do we not have some rights in these matters? Are we not entitled to have the House agree to some of our proposals? Yet nothing has been recommended to us except recession and recession. Why do we receive such recommendations in order to bring about an agreement?

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, if this practice is continued over any long period of time the Senate will become a vermiform appendage of the legislative branch of the Government. The Senate will descend into a secondary

position, because all the House will have to do will be to hold back the appropriation bills until the closing days or weeks of the fiscal year, and then say the Senate must agree in order to provide the necessary appropriations.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with what was being discussed when the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee was holding hearings, I asked the Surgeon General of the United States if he would express his opinion. We had a short discussion off the record.

The Secretary of War wrote a letter to the Appropriations Committee in connection with the Department of Labor appropriation bill. It may not be appropriate to read the letter at this time, when the Senate is considering another matter, but I ask unanimous consent to read it. It was written to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAYBANK. The letter is as follows:

Hon. CARTER GLASS,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GLASS: With reference to a request from the Department of Labor, relative to H. R. 2935, the following is submitted:

The Surgeon General, when he appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, stated, in substance, relative to the above bill, that in his opinion no one should be employed as a physician, unless he is a graduate of a regular medical school and eligible to practice medicine in the majority of the States of the Union This statement expresses the views of the War Department.

Inasmuch as it has been requested that this report be expedited, it is submitted without a determination by the Bureau of the Budget as to whether it conforms to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours.

I requested that information because of the large number of telegrams and letters I had received from the medical profession of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I say that if it is a perversion of the doctrine of States' rights to have this program, it certainly would be a perversion of the doctrine of State's rights to provide a program which would not take care of the wives of former service men now in the Army of the United States. I say that a vote for the conference report will be a vote to lower the standard of service the wives of servicemen will receive; it will be a vote to endanger the lives of the wives and the unborn children of men in the armed services of the country.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator in reply to the assertion he made a moment ago that the Senate is always yielding and seems to be getting into the position of always giving in to the House, that in the conference the House conferees yielded on 26 points, and the Senate conferees on only 4.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, perhaps I should have qualified my statement by saying that we are getting into a position of yielding to the House on legislative amendments which, under the House rule, if a special rule for them had not been brought in, would have been subject to a point of order in the House in the first place. The matter is being decided here without hearings, without consideration by the committee having jurisdiction of the effect on substantive law.

Mr. President, I say we should protect the wives of veterans in the armed forces of the country against inferior service at the time of their need.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my colleague the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I do not know how either Senator would vote if present. I allow my vote to stand.

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

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

I also announce the following general pairs: the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]; the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

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

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

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

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—42

Andrews	Danaher	Reynolds
Austin	Downey	Robertson
Barkley	Gurney	Russell
Brewster	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	McCarran	Taft
Buck	McFarland	Thomas, Okla
Burton	McKellar	Truman
Butler	Moore	Tunnell
Byrd	O'Daniel	Tydings
Capper	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Caraway	Overton	Walsh
Chavez	Reed	Wherry
Connally	Revercomb	White

NAYS—32

Aiken	Langer	Pepper
Ball	Lodge	Radcliffe
Chandler	Lucas	Shipstead
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Stewart
Eastland	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Maybank	Vandenberg
Gerry	Mead	Wagner
Guffey	Millikin	Wallgren
Hill	Murdock	Wheeler
Kilgore	Murray	Willis
La Follette	Nye	

NOT VOTING—22

Bailey	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Bankhead	George	McNary
Barbour	Gillette	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Glass	Tobey
Bone	Green	Wiley
Bushfield	Hatch	Wilson
Clark, Idaho	Hayden	
Davis	Johnson, Calif.	

So the report was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2935, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
July 1, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19 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, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, and insert at the end thereof, before the period, the following: ": *Provided*, That, hereafter, notice of such agreement shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of 3 months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where said agreement shall be open for inspection by any interested person"; and

That the House insist upon its amendment to Senate amendment No. 19 and insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 24 and 30 to said bill and ask a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what is Senate amendment numbered 19?

Mr. McCARRAN. Senate amendment numbered 19 is called the labor amendment.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator explain exactly what has been done?

Mr. McCARRAN. The provision came over from the House in the form of an amendment which had been placed in the bill on the floor of the House. The amendment inserted in the bill on the floor of the House was stricken out by the Senate, and was taken to conference. In conference an agreement was reached, after long study, as follows:

The first part of the amendment, as it now stands before the Senate, is the House language which was placed in the bill by a vote of the House when the bill was first before the House:

> 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 3 months or longer without complaint being filed.

To that the conferees agreed, with a proviso, as follows:

> *Provided*, That, hereafter, notice of such agreement shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of 3 months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where said agreement shall be open for inspection by any interested person.

The Senate will recall the colloquy between the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Nevada, in charge of the bill. It was the desire of the committee to have the question go to conference so that it might be settled in conference. It was the desire of the Committee on Appropriations to stabilize labor conditions for the duration of the war. Many views have been expressed, some laying blame on the National Labor Relations Board, and others laying blame elsewhere. We believe that when agreements are now in existence, regardless of whom the agreements may favor, the agreements should be frozen, if I may use that term, or at least stabilized, for the duration of the war, and not disrupted by confusion, misunderstanding, elections, or what not. The Senate Appropriations Committee sought to have the question settled in conference; and the form in which the language is now before the Senate represents our attempt to solve this perplexing problem.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words against the amendment.

I am a member of the Truman committee, which went into the Kaiser shipyard case in Portland, which is the basis for the language inserted by the House.

In the Portland shipyard case Kaiser entered a closed-shop union agreement with the American Federation of Labor building trades department, when he had 66 men employed. That closed-shop contract forced every man to join the union, pay an initiation fee, and pay dues. It would now cover 20,000 employees.

Mr. Kaiser testified that in that shipyard the labor turn-over is 20 percent a month, or 240 percent a year. Obviously there is something wrong with the labor-relations picture at that plant.

The American Federation of Labor sponsored this language, destroying a vital part of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, simply to stop the application of that law in this one case. If we adopt this provision we say that any contractor or employer may sign a contract with the union business agent, and if he can keep that contract from being attacked for 3 months, it will hold; it does not matter whether he signed it when there were no employees in his plant.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act is designed to protect the rights of workingmen in their jobs. All that the unions which are fighting over this particular clause are interested in—and they both admitted it before our committee—is not the welfare of the men doing the work, but the right of the unions to control the particular jobs and collect dues. It seems to me that the Senate would be departing from an important principle if it should abandon its position of protecting the rights of employees in their jobs and say that for the sake of a so-called stability, which results in a 240 percent labor turn-over annually, we are to freeze these men to any sort of labor contract, regardless of how it was entered into. Such action would legalize any kind of a "sweetheart" labor contract.

I hope the Senate will reject this proposal and send it back to conference to see if a provision can be drafted which would bring about stability, but would protect the workingman against such abuses as have occurred on a great many construction projects during this war.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that I may correct a mistake in my statement, I ask to be recognized now.

I made the statement that this provision would tend to stabilize labor relations for the duration of the war. In that statement I was in error, because this bill is an appropriation bill, which runs for only 1 year. But in the interim the Congress hopes that legislation may be enacted which will stabilize labor relations for the duration of the war. I merely wished to correct my statement, because the appropriation bill runs for only 1 year.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject this amendment. I think it is a vicious piece of legislation to attach to an appropriation bill. It would virtually repeal the Wagner Act and would not stabilize anything. I believe it would result in more trouble than good.

My colleague from Minnesota has stated correctly the evidence which was collected by the special committee of which I am the chairman. We heard all sides of the controversy, and this amendment is merely the result of the desire on the part of the American Federation of Labor on the west coast to maintain an agreement which was entered into by a very small number of men employed in the plant of Mr. Kaiser. It is not a proper amendment to be put on an appropriation bill at this time. I sincerely hope that the Senate will reject it and send it back for further consideration by the conference committee. I also sincerely hope that the Senate will never accept it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I regret to find myself in disagreement with the distinguished chairman of the so-called Truman committee, who is one of its most active members.

I concur entirely with the statement of facts which has been made, but I think other facts were brought out before the committee which are very relevant to the situation.

We are confronted by what I think was said at one time by a distinguished member of the opposition party to be a condition and not a theory. We are confronted by a condition brought about by agitation in shipyards and in other war activities, as a result of which labor production has been very seriously impaired. That was the testimony repeatedly of Mr. Kaiser before our committee. He begged us for any action which would end this continuing controversy in connection with his plants.

I do not agree at all that this amendment refers solely to the Kaiser difficulty. As a matter of fact, in shipyards along the Gulf and eastern coasts already there are pending or proposed applications which will open up the same question, and throw our entire labor relationships on those coasts into a chaos similar to that which we so much deplore.

Nor do I say that the amendment has any reference to the American Federation of Labor, because in my State of Maine the C. I. O. recently won a shipyard election which resulted in throwing out the A. F. of L. union and the A. F. of L. union there is under the same inhibition that is applied in this case.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I should like to ask the Senator if the basic and fundamental situation back of this controversy is not the struggle between the various racketeers of labor for the harvest of dues and initiation fees imposed upon the workers?

Mr. BREWSTER. I will let the Senator from Oregon phrase the situation as he wishes. The Senator from Minnesota said it was rather clearly indicated before our committee that there was a contest as to who should control.

Mr. HOLMAN. Control what and for what purpose?

Mr. BREWSTER. The receipt of funds. It seems clear to me that at this crisis the Senate should not be primarily concerned with whether one or another group shall receive the dues. We should rather direct ourselves in this

crisis to what will conduce to stability in our labor relations, and I believe that no one can successfully challenge the statement that by the adoption of this language we shall in some measure end this continuing controversy. I trust the Senate may find itself to be in agreement with the conferees by the adoption of the amendment which, whether it be to the advantage of one or another of the labor groups, will certainly be to the advantage of our boys who are on the fighting fronts, as well as to the great productive machinery which we are seeking to bring into action.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. REED. I hope my colleagues will not be too impatient. We will reach a vote soon enough. This is a very important matter of vital concern in labor legislation and in all labor controversies throughout the country.

I happen to be a member of the Appropriations Committee which heard the evidence of labor leaders on both sides. Frankly, Mr. President, this is a fight between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. for control of the dues collected from laboring men. That was frankly stated. Neither side denied it.

I was not a Member of the Senate when the Wagner Act was passed. If I had been I would have voted for it. The Wagner Act provided a method of organizing for collective bargaining, as well as selecting agencies to represent the men through their vote. The pending amendment would virtually repeal or nullify the Wagner Act, so far as the organizing of the men, or the right of men to vote for their collective-bargaining agencies is concerned.

I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri that the proposed amendment has no place in an appropriation bill. In the committee I objected to the amendment adopted by the House for the benefit of the A. F. of L. I object again. I do not think the addition made in conference improves the situation a particle. As I recall, I told the distinguished and able Senator from Nevada as much. At least, if I did not tell him, I should have told him. I believe, Mr. President, that the amendment, if adopted, will be hurtful to labor, will be a restriction upon the right of collective bargaining, and of the right of the men to establish their own bargaining agencies. The amendment should be defeated.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the proposed amendment concerning closed-shop agreements would practically repeal the Labor Relations Act. We were very careful in drafting the act to insure that a closed shop could only be agreed upon between the workers and the management after a majority of the workers, by a vote, agreed to the establishment of a closed shop. That is the law, and I have it right here before me.

In this particular instance, it is my understanding that when the manager, the owner, made an agreement with the labor leader, there were only about 30 men in that particular plant. After that, approximately 30,000 men came into this particular plant without having the opportunity of determining the question of whether they desired to belong to the union, or whether they were in favor of a closed shop. That is one of the very things which we provided for in the Labor Relations Act. We wanted to be sure that the workers would have a right to determine the question of whether they wanted a closed shop, and whether they wanted a union.

What occurred in this particular instance was that after these 30 men agreed to belong to a union, every worker who came to this particular plant—I understand that there are three or four plants in all—was required to sign a union contract, and a closed-shop agreement, without ever having the question determined by the worker as to whether he wanted that kind of an arrangement. The proposed legislation would dispose of the Labor Relations Act insofar as such closed-shop agreements are concerned for a period of a year.

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

Mr WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator contend there was any overreaching in the arrangement between the men and Mr. Kaiser?

Mr. WAGNER. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask the Senator if he believes there was any overreaching in the arrangement between the men and Mr. Kaiser, or whether it was a fair and square agreement into which they entered?

Mr. WAGNER. What I say is that where 30,000 workers enter a plant, then I think, when there is such a substantial number they should have the right, under a democratic system of government, to determine whether they want to belong to a union and whether they want a closed shop. That is so in this case.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not significant that the situation in this case was the result of the stabilization agreement on the west coast, by which the Government determined all wages, hours, and working conditions? It asked the shipowners in that case to enter into this agreement, and in the case of the Bethlehem shipyard compelled the acceptance of the closed shop, and Mr. Kaiser merely followed what was the Government's policy, as he testified before us, did what the Government asked him to do, and the workers did the same thing. It certainly has a great bearing on the fairness and the reasons for the arrangement.

Mr. WAGNER. The Bethlehem Steel case, as I understand it, is one in which the workers themselves agreed that they wanted a closed shop, and wanted to belong to a certain union.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Bethlehem Steel Co. did not agree they wanted a closed shop, but the Government compelled the Bethlehem Steel Co. to enter into that arrangement, and Mr. Kaiser simply followed suit. Those are the facts.

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know whether the Government did, under the Labor Relations Act, compel it.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think if the Senator will examine the record of that case, as testified to before our committee, he will find what I have said to be accurate.

Mr. WAGNER. I am not defending anyone or disagreeing with anyone. We have been talking about democracy. We passed the Labor Relations Act because we wanted to do away with company unions. No one objects to that, but what is proposed here will in effect authorize a company union.

Mr. BREWSTER. If we do not do something soon, and this labor chaos continues, we will not have any democracy.

Mr. WAGNER. The same thing may be said about our Congressional elections next year. There will be a division, I suppose, and it might be urged that we should not have an election because we may not stabilize conditions. No one would agree to that.

I think the best way to handle this matter is in the democratic way. Let the workers decide whether or not they want a union, and if they do want a union, what union, and whether they want a closed shop, and have that all decided—just as under the Connally-Smith Act it will be decided with reference to strikes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe in labor stabilization during the war?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; at any time.

Mr. BRIDGES. What the Senator proposes is the reverse, then, is it not?

Mr. WAGNER. No; it is not.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why is it not?

Mr. WAGNER. I am for deciding in the democratic way. I say the workers themselves should determine whether they want a closed shop or not. That is what we were discussing when the Connally-Smith bill was before the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not notice that the Senator was very enthusiastic in supporting that.

Mr. WAGNER. I was not.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then why quote it now as a great authority? I was not in sympathy with some of the provisions of the act but I supported it to stabilize war-labor conditions. However, I am not standing here quoting it now as any authority.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from New York whether there is not the right on the part of workingmen to organize their own collective bargaining agencies?

Mr. WAGNER. That is how we happened to pass the Labor Relations Act, and give them that right.

Mr. REED. And there is nothing more important to the laboring man than the preservation of that right.

Mr. WAGNER. Exactly.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator agrees with what I said, or I at least agree with his understanding, that the adoption of this rider upon an appropriation bill will have the effect of practically nullifying the Wagner Labor Act, so far as the right of workers to select their own bargaining agency is concerned.

Mr. WAGNER. That is so, so far as the question of the closed shop is concerned.

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Several Senators referred to this proviso as being aimed at stabilizing labor relations. I should like to reemphasize that the case out of which this proviso arose, the Kaiser yard at Portland, is a beautiful example of instability of labor relations, because that yard shows a 20-percent labor turn-over every month, 240 percent a year, indicating, obviously, that the 20,000 employees now employed do not like to work under a closed-shop contract negotiated when there were only 60 employees.

Mr. WAGNER. Of course, they never had an opportunity to determine the question, because the workers never had the chance for an election to determine that very question, and that is the thing we were discussing when we had the Labor Relations Act before us. There were only 12 votes against it in this body. The two things we emphasized were, first, the right of collective bargaining; and second, the question of a closed shop—there there could not be a closed shop unless a majority of the workers agreed to it. That is the law today, and that was a protection to the workers against the so-called company unions.

The provision we are discussing can easily be used for the company union purpose, as it has been, so far as the past is concerned. All an employer would have to do would be to get together one or two individuals and decide upon a closed shop and a certain union, a company union, and then a worker could enter only after being compelled to sign such an agreement. Employees would have no rights in the matter. That is one of the things about which we were so much concerned at the time we drafted the act.

The Senator fram Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] was chairman of the committee which reported the bill, and I should like to read from the report he made to the Senate on this very question. I read from the report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on the National Labor Relations Act:

> The bill does nothing to facilitate closed-shop agreements or to make them legal in any State where they may be illegal; it does not interfere with the status quo on this debatable subject but leaves the way open to such agreements as might now legally be consummated, with two exceptions about to be noted.

This is the important thing we brought up at that time:

> While today an employer may negotiate such an agreement even with a minority union, the bill provides that an employer shall be allowed to make a closed-shop contract only with a labor organization that represents the majority of employees in the collective bargaining unit covered by such agreement when made.

That was the point we had in mind when we passed the act, and now it is being nullified by the adoption of this particular amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator in his statement a moment ago, said in effect, that the American Federation of Labor was the same as a company union.

Mr. WAGNER. No, I did not; I do not and I did not.

Mr. BRIDGES. What did the Senator say? He said, in effect, you might as well have a company union as have the American Federation of Labor representing the workers.

Mr. WAGNER. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. BRIDGES. What did the Senator say?

Mr. WAGNER. I said that today, if this proposal shall be adopted, an employer could get together with only one man and agree upon a contract and a closed shop, and then employ his labor, 1,000 or 2,000, and those workers would have to join a particular union and enter into a closed-shop agreement.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall read the RECORD.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator may not agree with me——

Mr. BRIDGES. I know what the Senator said a few moments ago. I shall read the RECORD.

Mr. WAGNER. That is all I have to say, Mr. President.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. When this union was formed, the Senator says, there were only 60 workers?

Mr. WAGNER. Not the union; when this particular plant was formed, there were 30 or 60, I have forgotten which, a very small number.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Did they vote to join a union?

Mr. WAGNER. No; an agreement was made with a certain organization, I have forgotten the name——

Mr. BALL. There were 66 employees, furnished by the Building Trades Department of the A. F. of L. They were already members of a union.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD and Mr. TYDINGS addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Were they members of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. WAGNER. They probably were; I do not know.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Did they have a right to make a contract with the employer at that time?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; they did.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then they agreed to a closed shop; they agreed to wages and working conditions, I assume?

Mr. WAGNER. I assume so; yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As the workers came to this plant they were required to join the union. Were they free to decide whether they wanted to join the union? Were they free to decide whether they wanted to have a closed shop or not?

Mr. WAGNER. I understand not.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I never heard of an industrial plant to which a worker came who wanted to obtain employment, in which he was given a choice with respect to joining a union or not, or with respect to the shop being a closed shop or not. The worker had to accept the regulations and the rules as they existed when he went there.

May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have the matter clear in my mind so far as I have gone. Let us say that more workers came into this plant. They all joined the union. How many elections are there to be had with respect to the question of whether the plant is to be a closed shop or not, or with respect to what union shall be in control?

Mr. WAGNER. There should certainly be a substantial number of workers engaged before a decision is made of that question among the workers. Does the Senator think that a decision on the part of 60 workers should be binding on 30,000 workers? Does the Senator think that 60 workers is a sufficient number to determine the question as to whether the shop should be a closed shop or not?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What I have in mind is this: There is jurisdictional strife between various unions. They proselyte among the members belonging to other unions. Strikes and disturbances result, because, for example, one union desires to break in where another union has control. It makes no difference to me, or to the average citizen, or the average worker either, to what union he belongs.

Mr. WAGNER. It makes no difference to me, either.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The chances are that he will be protected in his job and in his work whatever the union to which he belongs. Suppose a controversy arises. The A. F. of L. makes an attack upon a plant to try to proselyte among the workers where the C. I. O. is in control. In another part of the country we may have the reverse condition obtaining. The result is jurisdictional strife. This procedure causes a great deal of disturbance. So far as I am concerned, I shall try as I have heretofore tried, to support legislation for the protection of labor. But we see competition existing between various unions with respect to collection of dues. Sometimes the main thing seems to be the collection of dues; who shall get the dough.

Mr. WAGNER. After the Labor Relations Act was passed the lower courts held it to be unconstitutional, and company unions increased to include about 45 percent of all the workers. When the Supreme Court finally decided the law to be constitutional the company unions had to disband. So we had elections

in the different plants all over the country. There are about 6,000,000 workers in the American Federation of Labor, and about 5,000,000, I think, in the C. I. O. There are over a 1,000,000 in the railway workers' organizations, and they, of course, are opposed to company unions, for their conditions of labor are stabilized.

When elections were proposed to be held all over the country, it was said that they would unstabilize conditions. The contrary, Mr. President, was true. The workers had the opportunity to decide in the elections which were held whether they wanted any union or not, and in some cases they declared by their votes against any union. The elections, however, resulted in producing stability. By them the workers were given the democratic right which we are claiming for ourselves here. I do not think any Senator will contend that 60 men should enter into a contract by which 30,000 men are compelled to belong to a particular union and to have a closed shop. I do not think that is the democratic way of doing things.

Mr. President, I had not intended to say so much on this question, but discussion of it was extended. I think the way to handle the situation is by legislation. I believe the whole matter should be brought out and discussed. Let us decide the question as to whether we want to go back to the old days of company unions or not.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not think that question has anything to do with the matter under discussion.

Mr. WAGNER. I will say to the Senator that I think it does.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I cannot understand the view taken by the Senator. Under the law as it is the men have the right to form unions. The question, however, is whether an election shall occur every 2 or 3 months.

Mr. WAGNER. No; I did not say that.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Or every 6 months.

Mr. WAGNER. No; I did not say an election should take place every 6 months. I say an election should occur when a representative number of workers are engaged in a particular plant. When 30,000 workers are employed in one plant, surely it cannot be contended that 60 men shall speak for them. It would be much better, it seems to me, to have an election to determine the question as to whether they want a union or do not want a union.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator knows very well that the idea seems to persist for one union to attack another and to proselyte among its members. I do not think that is a legitimate procedure.

Mr. WAGNER. We found that it was the democratic way to do. The company-union system previously existed, which the workers did not like and which they resented.

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to ask the Senator where he would stop in the matter of holding elections. The Senator said that 60 men should not control the actions of 30,000 men. I agree with the Senator in that respect under ordinary conditions; but today we are under war conditions and are doing many extraordinary things. At what point would the Senator say an election should occur? Should the election occur when there were 1,000 men in the plant, 2,000 men in the plant, 3,000 men, or where along the line should it occur?

Mr. WAGNER. I would say it should occur when there was a substantial number of workers engaged in the plant.

Mr. HAWKES. How often does the Senator think elections should occur? I myself have been through proceedings of this kind, and I can tell the Senator how an election upsets a plant.

Mr. WAGNER. I would not have an election more than once a year.

Mr. HAWKES. Very well. But where would the Senator stop? When a plant is growing in the number of workers employed by it from 60 to 30,000, when would the Senator have the election occur, at the time of employment of 10,000 men, 20,000 men, or when? How often would the Senator have elections occur in relation to the number of men employed?

Mr. WAGNER. I would not have an election occur when only 60 men were employed. Such things happened in the old days, and that is why we passed the Labor Relations Act. The Senator knows something about company unions, I am sure.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes, I know something about company unions, and about all kinds of unions, and I am in favor of all of them when they conduct themselves properly and with due regard to private property and to enterprise.

Mr. WAGNER. So am I.

Mr. HAWKES. But I desire to know where the Senator would stop in the matter of having elections, because every time an election occurs it results in disturbing the equilibrium of the workers in the plant for many weeks. They are talking about it before election, during election, and after election. I am in favor of trying to bring unity of action between labor and capital and management, so that our production lines may be kept going to the full extent of our ability, so that we may as speedily as possible win the war.

Mr. WAGNER. So am I. I am very anxious to have that brought about.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes, I know the Senator is.

Mr. WAGNER. But I want it done in the democratic way.

Mr. HAWKES. But can the Senator tell me at what point and when he would have elections? The Senator raised a very interesting point when he said that a decision made by 60 men should not be controlling over 30,000 men. Where would the Senator start to have elections, and where would he end them?

Mr. WAGNER. The plant in question began with 60 men, and had 60 men for a period of about 3 months, and then a large group of employees came into the plant, and within a comparatively short time there were 15,000 or 20,000 workers in that plant. That would be the time to give the workers the opportunity to decide the question. They may not want a union at all.

Mr. HAWKES. But the Senator is in favor of having as few elections as possible under the existing conditions?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. WAGNER. I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I was seeking the floor in my own right.

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I simply want to ask the Senator a question in connection with the case he has in mind. Were the 60 men the only men working in the plant at the time when the election was held?

Mr. WAGNER. I so understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then the war came, and, naturally, new employees went into the plant by the thousands, until a tremendous number of employees were working in a plant in which only 60 had formerly worked. Did each of the men who went into the plant have to join the union in accordance with the decision of the original 60 men?

Mr. WAGNER. I so understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. It might have been that many of them did not want to join the union, or did want to join the union. The point I make is that if the Senator wants the Wagner Labor Relations Act to remain in effect, it seems to me he should give consideration to the fact that all 30,000 of the men who went to work in that plant were forced to join a union which they might not have wanted to join, because the Wagner Act compelled them to comply with the agreement which was in existence when only 60 men were working in the plant.

Mr. WAGNER. Oh, no; the Wagner Act does not do anything of the kind.

Mr. TYDINGS. If a majority of the 60 men had decided to join the union, the great number who subsequently were employed would have to join the union.

Mr. WAGNER. The act provides that there can be a closed shop only when a majority of the workers——

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, a majority. I am asking for information. If only 60 men were working in the plant at the time when the election was held, and if a majority of them voted for the union and the closed shop, it would be impossible to employ any more men in the plant unless the employer employed them under the closed-shop contract; would it not?

Mr. WAGNER. That may be true.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, under the Wagner Labor Relations Act, what right did the 30,000 new employees have to say whether they wanted to belong to the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O., or to no union at all?

Mr. WAGNER. Because under the Wagner Act they could decide.

Mr. TYDINGS. But in that event it would be necessary to hold an election every month.

Mr. WAGNER. Oh, no.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, yes. Let me explain to the Senator. First, there were 60 men in the plant; then, let us say, a thousand men; then 2,000, then 10,000,

then 16,000, then 20,000, then 30,000; but all the men who came in day after day would have—it would be a violation of law if they did not; and I do not say this critically—to come in under the terms under which the 60 men originally working at the plant had decided by majority vote to work. There is no escape from it.

Mr. WAGNER. Under the act, the majority of the workers has to decide the question whether they want a closed shop.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator; but I do not believe I have made my position plain. At the time when the election was held, a majority of the employees was 31, because only 60 men were working in the plant at the time. By majority vote, they decided to have an agreement for a closed shop. The Senator concedes that; does he not?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; I so understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I want to understand. The next day there were 40 or 140 more men who wanted to go to work in the plant. How could they obtain employment in the plant without complying with the agreement already in existence? How could they secure employment in the plant, when labor and management had previously agreed, at a time when there were only 60 employees in the plant, that no one could work there without joining in the agreement?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; they could have an election.

Mr. TYDINGS. When? Could there be an election when, let us say, 100 additional men came in? That could not be done. Apparently the 160 men were satisfied. Would there be an election after the number of employees totaled 360?

The point I make is that when we pass a law declaring a labor policy, and when management and labor agree to the policy, all the new men who come in the plant, are bound by the law and the policy established under it. That is one of the weaknesses of the law, if there is a weakness to it.

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I happen to come from the district in which seems to be located the plant where the unjustified things occurred. The very question asked by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] indicates the situation of a monopoly on the issuing of permits by which men can earn their daily bread. The situation has reached such a point that men must buy a permit to work. That is the wording of it—a permit to work. It results in racketeering at the expense of the men who work; and every one of the thousands upon thousands of men who work have to buy from the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O. a permit to work. That results in graft which makes Al Capone look like a child in kindergarten. [Laughter.]

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I would not know about what the Senator has said as to that particular case; I think most labor leaders are very honest and faithful. But I will answer the Senator by saying this: Rather than have the men complain, why not give them the right to hold an election to determine the matter?

Mr. HOLMAN. I agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. WAGNER. Exactly. That is all I am asking for.

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us suppose they hold an election. Let us suppose 60 percent of the men vote to join union A, and 40 percent of them vote to join union B. As a result of the election, union A would be the bargaining agent. Let us suppose that 6 months afterward the employees who prefer union B are in the majority, and want another election? Let me ask the Senator if they would not be as much entitled to have an election then, and if their situation would not just as much warrant the holding of an election, as the situation the Senator has described would warrant the holding of one?

Mr. WAGNER. Oh, no; the laws must be reasonably construed. There could not be an election every 2 or 3 months.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the democratic way must be used.

Mr. WAGNER. It would be necessary to wait a year or so.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the law does not provide any term, I may say to the Senator. It is perfectly possible that if the A. F. of L. union had first been selected as the bargaining agent, and thereafter there was an election, by the election the employees might decide to select the C. I. O. union as the bargaining agent; and later they might turn back, and select the A. F. of L. union as their bargaining agent.

Mr. WAGNER. As a matter of fact the A. F. of L. has been very successful in the elections, particularly as against company unions; and by means of the act company unions have been practically eliminated. However, now I am afraid they may come back again. I hope not.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to say a word on this matter. I sat on the Committee on Education and Labor for 6 months hearing complaints against the National Labor Relations Act of 1939. The act should have been amended long ago. One of the greatest abuses occurs under the power to order an election when the Board wants to hold one. I heard of case after case in which the Board was so strongly C. I. O., in its early days, that it deliberately postponed the holding of an election until the C. I. O. had extended its election practices to get what it thought would be a majority in the plant. To my mind there is no doubt that the Wagner Labor Relations Act should be amended to provide exactly when and how elections should be held; for instance, not more often than every 3 years, and at specified times.

From the beginning, there has been abuse in connection with the matter of when the Board could and could not order an election.

I might agree with the Senator from New York that, as a basic principle, at regular, stated intervals there should be an election to determine to which union the men wished to belong. But let me point out that during the war we have suspended the rule, and we have witnessed a condition in which nearly every plant in the country is unionized, and a particular union controls the plant; and if it is not a closed shop, it is a maintenance-of-membership shop in which the union retains control.

On top of the Wagner Act, we have imposed a principle of stability in every plant in the country. Under the Connally-Smith bill which the Congress recently passed, we provide that if the Government takes over the plant, everything shall remain exactly as it was when the Government took it over; and the War Labor Board has been ordering the inclusion of maintenance-of-membership clauses in nearly every contract.

What is the justification for doing that? It is not provided for in the Wagner Act itself. The members of the Labor Board say, "We must maintain conditions in this plant stable. If this union controls today, we insist that the contract provide that every man maintain his membership in that union," making it absolutely impossible for another union to obtain a majority in that plant.

In other words, the maintenance-of-membership clause of the War Labor Board can be justified only on the principle of stabilizing union control as it is when the hearing is held before the War Labor Board. It seems to me that this provision does no more than that. It says in effect, for example, that it recognizes an existing condition in which the A. F. of L. has a contract and in which the majority of the men are members of the A. F. of L. It seems to me that when the National Labor Relations Board comes into the picture and tries to change that situation by ordering an election, it only makes trouble.

This is not the only case. There are other cases throughout the country in which elections have been ordered at a particular time and have resulted only in more labor trouble and bitter fighting. I believe that for this year at least—and this is good for only a year—we might well adopt the principle of stabilization of union control in the plants where particular unions are now in control. I do not believe any policy would contribute as strongly toward the prevention of strikes—and the most liberal source of strikes is interunion disputes—as would the adoption of this kind of an amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion

of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. BALL (and other Senators) asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the roll call is started, the yeas having been ordered, let me ask the Senator from Nevada, in view of the lateness of the hour, whether he wishes to have a vote on this particular amendment before a recess is taken?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to conclude action on this amendment and one other, which will require only a short time. The other matter is a motion to recede from one other amendment which was in dispute between the two Houses. Then the National Youth Administration amendment may go over until tomorrow at noon.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, a vote "yea" is a vote in favor of the provision of the House, as amended and agreed to by the Senate conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope no misunderstanding will prevail as to this amendment——

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, may I say a few words?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to say that I am voting on this question purely as a war measure. I shall vote "yea." I am in hearty agreement with what the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has said, that this provision would apply to more than merely the Kaiser shipyards. It would apply to labor situations all over the country. In my opinion, for the period of 1 year, it would aid in maintaining peace in labor relations.

Someday Congress will consider very deliberately the sacred right to work. It will consider the right to work without obtaining a permit. It will consider making it possible for laboring men to be free, to have their own units or unions, and to have collective bargaining without having to belong to a union in order to work and earn a living.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Kaiser shipyard is not involved in the pending question any more than is any other plant in the United States. The C. I. O. is not involved, and the A. F. of L. is not involved. No particular union is involved, as will be seen if Senators will read the language of the provision which was adopted by the House in the form of an amendment on the floor of the House, and concurred in by the conferees:

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.

What is a complaint case? It has been developed before the Senate Appropriations Committee that a complaint case is a case filed by the National Labor Relations Board. In other words, the National Labor Relations Board may not file complaint case after complaint case and keep a plant in turmoil when it has had notice of an election and an agreement under which the plant is operating. If such a complaint case arises more than 3 months after the agreement has been entered into, then the National Labor Relations Board is precluded by this amendment from filing the complaint case. There is no question about that.

The purpose of this provision is to stabilize labor relations. Whether the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L. has the plant makes no difference to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate or to the Senate. Whatever has been done is done. This amendment would not permit the National Labor Relations Board to hold a case for more than 3 months and then say, "We will order another election." That is all there is to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 19. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and let my vote stand.

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

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]; and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

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

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

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

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—40

Austin	McCarran	Shipstead
Brewster	McClellan	Stewart
Bridges	McFarland	Taft
Buck	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Maloney	Tydings
Byrd	Millikin	Vandenberg
Chavez	Moore	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Connally	Overton	Wheeler
Ferguson	Radcliffe	Wherry
Gerry	Revercomb	White
Gurney	Reynolds	Willis
Hawkes	Robertson	
Hayden	Scrugham	

NAYS—25

Aiken	Holman	Pepper
Ball	Kilgore	Reed
Barkley	La Follette	Russell
Burton	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Mead	Wallgren
Guffey	Murdock	
Hill	Murray	

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews	Davis	McNary
Bailey	Eastland	Nye
Bankhead	Ellender	O'Daniel
Barbour	George	Smith
Bilbo	Gillette	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Glass	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Green	Tobey
Bushfield	Hatch	Wiley
Caraway	Johnson, Calif	Wilson
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	

So Mr. McCARRAN's motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 24.

Let me say for the information of the Senate that amendment numbered 24 would provide that all appointments involving salaries of $4,500 or more made by the President under the appropriation bill shall be confirmed by the Senate. The House was adamant on this amendment, and would not recede. I am now moving that the Senate recede from the amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that the limitation relates solely to the War Manpower Commission. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; it applies to everything in the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Under the paragraph limiting it to the War Manpower Commission, it would be limited to that agency.

Mr. BARKLEY. The law already applies to the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. McCARRAN. I could not understand the Senator from Kentucky. The amendment which I am asking the Senate to vote upon would apply to appointments made in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. At the present time all appointments in the War Manpower Commission must be confirmed by the Senate. Would the motion of the Senator be in effect to accede to the position of the House in this matter, to do away with the necessity in the future for the Senate to confirm appointments to the War Manpower Commission?

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the law as it existed until the 30th of June last, appointments to the War Manpower Commission were subject to senatorial confirmation. The House refused to go along with that provision on this occasion. My motion now is that the Senate recede from the Senate amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the motion of the Senator from Nevada prevails then we will be changing the law which has been in effect for the past year.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct, but the provision went into an appropriation bill last year.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It would change the prevailing law?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; not the prevailing law, because what the Senator has in mind as the prevailing law expired on the 30th of June at midnight.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Day before yesterday.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays, and pending that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator will not insist upon his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly do not intend to allow the existing law to be repealed in this fashion without a record vote. If I could have a record vote on the question I would withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not asked if there was a sufficient seconding of the request. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is the motion to recede?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to recede from the amendment of the Senate numbered 24.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. AUSTIN (when his name was called). A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not understand how the question arises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Nevada is to recede from the amendment of the Senate by which confirmation was required of certain appointees covered under the appropriations covered in the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. I vote "nay."

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

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and let my vote stand.

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

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

I also announce the following general pairs: the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]; and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

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

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

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

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—19

Aiken	Hill	Scrugham
Ball	La Follette	Shipstead
Barkley	Langer	Tunnell
Buck	McCarran	Wagner
Ferguson	Murray	White
Guffey	Pepper	
Hayden	Radcliffe	

NAYS—39

Austin	Holman	Revercomb
Brewster	Kilgore	Reynolds
Bridges	Lucas	Robertson
Burton	McClellan	Stewart
Butler	McFarland	Taft
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Millikin	Wallgren
Danaher	Moore	Walsh
Gerry	Murdock	Wheeler
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Hawkes	Reed	Willis

NOT VOTING—38

Andrews	Downey	Nye
Bailey	Eastland	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Ellender	Overton
Barbour	George	Russell
Bilbo	Gillette	Smith
Bone	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Green	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Hatch	Tobey
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Van Nuys
Chandler	Lodge	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wilson
Davis	Mead	

So Mr. McCARRAN's motion to recede from Senate amendment No. 24 was rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think no greater tribute could be paid to the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] than that which has just been paid him by the vote of his colleagues on the floor of the Senate. This amendment being his pet amendment, he having fostered and promoted a bill through the Senate which carries the very provision, which is now pending in the House. I, indeed, take no umbrage at the vote against my motion.

Mr. TRUMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Senate rejected the motion of the Senator from Nevada be reconsidered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks,

announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider 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, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CONTINUANCE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House has just sent to the Senate, House Joint Resolution 147, continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation, as a result of the sustaining of the President's veto of House bill 2869. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution lie on the Vice President's desk until tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the President of the United States wants to veto the action of the Congress, that is his privilege, but he is certainly not entitled to have the status of the Commodity Credit Corporation maintained by any expedition of action in either branch of Congress. Therefore, I object to the request, which is obviously designed for the purpose of expediting the passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

VISIT BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago a delegation from the House and Senate of the United States made a trip to Canada on the invitation of certain members of the Canadian Parliament. The delegation was headed by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] were the other Senators making the trip. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was appointed a member of the Senate delegation, but was unable to leave Washington because of his official duties here. The members of the House delegation were Mr. BLOOM, of New York, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, of Texas, Mr. EATON, of New Jersey, and Mr. VORYS of Ohio.

There was a conference participated in by the members of the delegation from the Congress of the United States, members of the Canadian Parliament, members of the British Parliament, and members of certain other parliaments of members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The Speaker of the Senate of Canada, the Honorable Thomas Vien, has written a letter to the Secretary of the Senate, Col. Edwin A. Halsey, with regard to our delegation and the conference. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SENATE, CANADA,
SPEAKER'S CHAMBERS,
Ottawa, June 28, 1943.

Mr. EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALSEY: I have duly received a resolution of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States of America (First Session), pursuant to the invitation tendered by myself as the Speaker of the Senate of Canada and Joint-President of the Empire Parliamentary Association, Dominion of Canada Branch, authorizing four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives to attend the meeting to be held in Ottawa, during the conference of the Canadian Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association, with Delegates of the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and Bermuda.

We have had the pleasure of receiving three of the Senators and four Congressmen who had been designated by their honours the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

At our sitting, this morning, we have read this resolution into our records, and I am directed to express to you, and through you, to their honours the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, our high appreciation of the honour which has been conveyed to us for the first time in our Parliamentary history of delegating Members of your Congress to attend joint sittings of our Empire Parliamentary Association. It is a token of our association as United Nations in this war, and of our common task in re-establishing the world on a peace basis when we shall have won final victory.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Very faithfully yours,
THOMAS VIEN,
Speaker of the Senate of Canada.

NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, there is a very important bill on the calendar which I think can be disposed of in a few moments, because I believe it is not controversial. The bill is House bill 2936, which would authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the housing in connection with national defense." The bill deals with the so-called community facility section of the act, providing money for sewers, water mains, reservoirs, child day-care centers, construction of schools, school maintenance, and so forth. The funds of the Federal Works Agency in this connection are now depleted. It is very important that the bill be passed at the earliest possible moment, so that the House may have a chance to act upon it. The Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have reported an amendment to the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Has the Senator conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], concerning this measure?

Mr. MALONEY. I have not, but I should like to point out that the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor, is also a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor did speak to me briefly yesterday about the bill. He seemed quite satisfied with the action taken, when I told him that the bill had been amended at the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio to make provision that if Senate bill 1130, the so-called Thomas bill, shall pass the House none of the increase granted shall be used for grants for the operation of child day-care centers and maintenance of education.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It must be obvious that the passage of the bill would certainly be very detrimental to the interest of the enactment of the bill which the Senate has already passed, and in view of the fact that the Senator has not conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor concerning his desire to bring this bill up, I ask him to let it go over until tomorrow morning.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to make one further suggestion, if I may. I certainly do not care to press the bill if there is any objection. The Senator understands that there is probably no matter of greater importance than the child day-care centers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am being confronted with situations of that kind all the time.

Mr. MALONEY. I withdraw the request.

SUPERWEAPON, STORY OF RADAR
(S. DOC. NO. 89)

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed as a Senate document the articles written by John M. Hightower, for the Associated Press, on Radar, the superweapon recognized as a miracle performer.

Radar is the most revolutionary military device of this war, and was kept a secret until its accomplishments became daily featured news stories. It represents the greatest technical advance in warfare since the original evolution of the military uses of aircraft.

These articles are most informative and a tribute to the ingeniousness of the United States Navy in recognizing the possibilities of Radar and the application of its great effectiveness. The same instruments that are applied to detect the approach of airplanes and surface ships, with but minor changes, are also applicable to many other military uses, therefore making it one of the most useful and far-reaching developments of this war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the articles presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed as a Senate document.

RELIEF OF FARMERS IN FLOOD-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of a measure on the calendar, and if there is objection I shall certainly not undertake to press for its consideration. The bill is an emergency measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 386, Senate bill 1286, to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by flood in 1943. The bill was favorably reported, without amendment, from the Committee on Commerce, and, as I stated, is now on the calendar.

I make the request at this late hour, Mr. President, only because if the measure is to be acted on at all, if anything is to be accomplished by such relief legislation, it is necessary that it be done at the very earliest possible moment. It is necessary that the authorization measure be passed in order that if it is to be done at all, the item may be included in the appropriation bill now pending before the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I merely wish to add my request to that of the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I come from one of the States badly damaged by the floods of this year. The Senator's bill has been favorably reported from the Committee on Commerce, and I join with the Senator in the request for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. TAFT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senate that tomorrow at the hour of reconvening it is hoped that we may proceed to a conclusion of what is known as the N. Y. A. amendment by considering, discussing, and voting upon it.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators I wish to make this observation. I have been asked by many Senators whether the Senate will be in session on Monday. The Fourth of July falls on Sunday, and on Monday throughout the Nation there will probably be observations of the Fourth of July. In view of the fact, however, that the War Production Board and all other Government agencies have urged all factories and plants producing essential materials to work on holidays, and in view of the legislative situation, I feel it my duty to advise the Senate that unless something transpires between now and the adjournment or recess tomorrow night, it is very likely that we will be compelled to hold a session on Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope we will, because four appropriation bills have not as yet been finally acted on, and we certainly ought to stay here until we act on those bills.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that fact. It is largely in view of that situation that I wanted to advise Senators so they may govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. WHITE. I simply wish to indicate my complete approval of the decision taken by the Senator from Kentucky. I think we should work on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. 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 REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Sundry officers for promotion and temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law; and

Several citizens for appointment under the War Manpower Commission.

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

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc, and that the President may be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified immediately.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, July 3, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 2 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Lillian R. Carson, Essex.
Catherine H. Wiggerman, Maurice.

LOUISIANA

Ernest T. Cutter, Robeline.

MISSISSIPPI

Hall W. Wilson, Natchez.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Fred Coates, Provo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 2, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James D. Clark, O. S. A., of the faculty of St. Rita High School, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

O God, mightier than all the forces of arms, crowning with victory the defense of those who trust in Thee, stretch forth Thy hand in mercy to us Thy servants. On this day set apart to honor the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, we are mindful that none has ever had recourse to Thee through the Sacred Heart of Thy Son in vain. Animated by this confidence, we fly to Thee for strength and consolation, groaning as we are beneath the cross of war.

Fortify all of us who fight, whether at home or abroad, for truth and justice and the freedoms which are the birthright of all human beings. In particular, keep in Thy loving, guiding care our President, all Members of this Congress, their beloved families, and all whom they represent. Comfort all who are separated from those they love by the cross of war. Ease the worry and the anxiety of fathers and mothers concerned with the well-being of their children. Give hope to broken hearts. Teach them who mourn the martyred heroes of this war that "we have not here a lasting city," but look for one to come where we shall be reunited to those whom we have loved and lost a while.

Protect our noble and brave men and women who bear the brunt of battle on land, on the sea, under the sea, and in the air. Bring them back nobler still than when they went forth to battle, because they have learned to serve and to sacrifice. Bring them back blessed with victory and peace through Jesus Christ our Lord. And may the blessing of Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit descend upon us and these United States and remain forever. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1252. An act to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

WEALTH OF THE UNITED STATES

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, tucked away in an inconspicuous place in the morning papers is the most important news item that has appeared in many years. It brought instant and complete relief to those of us who have been seriously concerned about the vast expenditures of our Government and the accumulation of the most colossal debt in the history of our country. But, Mr. Speaker, the momentous announcement of that great financier, genius, statesman, humanitarian, liberal, reformer, and chicken raiser, Harold Ickes, has shown us how baseless are our fears and how niggardly Congress has been in restricting appropriations to a few hundred billions of dollars. Versatile Ickes has solved the riddle of how much this country is worth. In this morning's newspaper the Secretary advises us that the wealth of the United States is $12,023,000,000,000, which is the equivalent of $89,000 for each man, woman, and child in the United States. I am not only happy for the Nation and for my financially distressed colleagues in the House, but it is only human that I feel a sense of personal relief to know that I, my wife, and three children are now worth $445,000. My only complaint of the Secretary is that he has withheld from a troubled Congress and Nation this all-important information. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Nation that in this dark and troubled hour there should appear upon the horizon a stupendous intellect and a $12,000,000,000,000 heart to bring hope, consolation, and encouragement to suffering humanity. I now suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Vice President WALLACE revise his plan so as to provide everyone in the world with 12 gallons of milk each day.

SUSPENSION OF RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to recognize Members to move to suspend the rules at any time between now and the time that the House takes its recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. STARNES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article from the Baltimore Sun relative to the cattle situation in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a recent address given by the Governor of Ohio, Hon. John W. Bricker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. First that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

OPERATIONS OF THE O. P. A.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, some of us the other day voted to put in charge of the policy-making departments of O P. A. men who have had practical experience and knowledge of the particular department in which they exercise control. In further substantiation of our vote and that we need practical men in these departments, may I read to you an article that appeared in my local paper entitled "Bushels of Spuds Found on Dump; O. P. A. Is Puzzled":

BUSHELS OF SPUDS FOUND ON DUMP; OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION IS PUZZLED

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 30.—New potatoes, piled knee deep over an area 12 feet square, were found on a dump in the western section of Columbus today.

James Huffman, chief counsel here for the Office of Price Administration, said he was "very puzzled" and assigned investigators to the case.

The potatoes arrived at the dump either last night or early today, Huffman said, but where they came from or why they were discarded was more than he could figure out.

"Maybe some wholesaler told his help to clean out the basement and he was taken too literally," Huffman said. "Darned if I know."

Word of the windfall spread through the area and the potatoes vanished swiftly.

TWO REMARKABLE FAMILIES

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, in my district, which is Westmoreland County, Pa., there are two remarkable families, one in New Kensington and the other in Monessen.

In New Kensington, the aluminum city, there is the Semanski family that has eight sons in the service at this moment. There are six in the Army, one in the Coast Guard, and one in the Navy; three of those in the Army are serving overseas.

In the city of Monessen, Pa., a steel city, there is the Hubans family, that also has eight sons in the service; five in the Army, one in the Coast Guard, and two in the Navy; three of those in the Army are serving overseas.

I wish to pay my tribute to these families and to wish one thing for the father, mother, and brothers and sisters, that they may return safely soon.

JAMES B. M. McNALLY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, the other day the President appointed and the Senate ratified for United States district attorney for the southern district of New York, Mr. James B. M. McNally. I feel that the President is to be complimented upon that appointment, because Mr. McNally is one of the outstanding members of the New York bar and was endorsed by all the bar associations for the office. He has been practicing in New York for the past 20 years. He is one of the greatest trial lawyers we have at the New York bar, and I am certain that his tenure of office as district attorney for the southern district of New York will be marked with that same character and that force and efficiency which he has demonstrated in his private practice.

A graduate of Fordham University Law School, he later became a professor of law at St. Johns University in Brooklyn. As a private practitioner he won the respect of bench and bar. He leaves a lucrative private practice to enter public service.

I had the pleasure of serving with him as a delegate to the constitutional convention of New York State in 1938, where he distinguished himself.

I have no doubt that he will equal and indeed surpass the records of his predecessors in office.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial that appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of two resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Julius H. Altman, president of Chapter No. 5, American War Dads, at a meeting in Enid, Okla., and to include an editorial from the Enid Daily Eagle. My second request is to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GEN. PATRICK HURLEY

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I hail from Oklahoma. Oklahoma is one of the Western States which once had a member of the Cabinet. That member of the Cabinet of yesteryear is one of today's outstanding warriors. He was born near my district in the then Indian Territory. He was Secretary of War under President Hoover's administration, Hon. Patrick Hurley, of Oklahoma.

When this global war started he laid aside his political toga and reached for his sword and has been making battle trying to win this war. We Oklahomans are really proud of him. Mr. Speaker, this distinguished gentleman was recently the guest of the Oklahoma delegation, after having traveled many, many thousands of miles encircling the globe through enemy-infested territory.

Mr. Speaker, Gen. Pat Hurley is typical of the child brought into this world without means; his parents died at an early age, leaving him with nothing but an ambition and a determination which has paid big dividends many, many a time. Mr. Hurley practiced law in Oklahoma; at one time, attorney for the Choctaw Tribe of Indians; made his way in the oil industry, all before his coming to Washington; he has been prominent in politics, but he shelved all partisanism during this global conflict and again answered the call of his country. He stands for America first.

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

SCARCITY OF MEAT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article therein from the New York Times of this morning entitled "Roosevelt Maintains His Lead in the South."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House of a communication I received from the United Nations Committee of Maryland which reads as follows:

UNITED NATIONS COMMITTEE
OF MARYLAND, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., July 1, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: In the light of the sentiment in favor of the Fulbright Resolution, is it not possible to have the House take affirmative action before adjournment? In the name of the Maryland Committee of the United Nations Association and its distinguished sponsorship, we earnestly urge that you take whatever steps are feasible to this end.

With kind personal greetings,
Cordially yours,
MORRIS S. LAZARON,
Executive Vice Chairman.

RACE RIOTS

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution for the appointment of a select committee of this House to investigate the recent race riots in Detroit and Los Angeles, and to find out the causes behind those riots. In my opinion they were not entirely spontaneous; they were created by certain groups that are interested in stirring up dissension in this country. I think that in Detroit it was the remnants of the Ku Klux Klan, the Gerald Smith followers, and other subversive forces that were responsible for the riots. It is vitally important, in my opinion, that we go into this question thoroughly, so that we can uncover the instigators, and thus prevent a recurrence in other cities.

I hope that when the resolution comes before the House it will be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SHORTAGE OF BUTTER

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McKENZIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, since the first settler came to this country and brought with him several cows, it has been the custom of the rural housewife to take her surplus butter—the few pounds it may amount to each week—and use it down at the community store or with her neighbors as a medium of exchange. In fact, along with eggs and chickens, in some sections of this country, it has almost become legal tender.

Now, I am informed by the O. P. A. that the rural housewife can no longer sell her butter; she can no longer take her butter down to the local store and barter it for that little piece of gingham which she may need without getting from them the O. P. A. stamps or points. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this action on the part of the O. P. A. is tending to curtail the production of butter in this country. I say to you that in my own district there are hundreds of thousands of pounds of butter that will not be produced and put into the channels of trade for local consumption if this order is carried out. This community trading in so-called country butter does not in any way interfere with the regulation of commercial or creamery butter or butter substitutes, but, to the contrary, is a boon to the country or local consumer and producer alike. If encouraged, it will greatly reduce the butter shortage in this country, while if, on the other hand, this local trading is curtailed or stopped, we can expect a butter famine. Mr. Speaker, when is O. P. A. going to learn the hard practical facts of life?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, one to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio speech I made last night and the other to extend my remarks and to include a brief editorial from the New York World, New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE]?

There was no objection.

RESPONSIBILITY GOES WITH POWER

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, responsibility must go with power. As a result of events in recent days, the press has been saying that the Congress is taking over control and direction of the domestic front at the present time. If that be true, our responsibility cannot be fully discharged by simply turning down proposals of the Executive. I am not going to argue the question as to whether the Congress can or cannot write a better program on the domestic

problems of the country than has been so far proposed, but I do say we have to write one if we take the responsibility of turning down the one proposed by the President.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement recently appearing in the Boston Post by Hon. Joseph B. Ely, former distinguished Governor of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF VEHICLE USE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, to impose a motor vehicle use tax upon automobile owners of this Nation, who, under existing O. P. A. regulations, are not able to use their cars, is a gross miscarriage of justice, which in my opinion Congress never intended to permit when it enacted this particular tax.

For that reason, I am proposing an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which will provide for a rebate on motor vehicle stamp taxes in all cases where the use of motor vehicles has been curtailed 50 percent from normal use as a result of regulations of the O. P. A. Proposals have been made heretofore to suspend the operation of this indefensible tax, but no action has been taken and no remedial measures adopted. Therefore, in order to deal justly with millions of American car owners, I am asking Congress to authorize rebate of this unjustifiable tax, and urge early consideration of the measure.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

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

THE CONGRESS SHOULD ASSUME ITS RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] that almost everyone recognizes the fact that responsibility goes with power. And now is the time for the Congress to assume its responsibility. I for one have no desire to shirk that responsibility and I would like to have the opportunity to vote for an act which would make unlawful every policy-making order, directive, or regulation issued by the departments. Let the departments administer the law and quit making regulations which the present Supreme Court holds have the force of law.

We have heard this morning and yesterday about the shortage of beef, about the seizure of beef; we have heard about the shortage of butter and the rules and regulations which prevent the manufacture of butter. We know something also about the shortage of corn which is needed for poultry and dairy feed throughout the country. If there is anyone in this country who reads the papers who is aware of the result of some of the O. P. A. and W. P. B. orders who does not think he can write a policy which would be less harmful than the ones we have I would like to know where he lives. Why not write the policy ourselves? That is our duty. And while we are determining policy why not acknowledge that the laws of nature are still in existence, that the law of supply and demand still acts, that neither we nor the bureaucrats have control over rain or sunshine?

More than 2 years ago, in November of 1940, a bill was introduced by me which would have done much to stabilize prices and prevent inflation. Some day the principles of that bill will be put into law. Why not consider it now?

SMITH-CONNALLY BILL

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, now that a week has passed and some heads that were rather warm have cooled off, I should like the RECORD to show that I regret exceedingly that the hysteria of some of the Members of this House last week, 1 week ago today, prevented my being here at the moment to vote against the majority. Had I been here I would have taken great pleasure in voting against the majority, to sustain the President's veto.

OUR PUBLIC POWER PROGRAM

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was certainly amusing to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], who was not here to vote on the proposition, talk about the rest of us having hysteria in forcing the passage of the antistrike bill over the veto. We at least had our hysteria at the right place, here in the House, the place to which we were all elected and for which we are being paid.

We rendered a great service to the American people in the passage of that salutary measure—and there was really no hysteria manifested.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, while the House was crippling our public power program, we were advised by the local papers that the Government of the United States is being overcharged at least $150,000 a year for electricity in the War Department's Pentagon Building.

This is exactly what we were trying to prevent in California yesterday. It is what the power monopoly is driving at.

It is what the Power Trust is driving at in Oregon and in Washington, that is, to cripple this public power program in order to plunder the people with exorbitant overcharges, as they are doing in many States now.

In my speech day before yesterday, which you will find on page 6844 of the RECORD of that day, I inserted the figures showing that the American people were overcharged more than a billion dollars for their electricity in 1942; and I broke those overcharges down by States.

For instance the people of Tennessee used 4,833,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity last year and paid $40,183,000 for it.

The people of Massachusetts used 4,322,000,000 kilowatt-hours and paid $113,448,000 for it.

The people of Texas used 4,716,000,000 kilowatt-hours and paid $95,196,000 for it.

Yet here we have Members refusing to develop the water power of this Nation, refusing to back up our public power program that is sound and that would protect the American people against such overcharges.

I wish I had time to make the comparisons for every State in the Union. But I refer you to the tables I inserted on June 30. They speak for themselves. If the people who pay these overcharges knew the facts there would be such a ground swell of protest that Congress would not dare permit these injustices to continue. The people of every State should have their rates reduced to the T. V. A. rates as reflected in the figures for the State of Tennessee.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by him.

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

There was no objection.

INFLATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the spiral of inflation is the most prominent subject before the American people today. The cost of the World War was $32,000,000,000, of which $13,500,000,000 was inflation. The same rate in this war would have an inflationary value as of this date of $28,000,000,000. By the end of this year, 1943, at the same rate as the World War, the inflation bill to the American public would be $70,000,000,000. This is a matter that should have the attention of this Congress. The people cannot stand these prices. Some peg must be placed to stop inflation. The President has suggested a program with which I have attempted to cooperate. If Congress does not approve the President's plan, at least it should suggest one of its own.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a radio address delivered by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Thursday, July 1, 1943, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 1, 1943:

H. R. 332. An act to revise the Alaska game law;

H. R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2513. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, for the purpose of considering the two Senate amendments still in disagreement en bloc.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 98: On page 76, line 17, strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$7,818,748."

Amendment No. 99: On page 76, line 21, strike out the following: *"Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adhere to its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 98 and 99.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House adhere to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 98 and 99.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] only for the purpose of offering a motion.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PACE moves that the House recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language passed by the House (lines 13 to 24 on page 76 and lines 1 and 2 on page 77) and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

"Administrative and operating expenses: For operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501–1518; 55 Stat. 255–256) $3,500,000, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, together with the unobligated balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1943."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the language of the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia that it is not relevant to the subject matter. The motion is offered in part in lieu of language which has not been stricken from the bill and in regard to which the two Houses are not in disagreement.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I think that technically the point of order is good. I ask unanimous consent to have the opportunity to restate the amendment. It will be observed by the Chair that while it does strike out the House language, it immediately reinserts it word for word. It is not in substance a striking out of a single word in the House language, except that it inserts an amendment word for word that incorporates the House language with the suggested changes.

The SPEAKER. That does not cure the situation. As the matter stands, the gentleman has offered a motion to strike out certain language that the two Houses have agreed to. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion that the House recede and concur with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$7,718,748", and insert "$3,500,000", and in lieu of the matter stricken by Senate amendment numbered 99 beginning with the word *"Provided"* in line 21, page 76, and ending with the figures "1943" on page 77, and insert "together with the unobligated balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1943."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PACE moves that the House recede and concur with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$7,818,748" and insert "$3,500,000" and in lieu of the matter stricken insert "together with the unobligated balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1943."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the motion of the gentleman now submitted on amendment numbered 98 and point out that the objective of the motion of the gentleman would be accomplished by insisting on the House disagreement to the Senate amendment, because he proposes to strike out the amount in the Senate amendment and immediately reinsert the figures stated in the House bill. As far as his amendment to Senate amendment numbered 99 is concerned, he proposes to reappropriate an unexpended balance which is a separate matter, with which that amendment does not deal. It is not relevant to amendment numbered 99, which strikes out the proviso providing for the liquidation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold that the first part of the gentleman's motion would be in order, but he is compelled to hold that the second part is not germane. Does the gentleman desire to offer another amendment?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following, that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment with an amendment as follows——

The SPEAKER. Which Senate amendment?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order, the two amendments being considered together, to move to insist on one and recede on the other, inasmuch as they are being considered together?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to concur——

Mr. PACE. In the $3,500,000.

The SPEAKER. To recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 98?

Mr. PACE. No; I desire to insist on the House position on amendment numbered 98, on the $3,500,000, and concur in the Senate amendment numbered 99. The motion would be to insist on the House position on amendment numbered 98, and recede and concur on the Senate amendment numbered 99.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. PACE of Georgia: Mr. PACE moves that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 98, and recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 99.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of the amendments has been debated in the House on several different occasions. The House has had 3 votes upon it, 2 roll calls, and 1 standing vote on the subject matter involved. On the

last roll call the vote was 233 to 135 to sustain the House position. I do not believe that the House desires that the entire subject matter be discussed here again by men who have heretofore made speeches upon it and I now move the previous question.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he moves the previous question?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia to order the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 113, noes 16.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 126]

Barden	Harness, Ind.	O'Leary
Barry	Hays	Phillips
Bradley, Mich.	Hébert	Plumley
Buckley	Holifield	Pracht
Cannon, Fla.	Izac	Price
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Ward	Robsion, Ky.
Capozzoli	Kennedy	Rowe
Cochran	Kilburn	Russell
Culkin	King	Shafer
Domengeaux	Lea	Sheridan
Drewry	Lesinski	Simpson, Ill.
Fay	McKenzie	Stevenson
Fitzpatrick	Maloney	Tolan
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Treadway
Fulmer	Mason	Van Zandt
Furlong	Merritt	Vinson, Ga.
Gallagher	Morrison, La.	Wasielewski
Gifford	Morrison, N. C.	West
Green	Norton	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, Ill.	
	O'Hara	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-two Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 111 to 119, inclusive, may be considered en bloc and that the House further insist upon its disagreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, there are so many of these items that we want to dispose of as many of them en bloc as possible. I do want to suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma, however, that there are two or three Members on this side who would like to be heard briefly on some of these projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I assure the gentleman from California that those Members who wish to be heard will have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. CARTER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 111: Page 72, line 15, insert "Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $3,600,000."

Amendment No. 112: Page 72, line 17, insert "Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch, $4,100,000."

Amendment No. 113: Page 72, line 18, insert "Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, $1,985,000: *Provided*, That of the total construction cost of all features of the project not to exceed $3,080,000 shall be reimbursable under the provisions of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902."

Amendment No. 114: Page 72, line 22, insert "Tucumcari project, New Mexico, $1,200,000."

Amendment No. 115: Page 72, line 23, insert "Yakima project, Washington, Roza division, $1,415,000."

Amendment No. 117: Page 73, line 11, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$275,000."

Amendment No. 118: Page 73, line 12, strike out "$350,000" and insert "$400,000."

Amendment No. 119: Page 73, line 13, strike out "$12,100,000" and insert "$43,200,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments Nos. 111 to 119, inclusive.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, when I appeared before the Subcommittee on the Appropriation for the Interior Department, the gentleman from Oklahoma expressed complete approval of our project—the Colorado-Big Thompson. This is not a new project and does not bring into cultivation any new land, nor is it a development at the expense of the Federal Government. This is a conservancy district that is bonded for the entire amount necessary to complete the project, and the Federal Government is only making a loan to the district for the completion of the project and will be reimbursed for the entire cost.

In appearing before the subcommittee, I stated that more than 300,000 acres of cultivated land would be affected by this modified program now being considered in this appropriation act. One hundred thousand acre-feet of water, all for supplemental use, can be transferred from the western side of the Rocky Mountains to the eastern side when the tunnel is finished and a dam constructed on the Colorado River. This farm land is in a high state of cultivation and produces critical war crops necessary for the prosecution of the war. Our farmers have the machinery and they are experienced and ready to meet the program as outlined by the Department of Agriculture for the production of the very crops which today are so vitally needed in the prosecution of this war.

When the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Grover B. Hill, appeared before this subcommittee, he said:

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

While the War Production Board has placed a stop order on the use of critical material for the continuation of this project, we now find that they are reconsidering the matter and that the War Food Administrator has given his approval that this irrigation project be allowed enough steel and other critical materials to finish the temporary or modified plan.

The President, himself, in a letter to Governor Vivian, of Colorado, said:

> Thank you for the information which you provided in your letter of May 12 concerning the Colorado-Big Thompson project in your State. I am informed that the application for permission to resume work on the modified plan mentioned in your letter is now before the War Production Board. The War Food Administrator has recommended the resumption of work, and I hope that the Board will soon find it possible to revoke the stop order. The Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation has been requested to advise you immediately upon receipt of work that the War Production Board has acted.

Only this morning I received a copy of a letter from the Director of the Steel Division of the War Production Board in which he states, and I quote:

> The grade of steel from which reinforcing bars are rolled is not considered critical at this time, and with the essentiality established, the tonnage you require should be readily available from (1) current stocks, (2) producers of rail-steel bars, or (3) producers of billet steel using top cuts, discard, etc.
>
> The facilities of producers and fabricators are not now being fully employed, due primarily to the gradual completion of the war construction program. We can foresee no appreciable change in this situation for the duration.

From this it can readily be understood why we are insisting that our subcommittee approve the appropriation for $3,600,000 for the Colorado Big-Thompson project and I trust the House will support this Senate amendment.

So steel for our western projects is available and there is no excuse for not beginning work on these projects.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Do I understand the gentleman to say the President is for this project?

Mr. HILL. Absolutely. He is for the finishing of all 17 projects in the West that are necessary for the production of food for the war effort.

Mr. GRANGER. And the War Food Administration is for it?

Mr. HILL. The War Food Administration.

Mr. GRANGER. And Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board?

Mr. HILL. Absolutely.

Mr. GRANGER. And the Senate of the United States?

Mr. HILL. And the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GRANGER. Well, what is holding it up?

Mr. HILL. I think that this House will act favorably on these amendments.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The House is not holding it up, I want the gentleman to know, because we have favored those projects which have a Budget estimate, and yours is one of them.

Mr. HILL. That is right. I understand the House favors these reclamation projects that have Budget estimates.

Mr. JENSEN. That is true.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, history reveals that protein was one of the important factors contributing to the failure of Germany to successfully prosecute World War No. 1. The supply of protein foods in this country now during World War No. 2, both for animal and human consumption, is one of our most acute and serious problems. Are we going to face a food problem in this country that will give us a food supply of not enough too soon? The Senate has shown wisdom in endeavoring to set aside moneys to be expended for developing a sane and safe food program for this country. We are going to have to increase production in order to face this emergency. We have the word last night of Elmer Davis, who said we are going to have to increase our production from 350,000,000 to 385,000,000 acres of food-producing lands this year. There are two ways to bring about that expansion. The first is to till and plow the arid regions of the Rocky Mountain Plains area and throw that section of country back into a second Dust Bowl, or there is the program of bringing water upon productive lands that will in turn produce those commodities of high protein value that are so badly needed in this war effort and at the same time increase the badly needed acreage.

Secondly, nor is it going to be sufficient to produce food only for the war emergency. There is going to be a terrific demand for food for at least 2 years post-war and that program is being talked of today very seriously by individuals who are interested in keeping this program from coming to the place of not enough too soon.

The Senate of the United States is right in placing $1,415,000 for the appropriation for the completion of the Yakima project, Washington, Roza division. This project itself has one very unique characteristic attached to it; it is going to throw new lands into production that are capable of producing the vital proteins necessary; and secondly, it will bring into production land that will accommodate approximately 1,000 families recently dislocated by the purchase by the Army of 10,500 irrigated acres of land. This acreage has been put out of production for the erection of an ordnance plant. The completion of this project would bring these families dislocated by such action back into producing foodstuffs.

I urge your serious consideration in placing before you the necessity of the completion of this project substantiated by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Agriculture Department, which said it could be done in 1 year, and that is why it has been recommended.

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

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the gentleman for the fine presentation he made before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the Interior.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. As he will remember, we had no Budget estimate when this bill was under consideration by the committee for that item.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. We listened to the gentleman from Washington with a great deal of interest and he has a fine project. Since that time the Budget has, through the gentleman's efforts, given us an estimate on this project of $865,000.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Yes; that is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Which the House agreed to. So, I think the gentleman probably is just a little out of order when he gives the Senate the whole credit. Certainly the gentleman is deserving of a little credit himself.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I thank the gentleman. But the Senate made the recommendation and in the face of the fact that it could be completed in 1 year. In other words, the Budget Bureau estimate was based on a 2-year program rather than 1 year as recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation. That is why the appropriation should remain $1,415,000 as recommended by the Senate. I urge the House to recognize that important fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, since the budget was prepared by the Department of the Interior with the provisions for the appropriation items carried in this bill and since it was passed, on the basis of the Budget estimate when it came to the House, a new emergency has arisen in this country—a food emergency, and it is getting worse every minute.

We are coasting along now with the things from the gardens and we will probably get by this fall with the harvest coming along, and we may do pretty well through Christmas, but I want to tell the House that when next January, February, and March roll around, the people of the United States are not going to be eating. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who got up on the floor of the House yesterday and said that the cattle of the West should be seized and brought to New York to feed his hungry constituents, is not going to be the only one you will hear from on this floor before we settle this food emergency.

The Senate, in its wisdom, in taking up this bill, has put in a few items to prepare land and to bring water on land, so that it can produce food as well as increase production on the lands already under irrigation.

We have one item in this bill for the Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch, to resume work that has been shut down. I know about the Anderson Ranch and I know about the situation in Idaho. I know that this project deals with one of the finest of the various irrigation sections of the country. I know it deals with a section of the country where President Roosevelt, during his tour through the West, stopped and put in a whole day and saw the immense amount of food and dairy products that are being produced from this land.

I know that the land in this district is short of water. I know that they cannot produce dairy products in the fall when the pastures dry up. I know there is not enough moisture to put the sugar in the sugar beets in the fall, and they must have more water if we are going to have more cream and butter, sugar, and beef.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are dealing with here. I want to say to the conferees who are insisting that these reclamation items be sent back to the Senate that they should join hands with the Senate in its efforts to bring back these small appropriation items that we must have in order to produce the food so the people of this country may eat. That is the question involved here in these reclamation items. There can be no doubt, as far as production in the West is concerned, that we need these reclamation districts in order to feed the people of the United States, to maintain the men in the Army and the Navy, and supply our allies. This country has been and is being stripped bare; we have sent so much food out of the country that when next spring rolls around we are not going to eat unless we do something about the food situation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the conferees, instead of riding the Senate, will agree to these items and join with the Senate in putting them in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 120. Page 73, line 15:

"WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

"For the construction of water conservation and utilization projects and small reservoirs, including not to exceed $220,000 for surveys, investigations, and administrative

expenses in connection therewith (of which not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia), all as authorized by the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590y, 590z), $4,000,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my remarks especially to the distinguished Subcommittee on Appropriations for Interior.

As the committee well knows, these projects, in disagreement, were commenced under the Case-Wheeler Act and were partially financed by W. P. A. and C. C. C. Since those two organizations have gone out of existence, and the War Production Board's stop order was issued these projects have been standing in an uncompleted condition. With particular reference to the one in my district known as the Newton project, which, by the way, is the smallest of the projects considered in the amendment 120 now in disagreement, I want the committee to take my word for it respecting the condition of this project because I have been on the ground myself within the last month. The project is half completed, all the strategic material has already been put into the project; the equipment is still on the ground, being cared for by watchmen and by mechanics to keep the equipment in repair. Trained men are already there to operate the equipment. It will take $275,000 to complete this small project in a fertile valley that will produce anywhere from 18 to 25 tons of sugar beets per acre, and will produce other vital food crops that are so necessary at this time. It seems to me that with the call being made on this country to increase food production acreage from 255,000,000 to 380,000,000 acres, according to Mr. Davis, they have got to depend upon a portion of the increased acreage from irrigation and reclamation projects such as are here being discussed and appropriation for which are embraced in this bill. I hope the committee will look with favor upon this as a war food emergency program. I do not believe the committee should stand on any rule it might have adopted previously that because there is no Budget estimate for some of these projects they should not be completed. It seems to me it is a waste of money to let these projects stand in their present uncompleted state. It is the part of wisdom and good business sense to complete these projects. In my particular case 200 families can be placed upon profitable farms, who, in turn, would aid in the production of food that is so badly needed at the present time.

The Newton project was recommended as one necessary in the production-of-food program by the Bureau of Reclamation, the War Food Administrator, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and funds were provided by the Senate. At this point I desire to put into the RECORD a telegram just received from the State engineer of Utah which reads as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *July 2, 1943.*

Hon. WALTER K. GRANGER,
House Office Building:

Newton Dam unsafe. My nonstorage order in force. Temporary repairs exceeding $21,000 deemed unwise burden on water users. For production food urge you secure construction stop-order release for new permanent dam now partly constructed.

ED H. WATSON.

Members of the House and the committee, I emphasize that here is a project vitally needed in the production of food, half completed, needs very little strategic material, all equipment necessary to build it is now on the ground, men are already available who have been trained to operate this machinery. Is there any reason, in spite of the fact that there has not been a Budget estimate for it, why it should not be completed?

If we wait until fall for this appropriation, as the chairman indicated, it will simply mean putting off the production of food, as far as this project is concerned, another additional year. If we are sincere in our belief that there is a shortage of food, our sincerity will be tested in a case of this kind, and I am sure there are other projects in the same category deserving the same consideration.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to offer a preferential motion to recede and concur, but I have confidence in the good judgment of the subcommittee that they will see to it that appropriations are made available for these projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned in the item which is in dispute designated as amendment No. 120, providing $4,000,000 for water conservation and utilization projects. This, as the gentleman from Utah has so well said, is designed to take care of small irrigation projects which have been begun and carried on under what is known as the Case-Wheeler Act permitting construction of small irrigation projects which but for that act would be impossible. This $4,000,000 embraces $300,000 for the completion of what is known as Buffalo Rapids No. 2 project.

Buffalo Rapids project is perhaps the first of its kind in the Great Plains States for farm stabilization and water conservation utilization program. Its purpose is to reclaim semiarid lands and rehabilitate many droughted-out farmers. The cost of the project is about $1,840,000—approximately $740,000 is reimbursable. A lot of this work was done by the Work Projects Administration. This project No. 2 includes units known as the Terry, Fallon, and Fallon prelift. All are pumping units served by power from Fort Peck and with water pumped from the Yellowstone River. Construction began in September 1940. It is said authoritatively that this project will reclaim 11,000 acres approximately. In connection with the urgent necessity for the increased production of food in the coming years, it seems to me that it is imperative that this project be completed. I do not need to again remind the House, as I have done time after time for the past year and half, we are going to be short of food. We have taken upon ourselves not only to feed this country including our Army, Navy and civilian population but likewise through lend-lease and our good neighbor policy we have taken on the burden of feeding other nations as well.

My understanding is that the former Food Administrator, Chester Davis, approved the completion of this project in connection with the necessity for increasing our food production for the year 1944. I have also been informed that the Bureau of Reclamation has likewise recommended its completion as quickly as possible.

There is no denying the fact that the only place to which we can turn today for an increase of food production is to the small irrigation projects of the Western States. There we can secure a large acreage of land that will produce alfalfa, wheat, sugar beets, potatoes, beans, and all that sort of food at a lower cost than any place else. I realize the position the committee has taken; I realize they are trying to economize. I further realize that our distinguished chairman of this subcommittee has always been a very good friend of irrigation and reclamation projects. I also know there are many others on this committee who feel the same way as he does about it. I am not going to make any preferential motion to have this $4,000,000 included because I am a little bit fearful in view of what happened here yesterday that such motion would be voted down. I am going to rely upon our chairman and upon the members of the committee to realize the full necessity of creating and bringing into production a larger acreage of land for the production of the crops we will need next year in our war effort. I believe the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma will help us on this matter—at least I am hopeful of it.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment, written in the Senate, covers irrigation projects in many States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the hard task that the conferees have on their hands. They have been patient and tireless. I concur with the gentleman from Montana that perhaps a vote on this particular item, amendment No. 120, would not be wise. At this stage of the proceedings, with the fiscal year already at a close, there is a strong tendency in the House to follow the conferees. A vote would not be a true test of the merits of this item. That means, then, that the only thing we can

do is to appeal to the gentlemen on the conference committee.

This $4,000,000 item, represented by amendment No. 20, will be spent on a number of small irrigation projects in eight different States, and it will do more to increase the production of food than any other $4,000,000 you could spend.

Right now we have in my district 3,000 prisoners being moved in waiting to do worth-while work that will help this Nation with its necessary economy. War prisoners should be put to work on permanent worth-while improvements.

We should not take this Budget trouble too seriously. We have had busy times here, but do you realize that every item that comes to the Senate or House is channeled through the Bureau of the Budget. The Budget, too, has been busy. Consequently many worth-while things have been presented by the Food Administration, by the Bureau of Reclamation, and by the War Production Board that have not been heard in detail by the Bureau of the Budget. Eventually Budget will O. K. this item.

The passage of this amendment will provide two projects in my State. One of them has the steel and the other critical materials lying on the ground. Do you think construction ought to go ahead? I know that if the right presentation could be made to the Bureau of the Budget, and it has time to reach it it would say, "Go ahead." I think that is what the conferees ought to do. I believe that they will be well satisfied with their effort if they decide this question on the basis of more food. The conferees should resolve any doubt in favor of more food production.

I want to call as my witness Mr. Donald Nelson, and I hope the members of the committee will follow me in this. This is a letter from Donald Nelson dated June 29 and states:

> At the request of the Food Administrator, then Mr. Chester C. Davis, the War Production Board has been giving consideration to a number of irrigation projects which would increase food production.
>
> We have not completed our study of the projects with the War Food Administrator.

All must realize there has been a change of Food Administrators, consequently the stubborn insistence of the conferees that this clear through the Budget cannot be met before this House recesses and time is of the essence.

Going on with Mr. Donald Nelson's letter, he says this:

> It would be my suggestion that appropriation be made by the Congress for those projects which they consider necessary, and just as soon as manpower and materials can be made available we shall be glad to give proper consideration to them.

Why not follow Mr. Nelson and appropriate this money?

The War Production Board says, "We will wait on the Budget," the Budget says, "We will wait on War Production Board," and Congress says, "We will wait on the Budget." So we go around in a vicious circle and the food program is retarded. The public rightly demands action on the food front.

I want to read what Chester Davis had to say on June 7, 1943:

> Our present food-production resources in established areas already are operating at capacity; therefore, the only means of increasing the output would be through development which will permit more intensive cultivation. Through the development of additional irrigation acreage, production of these foods can be increased in certain and stable amounts without in any way sacrificing the output of other essential crops and livestock products.

I believe anyone familiar with this problem will agree that to wait until next fall to appropriate this same amount of money that the House conferees say that they are willing to appropriate is a tragic mistake. Time is of the essence in growing food. Time is of the essence in building these projects and preparing the ground. To fail to act now means the loss of an entire crop year.

I appeal to the conferees to do the patriotic thing and accept amendment No. 120.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to offer a preferential motion for exactly the same reason as stated by the gentleman who has just left the floor and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]. I am willing to leave this matter of small reclamation projects in the hands of the conferees, having yesterday the assurance of the gentleman in charge of the bill that they will take this important matter under advisement at the earliest possible moment.

I do want to stress again the need for haste, just as the gentleman who left the floor a moment ago indicated. I think the illustration I am about to use is an apt figure of speech. In modern war the first great assault by a mechanized force is usually referred to as the panzer attack and is a large-scale effort. After this large-scale attack, no less important is the mopping-up process of many smaller efforts. For many years, at least for four decades, the United States Government has been, through the Reclamation Bureau, waging relentless war upon the so-called Great American Desert. The building of such huge dams as Roosevelt Dam in my State, Elephant Butte Dam nearby, down to Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee, were the panzer attacks.

Mr. Speaker, we have done much in this way, but such big projects involve huge sums and long-range planning. In recent years we have changed our method of attack and have begun a mopping-up process through small irrigation projects under the Wheeler-Case Act. Many of these in eight or more States make possible a maximum of food production in a minimum of time.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to point out that if we wait until fall to appropriate this money, and the House conferees are agreed that it will probably be appropriated in the fall, we lose 1 crop year.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true. It is said that these projects fall within about eight States. I do not believe any of them falls within my State, but I do know there are many of these that are now half-completed projects. There is one project in my State on which $10,000,000 has already been spent. The storage dam is there, the diversion dam is there, 18 miles of canal are there, everything is there excepting the twig ends of canals—that is, laterals to put water on thousands of acres of desert land. This should be put to use at once, and it could be done without the outlay of much money, and it could be done quickly, in time to produce additional food this year in a country where we grow crops for 12 months in the year.

We produce alfalfa, for instance, all year round, getting five and six cuttings in a 12-month period. That is the possibility of some of these uncompleted projects. I ask the committee, the conferees especially, to help us along with this mopping-up process in this war on the desert, for that is exactly the most feasible way to get this food-production program enlarged as it must be.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Did the gentleman notice in the press yesterday where Mr. Davis said that next year's program would call for probably 380,000,000 acres, an increase of 30,000,000 acres of cultivated ground?

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not notice that in the press, but I do know that Chester Davis, as well as Donald Nelson, is strongly in favor of these very projects. It is only a matter of red tape that we do not have the Budget estimates to back them now.

Mr. GRANGER. They have made that acreage basis on the theory that these projects are going to be completed and used in the production of food.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to tell the committee that not only for the duration of this war but for many years after the war we are going to have need for food production, more than we can possibly produce with the acreage now in cultivation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the colloquy between the chairman of this Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], which occurred yesterday when we began discussing reclamation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman. I think I should further add that all of these projects are commendable projects. I think they would be desirable, probably the finest thing that we could think of for a post-war program. It occurs to me that if either the stop orders should be lifted or Budget estimates secured by the time we return in September, then the deficiency committee certainly will consider and may well consider these projects favorably. I think I may say that it will consider all of these projects for which stop orders may be lifted. I am a member of that deficiency committee, and I think I know how the members feel about anything that will produce more food. We are not opposed to the projects; I want to make that perfectly plain. I am very strongly for reclamation projects, even though I have none in my own district. The truth about this is that we have neither Budget estimates nor War Production Board approval for these projects with the possible exception of one.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CARTER. May I say that I concur in what the gentleman says in regard to these projects that lack Budget estimates and lack removal of the stop orders. Even if we do recess, we are going to be back here in September. If those stop orders are removed and Budget estimates are obtained, the projects can be presented at once to the deficiency committee and we can consider them in an orderly way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a member of the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] and I are naturally extremely anxious that there be included in this bill sufficient funds for the Tucumcari project. However, we are entirely happy to follow the pattern established by our colleagues in suggesting that this matter should be well handled by our conferees as it has been in the past.

I do think we ought to bear in mind that there is a very serious problem confronting this country now when we come to a decision as to how additional acreage is going to be put in cultivation. There will be a temptation shortly to go out and rip up the new sod that is being grown in the Dust Bowl areas. I think this House ought to have that problem firmly in mind to make sure that when this new land is brought into cultivation it not be the type of land that results ultimately in dust bowls but be one of these irrigated areas.

I spent the early part of my lifetime on the Plains of the Dakotas. I saw that country turned up, fine buffalo grass ripped out, and western South Dakota develop very quickly into a great dusty area where formerly it had been a fine cattle country.

I lived to go down and be a neighbor to the high plains countries of Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. There I saw that same thing repeated. The minute that prices got good, the minute the land got valuable, it was ripped up and "the plow that broke the Plains" resulted in the development of the great dust areas.

Just a few months ago I drove through the corner of Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas and saw there the 300,000 acres that this Government has placed under fence, land that was once a desperate-looking Dust Bowl. I am happy to say to this House that as a result of legislation passed by the Congress when I was not a Member of it—I am not trying, therefore, to take any credit for it—these 300,000 acres are back in grass. The Dust Bowl has vanished. The area has been saved.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that we farmers from the cities helped materially in having that brought about.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am very happy to acknowledge it. I am happy to say that the support for it came from both sides of the aisle. It was a fine piece of legislation, of which we are all proud.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I suggest to the gentleman that he has placed his finger on a very important feature of this whole business. By all means we must not plow up this grassland. The best way to increase the productive area is, just as the gentleman says, to increase our irrigated lands and leave the grasslands alone, and not make them again a place for the winds to lift their soil into the heavens and carry it from the Great Plains States down as far as the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. As a friend and near neighbor of the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, I wish to join with him in expressing the hope that the conferees will do something about the Tucumcari project, because I regard it as one of the most deserving in the West. I have personal knowledge of the situation.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman, who is a fine neighbor and a fine friend of that country.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I wish to compliment the gentleman from New Mexico on the splendid reclamation talk he has been making. I assure him that the reclamation-minded Representatives from California, despite what was said yesterday, will support him to a man, I think.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman. I assure the gentleman that the action I took yesterday was not based upon a desire to defeat any of the projects in California. As I tried to explain, the conference report must come back on a basis that can be accepted by the House. If it carries merely a recommendation to include large sums of money without an entire well-rounded group program, it has no possibility of success. I want to see brought back to this House a conference report that represents something that will be accepted by the House, and that can happen only when our conferees come back well satisfied with the work they have done.

I plead with this House to bear in mind that the temptation will be ahead of us to take this new land that has been brought under grass again and rip it up and quickly plant it to crops, because it can be more quickly handled than any other part. But if we do that, we have destroyed the very thing we have worked for for years. This House must take the position that it will keep in grass these areas upon which the Government has spent millions of dollars to develop top soil again.

It has required many years of hard work; it must not be passed over with a wartime program.

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

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION BILL—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that the veto message of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be read at 2:30 today and brought up for consideration and action by the House at that time.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of getting more food for our armed forces, our civilian population, and our friends overseas is of primary importance at this time. The recent floods in the Middle West, not to mention early frosts and other destructive agents, have lessened our already limited prospects for food production this year. It becomes constantly more evident that additional land must be placed under cultivation in addition to making, insofar as is possible, our presently cultivated lands produce more. We have two choices—either to plow up more dry land, such as was done in sections of Colorado, Texas, and Oklahoma, during and following the last World War, or to get more land under irrigation. The dust storms and other serious consequences, both to the land and to health, that followed the plowing up of the Dust Bowl should not be repeated. The alternative answer to our food problems must be more storage facilities for water to be used for irrigation.

Stop orders have involved a serious delay in the development of 877,500 acres of new land and 2,085,000 acres of presently cultivated land for which a supplemental water supply is needed.

The item in the bill having to do with completing small reservoirs and dams promises the quickest and the cheapest answer to the question of increasing our food production. During the depression and under the Case-Wheeler Act, W. P. A. and C. C. C. labor was used in the construction of many small dams and reservoirs in the Rocky Mountain area. These reservoirs are partially completed. They are of no value now and unless they are cared for soon, much of the work that has been done will be permanently lost. Already the War Food Administration has approved some of these projects to alleviate the food shortages. The necessary materials to complete the work is, in many instances, on the ground and labor is available.

To assist in the immediate completion of these smaller irrigation projects, the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the House has unanimously reported out two bills to permit the expenditure of appropriated money in lieu of "services, labor, materials, and other property" under the Case-Wheeler Act.

It is my hope that the conference committee will reconsider its action and agree to the amount approved by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, before moving the previous question I desire to make a brief statement with reference to this particular amendment. Several Members have said that the chairman of this subcommittee has in the past favored an appropriation under the Case-Wheeler Act. These statements are true and correct and absolutely in keeping with the RECORD. I think I am not violating any rules or secrets of the committee when I say that the other members of the conference committee also realize the importance of this great problem under the Case-Wheeler Act, which will provide an additional water supply in arid and semi-arid areas. My own State of Oklahoma, especially in the western and northwestern portions, is tremendously interested in this item, but, as I am sure you gentlemen know, there is no Budget estimate for this item nor is there a recommendation by the War Production Board. As Members also know these projects have been handicapped by the loss of the C. C. C. and the W. P. A. labor, and as Members also will recall, these projects are considered feasible only with the W. P. A. and C. C. C. aid. Let me read from the testimony with reference to this particular item, so that Members may understand the position of the House conferees. Here is a statement in the record of the hearings by the Acting Commisisoner of Reclamation with reference to this particular item:

These projects contemplated the use of contributed labor from the Work Projects Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, and are set up upon the theory that the water users can pay the allocation that the President makes out of this lump sum appropriation. Projects of this kind are now handicapped, of course, by reason of the fact that Work Projects Administration labor has disappeared and Civilian Conservation Corps labor has disappeared. In the place of those two in some cases we have C. C. S. camps—that is the conscientious objectors—and we are planning on the establishment of conscientious objectors' camps on the Mancos project about the 1st of July.

In addition to that, there is legislation pending now in the Congress authorizing taking into consideration the necessity for the growing of more foodstuffs to win the war which, if passed, will make many of these projects, and possibly all of them, financially feasible. The committee hopes that such legislation will pass, and we will then have a green light on these particular projects.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. In lieu of the C. C. C. camp labor and the W. P. A. labor, the Army has already moved into the area of these projects prisoners of war, prison labor, and they are ready and unless this committee acts, the months and years will roll by.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I am sure he knows my personal appreciation of this program.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that the Bureau of Reclamation has recommended what is known as the Buffalo Rapids No. 2 in eastern Montana to be completed upon the theory that it is in the course of completion now, and that it will bring into production in the neighborhood of 11,000 acres? I think that was recommended by the Reclamation Bureau, and likewise by Mr. Chester Davis, the Food Administrator, who was familiar with the area, having lived in Montana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is more familiar with the recommendations than I am, but if the gentleman says that that recommendation has been made I am sure that it has been made, because the House must depend upon the gentleman's statement. I am of opinion, however, that that recommendation has been made to another committee at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I was informed that what I stated occurred.

Mr. MURDOCK. Confirming what the chairman said a few minutes ago that legislation is now pending which would authorize further appropriations for these much-needed food projects, I may say that the House Reclamation Committee has already reported out favorably H. R. 3018 and H. R. 3019, and similar or identical bills have been reported out by a committee of the Senate, so they are in process of enactment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the extreme urgency of providing funds for the construction of water conservation and utilization projects and for the development, completion, and expansion of irrigation and reclamation projects in the West. These projects are of vital importance at this time for the reason that they offer the surest and quickest means and method of providing more food and fiber so badly needed to supply not only our present needs, but to build a stock-pile for postwar requirements. In providing food for ourselves and for nations that will be dependent upon us when the war is over, we must never be accused of providing too little, too late.

The fate of many human beings depends upon our foresight and judgment. In this connection, I wish to call attention to the possibilities of production from the developed and undeveloped irrigation projects of Wyoming.

Under these projects, new virgin land is available and awaits only proper development to produce in great quantities.

The Eden Valley project in Sweetwater County, Wyo., may be developed to add an additional 8,500 acres of productive lands in 1944.

The Riverton project will add 52,000 acres for 1944, and the Shoshone-Heart Mountain project will add approximately 26,000 acres for 1944.

We have all come suddenly face to face with the startling fact that there is a shortage of food and fiber and that every available acre must be made to produce if we are to meet the demands of our civilian population, our armed forces, and at the same time, meet the requirements of lend-lease.

These irrigation projects provide the surest method of supplying these needs, and support of these appropriations to continue their development is mandatory upon us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 121: Page 74, line 14, insert "Services or labor of prisoners of war, enemy aliens, and American-born Japanese who are in the control of the Federal Government may be utilized in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of Federal reclamation projects, water conservation and utilization projects, Indian irrigation projects, and related work, subject to the approval of, and regulations by, the War Department or other Federal agency having control of such persons."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COOPER]. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 142. Page 82, line 7, insert: "Protection of mineral resources and facilities (national defense): For all expenses necessary to enable the Bureau of Mines, independently or in cooperation with

other agencies, public or private, to initiate and augment measures to prevent subversive activities from interfering with the extraction and processing of minerals, including not to exceed $35,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed $5,000), maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; not to exceed $3,500 for printing and binding; purchase of special apparel and equipment for the protection of employees while engaged in their work; and purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation 'Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior,' $475,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 142 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"In line 6 of said amendment strike out '$35,000' and insert '$30,000.'

"In line 8 of said amendment strike out '$5,000' and insert '$4,500.'

"In line 12 of said amendment strike out '$3,500' and insert '$3,250.'

"In line 17 of said amendment strike out '$475,000' and insert '$400,000'."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 149: Page 84, line 12, insert "Purchase of land, etc., Bartlesville, Okla.: For the purchase of land in Bartlesville, Okla., which land may be acquired as an addition to the petroleum experiment station of the Bureau of Mines, and the purchase or construction of fences, temporary storage sheds, and other necessary structures, to remain available until expended, $30,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 149.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 154½ to 160, inclusive, be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 154½: Page 86, line 5, strike out the word "western."

Amendment No. 155: Page 86, line 9, strike out the word "coking."

Amendment No. 156: Page 86, line 11, insert "pilot plant construction and operation to utilize more fully found resources and."

Amendment No. 157: Page 86, line 15, insert the word "purchase" after the word "expenses."

Amendment No. 158: Page 86, line 16, strike out the word "two" and insert "twenty-five."

Amendment No. 159: Page 86, line 17, strike out "$8,000" and insert "$38,000."

Amendment No. 160: Page 86, line 24, strike out "$149,000" and insert "$2,750,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments numbered 154½ to 160, inclusive.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments 154½ to 160, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COOLEY moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 154½ to 160, inclusive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that this is a very important item. Without undertaking to discuss in detail the very acute steel shortage, I think I am safe in saying that no one will question the fact that we are now in a very distressing situation. Everyone seems to admit that there is a very definite shortage of steel.

Some 10 months ago this House created the Boykin committee and authorized that committee to conduct an investigation for the purpose of determining just what could be done to increase our supply of steel. The committee has worked very earnestly for the past 10 months and the committee believes that $2,750,000 is needed to the end that the Bureau of Mines, in cooperation with the interested agencies in the several States, might conduct an exploratory investigation for the purpose of obtaining information which might lead to a further production of raw materials used in the manufacture of steel. The Bureau of Mines likewise feels that $2,750,000 can well be used and is badly needed in the conduct of the investigation recommended by the Boykin committee. The House committee, instead of providing a sufficient sum for the investigation in the 26 States in which there is real reason to believe that very valuable deposits of strategic materials may be found, restricted the appropriation to a very small sum—only $149,000—and restricted the investigation to a very limited area of the country.

The chairman of the committee has just offered an amendment, striking out the word "western," the effect of which is to lift the limitation upon the area in which the investigation is to be conducted. My motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment will make available the funds deemed necessary by the Boykin committee, the Bureau of Mines, and by the Senate. Even this is a rather small amount of money when you take into consideration the importance of the work and the necessity for an increased production of steel.

The Governors of several of the States have been greatly interested in this matter. I know that the Governor of my own State, Hon. J. Melville Broughton, has taken a great interest in the proposed investigation. He recently appeared before the Boykin committee and made a very splendid statement. I am advised that the State of Alabama has appropriated $100,000 to be used in connection with the investigation contemplated. The proposed investigation, contemplated by this appropriation, now embraces a very large area of this country and yet, under the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma, to insist upon the position of the House, a very small and wholly inadequate amount of money will be made available. Seven or eight hundred thousand dollars, or even a million dollars, is not sufficient and I do not believe that this House should ignore the recommendations of the Boykin committee and the Bureau of Mines. We should make available every dollar needed to do the job. The Bureau of Mines, in cooperation with the various States, should be authorized and equipped to obtain full and complete information regarding the deposits of minerals which might be used in the manufacture of steel. The information acquired will be made available to private industries in the hope and in the belief that private business will develop mining possibilities.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I should not take issue with the gentleman and I would not take issue if it were not for the fact that we have been spending millions of dollars investigating these natural resources of ours and many small concerns, modest in size, concerns which have metal deposits, have made applications to the R. F. C. for loans and it seems to me that they got no consideration at all. The fight that is going on between a couple of fellows in this administration today is due in part to the very thing that the gentleman is asking about and that I am talking about.

Mr. COOLEY. Is that not all the more reason why this Congress should authorize this investigation?

Mr. JENSEN. I agree perfectly with the gentleman; only what good does it do to give them a lot of money if, when the investigations are made, they will not let the mines be opened for development?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his generosity in permitting me to proceed.

I reiterate, the House created this Boykin committee and authorized it to do a job. The enthusiastic and able and distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] and the members of his committee have discharged and are discharging their duties well and the members of this committee feel and be-

lieve that $2,750,000 should be made available for this investigation. The Bureau of Mines and the Senate of the United States approve the sum of $2,750,000. If this amount is needed it should be made available immediately.

I am not a miner. I do not speak the language of the miner. The fact is, I do not know anything about mining, but I do know that we ought to be thinking of the future of this country and planning for that future. Only by thinking of and planning for the future shall we be able to influence and to direct the destinies of this great Republic. Steel is needed and will be needed badly in the winning of this war. We should, of course, think of the present and yet, at the same time, we should think of the future. Steel is needed in war and likewise it will be needed in the days of peace.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman know that the Budget Bureau only approved $300,000?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not concerned about what the Budget Bureau did. This $2,750,000 has been approved by the Boykin committee, it has been approved by the Bureau of Mines, and it has been approved by the Senate and I have no information to the effect that the Bureau of the Budget looks with disfavor upon the amount sought to be made available. Of course, the routine procedure is to submit proposed appropriations to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of determining whether or not it is in line with the President's program. Just because this larger item was not submitted to the Bureau of the Budget does not mean that Congress cannot take action upon it. Our chief concern is the winning of this war and in the winning of the war we will need steel. In the war the world is being destroyed and in the days of peace we will need great stores of steel to rebuild the world which is now being destroyed. Only by a lack of foresight will we fail to prepare for the full development of our own resources.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is making about the same speech which I made before the committee and which is in the hearings.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope very much that the gentleman will vote for my motion. I am in dead earnest about this matter. If we fail to provide sufficient funds I do not believe that we are giving sufficient consideration to the recommendation of our own committee and I do not believe that in this important matter we will be treating America right. This is not a partisan proposition. Neither is it a personal nor a sectional problem. It is a national problem and a problem of great magnitude.

Mr. JENSEN. Is the gentleman from North Carolina willing to leave this matter to the judgment of the able chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. COOLEY. I have great respect for the ability and the integrity of the gentleman from Oklahoma but he is rather economy minded and sometimes "tight-fisted" when it comes to spending money. I am afraid that he has not considered the importance of the item we are discussing.

Mr. JENSEN. I know he is but he has done a wonderful job.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree. The gentleman from Oklahoma has done a wonderful job and I am not criticizing him.

Mr. JENSEN. And he is also thinking about what is going to be done with this item.

Mr. COOLEY. I appreciate the many outstanding and fine qualities of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He is a statesman of great ability and I know that he is in every respect trustworthy.

This is not a matter which affects my native State of North Carolina any more than it does a number of other States in the Union but I do think that it is tremendously important and I do not believe that just a few hundred thousand dollars will be sufficient. I hope that a full and complete job will be done and that sufficient money will be provided. I believe that valuable deposits can be located in various sections of this country. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge the adoption of my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Boykin committee on steel shortages referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The appropriation to be made in this bill through Senate amendments 154½ to 156, inclusive, in the interest of national defense, provides for the investigation of raw-material resources and the establishment of pilot plants where necessary for the development of steel production.

It is a well-known fact that there are many high-grade ore deposits scattered throughout the country in large commercial quantities that can be made readily available for the production of steel if we will take the initiative in providing for the early stages of development.

Steel, and more steel, is the crying need of our war-production effort today. That little group of steel masters who have held the entire steel industry of this Nation in a tight grip, centralized within 700 miles of this Capitol Building, have misled the Nation to protect their own selfish interests. Before this war started they owned the mines, the blast furnaces, the mills, and even the shipbuilding plants of the country. And months after we were engaged in the war they had the audacity to carry full-page newspaper advertisements to the effect that there was no steel shortage.

The shortage of steel in this country today is almost as crippling in its effect as the shortage of food. The steel shortage is a bottleneck that must be broken, and only the Congress of the United States is able to break that bottleneck because of the power the steel masters of this country now wield.

The shortage of steel has become so serious that the War Production Board took the initiative to call the situation to the country's attention by issuing a statement concerning our requirements for July, August, and September of this year. During this third quarter the 16 claimant agencies of the Government require 21,000,000 tons of finished carbon steel, and it is estimated there will only be 15,000,000 tons available for allocation. The War Department's requirements have been reduced 14 percent, while their requirements for alloys will be cut 16 percent. The Navy Department's requirements are being cut 20 percent, and alloys have been cut the same as the Army's. The Maritime Commission requirements are being cut 22 percent, Lend-Lease 32 percent, and the Office of Defense Transportation 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious and critical situation brought upon this Nation by the centralization of the steel industry in the hands of a small group of men. This situation cannot be permitted to continue.

Steel is the backbone of our war effort and our national economy in times of peace. Steel, steel, and more steel is the crying need of our war production effort today. Not alone is steel the main requirement for mechanized warfare, but it is needed in every other phase of our war production.

More and more steel is needed to build ships.

The shortage of steel today is responsible for the shortage of housing in large areas where war industries have brought about great shifts in our population. The filth and squalor in which the men and women in many of our war factories and their families now live slows down their production.

The shortage of steel today is in large measure responsible for our transportation problems. It has caused many war workers to have to travel 50 and 60 miles daily to and from their employment because of lack of housing adjacent to their work. This in turn has created problems of transportation difficult to cope with.

The shortage of steel has stopped the completion of large hydroelectric power plants, which in turn would save huge quantities of fast diminishing oil supplies, now so urgently required by our military and naval forces.

And, Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress representing a rural district is aware of the fact that the farmers in his district have been hamstrung in their desire to increase food production because they cannot purchase necessary farm machinery and equipment. Indeed, they cannot even purchase parts to repair and replace worn equipment already in their possession. This is due to the steel shortage.

We cannot face this issue with complacency. This war will not be over tomorrow, next week, or next month. Until the last shot is fired we must use every

means at our command to furnish the materials necessary to win the war.

The decentralization of the steel industry must be accomplished. It is the one industry of this Nation that must, in fact, be distributed over the Nation. We can no longer trust the fate of the Nation in the hands of a small group of men who are primarily interested in protecting their post-war interests. We must save the Nation first and then develop our national economy on a national scale with steel manufactured throughout the Nation where the ores are available. The decentralization of the steel industry will aid this development.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to ask the gentleman this question: In addition to the figures which he has just quoted to the House, which reveal a very distressing situation with respect to steel shortage, if it is not a fact that the steel necessary for the manufacture of farm implements in this country has been cut below necessary demands by 62 percent?

Mr. WELCH. Until very recently the allocation of steel for farm machinery and farm implements was only 22 percent of the allocation of steel for that purpose during the years 1941 and 1942. Recently they have increased the percentage, but there is still a critical shortage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I hope this preferential motion prevails. I do not like to find myself in disagreement with the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma or with my distinguished colleague from Iowa but I want to see both of them lose this afternoon. I want to see my friend from California and my friend from North Carolina prevail in their preferential motion.

Mr. Speaker, in the district I have the honor to represent there are literally billions of tons of low-grade iron ore which up to this time they have not been able to find a way to make commercially usable because the expense is too great. The result is that 80 percent of the iron ore that is being used in this country to make steel comes from the district I represent. It is known as a high-grade ore. There are people who say that in only a very short time we will not have any of this high-grade ore left, taking it out at the rate of 90,000,000 tons a year and shipping it down the Lakes to make this steel for war purposes and the commercial purposes of this country.

These experiments ought to be continued. The University of Minnesota is conducting experiments. As I understand these amendments, the Federal Government will cooperate in still further experiments so that the low-grade ores can be utilized and made of commercial value to this country.

I hope the preferential motion is agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, may extend his own remarks in the RECORD on the subject Posters Work for Victory.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Cooley motion because, in my opinion, if we allow only the $149,000 provided in the House bill, we might as well junk the whole program. Take my district, for instance. Some of the first iron ore produced in this country was produced in southwest Virginia. We had blast furnaces there prior to the Revolutionary War. As late as the nineties we had eight blast furnaces running in the southwestern part of Virginia; today we do not have a single one. I believe that if a proper investigation could be made of our iron deposits in the southwestern part of Virginia, in a few years these old blast furnaces would be reopened and put in operation. The problem has been that no one in that section has had the money to make the right kind of investigation. It takes money to investigate these deposits. If we only had the money available today to make a real investigation of our iron deposits, to do the right kind of prospecting, I believe the investigation would show that we have sufficient ore to justify the reopening of our furnaces and that in a short while southwestern Virginia could be producing thousands of tons of ore each month. If the investigation shows, as I believe it will, that we have the ore, then I do not think we will have any trouble in finding the capital.

The Senate included $2,750,000 for this purpose, which will be a sufficient fund to investigate the possibilities of our known iron deposits scattered over different sections of this country. I hope it will be the pleasure of the House to recede and concur in the Senate amendments in order to give the Bureau of Mines sufficient funds to make an honest investigation of the possibility of our iron deposits. It is time we found out in this country just what iron deposits we have. Our national security demands that we have this information. Give us the money so we can obtain the information.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the following statement which appears in a letter from Mr. R. R. Sayers, written under date of June 10, 1943, to Mr. Allen Forsberg:

> An over-all program of this character involving the total expenditure of $2,540,000 would definitely improve the country's position with respect to raw resources for iron and steel manufacture.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think that is a correct statement.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, ever since I came to this floor some 10 years ago we have had the problems of the farmer before us. If there is anything that has made it difficult for the farmer it has been the cost of his implements and the iron tools he uses on the farm. There has been a practical monopoly of machinery and things made of iron that are used in agricultural production. I have seen many a farmer go to the machinery houses and sign up interest bearing notes to buy a set of machinery that put him so hopelessly in debt that he ended up finally by losing his farm. I believe the root of agriculture's problem can be found in the unfair overcharges made for the iron and steel that goes into the machinery he uses to produce his crops and the food this country so desperately needs. Anybody who has seen the price of a binder jump from $175 to $350, anybody who has seen a mowing machine go from $45 to $110 and stay there, anybody who has seen nails go up, anybody who has seen all kinds of tools, plow points, and so forth, rise, anybody who knows anything about agriculture at all knows what has been done to the farmer by the iron producers and the Steel Trust.

We have an opportunity here to utilize the steel and iron deposits. In the State I have the honor to represent, Idaho, we have proven an important deposit of iron. We have harnessed the great rivers out there and are generating huge quantities of power. The power is there, the iron is there, all we need is an investigation and study and laboratory tests that will put that iron to use in order to lighten the heavy financial load carried by the farmer who is now compelled to patronize the present monopolies and the Steel Trust throughout the country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I concur in everything that the gentleman from Idaho has said. I want to also add that we have large iron deposits in the State of Montana that need exploration and not only that but development. We have iron enough in my State, in my opinion, to meet the demand for iron a long time to come.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to compliment the gentleman for the fine statement he is making. I would also like to point out the fact that a great portion of the demand for steel now comes from the western area, particularly along the Pacific coast in which are located these great shipyards. We have deposits in Oregon, Washington, and California that ought to be explored and in Idaho and in that part of the country.

Mr. WHITE. I know where there are mountains of iron in the great State of Washington, I know where there are great deposits of iron in the State of Idaho.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I also point out to the gentleman that in the district of my colleague from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] there is the greatest deposit of coke-burning coal known in the entire world and that is 22 miles from the tidewater flats of Puget Sound.

Mr. WHITE. We not only have the iron on hand ready to be mined in the States of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and all over the Northwest, but we have the power. We have the developed and undeveloped waterpower of the great Columbia River and its tributaries. We have an almost unlimited amount of potential power to smelt the iron and fabricate and make the things that the farmer needs to break the grip of this monopoly that has done more to cause the problem and the difficulty of the farmer than anything else, this problem and difficulty that we have been trying for 10 years to solve but have not been successful.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman has a lot of influence with the R. F. C. and with Mr. Jesse Jones, also with the Metals Reserve Board and the metal chief on the W. P B. I will tell the gentleman what I want him to do, and I may say I am in favor of this amount. I want him to go down there and get them to take the lid off of the money that is keeping these mines from being developed.

Mr. WHITE. I may remind the gentleman that we are dealing here with a policy of the Bureau of Mines and the Department of the Interior. We are considering the Interior Department bill. I hope that the conferees will go along with the Senate and give us this appropriation.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; and get the R. F. C. to go along with it, too.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 127]

Barden	Domengeaux	Furlong
Barry	Drewry	Gallagher
Bradley, Mich.	Fay	Gifford
Capozzoli	Fitzpatrick	Green
Cochran	Ford	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Culkin	Fulmer	
Harness, Ind.	Mansfield, Tex.	Robsion, Ky.
Hébert	Mason	Rowe
Holifield	Merritt	Russell
Izac	Morrison, N. C.	Shafer
Johnson, Ward	Norton	Sheridan
Kennedy	O'Brien, Ill.	Stevenson
Kilburn	O'Hara	Tolan
King	O'Leary	Treadway
Lambertson	Phillips	Van Zandt
Lesinski	Plumley	Vinson, Ga.
Maloney	Pracht	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 249)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

H. R. 2869, to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, is before me. This measure will become law only over my strenuous objection and protest.

The Congress is aware of my deep interest in the Commodity Credit Corporation. It was created by me under Executive order issued October 16, 1933, to meet a grave and critical emergency. It has proved to be useful not only in an emergency, but under other conditions. It has an essential function to perform in our war-food production program. It should and must be continued.

But this is not a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is a bill to hamstring the Commodity Credit Corporation. It places new and unwarranted restrictions on the use of its funds and on the powers heretofore given to the administration to stabilize the cost of living. These restrictions would prevent our giving to farmers the assistance they need in carrying out our new food-production programs, so essential to feed our citizens and our soldiers. They would make it impossible for us to stop the rising cost of living.

As the measure now stands this is an inflation bill, a high-cost-of-living bill, a food shortage bill.

There is, for instance, a provision in section 6 (a) which prohibits the establishment of a maximum price for any raw or processed agricultural commodity which will reflect to the producers thereof a price less than the support price heretofore or hereafter announced by the War Food Administrator, or less than the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942.

I have tried to analyze this section and to translate it into common-sense English. Frankly, I do not know what it means.

If the provision merely means that if the support price is higher than the maximum price established under the act of October 2, 1942, the commodity must be purchased from the producer at the support price or the farmer must be paid the difference between the support price and the maximum price, the provision would serve no purpose. That is now, as I understand it, the law.

If, on the other hand, despite language which looks the other way, the provision were construed to mean that the maximum price must be fixed so as to yield to the producer the support price without the payment of any subsidy, the provision would require the immediate upward adjustments in the ceiling prices for many basic food products. Prices for dry edible beans, cheese, canned vegetables, sugar, and, in some markets, fluid milk would immediately go up because the support prices for these products are higher than their present ceiling prices.

If the provision were so construed, it would not only immediately increase the cost of living but it would make it impossible for us to adopt support programs needed to increase production without causing a still further rise in the cost of living. Undoubtedly if we must in each case weigh the advantages of a support program against the disadvantages of an increase in the cost of living, many support programs which might otherwise be adopted will be rejected, and other support programs, although finally adopted, will inevitably be delayed.

Section 6 (b) of the bill prohibits, with specified exceptions, the making of any subsidy or other payment other than those which have accrued prior to August 1, 1943, if such a payment is designed either (1) to reduce or roll back maximum and support prices or (2) as a substitute for increasing maximum prices or support prices, unless such payments are specifically authorized by the Congress. The specified exceptions are rigidly limited. Subsidies or other payments can be made until the end of the current crop year on any agricultural commodity other than milk or livestock if, prior to June 15, 1943, the Government was committed to make them. Wheat can be sold for feeding purposes at not less than the parity price for corn. Maximum and support prices on domestic fats and oils and oil seeds can be adjusted as necessary to assure adequate production.

Section 7 seeks to subject to the War Food Administration's control all the powers given under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act in respect to the purchase, sale, storage, and use of foods. I am sure that the War Food Administration is amply capable of handling such a task. But even its hands are shackled by the imposition of rigid restrictions which were included neither in the original Price Control Act nor in the act of October 2, 1942.

Section 7 provides that purchases can be made only at prices which reflect to the farmer not less than the maximum price provided in the act of October 2, 1942, or the announced support price, whichever is the higher. No purchases can be made for the purpose of reducing any maximum price. No purchases can be made for the purpose of resale at a loss unless made under a program announced prior to July 1, 1943. Even under preexisting commitments, the Government is not authorized to make purchases which will involve losses in excess of $150,000,000. It apparently prohibits any purchase and sale program involving any loss for the 1944 crop.

Commodities purchased are not to be sold for less than the maximum price limitations provided in the act of October 2, 1942, or contrary to section 2 (f) of the Price Control Act. It is far from clear that this last restriction does not nullify the exception in section 6 permitting wheat to be sold for feed at the corn parity price.

It is not clear whether the restrictions in sections 6 and 7 are cumulative or whether the Congress wished to draw a distinction between direct subsidies and trading losses resulting from the purchase and resale of foods.

Reputable lawyers could, I am advised, argue that section 6 completely nullifies section 7. If I should agree, then the bill would be even more inflationary. If I should take the contrary view, I may be sure that I will be accused of misconstruing the law.

Many other serious complications and difficulties in administering and construing the bill have been brought to my attention. But if I attempted to deal with all of them here my message would become as complicated and confused as the language of the bill itself.

When farm prices were low, in time of peace, no one in either branch of Government ever suggested that the Commodity Credit Corporation should be forbidden to take losses in its operations. Now, in the critical emergency of war, it is proposed to tie the corporation's hands in ways undreamed of in less strenuous days.

No matter how this measure is interpreted, it will have a devastating effect upon our economy and our war effort about which I believe the Congress and the American people ought clearly to be warned.

1. This bill blacks out the program to reduce the cost of living. In other words, it completely outlaws the recent reductions in the price of meat and butter which we instituted in order to help get the cost of living back down from the height to which it has risen in recent months.

By this measure, the Congress will compel every housewife to pay 5 cents a pound more for every piece of butter that goes on her table, and to pay higher prices for every pork chop, every ounce of beef, every slice of ham or bacon which goes to feed her family.

2. This measure will make it virtually impossible to institute any additional measures to reduce the cost of living or even to hold the line.

3. The bill denies to the Executive any power to purchase farm products for resale at a loss or to make incentive payments to obtain increased production of foodstuffs without the approval of the Congress. I do not believe that the Congress has had an opportunity to know or to consider how seriously it may cripple our entire food program.

It is proper for the Congress to set the limits within which our food programs must operate and the principles to which they must conform. But there is not time to submit each specific food program for congressional approval. Crops will not wait for congressional debate. To require specific approval of each specific program is in effect a prohibition.

In order to obtain a greater production of important war foods it may be necessary to establish special incentives for our farmers. We are asking our agricultural producers to change their farming methods and to grow new crops to which they are unaccustomed and which we need greatly in place of the old crops to which they are accustomed and which we may not need so greatly. It may often be difficult for the War Food Administrator to decide just how great an incentive is required for this purpose. This bill does not prevent the continued use of generous incentive payments to obtain strategic war materials other than food. Yet food is as important as any other strategic war material.

This measure, however, would mean that every additional dollar paid to the farmer to get the extra war crops we need to feed our soldiers abroad would reduce the purchasing power of the limited allowances of their wives and children at home.

Such a restrictive measure would serve only to set the soldier, the worker, and the unorganized consumer at war with the farmer.

The original price control act gave the Government certain powers to regulate prices. In the summer of last year I informed the Congress that the administration could not control the cost of living and prevent inflation unless it was given more adequate power to stabilize wages and food prices. Thereafter the Congress passed the act of October 2, 1942, which authorized me to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries affecting the cost of living so far as practicable on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942.

The measure now before me virtually nullifies the Act of October 2, 1942. This Government cannot effectively stabilize the cost of living if it cannot stabilize the cost of necessary foods. As a matter of fact this measure even takes from the Government powers which it was given under the first Price Control Act.

As the danger of inflation grows, the Congress would by this bill put new shackles on those whose duty it is to fight inflation. The fight against inflation cannot be won that way.

To get our economy to work I realize that we cannot rigidly freeze all prices or all wages. In some cases we must pay higher prices to producers to get the extra war production which we need because that extra production costs more to produce. We must likewise put more money in the worker's pay envelope when he works longer hours or when he does more skilled or efficient work, or when his pay is insufficient to keep him on a decent subsistence level. But with a well-balanced combination of measures we must keep wage rates and consumers' food prices from rising if we wish to hold down living costs.

Our wage stabilization program is and must be dependent on the stabilization of the cost of living. This is expressly recognized in the Act of October 2, 1942. The Little Steel formula was based on the fact that there had been a rise of approximately 15 percent in the cost of living between January 1941 and May 1942, for which rise workers could be compensated by wage increases.

The cost of living is now about 8 percent above the level of May, 1942, and about 6 percent above last September. There has been an increase in the average worker's weekly pay check since September. This increase has come primarily through longer hours and through the shift of workers into war industries from lower-paid civilian occupations, although increases in wage rates to correct inequities have played a part. But there are many workers who have enjoyed no increase in earnings.

It is too easy to act on the assumption that all consumers have surplus purchasing power; and that the high earnings of some workers in munitions plants are enjoyed by every worker's family. This easy assumption overlooks the 4,000,000 wage workers still earning less than 40 cents per hour, and millions of others whose incomes are almost as low. It ignores the fact that more than 4,000,000 families have not had an increase of more than 5 percent in their income during the last 18 months. It further ignores the millions of salaried, white-collar workers—the school teachers, the clergymen, the State, county, and city officials, the policemen, the firemen, the clerks—whose salaries have remained low, but whose living standards are being cruelly and inequitably slashed by higher food prices. It equally ignores others on fixed incomes—the dependent mother of the soldier boy with her scant $37 per month, the widow living off the proceeds of her husband's insurance policy, and the old-age pensioner.

These millions are entitled to be protected against skyrocketing food costs. It is my duty to guard them against the ravages of inflation—and I shall guard them unless the Congress shackles my hand.

These unorganized millions must not become the forgotten men and women of our war economy.

The plea has been urged on behalf of industrial workers that if the cost of living is not cut to September, or even to May 1942, levels, wage rates should be raised to compensate. But to raise wages because living costs have risen will be at best only a temporary solution. Raising wage rates increases the cost of production, both of war goods and of the goods whose prices make up the cost of living. It also increases consumers' spending power. The combined effect of increased spending power and increased production cost is inevitably a further rise in the cost of living; and at the same time the money cost of the war increases. In short, to give people more money because prices are rising does not cure the evil, but makes it worse. This is precisely what is meant by the inflationary spiral.

To prevent this spiral of rising costs and prices we must hold firm to the stabilization of wage rates. But to do this, we must assure workers that they can get a fair share of available goods on

legitimate markets, and at prices "so far as practicable on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15," as prescribed by the act of October 2.

Whatever theoretical choices may conceivably be open to us, practically we will have only two. We must keep the cost of living more nearly in line with the level prescribed in the law or we will not be able to hold the wage line or protect the millions of men and women living on low salaries and small fixed incomes. If wages rise, the cost of living will not stand where it is; it will go up and the inflationary spiral will gain strength.

I do not think that a reduction of all living costs or wage increases to the September level is practicable. We all must be prepared in total war to accept a substantial cut in our accustomed standards of living. But we must definitely stop the rising trend of living and push back the price to consumers of important key commodities in the family market basket.

When I talk of important key commodities I do not mean fur coats, or tailored suits or caviar. I mean the necessities of life, things like bread, milk, butter, sugar, coffee, ordinary meats, fats, and canned foods, things that plain working folk must have. We must not only keep the prices of these necessities down, but we must increase, when we can, the supply which helps relieve the pressures for higher prices and helps reduce the temptations of the black markets. With the improvement in the war against the submarine we may even be able soon to remove sugar and possibly later, coffee from the ration list. But we cannot hope in a period of total war to increase the supply of all necessities sufficiently to relieve the price situation.

To reduce the price of key necessities or even to hold some of them at present levels, we either will have to reduce producers' prices and distributors' margins or we will have to use subsidies.

That does not mean that we can achieve stabilization by subsidies alone, without firm price and wage policies, adequate fiscal measures, and positive programs to assure that adequate supplies of essentials at legitimate prices will be available in the legitimate markets.

But the experience of other countries like Canada and England does demonstrate that limited subsidies can and must be effectively used as a key weapon to control inflation.

The alternative to such action would be more costly to the Treasury and to the people. If we do not take the course of action I have suggested, we shall be charged with having failed to stabilize the cost of living, as the act of October 2, 1942, directed us to do, and there will be increasing demands from the workers of the Nation for a drastic modification of the Little Steel formula.

If a 10-percent over-all increase in wages should occur as a consequence of our failure to stabilize living costs, that added cost of labor alone would cause an increase of not less than 4½ percent in the general level of prices. That would increase our annual war costs approximately $4,500,000,000. For we are spending one hundred billion per annum for war and every rise of 1 percent in the prices the Government pays, adds approximately one billion to the Government's war expenditures. I say approximately because some of the expenditures would not automatically be increased. A 10-percent wage increase would, moreover, increase the cost of living by at least 4½ percent and would cost consumers at least $4,000,000,000 a year.

And, what is more, if we should have to abandon the hold-the-line order and allow wages to rise we would have no assurance that we would be able to hold living costs stable even at a higher level. Rising costs would continue to press against the price and wage levels and these would be forced higher still. Rising wages would add to the excess purchasing power, and an enlarged inflationary gap would make the fiscal task of absorbing excess purchasing power by higher taxes and enforced savings unmanageable. Those with meager wages and small fixed incomes would be ground below the margin of fair subsistence.

I need not tell the Congress the devastation which will be wrought, far and wide, on the farmer, the worker, and the businessman, if the fires of inflation ever get out of control. The farmers will never forget the deflation following the last war and the sufferings they then endured.

To protect the farmer it is not necessary to oppress the consumer. The way to protect the farmer is to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the farmer what he should get for his products and to sell those products at a loss if need be to keep the cost of living down. That may be a subsidy, but that is the only way to avoid inflation which will be ruinous to farmer and consumer alike. If we prohibit subsidies and allow the cost of living to rise, as this bill does, whatever support prices we make to the farmer will be nullified by the inflation of all prices and all costs.

I have just been informed that the preliminary figures indicate that between May 15 and June 15 there was a decrease of 1 percent in food prices. This is the first decline in the food price index in more than a year. This bill would wipe out that decline and start anew a rise in the cost of living. I cannot by signing it share the responsibility for that rise and its disastrous consequences.

Those in command of our war economy like those in command of our armies must be endowed with adequate authority to meet emergency situations as they arise.

Subsidies to help hold down living costs and at the same time protect the farmer should be applied only in strictly limited and clearly defined circumstances. Such subsidies should be confined to goods essential to the maintenance of a reasonable wartime standard of living for the people. Wherever the grant of subsidies at flat rates would involve gross windfall profits for low-cost producers, processors, or distributors, they should be granted on a differential basis to cover the special burdens of small business and high-cost producers.

I do not intend to permit farm prices and farm incomes to be depressed. Today the aggregate net income of farmers like that of the workers is larger than ever before. As a result of my recommendation of September 7, 1942, that a floor be established for farm prices, Congress by the act of October 2, 1942, guaranteed to farmers 90 percent of parity on most farm products during the war and for at least 2 crop years thereafter—a guaranty given to no other group. If further payments to farmers are necessary to enable them to make the added outlays required to increase the production of war crops, those payments should and will be made.

But unless the Congress leaves with the executive branch the means of seeing to it that further increases in producers' prices do not increase the cost of living, the executive branch cannot accept responsibility for holding the wage line or for stopping the inflationary spiral.

If I am to hold the line, my hands must be left reasonably free to hold it even-handedly.

In this task of saving our free economy, Congress and the Executive must work together, as a team. H. R. 2869 marks a definite retreat from economic stability toward uncontrolled inflation. That retreat cannot be made with my approval.

I sincerely hope that if the Congress cannot agree before its recess on legislation which will remove the serious defects in this bill, it will pass a joint resolution continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and providing the increase in borrowing power until the Congress has time to agree upon an appropriate measure. The officials of the executive departments will welcome an opportunity to furnish information and be of assistance.

I return the bill without my signature.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1943.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President and the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to enter into an extended discussion of the matter before the House. Let me say that any layman or lawyer who will read section 2 of the first price-control bill will readily understand that the purpose of that section was to authorize the Price Administrator to pay subsidies or to buy and sell, use, and store commodities for one purpose—and one purpose only—to secure an adequate supply of commodities for the war program. It was not the intention of Congress—I think I speak for those who are responsible for the legislation—that that section should be used as it has been used or for the purpose of preventing inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to pursue this discussion further. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] that the message and the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. What will be the situation with respect to the veto message if this motion does not carry?

The SPEAKER. If the motion is rejected, the question will then be on whether or not the House will on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 200, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—184

Abernethy	Gore	O'Toole
Allen, La.	Gorski	Outland
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gossett	Pace
	Granger	Patman
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Patton
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	Peterson, Fla.
Beckworth	Hagen	Peterson, Ga.
Bloom	Hare	Pfeifer
Bonner	Harless, Ariz.	Poage
Boykin	Harris, Ark.	Price
Bradley, Pa.	Harris, Va.	Priest
Brooks	Hart	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Ramspeck
Bryson	Heffernan	Randolph
Buckley	Hendricks	Rankin
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Richards
Burch, Va.	Hoch	Rivers
Burchill, N. Y.	Jackson	Robertson
Burdick	Jarman	Robinson, Utah
Burgin	Johnson, Luther A.	Rogers, Calif.
Byrne		Rowan
Camp	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sabath
Cannon, Fla.		Sadowski
Celler	Johnson, Okla.	Sasscer
Chapman	Kee	Satterfield
Clark	Kefauver	Scanlon
Coffee	Kelley	Schuetz
Colmer	Keogh	Sheppard
Cooley	Kerr	Sikes
Cooper	Kilday	Slaughter
Costello	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Courtney	Klein	Smith, W. Va.
Cox	LaFollette	Snyder
Cravens	Lane	Somers, N.Y.
Creal	Lanham	Sparkman
Crosser	Larcade	Spence
Cullen	Lea	Starnes, Ala.
Curley	Lemke	Steagall
D'Alesandro	Ludlow	Sullivan
Davis	Lynch	Sumners, Tex.
Dawson	McCord	Tarver
Delaney	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Dickstein	McGranery	Thomason
Dies	McMillan	Vincent, Ky.
Dilweg	McMurray	Voorhis, Calif.
Dingell	Madden	Walter
Domengeaux	Magnuson	Ward
Doughton	Mahon	Wasielewski
Durham	Mansfield, Mont.	Weaver
Eberharter		Weiss
Elliott	Marcantonio	Welch
Ellison, Md.	May	Wene
Feighan	Mills	Whelchel, Ga.
Fernandez	Monroney	White
Fisher	Murdock	Whitten
Flannagan	Murphy	Whittington
Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.	Wickersham
Folger	Myers	Winstead
Forand	Nichols	Woodrum, Va.
Fulbright	Norrell	Worley
Gavagan	O'Brien, Mich.	Wright
Gibson	O'Connor	Zimmerman
Gordon	O'Neal	

NAYS—200

Allen, Ill.	Gilchrist	Miller, Nebr.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillette	Miller, Pa.
	Gillie	Monkiewicz
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Morrison, La.
Andresen, August H.	Graham	Mott
	Grant, Ind.	Mruk
Andrews	Griffiths	Mundt
Angell	Gross	Murray, Wis.
Arends	Gwynne	Newsome
Arnold	Hale	Norman
Auchincloss	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.		O'Konski
Barrett	Halleck	Philbin
Bates, Mass.	Hancock	Pittenger
Beall	Hartley	Ploeser
Bell	Heidinger	Poulson
Bender	Herter	Powers
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Ramey
Bennett, Mo.	Hill	Reece, Tenn.
Bishop	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Hoeven	Reed, N. Y.
Bland	Hoffman	Rees, Kans.
Bolton	Holmes, Mass.	Rizley
Boren	Holmes, Wash.	Rockwell
Brehm	Hope	Rodgers, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Rogers, Mass.
Buffett	Howell	Rohrbough
Busbey	Hull	Rolph
Butler	Jeffrey	Sauthoff
Canfield	Jenkins	Schiffler
Cannon, Mo.	Jennings	Schwabe
Carlson, Kans.	Jensen	Scott
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Anton J.	Short
Carter		Simpson, Ill.
Case	Johnson, Calvin D.	Simpson, Pa.
Chenoweth		Smith, Maine
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Ohio
Church	Johnson, J. Leroy	Smith, Wis.
Clason		Springer
Clevenger	Jones	Stanley
Cole, Mo.	Jonkman	Stearns, N. H.
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Stefan
Compton	Kean	Stewart
Crawford	Kearney	Stockman
Cunningham	Keefe	Sumner, Ill.
Curtis	Kinzer	Sundstrom
Day	Kleberg	Taber
Dewey	Knutson	Talbot
Dirksen	Kunkel	Talle
Disney	Lambertson	Taylor
Ditter	Landis	Thomas, N. J.
Dondero	LeCompte	Tibbott
Douglas	LeFevre	Towe
Dworshak	Lewis	Troutman
Eaton	Luce	Vorys, Ohio
Ellis	McCowen	Vursell
Ellsworth	McGehee	Wadsworth
Elmer	McGregor	Weichel, Ohio
Elston, Ohio	McKenzie	West
Engel	McLean	Wheat
Fellows	McWilliams	Wigglesworth
Fenton	Maas	Willey
Fish	Manasco	Wilson
Gale	Martin, Iowa	Winter
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Wolcott
Gathings	Merrow	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gavin	Michener	Wolverton, N. J.
Gearhart	Miller, Conn.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gerlach	Miller, Mo.	

NOT VOTING—47

Barden	Harness, Ind.	O'Leary
Barry	Hébert	Phillips
Bradley, Mich.	Holifield	Plumley
Capozzoli	Izac	Pracht
Cochran	Johnson, Ward	Robsion, Ky.
Culkin	Kennedy	Rowe
Drewry	Kilburn	Russell
Fay	King	Shafer
Fitzpatrick	Lesinski	Sheridan
Ford	Maloney	Stevenson
Fulmer	Mansfield, Tex.	Tolan
Furlong	Mason	Treadway
Gallagher	Merritt	Van Zandt
Gifford	Morrison, N. C.	Vinson, Ga.
Green	Norton	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, Ill.	
	O'Hara	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Merritt for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Shafer against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Mr. Barry for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Sheridan for, with Mr. Gifford against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Pracht against.

Mr. Furlong for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.

Mr. Drewry for, with Mr. Harness of Indiana against.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas for, with Mr. Bradley of Michigan against.

Mr. Lesinski for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Ward Johnson against.

General pairs:

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Rowe.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. COX changed his vote from "nay" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration agree to pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this measure has had as thorough study by the Congress as any measure coming within my knowledge in recent times. It was approved by the House, and by the Senate, and, after long study, in conference.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. Has the gentleman from Alabama the right to address the House; and if so, has anyone else the right to have the same amount of time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized and controls 1 hour. He is privileged to move the previous question at any time.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, in deference to the wishes of the House, and to the votes in the House, and in the interest of expediency, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 154, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—228

Abernethy	Beall	Canfield
Allen, Ill.	Bell	Cannon, Fla.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bender	Cannon, Mo.
	Bennett, Mich.	Carlson, Kans.
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett, Mo.	Carson, Ohio
Andresen, August H.	Bishop	Case
	Blackney	Chenoweth
Andrews	Bolton	Chiperfield
Angell	Boren	Church
Arends	Boykin	Clason
Arnold	Brehm	Clevenger
Auchincloss	Brown, Ga.	Cole, Mo.
Baldwin, Md.	Brown, Ohio	Cole, N. Y.
Baldwin, N.Y.	Buffett	Colmer
Barrett	Busbey	Compton
Bates, Mass.	Butler	Costello

Cox
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Day
Dewey
Dirksen
Disney
Ditter
Domengeaux
Dondero
Douglas
Dworshak
Eaton
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elmer
Elston, Ohio
Engel
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandez
Fish
Fisher
Gale
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gerlach
Gilchrist
Gillette
Gillie
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hancock
Hartley
Heidinger
Herter
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes, Mass.
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Horan
Howell
Hull
Jarman
Jeffrey
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Anton J.
Johnson, Calvin D.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, J. Leroy
Johnson, Luther A.
Jones
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Keefe
Kilday
Kinzer
Kleberg
Knutson
Kunkel
LaFollette
Lambertson
Landis
Lanham
Lea
LeCompte
Lemke
Lewis
Luce
McCowen
McGehee
McGregor
McKenzie
McLean
McWilliams
Maas
Manasco
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Michener
Miller, Mo.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller Pa.
Mills
Monkiewicz
Morrison, La.
Mott
Mruk
Mundt
Murray, Wis.
Newsome
Norman
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Connor
O'Konski
Peterson, Ga.
Philbin
Pittenger
Ploeser
Poage
Poulson
Ramey
Rankin
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rizley
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rolph
Sauthoff
Schiffler
Schwabe
Scott
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Slaughter
Smith, Maine
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Starnes, Ala.
Steagall
Stearns, N. H.
Stefan
Stewart
Stockman
Sumner, Ill.
Sumners, Tex.
Sundstrom
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Tibbott
Towe
Troutman
Vorys, Ohio
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel, Ohio
West
Wheat
Whelchel, Ga.
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Willey
Wilson
Winstead
Winter
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—154

Allen, La.
Anderson, N. Mex.
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bland
Bloom
Bonner
Bradley, Pa.
Brooks
Bryson
Buckley
Bulwinkle
Burch, Va.
Burchill, N. Y.
Burdick
Burgin
Byrne
Camp
Carter
Celler
Chapman
Clark
Coffee
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Cravens
Creal
Crosser
Cullen
Curley
D'Alesandro
Davis
Dawson
Delaney
Dickstein
Dies
Dilweg
Dingell
Doughton
Durham
Eberharter
Ellison, Md.
Feighan
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Fulbright
Gavagan
Gibson
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Granger
Gregory
Hare
Harless, Ariz.
Harris, Ark.
Harris, Va.
Hart
Hays
Heffernan
Hendricks
Hobbs
Hoch
Jackson
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Johnson, Okla.
Kee
Kefauver
Kelley
Keogh
Kerr
Kirwan
Klein
Lane
Larcade
Ludlow
Lynch
McCord
McCormack
McGranery
McMillan
McMurray
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mansfield, Mont.
Marcantonio
May
Miller, Conn.
Monroney
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Myers
Nichols
Norrell
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Neal
O'Toole
Outland
Pace
Patman
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Pfeifer
Powers
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Ramspeck
Randolph
Richards
Rivers
Robertson
Robinson, Utah
Rogers, Calif.
Rowan
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Satterfield
Scanlon
Schuetz
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Va.
Smith, W. Va.
Snyder
Somers, N. Y.
Sparkman
Spence
Sullivan
Tarver
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Vincent, Ky.
Voorhis, Calif.
Walter
Ward
Wesielewski
Weaver
Weiss
Welch
Wene
White
Wickersham
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodrum, Va.
Worley
Wright
Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—49

Barden
Barry
Bradley, Mich.
Capozzoli
Cochran
Culkin
Drewry
Fay
Fitzpatrick
Ford
Fulmer
Furlong
Gallagher
Gifford
Green
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Harness, Ind.
Hébert
Holifield
Izac
Johnson, Ward
Kennedy
Kilburn
King
LeFevre
Lesinski
Maloney
Mansfield, Tex.
Mason
Merritt
Morrison, N. C.
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara
O'Leary
Phillips
Plumley
Pracht
Robsion, Ky.
Rowe
Russell
Shafer
Sheridan
Short
Stevenson
Tolan
Treadway
Van Zandt
Vinson, Ga.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote.

Mr. Short and Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Plumley for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Phillips and Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Fitzpatrick against.

Mr. Kilburn and Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Gifford and Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Robsion of Kentucky for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Pracht and Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan and Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Merritt against.

General pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Rowe.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. FISHER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. McGEHEE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and the bill together with the accompanying papers is referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered printed, and the Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement upon the bill (S. 1134) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendment No. 61 to said bill.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the amendment under consideration is an item that originally had a Budget estimate of $150,000 when we brought the Interior bill into the House on May 20 this year. In the meantime a supplemental estimate of $150,000 was furnished, which the House did not have before it to consider. Now the Budget estimate for this item is $300,000. The Senate allowed this Budget estimate and $2,450,000 for good measure, or eight times more than the Budget estimate. I say without fear of contradiction that the Bureau of Mines never had a better friend than this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. There was never any division of objective throughout the consideration of this bill on any item. The entire subcommittee on both sides of the aisle had only one objective before them, and that was, How could we help with funds absolutely necessary to carry on the war effort, and uphold the Army, Navy, and marines with the necessary tools and equipment to do the job, and fulfill the requirements for food for victory?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I have only 3 minutes. There is a Budget estimate of $300,000. Your conferees have measured and will approach the differences between the House and the Senate with a constructive point of view to meet the demand of the war on the home and battle fronts. I want to say that I stand ready and willing to raise my sights above the Budget estimate. I yield to no man as far as being economy-minded is concerned, and the desire to save money.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I cannot yield. I do not intend to be parsimonious with what the Bureau of Mines needs. I think we should have orderly procedure. I am willing to go considerably above the amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget. I think, however, that we should set an amount that they can spend wisely and judiciously in connection with all of the other Bureau of

Mines items which will demand their manpower, effort, and resources. With this approach that I, as one of the most economy-minded men on the committee, am willing to give them, I am sure the House will trust this subcommittee, a friend of the Bureau of Mines, to do an adequate job in conferring with Senate conferees to reach a satisfactory conclusion on this amendment that will help to win the war and feed our Army, Navy, Marines, and our people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the observations of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], and I am sorry that I disagree with his viewpoint in connection with the proposal offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. I ask him, and I wish he would answer this question, What is the worth-while program in connection with the production and development of strategic materials, which the Bureau of Mines or the Federal Government could accomplish with something less than $150,000?

What effective exploration for critical minerals could be developed? I believe it would be so meager as to be absolutely nullified from the standpoint of valuable results.

I call attention of the House to the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 88, page A3182, in which I set forth the picture as I saw it from the standpoint of the 18 strategic or critical war materials, which are found in the United States. I believe the Members from the various States might be interested in these deposits and their locations.

The State of California has 9 of these strategic or critical materials; the State of Nevada has 6 of these needed minerals; North Carolina has 6; Arizona, 7; Virginia, 5; Colorado, 5; New York, 4; Idaho, 4; Montana, 3; Tennessee, 3; Utah, 3; Oregon, 3; New Mexico, 3; Arkansas, 3; Maryland, 3; Ohio, 2; Illinois, 2; Washington, 2; Georgia, 2; New Hampshire, 2; South Dakota, 2; Maine, 2. In the States of Nebraska, Vermont, Minnesota, Oklahoma, New Jersey, Wyoming, Kentucky, Rhode Island, Alabama, Massachusetts, West Virginia, Texas, Connecticut, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Missouri there is at least one of these strategic materials which we need to explore and possibly develop.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] did not reply to my query as to what sort of development or production program, taking the over-all picture of the United States as a whole, could be soundly gone into with the insufficient fund of less than $150,000. I believe that he feels we must do the task on a much more expanded scale.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my friend.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], if the gentleman from West Virginia will permit, if when this $149,000 was agreed upon by the House committee it was not the intention at that time to conduct a very limited investigation on western steel production, and if the House committee has not agreed to strike out the word "western" and to extend the investigation throughout the country, but at the same time has refused to provide adequate funds to do the job?

Mr. JONES. When the House had it there was only a Budget estimate of $150,000. Since that time a supplementary estimate for $150,000 came up since the hearing and since we considered it on the floor. So that we did not have an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. COOLEY. But it is a fact that the broader program, calling for $750,000, has never been submitted to the Budget.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes; $150,000 was submitted to the Budget and allowed.

Mr. COOLEY. I am talking about $2,750,000.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully decline to yield for further colloquy between the two gentlemen.

The geologists have found deposits of 18 critical and strategic minerals within the continental limits of the United States, as follows:

Aluminum: New York, Tennessee, and North Carolina.

Antimony: Idaho, California, Nebraska.

Asbestos: Vermont, Arizona, Maryland.

Cadmium: Byproduct of zinc. Produced in plants of Colorado, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Montana, Maryland, Ohio, Oklahoma, Idaho, New Jersey, Utah.

Cryolite: Ivigtut, Greenland.

Chromium: California, Oregon, Montana, Washington, Wyoming; also Kenai Peninsula in Alaska.

Fluorspar: Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, Colorado.

Graphite: New York, Nevada, Rhode Island, Georgia.

Iodine: California.

Manganese: Low grade, Alabama, California, Colorado, Idaho, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico; high grade, Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia.

Mercury: Arkansas, California, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Texas.

Mica: North Carolina, New Hampshire, Connecticut, South Dakota, Maine, Virginia, New York.

Nickel: Colorado, North Carolina, Nevada.

Platinum: California, Oregon, also Alaska.

Quartz crystal: New Hampshire, Arizona, California, North Carolina, Virginia, Maine, Maryland, New York, Ohio, Tennessee.

Tin: South Dakota, New Mexico, Virginia, North Carolina.

Titanium: Virginia, Arkansas, California.

Tungsten: Nevada, Arkansas, California.

Vanadium: Arizona, Colorado, Utah.

One of the sad commentaries on our preparation of America for the world struggle in which we are now engaged, was the fact that we had failed to develop a synthetic process for making rubber and gasoline and these other substitutes which we find we should have furthered in order to more successfully prosecute the war on the home front, as well as the fighting zones. Money spent on research is well spent and excellent dividends are paid, far beyond the extent involved in the initial money. Eventually Germany will be the loser in this conflict, but we find her advanced in some items over the United States in the fashion in which she has processed gasoline and rubber and other materials. Necessity caused her to dig deep. Perhaps we thought our abundance would always take care of our needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] such time as he may desire.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therewith an excerpt from the testimony of James A. Emory before the Ways and Means Committee on the Bituminous Coal Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion made by my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] primarily because I am hopeful that by a survey of this character, which cannot be adequate unless the gentleman's motion is adopted, there may be additional information secured about the extent of mineral deposits, notably of iron ore deposits throughout the country.

It was only a few weeks ago that Mr. Batchelder, of the War Production Board, told the Open Hearth Association that there never would be enough steel to meet our war needs. Every claimant agency has been cut about 30 percent under its own estimate of its requirements as far as the consumption of steel is concerned.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman is going to anticipate some of the things I am about to say if I have time.

Mr. JENSEN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he does not realize that no matter how much we appropriated, even if we appropriated a billion dollars, it would not help the situation any if they did not take the lid off——

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I heard what the gentleman said earlier in the day, and I think he is quite right. I think my remarks will bolster his position if I can go ahead.

The job that we have to do—and when I say "we" I mean the Congress, the War Production Board, and everybody else—is first to produce enough steel to win

the war. Second, and only second, to worry about how it is going to be distributed afterward.

I am fearful, however, that certain counsels have prevailed within the W. P. B. which have put first concern on the possibility of an excess of post-war capacity of production in this country instead of on the maximum production at the present time when it is so desperately needed.

We ought not to have to reduce the demands for steel for agriculture or the Army or the Navy if it is possible to get a supply large enough to meet these demands. I believe it can be made possible. Personally, I believe that the possibility of production is much more and that we could achieve a much larger production than has heretofore appeared.

There has been insistent and stubborn resistance, in my judgment, to the expansion and output of raw materials in the metals field, and notably in steel. I believe the basic reason for this steel shortage is the failure to expand and decentralize the steel industry as much as it could be done. We have gone along feeling that the collection of scrap would meet the demands for making of steel. I hope it will. But the industry at present can only use high-grade scrap, and it is a question whether the supply will be enough.

Now, sponge iron can be made, and I am not talking as a metallurgist now, but it is a proven fact that it can be made from low-grade iron ore, and it can be used on a tremendous scale under the Anderson process, and is being used right now by our enemy, Japan, at this moment, which has a huge plant in Manchuria turning out a million tons of steel per year by the use of sponge iron. Sponge iron is a substitute for scrap.

Some time ago, before Pearl Harbor, we were told that we did not need a capacity in this country of more than 90,000,000 tons. This was in the Gano Dunn report. But soon after Pearl Harbor the War Production Board came along and said that we needed an additional 10,000,000-ton capacity, and we were going to get it over a 2-, 3-, or 4-year period. On July 24, 1942, the steel branch of the War Production Board came out and said they had underestimated and that we would need still more capacity. But we just do not have it. The key to the situation, in my judgment, is to put an end to the resistance to expansion of the sponge-iron industry and to expansion of steel production therefrom. The sponge-iron industry can go ahead and develop and produce throughout peacetime, and if it did it would mean the decentralization of the steel industry, which would go into many parts of this country, especially the west coast. That is not what the Steel Trust wants. But it would be a very good thing for the United States. In our Pacific coast section of the country we should have had a steel industry developed years ago and would have but for the opposition of entrenched interests.

Now just to summarize: There is grave danger of at least a shortage of scrap; the Mesabi Range iron is not going to last forever; sponge iron can be substituted for scrap, and by this process low-grade ores can be used. There has been opposition to expansion of steel production, which might be partially removed at least by a survey of how much can be provided by the use of low-grade iron-ore deposits which exist in many parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very much the motion will prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN].

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I speak in favor of the Senate amendments, on the basis of our committee investigation into the steel-shortage situation of which I have the honor to be chairman.

For the past 10 months we have been investigating several phases of this tremendous situation. Our work at this point has only begun. Facts of great importance, however, have already been brought to light. This information was summarized in our interim report to this Congress on December 16, 1942, from which I quote:

> Your committee has found that the supply of steel is woefully short of the requirements, as set forth each month by the service agencies (i. e., the Maritime Shipbuilding, the Navy, and the War Department). Notwithstanding the many drastic War Production Board limitation orders issued since Pearl Harbor—each of which prohibit the use of steel in the manufacture of hundreds of items—the shortage still persists.
>
> The magnitude of this shortage is so serious that any public statement of actual figures is impossible at this time, for such information would be of real aid to the enemy.
>
> During the 6 months of your inquiry the supply has never come even close to meeting the demand for steel, as indicated by the requirements which the service agencies set forth is necessary for their monthly production needs.
>
> Instead, all three service agencies are regularly compelled to curtail their schedules and war production and to pare down their requirements figure to the total amount of steel which the steel mills are producing.

Recently the War Production Board has come forth in published statements which reveal in tons the magnitude of the shortage under which our war-production effort must labor. I refer to the W. P. B. release No. 76104, printed in the RECORD just yesterday by my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. This release clearly indicates that for the third quarter these agencies requested 21,000,000 tons. The industry, however, is capable of turning out but 15,000,000 tons. What that means on an annual basis is a shortage above 20,000,000 tons. This shortage of steel is at present being distributed over each of the agencies, so that each must be "cut back." Each is compelled to carry on its production effort with less steel than it requires; for example, the W. P. B. states:

First. The War Department for July, August, and September of this year will have to be cut back 14 percent.

Second. The Navy Department during the same period is cut back 20 percent.

Third. Maritime shipbuilding is cut back 22 percent.

Fourth. Lend-Lease Administration requests are cut back 32 percent.

Fifth. Office of Defense Transportation requests, 40 percent.

I am not able to confirm yesterday's report that the over-all allowance for farm machinery will be 20 percent under the 1940–41 level.

To date, the Axis has set no date for the ending of this war. The United Nations intend carrying on for an unconditional surrender. High-ranking officials indicate we are in for a long war and that there is no ground for the current optimistic talk about being in a comfortable position. In fact, we should have been stock-piling this basic metal 5 and 6 years ago, when the steel furnaces were operating at 50 percent of capacity.

As there is no telling how long the war will last, or what form our changing military strategy will take, our committee members would rather play safe. We see no basis for the overconfidence that grows from inspired publicity.

Fortunately there is good iron ore in 26 States of the Union. But in the last two decades the small independent iron and steel producing companies have been crowded out of business, and the mines have closed down. From time to time some independent fellow has proposed to build a small plant to exploit local ores. But then he has found himself up against this situation; if he is to borrow money and attract investment he has to have at his command an assured supply of ore of a certain quality that will last for 20 to 40 years. He needs to be certain that he has selected a site for operations where adequate supply is accessible.

Satisfactory and complete information, such as cautious investors require, is hard to get. The bigger companies already have this valuable information but they are keeping it under their hats. What is needed is responsible and complete data on available tonnage and complete analyses of quality made by impartial engineers and freely available to all who may require it.

Only the Government is in a position to provide this information. The United States Bureau of Mines has some experience in doing this iron exploration work, and it can contract out as much of it as may be necessary to accomplish the work expeditiously.

If small plants set up for use during the war are to be of long-term value in the years of peace to come they will need beforehand the best information that can be given by impartial experts. First know you are right, then go ahead—that is a motto that fits this situation. And we want to be in a position to go ahead good and strong on this proposition.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Alabama advise us how much he feels is necessary in order to carry out his recommendation?

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I think we need exactly what the Senate has already approved, $2,750,000. The Senate voted for that amount. Governors,

Departments of Conservation, and other bodies and officials concerned with developing these resources in the 26 states, have requested this help. and I think all the Congressmen and Senators, from these 26 states favor it. And we have had about 8 or 10 governors up here who have told us that they could get the investigation under way, and that they could get private capital to develop the wonderful resources of these states as a part of our entire war effort.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Would it be possible to make the investigation in all of the States?

Mr. BOYKIN. They can commence in all of the States where they have this low-grade iron ore. There is low-grade iron ore in all of the 26 States which we are satisfied is much better than the ore Japan has.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak the sentiment, not only of every member of this subcommittee, but every Member of the House of Representatives, when I say that we appreciate the very fine, sacrificial, tireless efforts that the gentleman from Alabama and his committee investigating the steel situation have put forth and the service they have rendered.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me add further that this committee is also interested in the subject matter that he is discussing. I might say, and I hope that the Members will forgive me if I am revealing any secrets, that the subcommittee agreed to go considerably higher than the Budget estimate during its conference with the Senate conferees. Would the gentleman from Alabama be willing to leave the matter to this subcommittee to see if we cannot work out a satisfactory arrangement with them?

Mr. BOYKIN. Can the gentleman from Oklahoma advise us what kind of an arrangement they may be able to work out?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course. I cannot commit the conferees.

Mr. BOYKIN. I have every confidence in the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Every member of the committee is tremendously interested in this matter and I hope the gentleman will prevail upon the gentleman from North Carolina to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think that the conferees might be guided by the advice of the Director of the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. BOYKIN. I certainly do; and I believe we should have this full amount.

Mr. COOLEY. The Bureau of Mines has considered this particular program, which was worked out by the Steel Investigating Committee, and they agree with this Committee's findings and recommendations. The Bureau thinks this money is needed.

Mr. BOYKIN. The amendments before us today will make it possible to increase greatly our iron and steel production. For in at least 26 States there will be reliable surveys by subsurface drillings, prosecuted by money appropriated to the Bureau of Mines. This money is to be expended, however, in close cooperation with the respective States, whose officials may be more thoroughly familiar with these properties and in a position to obtain the maximum local cooperation.

And your committee, which is pledged to continue its efforts to get more steel, will keep in touch with Members whose districts are concerned. It will act in a liaison capacity to see that this work is done expeditiously and in the cooperative manner intended by the Congress.

These amendments are not the cure-all—this is only a beginning. It is a step in the right direction. It is the first step that must be made. It will provide a reliable stock pile of information on our most essential metal, iron and steel, the master metal of war and peacetime.

I hope the Members will vote to give us the full amount.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, a neighbor of mine, for any reasonable request.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the expiration of the other special orders heretofore entered, I may be privileged to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, within a very few moments I hope to move the previous question. I believe one other Member has asked for brief time to speak. I think, however, I should make a brief statement before I yield to him.

As the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee, stated when this bill first came to the House committee there was a Budget estimate for $150,000. The Bureau of Mines did not ask this committee for $1,250,000 or for $2,750,000, or for $300,000 which is now the Budget estimate; the Bureau of Mines asked our committee for $150,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I cannot for the time being. After I complete my statement I will yield.

If the gentleman will read the hearings he will find that I, as chairman of the subcommittee, complained to the Bureau of Mines because they had not asked for sufficient funds for this work. There was a considerable discussion and some of it was off the record, but the hearings will disclose that we were complaining and even intimating that a supplemental Budget estimate should be obtained. The Members who have addressed this body have been very kind and said generally that we have been interested and fair, but some have seemed to feel that we have been very, very "tight" with reference to the Bureau of Mines and with reference to other items. I did not take any exception to the statement of my dear friend from North Carolina that I am one of the "tightest" Members of this House; I took it as a compliment.

Mr. COOLEY. I intended to compliment the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman. As far as the Bureau of Mines is concerned, however, let me say that this committee has probably offered to go further above the Budget estimate than on any other item in the bill. As I say, a supplemental estimate was requested and we finally got a supplemental estimate not for $2,750,000 but for another $150,000, and the committee was willing to give the Bureau of Mines more than they asked for. We believed it was important.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman's committee objected to the failure of the Bureau of Mines to seek an amount which, in his judgment, was adequate, why is he complaining now and not attempting to secure this larger amount?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, I am not complaining now at all; I want to tell the gentleman that the committee did give the Bureau of Mines substantially what it asked for. This was one of the very few items that our committee did not cut substantially below the Budget estimates. After 6 weeks of hearings your subcommittee was able to bring this bill in here nearly $10,000,000 below Budget estimates and about $60,000,000 below what it took to operate the department for the current year. You approved that overwhelmingly and passed this bill without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," within less time than any Interior Department bill has ever been passed in this House or in the history of the Congress; so the committee felt that you approved its action in trying to economize on these matters. Then the bill went to the Senate, and the supplemental estimate arrived in the Senate, and they increased the Budget estimate to $2,750,000. Then we had a conference with the Senate, and, as was indicated a while ago, the committee has been anxious to agree on a sum substantially higher than the amount of both Budget estimates.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman think we ought to compromise an impor-

tant proposition like this, and does not the gentleman think that we ought to follow the feelings of the Bureau of Mines? Here is a letter from Mr. Sayre, which has not been read into the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman had considerable time; I do not know why he has not read it into the RECORD. He has my permission to put it into the RECORD now.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to call it to the attention of the House. They mention the figure here $2,450,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. But that is not the figure they mentioned when talked to this committee across the table.

Mr. COOLEY. That is dated June 10.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That was afterward.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is impugning the motives of the Bureau.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am not impugning anything. I am telling you that we had 6 weeks of hearings and we indicated to the Bureau of Mines that they should ask for more money if it was necessary.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask one other question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that at that time the Bureau of Mines had intended to make an investigation only in one section of the country, out in the western section?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is hardly a fair statement. We have not stricken out anything. We simply ask for permission to go back to conference and reach an agreement there. Again I say to the House, Are you going to stand by this committee and give us an opportunity to go back and work out a fair and reasonable agreement with the Senate or are you going to repudiate this committee and say, after all of the hearings, that we do not know anything about what the situation is? We do not claim to have all the information but we do have some information, and I think we are entitled to work out a compromise with the Senate conferees.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this opportunity to go by without paying my tribute to the eminent fairness of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to bring his attention to one matter and I think he will agree with me upon this: The United States Bureau of Mines for many, many years studied the necessity for finding ways in which coal could be used to manufacture gasoline. They went at it step by step, then all at once, within the last few months, they have seen the necessity for a great program of this type. I think that is what the gentleman from North Carolina is attempting to bring out here, that is, that piece-meal the figures the gentleman uses are correct as of June 10 of this year. That is the early picture, but they come in with this new estimate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This House hopes to recess some of these days. Some say it might be about the evening of July 10. I hope that is correct. Of course, the events of the day may move that up by 2, 3, or 4 weeks, I do not know, but in case this House does takes a recess until September, we will be back here then. The Deficiency Committee of this Congress that meets nearly every day in the year and has met nearly every day since a year ago last September is in session and I have found that the Bureau of Mines, the Members of Congress and others, know the way to the Deficiency Committee. I happen to be a member of that committee and I think I know the feeling of the committee about this important matter. If this is not sufficient to take care of the situation the Bureau of Mines will know a lot more definitely about it by September, they will be back here and they will be asking maybe for more than the amount you are asking for now, and if they can show it is for the war effort you know they will get every dollar for which they ask.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assume that the gentleman believes this is a worth-while program?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I certainly do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And the committee does?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; or else we would not have asked for a supplemental estimate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why not agree with the Senate and get it over with? If it is not worth while we ought to cut it out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say there are $55,000,000 worth of worthwhile projects in this bill, every dollar of which, in my judgment, would be a worth-while proposition in any kind of a program, especially a post-war program; but this committee is unwilling to go along on $55,000,000 added to the Senate in this bill simply because it may be desirable. I can think of some worthwhile projects in my district and they have to do with the war effort. I have had telephone calls from my own State complaining bitterly about some of the items in this bill. They charge this committee with being "tight."

I am simply trying to do my duty as I see it toward the war effort. I have voted for every dollar for the war effort, but, as to other appropriations, we have to be a little more careful in trying to stay within the Budget estimates. That is not possible perhaps, and the gentleman knows this is about the only item in this bill that the committee has indicated a willingness to go over the Budget estimate. I call on the members of my committee to say whether that is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we were asking the gentleman to fight the Senate on this matter, that would be another story, but here is a majority of the House telling the gentleman what the Senate says is O. K. That ought to settle it all the quicker.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman assumes this is a majority of the House, then the gentlemen is correct, but if the gentleman will remember, there was another item yesterday and I was told that 90 percent of the Members of the House were for it, but when the vote was taken the House stood by the committee 3 to 1 and I feel, perhaps, the House may do the same thing on this amendment.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KELLEY. The first estimate made to the gentleman's committee by the Bureau of Mines the gentleman said was $150,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. KELLEY. That was not to embrace all of the exploratory work that was to be done in the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. There are other items in this bill, of course, for the Bureau of Mines to make investigations with reference to other strategic metals.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All time has expired.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That the first sentence of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended, as of June 30, 1943, by striking out "June 30, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1943."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$2,650,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,150,000,000."

SEC. 3. The Federal Reserve banks are hereby authorized to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

SEC. 4. Section 22 (g) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 375a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This subsection shall not apply to loans which the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to take over or purchase."

SEC. 5. Full reimbursement shall be made to the Commodity Credit Corporation for services performed, losses sustained, operating costs incurred, or commodities purchased or delivered to or on behalf of the Lend-Lease Administration, the Army or Navy, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other Government agency, from the appropriate funds of these agencies.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has read an uncorrected copy of the joint resolution. I ask unanimous consent to modify the joint resolution by

striking out "$3,150,000,000" in line 8 and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,000,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Andrews	Harness, Ind.	Plumley
Barry	Hartley	Powers
Bradley, Mich.	Hébert	Pracht
Burch, Va.	Holifield	Robsion, Ky.
Capozzoli	Izac	Rowe
Cochran	Johnson, Ward	Russell
Culkin	Kennedy	Shafer
Elmer	Kilburn	Sheridan
Fay	King	Simpson, Pa.
Fernandez	Lesinski	Slaughter
Fitzpatrick	Maloney	Smith, Va.
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Stevenson
Fulbright	Mason	Tolan
Fulmer	Merritt	Treadway
Furlong	Morrison, N. C.	Van Zandt
Gallagher	Murphy	Vinson, Ga.
Gifford	Nichols	West
Green	O'Brien, Ill.	
Gwynne	O'Hara	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Leary	
	Phillips	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the 1st of January 1944. There is nothing in the joint resolution to which the Executive's objection was directed. There is no objection on the part of the Committee on Banking and Currency to the consideration of this proposed legislation. The provisions of this joint resolution represent the unanimous views of the Committee on Banking and Currency, with only one exception.

The amount of authorization of the Commodity Credit Corporation is increased $350,000,000. It is $150,000,000 less than was provided in the House bill. The amount was raised to $1,000,000,000 in the Senate and the amount agreed upon in conference was $750,000,000.

The resolution embraces two minor amendments to the Federal Reserve Act, as to which there is no objection whatever in the committee, and it is acceptable to the Federal Reserve officials.

Another provision of the resolution was taken from the original House bill and provides that any services rendered by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Lend-Lease Administration or to other Government agencies shall be conducted without loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that the Corporation shall be reimbursed for all funds expended, for the cost of administration and other expenses.

The resolution is a simple plan to take care of the situation that arises by reason of the action on the legislation which was dealt with this afternoon in connection with the message of the Chief Executive.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, needless to say I am somewhat reluctantly for this resolution, but I will say that under the circumstances it is the best thing we can do and the only just and equitable thing to do under the circumstances.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I realize it is necessary to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but may I ask the gentleman why it is necessary to extend it for 6 months when we shall be back here in less than 90 days?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that if we extend it until October 1 it would give us only perhaps 10 days after the recess to lay out a program for 1944. We are giving them the 6 months so that there will be ample opportunity after the 13th of September, when we are expected to be back here, to lay out a comprehensive program for the 1944 crop year.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman think this is the minimum time, then, that we are safe in making this extension?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I would think so. There is no particular harm in giving them that. The time is purely arbitrary. In the bill that was vetoed we had extended the time to 2 years. We cut this down to 6 months. It seems that that will allow them to carry out any program this year. We cannot stop it whether we like it or not. The bill has been vetoed and we have not overridden the veto, so under this joint resolution we cannot stop subsidies, to pay roll-backs, and reduce maximum prices. However, it is to be hoped that the President—and, of course, he will do as he said in his message—will not promulgate any extensive program along that line any more than is absolutely necessary to accomplish what he considers to be the purposes of the act.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If this resolution is passed, is there a possibility that the Commodity Credit Corporation or the administration can commit the country to billions of dollars of expenditures for 1944?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think under the language of the act there is nothing to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from committing the country to a program limited only by the availability of their funds. It was for that reason that we cut this amount down to $350,000,000 instead of giving them $750,000,000, which was in the original bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And that is as far as they can go?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe there is that much limitation in the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know how long the gentleman expects to speak on this proposition, but if he is about ready to quit I wish he would not quit until he goes into this a little more fully and explains it. There are many Members of the Congress who have not been able to follow this matter intelligently through its ramifications. It is a very important matter. We tried to override the President's veto on this matter. To me this has been one of the most intricate and controversial matters I have ever experienced in Congress. I think the gentleman in his own wise and sagacious way ought to take 2 or 3 minutes and tell us exactly what this does or does not do.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, nothing can be gained by post mortems. Many of us regret very much that the President vetoed the bill. We regret also that we were unable to override the veto. But he did veto it and we did not override his veto and so we have brought back in this resolution all of the noncontroversial features of the bill which was reported out of the House committee, which is an extension of the time, but we extend the time only to December 31, 1943, instead of June 30, 1945, as was in the original bill.

The original bill provided for an increase in their loaning facilities of $750,000,000. Because we have shortened the period, we have cut the amount down to $350,000,000, making a total of $3,000,000,000 available to the Commodity Credit Corporation for all purposes.

The chairman has explained the other noncontroversial features. There is nothing in this bill which will prohibit the subsidizing of roll-backs or the maintenance of maximum prices by subsidies, because the President vetoed that prohibition and this House has sustained the veto. Of course, it would be simply folly for us to incorporate another prohibition against roll-backs and subsidies or maintaining prices, only to have it go to the White House and have it vetoed again. We, as legislators, have to be realistic, and the only reason I am going along with this resolution is because the Commodity Credit Corporation has got to continue to function. When the time ever comes that we stop the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, we shall have to set some period for liquidation. At the present time they are doing hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of business every day, and they have total commitments on their books of $2,650,000,000. So it is not just

possible or practicable at this time to cut the head off of the Commodity Credit Corporation and run the chance of their having to liquidate, which might involve hundreds of thousands of dollars of losses to the Federal Government.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. I would like the gentleman to explain why if this resolution is to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for 6 months, which is one-fourth of the period in the original bill, the funds are limited to $350,000,000 instead of one-quarter of the amount originally fixed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Seven hundred and fifty million dollars was a compromise between the $1,000,000,000 that the Senate gave them and the $500,000,000 that the House gave them. One-fourth of that maximum would have been $250,000,000. Perhaps all you can say for the other $100,000,000 is that we threw it in for good measure.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. A vote against this resolution would deprive the country of the Commodity Credit Corporation and it would not stop inflation or roll-backs, because it would be possible to pursue this program with other funds. Is that not correct? I am talking about the effect of a negative vote of any Member. If a Member votes against the resolution he votes against the Commodity Credit Corporation and he does not vote to stop roll-backs or subsidies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, because those functions under the present interpretation of existing law could be transferred to the War Food Administrator or the Office of Price Administration, and the roll-back program would continue.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the committee considered the possibility of placing any limitation whatsoever on the amount of this money which might be used in this roll-back food-subsidy program which appeals to many of us as being simply a scheme to charge this year's grocery bills to the taxpayers of future generations.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I have the gentleman's point in mind. We have to be very careful not to do anything which will result in another veto. It is hoped that somewhere along the line some restriction will be placed in the bill. I do not know where that will be.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position clear on this resolution to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation without any restrictions whatever on the use of the funds appropriated to it for the payment of subsidies.

The whole program of subsidies is viciously inflationary. Every dollar used for the payment of subsidies is a dollar of inflation, for it represents just that much Government printed money. In proof of this, one needs but look at the enormous volume of dollars that is being created in the financing of Government costs through the deposit of Government securities in the banking system.

The effects of subsidies are deceptive. Outwardly they can give the appearance of holding the cost of living down. But this effect must inevitably be to raise prices, undermine the whole economy and drive our people into further regimentation.

I think it is a great mistake to rush this resolution through as is being done. Surely we could have taken enough time to at least try to write into this bill some restrictions on the payment of subsidies.

I too want to go home. I have a son who is about to leave for the service and am, therefore, very anxious to get home to be with him as much as possible before he leaves. But I consider this bill so very important that I am willing to forego this desire in just as great measure as possible in order to do what I believe to be my duty with respect to this bill.

This may well be a crumbling of the last line of defense against inflation, and I want the record to show that I have done all I possibly can to hold it.

I must vote against this resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, by a substantial majority in both Houses, extended the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and wrote into the bill an inhibition against roll-backs and the payment of subsidies out of the Public Treasury to pay the food bill, which is nothing but a dole and hand-out for millions of people who are receiving the highest wages and salaries ever paid in the history of any nation.

The bill as passed by the Congress adequately provided for support prices for farm products and for an adequate program for increased production of food and fiber products for our armed forces and our civilian population. This action of the President in vetoing the bill places the burden of paying for the food we eat on the taxpayers and the future taxpayers of this country. It means that our 11,000,000 men in the armed forces, many of whom are only receiving $50 per month, must pay the food bill when they come home, through increased taxation for those who are now working in defense plants and other branches of the Government and receiving wages in many instances of $100 per week and more.

It is encouraging that a vast majority of the Members of the House, by their votes, refused to be a party to passing this food bill on to future generations. It is extremely unfortunate however, that the Chief Executive yielded to the pressure of a few vociferous so-called leaders of organized labor from the industrial sections of the East, and the political patronage group who see in the subsidy program a chance to use the taxpayers' money to play politics and further their own political interests. It is unjust to the American farmer and the producer, and a gross injustice to the boys in the service and to their children who must pay the increased tax bill, for subsidies which may well amount to billions. The President and his advisers have refused to accept any limitations on the amount that may be expended under the subsidy program.

This resolution, which we are now about to vote on, becomes necessary because of the President's veto. Of course, it is necessary to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation. I am hopeful that when the bill reaches the other body they will put a specific limitation in the resolution as to the amount that may be expended for subsidies, and that the resolution, if returned here with express limitations on the amount that may be expended, will receive the same courageous support of a vast majority of this House as was exhibited today in an effort to override the President's veto.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I note that in the President's message little or nothing was said as to who will pay the taxes for the subsidy program. Every benefit which the country receives carries with it a responsibility, and somebody is going to have to pay the cost of this program. I recall that recently the President said that if he did not get his subsidy roll-back program, it would be the fault of the Congress, and that the resulting inflation would be the fault of the Congress. It looks as if he is going to get his subsidy and his roll-back program.

The people will get the taxes to pay for it from some place, and if the program then fails, and the hold-the-line policy trips on itself and turns out to be an inflation policy, it seems to me that the fault would then not be the fault of the Congress of the United States, but the fault of the President of the United States. He has asked for this program. He has asked for the power to impose subsidies and roll-backs. Subsidies will lead to more subsidies, and roll-backs to more roll-backs, and all of that will lead to greater and greater taxes that the public will pay. The responsibility is now on the President of the United States, as to whether the program succeeds or fails.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, bureaucratic waste of manpower and money is legalized theft. For the last several days the Congress has been working feverishly to pass the various appropriation bills, carrying deficiency funds for the fiscal year that ended at midnight last Wednesday, June 30, and new funds to be expended in the ensuing fiscal year. While I do not wish to detain the House,

I do not believe there will be a more appropriate time to consider the over-all picture of Federal receipts and expenditures. We have been so occupied with individual bills and individual items of appropriation that, understandably, we may fail to see the forest for the trees, so to speak.

Not all the appropriation bills having become law, and there having been so many changes, in the House, in the Senate and in conference committees, with respect to various items, it is impossible to say at the moment just how much money has been spent for the last fiscal year and how much has been appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year. We do know, however, that it is an astronomical sum, so large that I do not believe the Director of the Budget himself has a true mental grasp of the size, not even the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], of our overworked Committee on Appropriations.

We also know that the expenditures exceed the receipts. The financial record of the past fiscal year will probably show that the total receipts will be around $21,000,000,000 and the expenditures close to $76,000,000,000. In other words, in spite of the heavy tax burden on the people, less than 30 percent of the cost of the Federal Government is defrayed by current revenue. Most of the expenditures come from borowings, which themselves represent an additional charge.

The American people are faced with still further increases in their Federal taxes. They recognize that war is costly. They recognize that all must contribute in accordance with his ability for early and complete victory. As in the beginning of our Republic the signers of the Declaration of Independence courageously pledged their "lives, fortunes, and sacred honor" to freedom's cause, so today the American people pledge their all. There is not an American citizen, worthy of the name American, who is not willing to pay whatever taxes may be necessary to finance the war.

But, Mr. Speaker—and it is an important but—the American people have a right to insist that there be an elimination of waste, and they do insist. They insist that we, their representatives, eliminate all items of expenditure not essential. We cannot afford much more than that which can be clearly shown to be essential to the war effort. It is our duty to save every dollar that can be saved.

While some progress was made during these last several months for economies, there is indeed much to be done. For the first time in years there has been at least a beginning for eliminating nonessential spending. But it is only a beginning. In our consideration of the appropriation bills during these past few weeks it has been significant that many agencies and bureaus have resisted, in some instances successfully, the efforts of the House to eliminate them entirely or appreciably reduce their normal operations. They all claim activities essential to the war.

Whenever a so-called war agency requests a certain amount of money to carry on its work, we are naturally hesitant to deny that agency any part of the money it requests. There will be those who will accuse us of obstructing or hindering the war effort. We will be accused of "playing politics." However that may be, I am personally convinced that there should be a closer examination of the expenditures of the war agencies and that such examination will show many places where there can be a substantial saving of money, materials, time, and manpower. Surely it is recognized that an agency directly connected with the war effort and designed to serve a very useful purpose can become so large and so cumbersome that it proves to be a hindrance rather than a help.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] filed its report last month on the subject of "Federal personnel." I earnestly recommend a careful reading of this report by every Member of Congress. The facts presented in the report make it clear why those who have business to transact with the Federal Government find it so difficult to locate the party in authority and why there are so many Government employees who, upon the occasion of our visits to departments and agencies, seem to have so little to do.

On November 11, 1918, when the armistice of World War No. 1 was declared, the number of employees in the executive branch of the Government was 917,760. In April of this year the number was 3,008,519. I cannot believe, I simply do not believe, that there is such a great difference between this war and the last war that almost 4 times as many civilian employees are necessary in the executive branch of the Government. In the last war the ratio was 1 civilian Government employee to every 5 soldiers, but in this war the ratio is 1 to every 2½ soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, if the expansion of Federal employees continues as it has over the past year and a half, it will be no gross exaggeration to say that before the end of the war there will be more civilian Government employees than soldiers. It is an alarming situation, particularly considering the fact that workers are needed for the farms, in the factories and in so many occupations absolutely essential for the successful functioning of our national economic life.

The monthly pay roll of the executive branch of the Government approximates $600,000,000. In 1 year the American people pay over $7,000,000,000 in salaries alone to people serving in a civilian capacity in the various departments and agencies.

The more I think about these startling facts the deeper becomes my personal conviction that it would be a distinct contribution for early victory if a substantial number of these employees were removed from the Federal pay roll. Not only would it represent a saving in dollars; not only would it represent a saving in manpower; it would also serve to remove some of the duplications and red-tape now hindering the entire war effort.

To be a bit facetious, it would perhaps be helpful if instead of the standing Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers we substituted a standing Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Employees. I can assure you that the new committee would have considerably more work than the existing committee, with due respect to its distinguished members.

Some of you may recall that during my previous service in the House I protested on several occasions on this floor against the tendency of Federal employees to make extensive trips at Government expense, ostensibly on official business, but, in my judgment, for purely personal pleasure. I have also protested against abuses of the franking privilege. It is more or less characteristic of a bureaucrat not to have any concern whatsoever about expenses. We are today confronted with one of the largest, one of the most expensive, one of the most wasteful, and one of the most dangerous bureaucracies the world has ever seen.

Excluding the War and Navy Departments, the travel and communication expenditures of the executive branch for this past fiscal year has been estimated as exceeding $100,000,000. The average citizen finds it difficult to obtain train accommodations. He has been asked to refrain from traveling and is glad to do so, with the knowledge that in time of war our soldiers must and should have preference. The average citizen has also been asked not to make long-distance calls unless absolutely necessary. He has willingly responded to the appeal.

I shall not take the time of the House with details, but it is very significant that there have been increases in train expenses, telephone calls, airplane accommodations, telegrams, mail, and so forth, in agencies which are engaged in work strictly of a nonmilitary character and which, in many respects, have a very remote connection with the war itself.

There is one other feature of the existing Federal bureaucracy to which I should like to direct your attention, where not only can economies be realized but a real hindrance to the war effort removed. I refer to the numerous reports and questionnaires which the various agencies submit to businessmen, who are endeavoring to produce as rapidly as possible the materials needed by our armed forces and who are faced with a shortage of manpower. Literally thousands of men are diverted from their war production work to answering questionnaires which serve no useful purpose, except perhaps to satisfy the curiosity of some bureaucrat or perhaps to find something to keep himself occupied.

The Byrd committee report of last February shows that a total of 7,025 separate reports and questionnaires were required by 48 agencies to be answered, and this figure does not include the requests for further information that may be sent out by letter. The inquiry into

this matter has brought to light some interesting data.

One corporation has stated that it costs them approximately $90,000 a year just to file the Federal reports requested of them. The Eastman Kodak Co. employs 84 persons, 3,224 hours a week, to complete 409 reports for each quarter. And there is the amusing but pathetic case of a farmer who had to fill out a two-page report to get a pair of rubber boots. He was informed that if he lost the boots he was subject to a $10,000 fine or 10 years' imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, the waste of time, money, and manpower in connection with needless Government reports and questionnaires is in itself enormous, not to speak of the burden it places on American business. Many companies have been obliged to hire personnel to do nothing more than try to answer the reports and questionnaires they receive from Washington. The questionnaires themselves are so technical and so complicated that I seriously doubt that the people who prepared the form really knew what information they wanted. They only knew they wanted to ask some questions and they thought it would add to the importance of the questions they suspected as being of some value to someone sometime if they couched them in the most involved language.

All this is bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker, but it isn't all that could and should be said. The people are ready to bear the burden of the cost of war. They will do everything, anything. But they are not willing to have their money wasted. It amounts to legalized theft. Unless we deal with this problem courageously and promptly, while we win the war abroad we may lose our freedom here at home to a bureaucratic government.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of this bill now under consideration, my remarks on the profits of corporations in war industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, shifting the grocery bills of civilians earning high wages to the shoulders of the soldiers who are fighting this war does not look like a wise policy. In my opinion, it is not in keeping with American ideals and traditions. I sincerely regret that President Roosevelt has insisted by his veto message of a few hours ago that this country be put in position of having to pay for its everyday food bills out of the pockets of tomorrow's taxpayers who, as we all well realize, will be largely the selfsame men and women who are today serving the colors of the United States in the armed services on every sea and continent. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that President Roosevelt will find that the percentage of civilians who desire to mooch their food from the taxes of future taxpayers is gratifyingly small and that his scheme of deferring until some future date the pay day for meeting today's living costs will not prove to be any more popular than it is equitable or sound.

Mr. Speaker, American citizens have found out that the New Deal Santa Claus has an unpleasant but inevitable habit of calling back with due bills for the gilded presents which he leaves on the doorsteps of the people. Even the good and the faithful who have rewarded this policy of synthetic largess by voting for a third term for the man who promoted it are beginning to look with suspicion on the theory that you should never pay today anything which can be put off until tomorrow. Of all New Deal schemes to deceive the people into thinking they are getting something for nothing this proposed program of price roll-backs coupled with cash subsidies is the most shallow and shocking since it in actuality commits the servicemen fighting for $50 a month to pay part of the household expenses of the war worker earning in excess of $500 per month in many cases. It is the same principle as putting a tax on the chauffeur's beer to help buy champagne for the owner of the automobile.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, since the President has vetoed the legislation, and since it is necessary to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation at this time, we must now vote for the committee recommendation for a 6 months' extension of this act, and it would be futile to write in the same prohibitions against subsidies which the President has just today vetoed. We must bow to the inevitable. It is stimulating, however, to realize that a vast majority of this House has just voted to override that Presidential veto, and while the veto was sustained by a small margin, it is encouraging to know that Congress as a whole remains opposed to this program of mortgaging the future in order to revel in the present. Had just a few more Democratic Members of this House manifested the courage just demonstrated by some of them in refusing to yield to Presidential pressure and patronage we would have overridden this veto which not only is grossly unfair to American servicemen and to future generations, but which is likewise unjust to the farmers and producers of this Republic. It is indeed unfortunate that the political pressure of a few vociferous leaders of eastern labor unions, and the urging of Mayor LaGuardia, of New York City, should shackle upon this country a proposal as unsound and as unsavory as the food-subsidy program which the President will now be able to promote despite the emphatic and repeated opposition of the vast majority of Congress. We may get some hope from the fact that the emergency extension we are about to vote provides only 25 percent of the funds carried in the original 2-year extension and that Congress at the end of this year will again have an opportunity to reflect the people's wishes in this matter.

May I add the hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate which will get this legislation tomorrow may in its wisdom place some limitations upon the percentage of these funds which can be frittered away in this grandiose experiment of food subsidization? Unless this is done, either other far more important services of the Commodity Credit Corporation may be curtailed or else commitments may be made which will force Congress to pass a deficiency appropriation to pay obligations incurred by the Government. I expect to discuss this suggestion with several Senators tonight and I sincerely hope that something along the lines of my suggestion may finally be incorporated in this legislation.

Somebody must pay for the food we eat. Is it to be the people who eat it, in true American style, or is it to be future taxpayers who must then shoulder the burden of our grocery bills in addition to their own costs of living and the carrying and amortization charges of a national debt which threatens to approximate $300,000,000,000? Congress has said, "The lease we can do is to pay for our own grocery bills." The President has said, in substance, "Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow is far away and others must then pay the bills." Mr. Speaker, that is the issue bluntly put. Either we pay or others must. The President has even refused to accept the compromise proposed by Senator AIKEN of Vermont whereby something akin to the stamp plan would be provided so that those whose incomes have not risen during the war would have their costs of living adjusted accordingly. Under the President's program the favored laborer in the shipyards earning $150 per week will receive the same benefits as the white-collar worker or the laborer in civilian circles whose incomes may have received no substantial increases. The President's proposal will provide manna for the profligate wastrel as handsomely as for the poor widow. It is a give-away scheme for rich and poor alike, for the just and the unjust, for the rich and the needy, and it gayly ignores the realistic fact that what is given away today must be added to the already alarming tax burdens confronting those who must pay it all back tomorrow.

One more word and I am through, Mr. Speaker. I listened attentively to every word of the President's veto message. It was long on vote appeal and short on economics. As a fourth-term lure it may have had merit, but as a fact-tallying message it was disappointing. Most surprising of all, however, was its condemnation of the very inflationary spirals which it creates. The excess purchasing power which the food-subsidy program keeps from being drained off for the necessities of life will be spent for nonessentials, thus adding to the inflationary trends. It increases the already staggering national debt and excessive national debt is the mother of inflation. It means that bonds purchased to buy bombers must be used to pay butter subsidies instead. It helps create a tidal wave of extra private purchasing power which will press harder against the floodgates now shaking from the push of inflationary movements. It means that while we have pay-as-you-go taxation we

have eat-and-postpone-paying household economics; this may enable us to buy enough aspirin today to pay for the headaches of tomorrow but it is far from a sound approach to anything seeking to prevent future disasters. The President's veto message indicates he believes these price roll-backs and food subsidies will eliminate the necessity of any further wage increases, that they will provide parity prices for producers, that they will equalize the costs of living between workers enjoying huge wage increases and those receiving none, and that they will prevent inflation. It will indeed be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to watch developments between now and December 31 to see how nearly the President has gaged the future and now that he has the program upon which he has insisted the country has a right to expect that he will produce the results which have been promised.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a letter from a farmer in my district written to the Gazette and Daily Newspaper of York, Pa., which ought to furnish some light and information to this House. It is headed "An Answer" and states:

AN ANSWER

EDITOR THE GAZETTE AND DAILY:

It's easy to see that pigheadedness and stubborn stupidity are not confined only to Congress.

It seems as if some of our private citizens have just a little more than their fair share of it.

It certainly does not hurt the morale of the farmers a bit to have someone to stand up for us once in awhile, like Senator GEORGE did. It makes us feel as if we have not been entirely deserted.

As far as subsidy payments are concerned, we would not accept such bribes anyway, even if Congress would try to impose them upon us.

When we bought our farm we bought it so we would have a way to work and earn an honest living, not just so we would have an excuse to live off of the Government, which, by the way, is supposed to be the servant of the people and must be financed by the people.

In plain words, those subsidy payments would have to be paid to the Government by the people in the form of higher taxes, so why not give the farmers a square deal once? Let them get fair prices for their crops and save the people the cost of administering such a program?

As for inflation, why didn't they think about that when the national debt was jumping from 16 billion to 65 billion dollars in 9 years of peace times? Why don't they worry about inflation when the labor racketeers are yelling for more pay? How did labor live through the last war, when they were not getting paid as much as they are now and the farmers were getting $3 a bushel for wheat? You holler about production of food. How could the people be damned to starvation by overproduction of food when they have more money to buy it with now than they ever had? I haven't heard anyone complain as much about food prices as the fact that they couldn't get a lot of things.

Just try to imagine what shape our country would be in now if all of us farmers would have listened to the preachings of the agents of destruction who tried to make us destroy our crops and produce less. Gives you an empty feeling under the short ribs, doesn't it?

So you don't like Congress, eh? Well, just you march ahead toward dictatorship, if you want to. We farmers will not be with you.

WALTER I. KUNKLE.

DOVER, PA., *June 28, 1943.*

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day we were not able to muster a sufficient number of votes to pass this bill, the Commodity Credit Corporation extension bill, over the President's veto, notwithstanding a very substantial majority of this body has indicated its disapproval and disrespect for the President's roll-back subsidy program.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of assuring each of my colleagues that I have made every effort to try to furnish the food to win this war. We still hear about price instead of production. We need a "prince of production" to furnish this food. No "prince of scarcity" will ever accomplish the task. If in their wisdom the Members of this body want to put into effect a program that is going to hurt the war-food program, it will be their own responsibility. We are taking the recommendation of the people who want to roll the prices back from the same point at which they were placed by the same people who want to roll them back. In a few months time, I am sure, there are going to be a lot of people in this country who will say, "I thought that they had rolled prices back." Or "Where is the food to roll back the prices on?"

They talk about feeding the people of occupied countries and those in the war zones under lend-lease, upon milk solids. The only way you can get milk solids is as a byproduct of butter fat, and in order to get enough of it and meet the requirements of lend-lease is to stimulate milk production. We need four times the amount of milk solids we are now producing. Yet we are faced with a butter roll-back that will provide less milk solids.

When we are not able to obtain enough milk solids, they are willing to take a chance of rolling back the price of butter, sabotage the whole war food program in order to meet the demands of a few groups.

Here is an industry, the dairy industry, that represents 20 percent of the Nation's farm income. The only time we hear anything about inflation is when the low-income groups are being considered, or when the American farmer is in the picture. This administration provided $700,000,000 to one and one-half million Federal employees who are receiving anywhere from $2,900 to $12,000 a year. You did not hear a word about inflation from Mr. Byrnes, Br. Brown, or any other of the Government economists when that group was being considered and it is pretty hard to figure out the distinction. We roll back one group of producers obtaining less than 40 cents per hour, and help pay the grocery bill for people getting $1 an hour to thousands a year. Remember there are no calories in a roll-back.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin is one of the fairest-minded men I have ever heard discuss any public question and I would like to ask him if we have not, by congressional action, directed the President to try to keep prices at the September 1942 level?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. By what authority or legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. By the act of Congress in October.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to answer that question?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; I want to answer the gentleman's question if I may. There has been no mandate from Congress by legislation to do this.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of July 2, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the parade of our Republican colleagues to the Well of the House in their futile efforts to reply to the great message which accompanied the President's veto of the Commodity Credit Corporation legislation, demonstrates how devastatingly the Chief Executive disposed of the contentions of those who seek to sabotage the administration's program to effectively control the cost of living and prevent runaway inflation. It will take more than their feeble speeches to answer the indictment contained in the President's message insofar as the thoughts of the American consumer are concerned.

Under the unanimous consent I have received, I am including in my remarks an editorial published in today's Philadelphia Record, which sets forth in plain language what millions of American citizens are thinking regarding the failure of Congress to meet its responsibilities to the American people:

CONGRESS ON ITS RAMPAGE IS HITLER'S COLLABORATOR

Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes has made a powerful appeal to striking miners to return to work.

He declared that on the eve of the greatest military campaign in history, "every muscle, every sinew, every ounce of blood and guts

that we have must be pledged to a single purpose."

Somebody ought to make a speech like that to Congress.

For Congress, in effect, is on strike against the war effort.

It is sabotaging the home front just as surely as the man who makes faulty shell casings is sabotaging the fighting front.

Everywhere the military forces of the United States and our allies are on the march, forward.

We are smashing ahead in a two-pronged drive in the southwest Pacific. We are laying waste German factories by air in Europe.

But Congress is heading the home front for a retreat that may completely smash our domestic economy.

That rout must be halted where it started, in Congress. Or thousands of lives will be sacrificed as the war is dragged on by collapse of the production front at home.

Action of Congress to forbid use of subsidies to reduce retail food prices combined the worst features of a strike and absenteeism.

Vote in the House against the subsidy program, backed by the War Labor Board as well as the President, was 160 to 32—showing absenteeism of about 60 percent. Vote in the Senate was 62 to 13—showing absenteeism of about one-third.

By this action, Congress was shouting "No" in a vacuum. It has no plan of its own, save appointment of a food czar who could only carry out the "no, no, no" policies of Congress itself.

Wall Street knows what this action of Congress means. You don't fool Wall Street very often. Commodity prices soared yesterday because traders knew Congress was out to wreck the administration's program to control inflation. Oats went up to a 23-year peak. Cotton was up 85 cents a bale, wheat was up nearly 2 cents a bushel.

The smart boys in Wall Street know what happens to the consumer when food prices rise. Traders can make money in an inflationary period; the consumer is sure to lose.

There are some sound, honest men in Congress, but they seem today to be a pitiful minority. The majority of both Houses is on the loose, gambling for political gains at the expense of the war. Killing of subsidies is only one example.

Congress has slashed the appropriation for the Office of War Information, passed the Smith-Connally antistrike bill over the President's veto, hamstrung the administration's food plans by attacking the Farm Security Administration. Because of congressional delay a dozen vital war agencies were left at the end of the fiscal year yesterday without a cent of emergency funds.

An unholy alliance of reactionary Republicans and anti-Roosevelt Democrats, bellwethered by the McCormick-Patterson press is out to "get" the President. It may get him, politically. But by doing so, it will wreck the home front, perhaps delay victory for years.

Congress may think it can enjoy the luxury of obstructionist opposition because victory is almost won. Military leaders know better.

Lieutenant General Somervell, commanding the Army Service Forces, has just warned that a lag in production of equipment urgently needed by the Army threatens the whole strategy and tactical plans of the war.

We are now so short of weapons and matériel, he said, that we have been forced to take some of the equipment being used to train our Army in this country and send it abroad for combat use. Earlier, Assistant Secretary of War Patterson reported that production for the Army ground forces in May, scheduled to rise 2 percent, actually declined 3½ percent.

May was the month when Congress was beginning its attacks on the subsidy plan and laying the ground work for its attack on labor.

Hitler and Goebbels have long boasted that this country, under the stress of war, would fall apart internally.

Congress, by opening the gates on inflation, by its blind opposition to anything the President proposes, is doing its best to make our enemy's predictions come true.

Congress must call off its strike against the war. It must get behind the President and vote for victory.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the resolution?

The question was taken; and, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR PROFITS OF CORPORATIONS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 29, I discussed excess labor costs on war production. Today, I want to discuss excess corporation profits on war-production contracts. Before I do so, I would like to repeat what I said in my remarks of last Tuesday:

> I believe in the capitalistic form of government. I believe in the profits system. I believe that a corporation or an individual engaged in any type of business, whether public or private, is entitled to a reasonable profit, including an amount set aside as a surplus to act as a cushion against another depression and reconversion to peacetime industry. I do not believe that any company or individual is entitled to excess profits on an investment. No corporation nor individual should be permitted to take a 20 percent profit on an investment when that profit is paid for by taxpayers whose tax exemptions have been lowered as low as $500 and bond buyers who are receiving a low interest rate on the money they are lending to their Government for wartime expenses.

If there is any one thing that will give state socialism or communism a foothold in this country, it is the abuse of the profits system by those corporate or individual interests who are in the minority and who wring excess war profits from the toil and sweat of the worker, whether that worker is in a job where he is being paid a comparatively unjust wage or whether he takes the role of a taxpayer with a low exemption or a bond buyer lending his hard-earned money to the Government at a low rate of interest. If there is any one thing that will set the returning soldier against his Government it is excess profits paid to corporations or individuals on invested capital and excess wages paid to labor while he, the soldier, was compelled to accept a mere pittance for the services he rendered to his country.

If there is any one thing that will set the worker against his Government it is being frozen at a wage which is so low as to be incompatible with the rising cost of living while his fellow worker, doing the same type of work, is receiving an excess wage which cannot be justified on any ground. The returned serviceman and the low-paid worker knows that when the war is over he must toil and sweat the rest of his life to pay a tax on his diminishing income so his Government can pay the principal and interest on the bonds issued, to pay such excess corporation, or individual profits and such excess labor costs. Millions of workers who have worked and toiled faithfully for a fair wage and thousands of businessmen and millions of stockholders who have taken a small, if any, profit will be penalized and will have to pay for the greed of those in the ranks of both labor and industry who have in some way been successful in wringing excessive war profits from the taxpayers through their Government. I repeat, if socialism or communism gets a foothold in this country, it is because of these wartime profiteers in the ranks of both labor and industry.

SUMMARY OF OVER-ALL PICTURE OF COMPANIES WHOSE PLANTS I VISITED

Factory pay rolls of the companies whose plants I visited and whose reports I was able to obtain, including General Motors, Ford, Chrysler and General Electric, but excluding Government arsenals, show an aggregated pay roll for the calendar year of 1942 of $2,316,041,747. The total number of employees working in these plants aggregated 850,522. The annual average earning, per employee, for the calendar year of 1942 was $2,725. The total number of hours worked for the calendar year was 1,706,484,931 while the average amount paid for each hour was $1.35. While factories were on a 48-hour basis, lay-offs, because of lack of material, absenteeism, sick leave, vacation leave and other causes brought the actual number of hours worked down to an average of 38.6 hours per week for the year.

SPOT CHECK ON CORPORATION PROFITS

In the discussion of this problem, may I say again that to the extent to which a corporation, or individual, is engaged in war-production, to that extent the corporate or individual pay roll is a public pay roll and the profits statement is a statement to which the public is entitled to see because that pay roll and those profits are paid for by the taxpayer and the bond buyer.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing into the RECORD, as Exhibit A, a study I made of 48 corporations who are engaged in war production. In addition to the name of the corporation, this table gives the following information on corporation earnings for the years 1941 and 1942: First, income and excess-profits taxes paid; second, depreciation deducted; third, net income after taxes; fourth, the earnings per share of common stock after taxes; fifth, the market value per share of common stock; sixth, the earnings after taxes per $1 market value of common stock in terms of percentages.

The market value for 1941 was taken from the stock market report of January 16, 1942, and the market value for 1942 was taken from the stock market report of January 16, 1943. All stock reports were taken from the New York Times.

In making a study of these earnings and particularly in the returns on market values, one must take into consideration the fact that the 1942 earnings helped to increase the market value of that same stock in 1943. In other words,

while there may not have been any increase in the physical value of the corporation profits there was an increase in the market value of the stock. The New York Times report on averages on 50 stocks show that such stock sold for an average of $77.10 on January 16, 1942, and $84.17 on January 8, 1943, or an increase in the market value of the stock in 1943 over 1942 of 9.17 percent.

While I visited some of the companies whose figures I am giving in this table, the information in the table was taken from information on file in the Congressional Library and not from information which the companies furnished me. I have similar information on these same companies for 1939 and 1940.

TAXES AS A PART OF PRODUCTION COSTS

These 48 companies who were engaged primarily in war production paid during 1941 and 1942, $2,766,559,000 in Federal income and excess-profits taxes, not including social security or unemployment taxes. Taxes, of course, are figured in as an item in the cost of production. In view of the fact that these companies were practically 100 percent on war production, the fact is that these companies first collected this amount of tax from the Government as a part of the cost of production and then paid the money back into the Treasury as taxes. Nevertheless, it is a cost item of production. It is only when one takes into consideration the fact that here we have 48 corporations paying in 2 years nearly $3,000,000,000 in taxes and the further fact that there are literally thousands of companies in war production paying similar taxes that we can begin to appreciate the increased war costs due to taxes. What happens is that the Government pays these sums out of the Treasury as war costs and then they are paid back into the Treasury as taxes.

The above figures do not include millions of dollars paid by these companies for social security, unemployment-insurance taxes, State corporation and real-estate taxes and other taxes which likewise come out of the Federal Treasury in the cost of production but, of course, do not come back into the Federal Treasury.

DEPRECIATION

These 48 corporations charged off during the years 1941 and 1942 $769,049,000 in depreciation.

NET INCOME

The study shows that the net income, after taxes, of these 48 corporations for the year 1941 was $872,378,000 and for 1942 was $705,206,000 or a total of $1,577,584,000 after taxes, for this 2-year period.

So we find that taxes, depreciation, and net earnings for these 48 corporations aggregated a total for 1941 and 1942 of $5,113,192,000.

In view of the fact that there are some 300,000 contracts and subcontracts held by thousands of corporations and business concerns, large and small, we can appreciate that taxes, depreciation, and earnings constitute a tremendous sum in trying to break down the total war-production cost.

INDIVIDUAL EARNINGS OF CORPORATIONS

In studying this table one finds the following information of interest. The net percentage earned after taxes per dollar market value of the stock of the 48 corporations was as follows:

In 1941, 1 earned less than 5 percent; 7 earned from 5 to 10 percent; 18 earned from 10 to 15 percent; 6 earned from 15 to 20 percent; 2 earned from 20 to 25 percent; 5 earned from 25 to 30 percent; 3 earned from 30 to 35 percent; 3 earned from 35 to 40 percent; 3 earned from 40 to 53.21 percent.

In 1942, 4 earned 5 percent or less; 16 earned from 5 to 10 percent; 10 earned from 10 to 15 percent; 6 earned from 15 to 20 percent; 5 earned from 20 to 25 percent; 1 earned from 25 to 30 percent; 1 earned from 30 to 35 percent; 1 earned from 35 to 40 percent; 3 earned from 40 to 53.88 percent; 1, no report for 1942.

This study further shows that in 1941 that of the 48 corporations surveyed, 8 earned less than 10 percent; 24 earned from 10 to 20 percent; 16 earned from 20 to 53.21 percent.

In 1942, 20 earned less than 10 percent; 16 earned from 10 to 20 percent; 11 earned from 20 to 53.88 percent; 1, no report for 1942.

These are nearly all large- or medium-sized corporations whose stock is quoted on the stock market. It gives one a birds-eye picture of the profits taken by this class of corporation.

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED CORPORATIONS

There is another type of corporation which takes excessive profits far in excess of those taken by the 48 corporations named in the table. It is the type of a corporation which has a small, in fact an extremely small, capital stock and paid in surplus but whose principal capital was or is being furnished by the Government either direct or through the Defense Plant Corporation. We find these corporations earning a profit on a large Government capital but distributing that profit to a small group of stockholders who have very little capital invested. Jack & Heintz, Inc., gives a good illustration of this type of corporation. The following is their set-up.

JACK & HEINTZ, INC.

This company was organized in November 1940 with a capital stock structure consisting of 100 shares no-par stock for which four stockholders paid in $5 per share. They also paid in $99,500 in surplus. Thus we have four individual stockholders who have paid in $100,000 in capital and surplus.

The total cost of defense plants, machinery, and equipment furnished by the Defense Plant Corporation as of October 31, 1942, was $7,477,100. Earnings for the calendar year of 1941, before taxes, were $932,024 and after taxes $289,089. Earnings for the year 1942 before taxes were $7,740,829 and after taxes $1,740,829. The earnings before taxes were 7,740 percent of the capital stock and paid-in surplus and after taxes 1,740 percent of the capital stock and paid-in surplus.

Thus in 1942, after setting aside $173,680 for depreciation and obsolescence; after paying the three top officers $116,645 each; after giving a Christmas bonus of $944,300; after paying wages that, according to their statement, averaged an annual rate of $5,172 per employee, as shown in my statement to the House on Tuesday, and after paying $6,000,000 in income and excess-profits taxes, this company showed a total 1942 earning of $1,740,839 on an invested capital and paid-in surplus of $100,000. The total pay roll for 1942 was $8,886,000 while the annual sales for the year were $23,661,000. This company has an exceptionally good production and low-cost record.

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED CORPORATION PLUS MANAGEMENT FEES SPELL EXCESS PROFITS

Another class of corporations are those which, like the preceding case, have an extremely small paid-in capital and paid-in surplus; have practically no property nor capital of their own to start with; whose capital is furnished by the Government through the Defense Plant Corporation or otherwise, but who take not only an excessive profit on their small capital investment but take in addition a management fee which adds to the cost and excess profits. The following is an illustration of a class of corporations which combines these two features, that is, capital furnished by the Government plus management fees paid to the owners of the company through another corporation:

THE HIGH STANDARDS MANUFACTURING CO., INC.

This company was organized in 1926. The amount of capital stock issued and outstanding is 5,000 shares of a par value of $5 per share, or $25,000. Approximately 4,700 shares are owned by one family. The stockholders, in addition, contributed cash capital in the amount of $17,775, and on December 31, 1940, the company had an earned surplus of $22,685. Thus on December 31, 1940, this company had a capital stock, paid in and earned surplus of $65,660, according to the figures furnished me.

The amount of money furnished by the Government, through the Defense Plant Corporation, as of December 31, 1942, was $6,696,628, including $3,473,000 furnished by the British and taken over by the United States under lend-lease. This company had a total sales in 1942 of $50,771,000, with a net profit before renegotiation and before taxes of $30,496,000. The net profit before taxes and before renegotiation was 60 percent of the sales. After refunding $23,775,000 in renegotiation and after paying approximately $4,800,000 in taxes, this company showed a net profit in 1942 of $1,888,918 on a paid-in capital, paid-in surplus, and earned surplus of $65,660 as of December 31, 1940.

The earnings per share of stock after deductions, including taxes and renego-

tiation, was $377.78 in 1942. The amount paid in per share of stock was $5. This is 7,500 percent on the par value of the stock or nearly 3,000 percent of the paid-in capital, earned and paid-in surplus.

The chief officers of the High Standards Manufacturing Co., Inc., are also members and owners of the Dixwell Corporation. The Dixwell Corporation has a contract with the High Standards Manufacturing Co., Inc., by which the former manages and engineers the entire business of the latter under an agreement whereby the High Standards Corporation pays the Dixwell Corporation 6 percent of its gross sales. Under this agreement, the High Standards Manufacturing Co., Inc., in 1942 paid the Dixwell Corporation as management and engineering fees 6 percent on $50,771,000 gross sales, or $3,091,000. In the renegotiation $1,453,000 of the Dixwell Corporation originally indicated 1942 fees of $3,091,000 was disallowed. This company had made an exceptionally fine record in the low-cost production of .50-caliber machine guns.

I want to give another illustration of excess profits which is self-explanatory:

CONTINENTAL MOTORS CORPORATION

This company has 3,000,000 shares of common stock, authorized and issued, par value $1 per share, or $3,000,000. Its total sales for the year 1942 was $139,500,000, of which $98,154,000 were subject to renegotiation and $41,350,000, because of technical reasons, was not subject to renegotiation. This company made a net profit, before taxes and before renegotiation, of $36,690,000, of which $24,426,000 was subject to renegotiation and $12,264,000 was not. Thirty-six million six hundred and ninety thousand dollars is 12 times the par value and 3½ times the market value of the stock as that market value was given on June 16, 1942—$4.06 per share.

In addition to the reduction of prices in the amount of $39,000,000 it refunded in renegotiation in 1942, $13,126,000. The total profit before taxes but after renegotiation was $23,564,000. After paying $13,000,000 in taxes they had left, after renegotiation and taxes, $5,564,000. This is 182 percent of the par value of their stock or 44.8 percent of the market value of their stock as that market value was shown in the New York Times on January 16, 1943.

The above case illustrates how excessive profits are taken in hundreds of cases. Those in charge of renegotiation of war contracts have many similar cases they are working on.

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF WAR DEPARTMENT PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Mr. Maurice Karker, Chairman of the War Department Price Adjustment Board, testified before the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the recent bill—see page 501 of the hearings—that 10 percent of the corporations subject to renegotiation were decidedly not cooperative and that 90 percent were willing to face the facts of the statute and the facts of profit realization. He stated that the 10 percent will go to any length to avoid exposure of the facts:

> One-third of the businesses that have been renegotiated up to now have not made excessive profits in 1942. Probably one-half of the remaining 67 percent are loud in their opposition, and in their effort to avoid coming to grips with the problem.

Mr. Karker gives the profits on a certain machine tool company—page 503 of the hearings—and I quote:

> In the days before the war their sales were $7,500,000 and their profits, before payment of taxes, were about $1,850,000. This represents a profit of about 25 percent before the payment of taxes. * * * In 1942 they did a $50,000,000 business. Thirty million dollars' worth of that business was not renegotiable because it was largely with the Defense Plant Corporation, which you have not included in the statute. Twenty million dollars of the business was renegotiable because it was business with departments which are covered by the statute. On the $30,000,000 volume of business, which was not renegotiable, their margin of profit increased from 25 percent in the base years to 38 percent in 1942. On the $20,000,000 worth of business over which we now have jurisdiction they made as much profit as they did on the nonrenegotiable portion—38 percent. On the $50,000,000 worth of total 1942 business they made a profit of 38 percent—38 cents out of every dollar—and it is their contention that that profit is not excessive.

RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT CASES

While the War Department cooperated in every way, and while those in charge of renegotiation were eager to help me all they could, they were naturally reluctant in giving out facts regarding individual cases. I did not insist upon this information except in cases where I already had the information and where I wanted to verify the facts. In order to avoid any possibility of embarrassment, and at the request of the War Department, I am not giving the names of these companies but use a case designation. Seven of the companies discussed here have, as a result of renegotiation, repaid to the Government $257,560,000 and have made price reductions representing an additional savings to the Government of a substantially larger sum.

In this connection, I desire to point out that the renegotiation statute was developed and had its origin in the War Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], concerned as we all were with the problem of controlling excessive profits while we speeded up the war program, originally proposed "renegotiation" as a law and offered the amendment that initiated the statute.

It was during the hearings which the subcommittee conducted on the items for the War Department in the sixth supplemental defense bill in March last year. The problem, as seen by the gentleman from South Dakota, was to find some device that would permit the expeditious letting of contracts and yet preserve for the Government the right to review costs and eliminate excessive profits.

He has stated that the need for the legislation was brought to his attention by a decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Bethlehem Shipbuilding case, handed down in February of 1942, a case growing out of World War No. 1, in which the Court held that after papers of final settlement had been issued, the Government could not recover any part of the price paid regardless of how unconscionable the profits that had been made, except, of course, such as might have been recovered through taxation.

So the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] proposed language that would require an agreement for a renegotiation before final settlement and payment on a war contract. He submitted the idea to two witnesses who appeared before us on that bill, Major General Reybold, chief of engineers, in charge of construction, and Colonel Kutz, who appeared in behalf of the Ordnance items in the bill. Both expressed interest in the proposal. The committee decided, however, that the matter should not be reported in the bill but be presented by its author when the bill went to the floor of the House since the amendment was legislative in character.

The sixth supplemental bill went to the floor and was passed by the House on a Saturday afternoon, March 28, 1942. Time had been fixed and debate was limited before the point in the bill was reached where the amendment would come. Consequently the author's explanation of his amendment was brief and came so far ahead of the offering of the amendment that later the newspapers said it was accepted without debate.

In the form first offered, the amendment provided that no part of the funds appropriated in the bill could be used to pay that portion of a contract price known as final payment or final settlement to a contractor who had failed to file "a renegotiation agreement" satisfactory to the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy, as the case might be.

A point of order was made that the language constituted legislation by imposing additional duties on a Government official, the Secretary concerned. The gentleman from South Dakota had anticipated that so he had prepared an alternative form which he immediately offered. This barred use of the funds to make final settlement payments to contractors who failed to file an agreement to renegotiate profits in excess of 6 percent. Curbing of war profits was in the air at the time, due to exposures by the Naval Affairs Committee. The amendment was adopted on a division vote, 70 to 8, and went to the Senate.

The next day the papers headlined the 6-percent curb on war profits and few of them caught the new word "renegotiation" which had been introduced into legislation dealing with excessive war

profits. The author of the amendment explained its purpose to the Senate committee that considered the bill, and stated that he recognized the 6-percent clause was difficult of application, but that he had to put in a rigid formula to avoid a point of order. The Senate committee understood, asked the War Department to draft the details to make renegotiation a part of all contracts. The expanded amendment became section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental Defense Act of 1942, approved April 28, 1942, placing contracts of the War Department, Navy Department, and Maritime Commission under its provisions.

In October contracts placed by the Treasury Department were added and a few other amendments were made, based upon experience in the workings of the act, and renegotiation of war contracts became section 801 of the Revenue Act of 1942, approved October 21, 1942.

The other day when the House passed the Army appropriation bill for fiscal 1944, the gentleman from South Dakota offered a further amendment to the act, bringing war contracts placed by such agencies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as Defense Plant and Defense Supplies, under the renegotiation statute. That addition grew out of testimony developed in our hearings, such as that I have already mentioned. It was accepted by the House and subsequently agreed to in conference with the Senate.

I have taken the time to give this history of the renegotiation statute because it occupies such a large place in our current efforts to control and prevent excessive war profits, and because its modest beginnings have tended to obscure its far-reaching importance. We all agree that the renegotiation procedure has some difficulties, but it has permitted the placing of contracts to go ahead full speed and yet preserve for the Government and for the people a check on excessive profits. Let us see how it has worked.

FIFTY-FOUR COMPANIES I STUDIED EITHER HAVE BEEN OR WILL BE RENEGOTIATED

Out of the 54 companies of which I made a study, including the 48 contained in exhibit A, 31 companies have been renegotiated while 23 are assigned for renegotiation but not yet completed.

I have commented specifically on three of these companies by name. I now wish to give the facts on five more companies who have been renegotiated but whose names I have been requested by the War Department not to publish.

CASE C

This company had sales of $48,000,000 and their profit before taxes and before renegotiations was over $18,000,000, or 37½ percent of their gross sales. This profit, before taxes and before renegotiation, was approximately 100 percent of the capital stock and earned surplus. After refunding more than $6,500,000 on renegotiation and paying nearly $8,500,000 in taxes, this company had left a net profit of $3,200,000, or nearly 16 percent of the invested capital and earned surplus.

CASE D

This company had sales of approximately $450,000,000, and their profit before taxes and before renegotiation was $125,000,000, or 28 percent of the gross sales. After refunding $65,000,000 in renegotiation and paying $45,000,000 in taxes, this company had $13,600,000 left on an invested capital and earned surplus of approximately $37,000,000. This company increased its surplus more than $8,000,000 from 1940 to 1942.

CASE E

This company had sales of approximately $127,000,000. Their profit before taxes and renegotiation was $35,000,000 or approximately 27½ percent of the gross sales. In addition, approximately $10,000,000 was earned on cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts making the total profit $45,000,000. After refunding $14,000,000 in renegotiation and paying $24,000,000 in taxes, this company had left approximately $7,000,000 profit, or approximately 37 percent of the invested capital and earned surplus of approximately $20,000,000.

CASE F

This company had sales of approximately $370,000,000 with a profit before refund and before taxes of $120,000,000, or 32 percent of the gross sales. The gross profit was 20 percent larger than the invested capital and earned surplus. After refunding over $93,000,000 in renegotiation and after paying over $20,000,000 in taxes, the company had left over $7,500,000. This company increased its surplus more than $15,000,000 from 1940 to 1942.

CASE G

This company had sales of approximately $65,000,000 with a profit before renegotiation and before taxes of over $18,000,000, or 28 percent of the gross sales, on an invested capital and earned surplus of $26,000,000. After refunding $9,500,000 in renegotiation and after paying $6,500,000 in taxes, this company showed a profit of approximately $3,000,000.

AMOUNT RECOVERED BY RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

Mr. Karker, Chairman of the War Department Price Adjustment Board, testified before our committee that renegotiations conducted by the War Department in the period between April 28, 1942, and May 1, 1943 have resulted in the elimination of excess profits in an estimated amount of $1,866,000,000. Of this amount $698,000,000 represents recovery of excess profits realized and $1,168,000,000 represents price reductions for future deliveries on existing contracts.

He further said that this does not, however, measure the full effect of this law. In the renegotiation of these contracts, we are able to determine what the prices of new contracts should be and learn which prices are excessive and the savings on new contracts let will exceed the amount of refunds and reductions on existing contracts.

This, of course, does not take into consideration Navy and other contracts which are being renegotiated.

No one can study the individual cases such as I have given in illustrations above without coming to the conclusion that while some of the excess profits would have been recovered by taxation, a great deal of such profits will not be recovered unless these contracts are renegotiated and refunds made.

CONCLUSION

In concluding my remarks, I want to issue a word of warning. The fact that a corporation finds itself with excess profits does not necessarily mean that that corporation has been guilty of wrongdoing. Corporations, like individuals in making contracts for war supplies, protect themselves by insisting that the unit price be large enough to protect them from loss. This is particularly true when a corporation is making an article which they have never made before. Let me give you an illustration.

In going through one of the large plants I found that the original contract for a definite number of shells contained a unit price of $16.80 per shell. Against this unit price had to be charged the tools and dies to make a shell, the cost of educating labor, change-over in factory, and so forth, as this company was operating on its own capital. The company took successive contracts to make the same shell, each contract being voluntarily lowered until the last contract price was $6.70 to make the same shell which was made through the original contract for $16.80. Charging off of equipment, education of labor, and so forth, enabled them to make this reduction which they did voluntarily. Some companies, however, would have offered to make these shells at $8.40 per shell instead of $16.80. The public would have thought that they had obtained a very good price when, as a matter of fact, the company would have been making excessive profits despite the fact that they had reduced the cost of the shell 50 percent. I am merely using this as an illustration. Many companies find themselves with excessive profits on their hands which they are willing, as Mr. Karker testified, to refund. Others do so reluctantly, while others oppose renegotiation violently.

May I repeat again that regardless as to how efficient a company may be, how good they are at production, they have no right to make excess war profits when those profits are paid for by taxpayers whose tax exemptions have been lowered as low as $500, by bond buyers who are investing their hard-earned money in low-interest bonds.

Not one has a right to make excess profits when the public debt incurred to pay those excess profits must be paid by returning servicemen and others after the war out of any income they may earn.

EXHIBIT A

Figures show amounts allotted for taxes, depreciation, net income, earnings per share of common stock, market value per share of common stock, and percentage of earnings per $1 of market value of stock for selected corporations receiving contracts for ordnance from the United States Government for 1941 and 1942

[Unless otherwise indicated, figures are for calendar year. Market values were taken from the stock market report of the New York Times]

Corporation	Taxes (thousands)	Depreciation (thousands)	Net income [1] (thousands)	Earnings per share of common stock [1]	Market value per share of common stock	Earnings per $1 of market value (percent)
E. I. du Pont de Nemours Corporation, Wilmington, Del.:						
1941	$103,190	$26,441	$90,401	$7.44	$134.50	5.53
1942	99,800	32,141	63,941	5.07	136.00	3.72
Colorado Fuel & Iron Corporation, Pueblo, Colo.:						
1941	2,982	1,339	2,580	[2] 4.53	16.50	27.45
1942	729	1,729	787	[2] 1.40	15.0625	9.28
Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y.:						
1941	28,230	8,709	21,588	8.57	137.25	6.24
1942	39,130	10,915	21,184	8.41	149.50	5.62
Chrysler Corporation, Detroit, Mich.:						
1941	28,700	25,126	40,114	9.22	48.375	19.05
1942	35,418	27,423	15,529	3.57	69.875	5.10
Continental Motors Corporation, Muskegon, Mich.:						
1941	3,250	285	3,232	1.08	3.625	29.79
1942	18,000	694	5,473	1.82	4.0625	44.8
Crucible Steel Co. of America, Harrison, N. J.:						
1941	15,022	2,620	7,439	12.96	34.25	37.83
1942	34,257	4,791	4,865	7.26	34.00	21.35
Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill.:						
1941	9,192	3,541	7,784	4.14	39.50	10.48
1942 (12 months ending Feb. 1, 1943)			7,130	3.79	41.25	9.187
American Brake Shoe & Foundry, Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	3,300	1,823	3,195	3.56	33.00	10.78
1942	6,967	2,227	2,991	3.22	30.50	10.557
American Car & Foundry Co., New York, N. Y.:						
1941 [4]	2,194	2,955	8,161	5.23	31.75	16.47
1942 [4]	38,507	5,134	9,275	[5] 12.09	26.50	45.62
Bendix Aviation Corporation, Bendix, N. J.:						
1941	23,445	1,428	18,267	6.30	38.25	16.47
1942	45,666	2,033	12,464	5.90	35.00	16.857
American Can Co., New York, N. Y.:						
1941	18,700	7,523	18,846	6.45	63.75	10.11
1942	12,575	7,545	12,867	4.03	75.50	5.337
American Locomotive Co., Schenectady, N. Y.:						
1941	4,090	1,390	5,629	4.12	9.625	42.80
1942	23,600	2,775	5,052	3.37	8.50	39.64
Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.:						
1941	3,969	2,140	4,241	2.86	26.25	10.89
1942	2,223	1,927	2,964	1.95	32.50	6.00
Baldwin Locomotive Works, Eddystone, Pa.:						
1941	8,296	1,855	3,975	3.71	14.00	2.65
1942	13,683	1,407	4,516	2.94	12.225	24.04
Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Bethlehem, Pa.:						
1941	108,961	24,105	34,457	9.35	64.75	14.44
1942	184,704	22,768	25,388	6.32	113.50	5.568
Hercules Powder Co., Wilmington, Del.:						
1941	14,163	5,566	6,099	4.23	71.50	5.91
1942	20,513	4,847	5,547	3.81	74.75	5.096
International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	17,421	7,259	30,635	5.87	48.50	12.10
1942	20,878	7,314	26,747	4.95	164.00	3.018
General Motors Corporation, Detroit, Mich.:						
1941	257,619	53,161	201,653	4.45	33.00	13.48
1942	134,501	59,163	163,652	3.55	45.00	7.88
General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.:						
1941	120,000	20,955	57,197	1.99	28.25	7.04
1942	193,000	23,119	45,081	1.56	32.275	4.833
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio:						
1941 [6]	14,262	8,711	11,262	4.37	14.375	30.4
1942 [6]	19,162	10,307	12,481	5.04	26.225	19.21
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.:						
1941	22,142	19,885	15,500	10.23	24.00	18.20
1942	31,900	22,361	10,142	4.60	20.875	22.03
Otis Elevator Co., Yonkers, N. Y.:						
1941	1,663		2,590	1.10	12.50	8.8
1942	6,295		2,573	1.09	17.50	6.22
National Cash Register Co., Dayton, Ohio:						
1941	1,653	1,209	3,257	2.00	12.50	16.00
1942	6,950	1,593	3,137	1.93	19.625	9.834
Pressed Steel Car Co., Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	364	351	813	1.09	7.75	14.06
1942	5,800	384	1,729	2.18	7.225	30.17
Pullman, Inc., Hammond, Ind.:						
1941	5,168	12,831	10,919	3.31	25.25	13.10
1942	32,117	12,963	10,361	3.14	27.875	11.26
Servel Inc., Evansville, Ind.:						
1941 [6]	1,291	410	2,737	1.54	5.75	26.78
1942 [6]	205	459	1,053	.61	10.875	5.6
Savage Arms Corporation, Utica, N. Y.:						
1941	11,655	294	3,427	5.11	18.625	27.43
1942	12,388	461	1,642	2.45	10.0625	24.34
The Sperry Corporation, Brooklyn, N. Y.:						
1941	19,400		8,282	4.11	30.125	13.64
1942	23,242		5,778	1.79	27.06	6.6
Philco Corporation, Philadelphia, Pa.:						
1941	5,823	1,643	2,514	1.83	10.25	17.85
1942	6,400	1,753	2,210	1.61	15.00	10.73
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Springfield, Mass.:						
1941	40,571	7,519	23,118	7.21	80.00	9.01
1942	49,602	9,943	17,367	5.42	82.225	6.59

[1] After taxes. [2] June 30. [3] Dec. 31. [4] Fiscal years ending Apr. 30. [5] Feb. 26, 1943. [6] Fiscal year ending Oct. 31.

Figures show amounts allotted for taxes, depreciation, net income, earnings per share of common stock, market value per share of common stock, and percentage of earnings per $1 of market value of stock for selected corporations receiving contracts for ordnance from the U. S. Government for 1941 and 1942—Continued

Corporation	Taxes (thousands)	Depreciation (thousands)	Net income (thousands)	Earnings per share of common stock	Market value per share of common stock	Earnings per $1 of market value (percent)
United States Steel Corporation (including Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co.), New York, N. Y.:						
1941	$191,502	$86,756	$149,090	$10.45	$54.125	19.30
1942	228,001	91,765	107,406	5.35	50.50	10.59
Link-Belt Co., Indianapolis, Ind.:						
1941	4,741	510	2,913	3.95	33.00	11.36
1942	10,222	923	3,479	4.64	35.50	13.07
Mesta Machine Co., West Homestead, Pa.:						
1941	3,665	399	3,608	3.61	29.00	12.44
1942	6,354	429	3,626	3.63	27.50	13.2
Diamond T Motor Car Co., Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	2,727	136	1,365	3.24	9.00	36.00
1942	7,685	266	2,044	4.85	9.00	53.88
Borg-Warner Corporation (including Norge Products and Norge Refrigerator), Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	15,464	1,752	7,475	3.20	22.375	14.30
1942	18,204	2,516	7,216	3.09	28.00	11.0
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., La Porte, Ind.:						
1941	8,600	1,343	5,744	3.23	29.75	10.91
1942	21,400	1,619	5,924	3.34	27.875	11.98
Briggs & Stratton Corporation, Milwaukee, Wis.:						
1941	1,500	97	1,155	3.89	27.50	14.14
1942	5,370	108	1,784	6.00	33.50	17.91
American Type Founders, Inc., Elizabeth, N. J.:						
1941 [1]	84	241	301	.53	4.875	10.87
1942 [1]	395	246	810	1.43	7.225	19.79
Crown Cork & Seal Co., Baltimore, Md.:						
1941	2,089	1,592	2,930	4.68	18.00	26.00
1942	2,742	1,695	1,459	1.84	19.00	9.68
General Steel Castings Corporation, Eddystone, Pa.:						
1941	4,750	1,207	3,266	5.84	76.875	7.59
1942	8,492	1,220	2,003	3.07	67.50	4.56
Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulatory Co., Minneapolis, Minn.:						
1941	4,302	583	2,737	4.20	37.25	11.27
1942	14,833	624	2,868	4.29	59.50	7.21
Mullins Manufacturing Corporation, Warren, Ohio: 9 months ending Sept. 30	1,095	379	692	0.99	2.75	36.00
National Supply Co., Ambridge, Pa.:						
1941	5,584	1,966	6,082	3.06	5.75	53.21
1942	10,396	2,129	4,108	1.66	6.25	26.56
Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	13,100	1,952	4,067	2.64	5.875	44.54
1942	12,114	1,804	1,749	0.86	6.875	12.52
Stewart-Warner Corporation, Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	4,586	1,388	1,657	1.30	5.75	22.60
1942	19,400	2,683	1,590	1.25	7.0625	17.69
United Engineering & Foundry Co., New York City:						
1941	4,308	320	3,309	3.96	31.50	12.57
1942	8,963	562	3,105	3.71	27.00	13.74
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	1,350	303	2,027	4.28	13.25	32.30
1942	1,018	----------	1,592	3.28	14.00	23.42
Republic Steel Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.:						
1941	46,250	13,350	24,038	3.87	18.25	21.20
1942	69,250	16,557	17,155	2.67	15.275	17.47
Total	2,766,599	769,049	1,577,584	----------	----------	----------

[1] Fiscal year ending Mar. 31.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the attitude and statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee regarding the motion which I made to recede and concur in the Senate amendments I desire to withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina withdraws his motion.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 161: Page 87, line 11, insert "Gaseous and solid fuel reduction of iron ores (national defense): For necessary expenses without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, for pilot-scale tests on the gaseous and solid-fuel reduction of iron ores, including laboratory research and maintenance and operation of pilot plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores; purchase or lease of land or buildings; construction and equipment of buildings; engagement by contract or otherwise, at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of engineers, architects, or firms, or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the buildings and pilot plants; supplies and equipment; travel expenses; not to exceed $9,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $200 for printing and binding, books of reference and periodicals; purchase not to exceed $2,775 (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; special wearing apparel and equipment for the protection of employees while employed; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior", $400,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources for the purposes hereof, and to carry out projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161 and concur in the same.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the next two amendments may be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma that amendments numbered 162 and 163 be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 162: Strike out "$20,000" and insert "$40,000."

Amendment No. 163: Strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,900,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments 162 and 163.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I am very reluctant to take the time of the House at this late hour on this matter but I should like to direct the attention of the conferees particularly to what is involved in the amendment adopted by the Senate. This is one case in which the subcommittee did not grant the estimate of the Budget nor of the Bureau of Mines. The Budget estimate, as I understand it, called for $1,000,000 for work in the manganese experimental plants of the Bureau of Mines. The House committee allowed $900,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. The Senate raised that to $1,900,000; in other words raised it by $1,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That also is correct.

Mr. CASE. I understand that the major part of the raise was for operation of the plant of the Bureau of Mines at Chamberlain, S. Dak., and was made upon the recommendation of the Bureau. I recognize that with the lateness of the hour what I might say here is not going to be heard very patiently; so, I am not going to resist the motion that has been made but shall prepare a memorandum on this matter for each of the conferees, ask their careful consideration of it, and ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point with that memorandum.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MEMORANDUM ON MANGANESE ITEM

Please keep these facts in mind:

1. Manganese is essential to the making of steel, and is our No. 1 problem in tonnage of wartime imports.

2. The Chamberlain deposit is the largest in the United States, large enough to supply all our demands for hundreds of years to come, if developed.

3. The Bureau of Mines already has a plant there with months of experimentation behind it.

4. That plant will be idle, the proving of large scale production possibilities will stop, unless funds are provided to go ahead.

5. The Bureau recommends going ahead.

The importance of manganese is known to everyone. Every ton of steel requires 14 pounds of it. We have passed all kinds of legislation and taken expensive steps to insure a supply—from abroad. I distinctly remember one bill that authorized $200,000,000 for cargo ships and the principal argument for them was to haul manganese. Ships that took critical material, men, and time. Ships that could be sunk.

The enormous size of the manganese deposit in the bluffs of the Missouri River in the vicinity of Chamberlain is recognized by all authorities. Dr. Dean, assistant director of the Bureau of Mines, at page 721 of the hearings before your subcommittee this year, said:

"In Chamberlain, S. Dak., we have a manganese deposit of such enormous extent that it would supply manganese for an unlimited number of years, but it is a very low-grade deposits."

And at page 779 he said:

"It is very important that we have in a completely worked out and proper shape the processes by which we can use such large deposits as those in Chamberlain, S. Dak., and a large deposit at Artillery Peak, Calif., Batesville, Ark., and so on."

The Bureau of Mines and the Metals Reserve Company have been exploring the field and experimenting in the field for two seasons. Two proposals for operation in the field have been considered—and were under consideration at the time the Budget estimates were prepared. Neither was far enough along for a decision to be reached at that time. Otherwise, I believe, there would have been a Budget estimate for what is now proposed. From a memorandum by Dr. Sayers, director of the Bureau, under date of June 5, I quote:

"An estimate has been made that a commercial plant capable of treating 20,000 tons of shale per day to produce 175 tons of 61-percent manganese sinter and 200 tons of pig iron on a daily basis might produce the manganese sinter for about $40 per ton. The complete plant of this size would cost from eight and one-half to nine million dollars."

And then he says:

"Before risking an expenditure of this size, it would appear that the next logical step would be the construction and operation of semicommercial plants on a scale that would recover 50 tons of nodules per day from some 1,300 wet long tons of shale and produce about 12 tons of sinter assaying 61 percent manganese, an operation about one-fifteenth that indicated above."

And this is Dr. Sayers' estimate of the cost:

"The cost of construction, equipment, and 12 months' operation using the Bureau of Mines' equipment now stored at Chamberlain as a nucleus, would approximate $900,000. A credit of about $200,000 might be derived from sale of products. If this be deducted, a net of $700,000 would result."

It should be noted, however, that a paragraph in the bill would put proceeds from Bureau sales in the general fund of the Treasury, so that while the net cost might be only $700,000, the full amount of $900,000 should be provided here. If the conferees think it wise to reduce the item, however, the project could be divided, as indicated in this final sentence of Dr. Sayers' letter:

"A sum of $625,000 should be reserved for the mining, milling, calcining, and matte smelting operations in South Dakota, and $275,000 would be needed at some point where suitable power and other requirements for the matte refining step are available."

At the matte smelting stage we would have a manganese product for which there is a definite demand and what could be done with it is known to everyone in the steel industry. To carry forward this work at Chamberlain to that point is the very least that should be done.

Remember—

1. This deposit alone can supply all our needs when the process proposed is demonstrated on this semicommercial scale.

2. Two years of specific research and an experimental plant representing several hundred thousand dollars will be put on the shelf if funds for continued operation are not provided.

3. The reason why a Budget request was not made on this item is that at the time Budget requests were being prepared, an $8,000,000 project was under consideration and only lately has it been determined that it would be better to proceed on the smaller scale here proposed.

Knowing that the conferees on the Interior bill believe in the proving and developing of our own resources, and believing that they will see the possibility of eventual enormous savings and contribution to our war effort through continuation of this project, I leave the matter in their hands with confidence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendments 162 and 163.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 169: Page 91, line 21, insert:

"Magnesium pilot plants and research (national defense): For all necessary expenses, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, for the conduct of investigations and development of methods for the recovery of magnesium from domestic raw materials, including naturally occurring brines, salt deposits, dolomite, magnesite, and brucite, by hydrometallurgy, direct reduction, and electrolytic methods, including laboratory research; maintenance and operation of pilot plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores for metallurgical tests; purchase or lease of land; construction and equipment of buildings to house pilot plants, including employment by contract or otherwise at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the buildings and pilot plants; supplies and equipment; travel expenses; not to exceed $8,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $750 for printing and binding; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior"; books of reference and periodicals; special wearing apparel and equipment for protection of employees while employed; and the operation, maintenance, and repair of three passenger-carrying automobiles; $525,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources for the purposes hereof, and to operate said plants in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State or private."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 24 of said amendment strike out "$525,000" and insert "$225,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 172: Page 93, line 23, insert: "Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo. (national defense): For all expenses necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, to construct, operate, and maintain, independently or in cooperation with public or private agencies, a drainage tunnel, including lateral tunnels, to drain mining land in the Leadville, Colo., mining district, including the acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or donation of lands rights-of-way, or other interests in lands, or other property; the engagement by contract or otherwise at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of individuals, firms, or corporations, necessary to design and construct the tunnel; purchase, not to

exceed $2,700, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, which may be used for transporting employees from their homes to temporary locations of employment; purchase of special wearing apparel or equipment for the protection of emloyees while engaged in their work; not to exceed $13,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; and other items of expenditure otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation 'Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior'; $1,500,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 172 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 21 of said amendment, strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,400,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of this body may know the purpose of this appropriation of funds for this tunnel to unwater mines at Leadville, Colo., I wish to make a brief statement.

In March of this year, the Director of the Zinc Division of the War Production Board met with the two Colorado Senators and me to discuss the problem of making available more zinc for war purposes.

It seems that our zinc smelting facilities are adequate to take care of military and essential civilian requirements, but to keep these smelters operating to capacity, it now is necessary to import two-fifths of our total zinc concentrates. In 1944, about one-half of our requirements would have to be met by imports. The zinc ore reserves upon which this country has been depending are very low and in many districts are running out at the present rate of use. New supplies must be found therefore, that will start producing within the space of a year and a half.

The Leadville district, in the past, was one of the best producers of lead and zinc in the United States. Operations were stopped there in 1930, because of the cost of pumping excessive water and the low prices for metals. This tunnel will drain out the water and make accessible potential ore resources that remain to be mined.

From 1860 to 1935—according to U. S. Bureau of Mines statistical reports—there have been mined over 20,000,000 tons of ore including the following amounts of the strategic ores:

Zinc, 694,160 tons, valued at $94,900,871.

Lead, 1,011,505 tons, valued at $92,001,866.

Copper, 48,967 tons, valued at $14,560,187.

Manganese, 936,024 tons, valued at $4,103,952.

Since the Leadville area is so highly mineralized, it is estimated that the drainage afforded by the tunnel will open up 720,000 tons of recoverable zinc ore, which runs 16-percent zinc. At the present time, a very large part of our zinc comes from Canada, Australia, Mexico, South America, and Africa, and therefore, the opening up of domestic mines will help to relieve the shipping problem and remove our dependence upon the dwindling supplies of these countries.

The project has been carefully gone over by the Board of Economic Warfare, the Mining Division of the War Production Board, and by the Bureau of Mines.

The tunnel is to be 2½ miles long with laterals of a total of a little over a mile in length branching from the main shaft. The tunnel will be drilled through solid rock which will make the cost of upkeep very small.

An attempt to get Reconstruction Finance funds was made, but this method of financing would not be possible in sufficient time for the mines to get into production and be of any help in our war effort. Titles are held by hundreds of persons, and there are many conflicting and contested claims. The R. F. C. would not make a loan until a great amount of work clearing such titles had been done, and the legal proceedings necessary would take many months. Any such difficulty is removed by making a direct appropriation, which is the only feasible way of getting this vital metal into the factories.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the pending motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 173: Page 96, line 4, insert "The Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated from funds appropriated to the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Tresaury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 173 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, after the word "authorize", add the following: ", during the fiscal year 1944."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 174: Page 96, line 10, strike out "$8,640,225" and insert "$18,742,600."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment. This is the total for the Bureau of Mines.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 184: Page 106, line 9, strike out "$90,000" and insert "$115,000, including not to exceed $11,300 for the purchase of the land, buildings, and other privately owned property at the United States Rabbit Experiment Station at Fontana, Calif."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 184.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 190: Page 109, line 1, strike out "$4,147,350" and insert "$4,873,205."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 190, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$4,456,390."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 192: Page 109, line 18, strike out "$4,897,350" and insert "$6,123,205."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 192, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$5,456,390."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 194: Page 110, line 7, after the word "outfits" insert "plans and specifications for vessels, or for contract personal services for the preparation thereof."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 200: Page 118, line 17, insert the following: "SEC. 9. 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. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 201: Page 119, line 1, strike out "8" and insert "10."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions in connection with the conference report was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments which are still in disagreement and request a conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Messrs. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, FITZPATRICK, KIRWAN, NORRELL, CARTER, JONES, and JENSEN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY was granted leave of absence, for 1 day, on account of attending a funeral.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written to Mr. Davies from the Oil Controller of Canada regarding oil and gasoline rationing there. They have a very much better system than we have.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some speeches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a cablegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] be permitted to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2349. An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 3026. An act relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; and

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1109. An act 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, July 3, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m., Saturday, July 3, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect naval petroleum reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

532. A letter from the Chairman, United State Tariff Commission, transmitting a copy of the estimates of and justification for personnel requirements of the Tariff Commission for the fiscal quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

533. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 163 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, pursuant to the provisions of section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended by the acts of June 28, 1940, and December 8, 1942, and referring to his letter to the Congress dated January 7, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 541), reporting similar cases; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1242. An act to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination; without amendment (Rept. No. 642). 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. 2801. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; with amendment (Rept. No. 644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 378. An act to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument; without amendment (Rept. No. 645). 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. GILLIE:

H. R. 3103. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Maumee River and tributaries, Indiana and Ohio, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3104. A bill to further amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3105. A bill providing for rebates of motor vehicle use stamp tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia:

H. R. 3106. A bill to restore former basis of compensation and allowances of postmasters and postal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 3107. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3108. A bill to continue the pay of all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 1 year after the termination of the present conflict; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3109. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 3110. A bill to provide for the return of unabsorbed premiums for war damage insurance, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEE:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution authorizing the making without avoidable delay of agreements between the United States and the several United Nations to secure and maintain law, order, and peace among the nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. Res. 284. Resolution authorizing the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Res. 285. Resolution to authorize the appropriation of $5,000 for the investigation to be undertaken under the provisions of House Resolution 262; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DIES:

H. Res. 286. Resolution to establish an inter-Government committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Res. 287. Resolution establishing a select committee to investigate the causes of and forces behind the recent race riots; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3111. A bill for the relief of William D. Ellison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3112. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Werner A. S. Ohls, of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3113. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Gust Haller, of Palmer, Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 3114. A bill for the relief of Ruth Coe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 3115. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Julia Hinton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3116. A bill for the relief of Emmett Shaw; 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:

1837. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Anna Craik, Thief River Falls, Minn., and 25 other signers from that community, urging enactment of House bill 2082, providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war, in order to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1838. By Mr. KENNEDY: Petition of the Sons of the Revolution concerning the use of our flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1839. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Murry Leach, vice president and general manager of Loose-Wiles Biscuit Co., Dallas, Tex., opposing House bill 2100; to the Committee on Patents.

1840. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of the students at Michigan State Normal College and friends or members of the Alpha Chapter of the International Council for Exceptional Children, asking for the enactment of House bill 496; to the Committee on Education.

1841. By Mr. LANE: Resolution of Mayor W. A. Bennett and City Council of Worcester, Mass., concerning a more equitable distribution of gasoline and fuel oil; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1842. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by H. J. Hart, of Tillamook, Oreg., and 34 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JULY 3, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

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

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

God of our fathers, to whose kingdom of justice and love the future belongs, it is Thy might which hath made and preserved us a nation. Standing this day on the threshold of an immortal date which has engraved itself forever on the fast-hurrying years and whose scarlet threads are woven into the grateful memory of every true patriot of the Republic, we lift our joyful praise for the American dream—the dream of a land where the people rule, of a state which is the instrument of the common good, of a union which finds room for the richness of diversity.

In this solemn hour of the supreme test of America's faith, when determined foes deny, defy, and would defile the very conceptions and aspirations which to us, nurtured in liberty, make life precious and sacred, may this Nation under God have a new birth of freedom. If the way to victory is long and difficult and at crimson cost, still keep our wills steadfast and our faith strong as was the faith of our fathers when they built this Nation of our love and prayer. May our flag, born in the tragedy of strife, be an inspiring symbol to all the world that out of today's death and night shall rise the dawn of an ampler life for all mankind. May we bear our full part in freedom's crowning hour that we may tell our sons and daughters who will live in the light of the new day, "I saw the power of darkness put to flight. I saw the morning break!" We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the calendar day Friday, July 2, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MEETING OF EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION AT OTTAWA, CANADA

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate who were appointed under authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, adopted by the Senate on June 18, 1943, excepting one Member who was unable to leave Washington because of his official duties here, attended the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association, Dominion of Canada Branch, during the period June 26 to June 30, as guests of that association. All of the Members of the House of Representatives who were appointed under this resolution, which was adopted by the House of Representatives on June 22, also attended that meeting.

Delegations from the United Kingdom Parliament and from the legislative bodies of Australia, New Zealand, and Bermuda also participated.

The subject of study and informal discussion was the qualification and capacity of democracies to win the war and to attain peace that will prevail throughout the world.

The discussions were marked by eagerness for information, candor of expression, and friendly understanding.

No obligations were sought or undertaken, but consequences of high value in mutual understanding were realized.

The hospitality for which Canadians are famous was greatly appreciated by all their guests.

The Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honorable W. L. Mackenzie King, in the House of Commons debates of Tuesday, June 29, 1943—volume LXXXI, No. 99, page 4217—referred to that conference.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of that House of Commons Record, pages 4217 and 4218, containing the remarks of the Prime Minister of Canada and those of the leader of the opposition, Mr. Gordon Graydon, as well as those of the member from Rosetown-Biggar, Mr. M. J. Coldwell, who, by the way, called on us afterward here in Washington, and the member from Lethbridge, Mr. J. H. Blackmore.

I concur in the opinion of the Prime Minister of Canada that "the resolution itself will in time become an historic document," and I believe that this first meeting of Members of the Congress of the United States with members of the Empire Parliamentary Association is the beginning of a relationship among those bodies—which are closest to the people of the democracies—having endless possibilities of understanding and achievement.

On our return to Washington the Congress was honored by a visit from the following members of the Empire Parliamentary Association on June 30 and July 1:

The Right Honorable Viscount Stansgate, P. C., D. S. O., D. F. C., leader of United Kingdom delegation—William Wedgwood Benn; Sir John Wardlaw-Milne, K. B. E., M. P., deputy leader of the United Kingdom delegation; the Right Honorable Sir Percy Harris, Bt., M. P.; Sir Howard d'Egville, K. B. E., LL. D., editor of the publications of the Empire Parliamentary Association and secretary of the United Kingdom branch of the association, representing the United Kingdom.

The Honorable Thomas Vien, K. C., Speaker of the Senate of Canada; Mr. John G. Diefenbaker, K. C., M. P.; Mr. M. J. Coldwell, M. P.; Mr. Lionel Chevier, K. C., M. P.; all of the Dominion of Canada branch.

David Oliver Watkins, M. P., leader of the Australian delegation.

Leonard George Lowry, M. P., leader of the New Zealand delegation.